



NICHOLAS GRENE

BERNARD SHAW

A CRITICAL VIEW



MACMILLAN STUDIES IN ANGLO-IRISH LITERATURE

BERNARD SHAW

A Critical View

Nicholas Grene

M  
MACMILLAN

© Nicholas Grene 1984

All rights reserved. No part of this publication  
may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form  
or by any means, without permission

First published 1984 by  
**THE MACMILLAN PRESS LTD**  
London and Basingstoke  
Companies and representatives  
throughout the world

Printed in Hong Kong

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Grene, Nicholas  
Bernard Shaw.—(Macmillan studies in Anglo-Irish  
literature)

1. Shaw, Bernard

I. Title

822'.912 PR5367

ISBN 0-333-33424-8

MACMILLAN STUDIES IN ANGLO-IRISH LITERATURE

Nicholas Grene

BERNARD SHAW: A CRITICAL VIEW

John O'Riordan

A GUIDE TO O'CASEY'S PLAYS

*Further titles in preparation*

---

*Also by Nicholas Grene*

SYNGE: A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE PLAYS

SHAKESPEARE, JONSON, MOLIÈRE: THE COMIC  
CONTRACT

THE WELL OF THE SAINTS by J. M. Synge (*editor*)

**For my mother and father**

# Acknowledgements

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the Society of Authors on behalf of the Bernard Shaw Estate for permission to quote from Shaw's work. Most of the quotations are taken from the following texts (abbreviated references in square brackets):

*The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw: Collected Plays with Their Prefaces*  
(London, 1970-4), 7 vol [CP, I-VII].

*Collected Letters, 1874-1897*, edited by Dan H. Laurence  
(London, 1965) [CL, I].

*Collected Letters, 1898-1910*, edited by Dan H. Laurence (London, 1972) [CL, II].

All other references are given in full in the notes.

My wife Eleanor Grene, my father David Grene, and my colleague Terence Brown have read parts or all of this book in manuscript. For their help and encouragement I am very grateful.

N.G.

# I Two Models: Wilde and Ibsen

Without the contribution of Irishmen there would scarcely be a single major comedy in English between 1700 and 1900. Farquhar, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Wilde – the Irish monopoly on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century comedy is remarkable. What is more, these Irish-English comedies have much in common. Each of the comedians was skilled at giving the London audience what they wanted, to some extent even what they expected, but with a cynical stylishness or a cut of satire which made their plays look strikingly original, and differentiated them from their blander English contemporaries. Aimwell in *The Beaux' Stratagem*, for instance, fulfils the ideal of early eighteenth-century tastes in his conversion to marriage for love; but his co-conspirator Archer remains faithful to the tougher ethics of the rake, and the 'happy divorce' of the Sullens, balancing the happy marriage of Aimwell at the end, lends piquancy to the play as a whole. Sheridan, on the other hand, professed to run counter to the tastes of his time in sending up the hypocrisies of sentimentalism in *The School for Scandal*. Yet the ending, with the revelation of Sir Peter's heart of gold reforming an only mildly erring Lady Teazle, is as properly sentimental as can be. Wilde, the last of the line, could produce 'woman with a past' plots of unimpeachable Victorian conventionality, and yet lace them with a series of epigrams which imply a totally cynical disbelief in the values the plots appear to endorse.

It is tempting to define this common quality of creative double-thinking as characteristically Irish. Farquhar, Sheridan, Goldsmith and Wilde may be seen as Irishmen in London out to make their way – aware of their provinciality, eager to succeed in metropolitan terms, but using their sense of distance and self-possession to cultivate a non-English audacity of style.<sup>1</sup> Such generalisations about nationality must not be pressed too hard, if only because of the obvious exceptions. Steele, as Irish as the others, produced plays

utterly unambiguous in their humourless sentimentality. Sheridan was an orator and entrepreneur in an age of orators and entrepreneurs, and we should not lean too heavily on the idea of him as a fluent Irish actor winning his way to the managership of Drury Lane. However, the concept of the Irishman playing to a foreign market, what Joyce called the role of 'court jester to the English',<sup>2</sup> is genuinely there in the work of all the major Anglo-Irish comedians.

Shaw in many ways fits easily on to the end of this series – Farquhar, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Wilde. Like the rest of them, he came to London from an Anglo-Irish Protestant background, though lower down the social scale than some of the others. Like Wilde, in particular, he made his name as a personality long before he became a playwright. Indeed like so many of his Anglo-Irish comic predecessors, he turned to the writing of plays not as a full-time career, but as the occasional employment of an otherwise busy man. The style, the paradoxes, the wit relate him very obviously to Wilde. And yet his own feelings about Wilde and this whole Irish comic tradition are ambivalent. In some ways if there was one thing of which Shaw was certain at the outset of his career as a dramatist, it was that he would not be another mere Irish jester. He might use his Irish persona, his reputation for cynical iconoclasm, but he would use it to more pointed purpose than the Farquhars, Sheridans and Wildes. Shaw was not just out to conquer London, but to change London. And in this he took as precedent not the part of the Irish jester but that of the Scandinavian prophet. One way of approaching Shaw is by looking at two possible models for his work, the two most significant figures on the theatre scene in the 1890s when he was a reviewer and began writing plays: Wilde and Ibsen.

In a self-drafted interview in the *Star* in 1892, Shaw made clear both his sense of affinity with Wilde and his sense of difference. The interviewer was made to ask whether the public could expect any of Shaw's celebrated humour in *Widowers' Houses*, then about to be produced by the Independent Theatre:

"Certainly not. I have removed with the greatest care every line that could possibly provoke a smile. I have been greatly misunderstood in this matter. Being an Irishman, I do not always see things exactly as an Englishman would: consequently my most serious and blunt statements sometimes raise a laugh and create an impression that I am intentionally jesting. I admit that some Irishmen do take advantage of the public in this way.



Wilde, unquestionably the ablest of our dramatists, has done so in 'Lady Windermere's Fan'. There are lines in that play which were put in for no other purpose than to make the audience laugh."

"'Widowers' Houses' will be quite free from that sort of thing, then?"

"Absolutely. However, I do not blame Wilde. He wrote for the stage as an artist. I am simply a propagandist."

(CP, I, 126-7)

A piece of Shaw's deadpan clowning like this has to be recognised for what it is. Naming Wilde as 'unquestionably the ablest of our dramatists', at that stage on the strength of *Lady Windermere's Fan* only, was no doubt intended to outrage and startle. It would be ludicrous to take literally Shaw's distinction between Wilde as artist and himself as propagandist. But from the (nearly simultaneous) beginning of their playwriting careers Shaw stressed the common distinctiveness of their Irish alienation and claimed for himself a greater responsibility in its use.

Shaw was clearly delighted with the subversion of seriousness which he found in *An Ideal Husband*, as we can see from his review of the first production in 1895.

In a certain sense Mr Wilde is to me our only thorough playwright. He plays with everything: with wit, with philosophy, with drama, with actors and audience, with the whole theatre. Such a feat scandalises the Englishman, who can no more play with wit and philosophy than he can with a football or cricket bat.

Shaw congratulates Wilde on the 'subtle and pervading levity' of *An Ideal Husband* because it annoys the English. There is no mistaking the tone of self-identification in his praise for Wilde here:

to the Irishman (and Mr Wilde is almost as acutely Irish an Irishman as the Iron Duke of Wellington) there is nothing in the world quite so exquisitely comic as an Englishman's seriousness. It becomes tragic, perhaps, when the Englishman acts on it; but that occurs too seldom to be taken into account, a fact which intensifies the humor of the situation, the total result being the Englishman utterly unconscious of his real self, Mr Wilde keenly

observant of it and playing on the self-unconsciousness with irresistible humor, and finally, of course, the Englishman annoyed with himself for being amused at his own expense, and for being unable to convict Mr Wilde of what seems an obvious misunderstanding of human nature.<sup>3</sup>

Shaw's claim for the Irish comedian, for both Wilde and himself, is that they are capable of seeing the truth of English behaviour as the Englishman cannot, that their comedy derives from the tongue-in-cheek observation of the absurdities of the English social scene.

Yet, remarkably, in view of his eloquent review of *An Ideal Husband*, Shaw was disappointed in Wilde's final comic achievement, *The Importance of Being Earnest*. Of course, as always with Shaw's reviewing, we need to allow for an element of perversity. His contention that *The Importance* was an early play – 'it must certainly have been written before Lady Windermere's Fan' – is an attempt to make fools of the critics who declared that 'The Importance of Being Earnest is a strained effort of Mr Wilde's at ultra-modernity, and that it could never have been written but for the opening up of entirely new paths in drama last year by *Arms and the Man*'.<sup>4</sup> But his refusal to join in the chorus of praise for *The Importance* was not just an affectation of singularity. He did not like the play – he was to dislike it all his life – and the reasons why are significant:

I cannot say that I greatly cared for *The Importance of Being Earnest*. It amused me, of course; but unless comedy touches me as well as amuses me, it leaves me with a sense of having wasted my evening. I go to the theatre to be moved to laughter, not to be tickled or hustled into it; and that is why, though I laugh as much as anybody at a farcical comedy, I am out of spirits before the end of the second act, and out of temper before the end of the third, my miserable mechanical laughter intensifying these symptoms at every outburst.<sup>5</sup>

It is curious to find Shaw, so often accused of heartless comedy himself, complaining of want of feeling in Wilde. It was Shaw's *Arms and the Man*, produced in 1894, which provoked Yeats's famous dream of the sewing-machine that smiled. But Shaw's belief that comedy should 'move to laughter' is basic to his work. For most modern critics *The Importance* is Wilde's most perfect play, where he finally liberated himself from the need to produce the convention-

ally sentimental plot to house his farcical vision of the absurd: To Shaw, the complete removal of an emotional strand from comedy, however conventional that emotion might have been, represented a step backwards towards the merely mechanical and unreal.

Shaw and Wilde never became friends. When recalling his memories of Wilde for the benefit of Frank Harris in 1916, Shaw could remember no more than half a dozen occasions on which they met. There was a social dimension to their mutual uneasiness, as Shaw told Harris:

I was in no way predisposed to like him: he was my fellow-townsmen, and a very prime specimen of the sort of fellow-townsmen I most loathed: to wit, the Dublin snob. His Irish charm, potent with Englishmen, did not exist for me; and on the whole it may be claimed for him that he got no regard from me that he did not earn.<sup>6</sup>

It may be that Shaw was hurt by Wilde's famous epigram about him; at least he answered it with dignity in a letter to Ellen Terry: 'Oscar Wilde said of me "An excellent man: he has no enemies; and none of his friends like him." And that's quite true: they don't like me; but they are my friends, and some of them love me' (CL, I, 668). The lack of a close relationship between them did not stop Shaw from supporting Wilde loyally during and after his imprisonment, and his one substantial essay on Wilde, published in German in the *Neue Freie Presse* in 1905, accords him generous praise. Yet in that essay it is clear what he saw as their essential differences and ultimately Wilde's limitation:

On the whole, Wilde's tastes were basically different from mine. He loved luxury, and the salon and the *atelier* were his domain; while I was a man of the street, an agitator, a vegetarian, a teetotaler, incapable of enjoying the life of the drawing-room and the chatter of the studio.<sup>7</sup>

Shaw concludes that 'his originality lay in his superiority to the delusive morality of our time' but that 'he had not, as Nietzsche had, thought through his own situation sufficiently to understand himself. Without a precisely mapped-out program of life it is impossible, if not useless, to discard moral concepts.'<sup>8</sup>

Shaw's admiration for Wilde was qualified by his view of him as

essentially an unmodern writer: 'it is difficult to believe that the author of *An Ideal Husband* was a contemporary of Ibsen, Strindberg, Wagner, Tolstoi, or myself.'<sup>9</sup> In his section on 'Evolution in the Theatre' in the Preface to *Back to Methusaleh*, Shaw names Wilde as the last of a comic tradition which began in the seventeenth century:

From Molière to Oscar Wilde we had a line of comedic playwrights who, if they had nothing fundamentally positive to say, were at least in revolt against falsehood and imposture, and were not only, as they claimed, 'chastening morals by ridicule', but, in Johnson's phrase, clearing our minds of cant, and thereby shewing an uneasiness in the presence of error which is the surest symptom of intellectual vitality. (CP, v, 335)

But these negative virtues were not enough:

Ever since Shakespear, playwrights have been struggling with their lack of positive religion. Many of them were forced to become mere pandars and sensation-mongers because, though they had higher ambitions, they could find no better subject matter. From Congreve to Sheridan they were so sterile in spite of their wit that they did not achieve between them the output of Molière's single lifetime; and they were all (not without reason) ashamed of their profession, and preferred to be regarded as mere men of fashion with a rakish hobby. (CP, v, 336)

In a passage like this we see expressed the full Puritanism of Shaw which ultimately differentiated him from Wilde, or indeed most other comedians. For all his clowning, he believed that plays and playwrights had to take themselves seriously, that they had to have something positive to say. This was not necessarily to claim that all plays should have a direct social or moral purpose, but that the dramatist should feel himself committed to his work, not a 'mere man of fashion with a rakish hobby'. It is this which made Shaw reject Wilde's dandy-like aestheticism, and it is this which makes all his own plays in some sense plays for Puritans.

The influence of Ibsen on Shaw is well known, and has by now been often and thoroughly discussed.<sup>10</sup> J. L. Wisenthal has collected all of Shaw's writings on Ibsen, including *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, and has shown in his introductory essay how much more

complex Shaw's response was than has generally been imagined.<sup>11</sup> Shaw did not butcher Ibsen to make a Fabian holiday; though *The Quintessence* was avowedly written to show what Ibsen had to offer socialists, it does not mean that it was all Shaw thought Ibsen had to offer. What Shaw rightly detected in Ibsen, and was most crucial for him, was a radical belief in artistic truth-telling that went far beyond any party-political platform. Ibsen spent most of his life avoiding identification with any political group and was particularly scornful of so-called progressive parties. His iconoclasm was not to be put to the service of a given set of social objectives. But that it was iconoclasm, and that Shaw was more nearly right about Ibsen than is normally supposed, is evident, for example, from Ibsen's comment in a letter about *Ghosts* before it was published: '*Ghosts* will probably cause alarm in some circles; but there is nothing to be done about it. If it didn't do that, there would have been no need to write it.'<sup>12</sup> Ibsen saw his own work, as Shaw saw it, as a contribution to a forward struggle to give people new images of truth, images which at first they would inevitably be unable to accept.

For Shaw Ibsen was the realist who at last enabled the theatre to escape from the vapid and meaningless ideals which had dominated it for so long. In *The Quintessence* he explains the unorthodox use he makes of the terms realist and idealist. The idealist is the man who creates self-deceiving myths to make tolerable the reality of a life which he could not otherwise endure. The realist insists on the liberation of the human will from the artificial constraints of idealism which he rejects as deadening and unreal. He is prepared to face life objectively without the narcotics of the ideal. It can be fairly objected that this view of Ibsen as realist suits some plays more than others, and does not take into account Ibsen's deeply ambiguous attitude towards idealistic self-sacrifice. But it explains why Shaw so constantly stressed the modernity of Ibsen, and saw him as a crucial revolutionary writer along with Nietzsche or Schopenhauer. In Shaw's evolutionary concept of human culture Ibsen is one of the 'pioneers of the march to the plains of heaven', moving forward the ideas of the race by destroying outmoded pieties and beliefs. It is in this spirit that Shaw celebrated Ibsen's 'plays of nineteenth-century life with which he overcame Europe, and broke the dusty windows of every dry-rotten theatre in it from Moscow to Manchester' (CP, v, 336).

If Ibsen is to be seen as a pioneer, a progressive in this supra-political sense, then the structure of his plays involves a dialectic of

progressive understanding for an audience. Obviously here *A Doll's House* and *Ghosts* are Shaw's best examples. *A Doll's House* takes Nora, and us with her, from 'the sweet home, the womanly woman, the happy family life of the idealist's dream' through disillusionment to the determination to meet the real world and 'to find out its reality for herself'. *Ghosts*, which Shaw was one of the first to see as a sequel to *A Doll's House*; gives a terrifying warning of the consequences of holding on to the false 'idealist's dream' and refusing to meet reality. Although the linear synopses of the plays in *The Quintessence* destroy the emphasis of Ibsen's retrospective technique by which our understanding of the present action involves a growing discovery of the past shared with the characters, Shaw does demonstrate the essential dramatic movement from stereotype, presupposition and prejudice towards the climactic revelation of truth. We may well feel that the breezy clarity of his prose is no adequate vehicle for expressing the enigmatic and mysterious form which that truth takes in Ibsen. But Shaw registers the continuous and unresting nature of truth-seeking in Ibsen's work. Within each individual play, from play to play within the canon, Ibsen never allows his audience or readers to settle into the unquestioned assumption that the truth is now before them. The fallacious ideals exposed could include, for example, the apparently Ibsenian ideal of truth-telling represented by Gregers Werle in *The Wild Duck*. Shaw did not, as is sometimes supposed, reduce Ibsen's drama to problem plays with problems which could be solved once and for all by sexual equality, free love, or hygienic drains. The struggle which he saw in Ibsen between idealism and realism was to be a continuing one with no final and unequivocal victory for the latter. The appropriate response to an Ibsen play was open-ended questioning rather than confident enlightenment.

What Shaw admired in Ibsen was his seriousness as an artist, his anti-idealistic stance, and the dialectic structure of his works. In all of these Shaw may be said to have taken Ibsen as his model when he began to write plays himself. Although accusations of influence provoked Shaw into perverse disclaimers—he insisted that *Widowers' Houses* had been started years before he had even heard of Ibsen—no one is likely to miss the obvious Ibsenism of much of Shaw's early work. In fact for generations Shaw was commonly described as the English disciple of Ibsen. But in the unique and distinctive form of comedy of ideas which Shaw developed in the 1890s we must recognise an extraordinary hybrid. There could

scarcely be two writers more unlike than Wilde and Ibsen, yet Shaw's plays partake of the nature of both. We could call Shaw, with as much truth as he called Wilde, 'our only thorough playwright. He plays with everything: with wit, with philosophy, with drama, with actors and audience, with the whole theatre.' Ibsen, on the other hand, is the least playful of dramatists. If Shaw at his most Wildean yet reveals characteristics which identify him with Ibsen, at his most Ibsenian he is still not far from the comic mood and manner of Wilde.

A Pleasant and an Unpleasant play may be taken to illustrate the point. *You Never Can Tell* is undoubtedly Shaw's most Wildean play; what is more, it most closely resembles the Wilde play which Shaw professed to dislike, *The Importance of Being Earnest*. The farcical success of both depend on the skill and lightness of touch with which Shaw and Wilde create an absurd world which barely touches on the real. In the spirit of Lady Bracknell's celebrated line – 'To lose one parent, Mr Worthing, may be regarded as a misfortune; to lose both looks like carelessness' – is Valentine's benevolent advice to the fatherless Phil and Dolly:

We dont bother much about dress and manners in England, because, as a nation, we dont dress well and weve no manners. But – and now you will excuse my frankness? [*They nod*]. Thank you. Well, in a seaside resort theres one thing you must have before anybody can afford to be seen going about with you; and thats a father, alive or dead. Am I to infer that you have omitted that indispensable part of your social equipment? (CP, 1, 677)

Margery Morgan suggests that in *You Never Can Tell* Shaw gave comic expression to some of the unhappiness of his own separated family.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps; but more to the point is her observation that the separation and reunion of parents and children is one of the oldest of comic themes. Both Shaw and Wilde stand at the end of the long European tradition of comedy and play knowingly with its familiar conventions. The device of the foundling and the long-lost parent, so standard in Roman comedy, ends up with the absurdity of the lost-property office hero of *The Importance*. The coming together of father and daughter, so moving in *The Winter's Tale* and *Pericles*, becomes deliberate anti-climax in the meeting of Crampton and Gloria in *You Never Can Tell*. The delight of *The Importance* and *You Never Can Tell* is of an elegant and stylised unreality which inverts and parodies the norms of human experience.

It would be absurd to claim that there was much in *You Never Can Tell* to remind us directly of Ibsen. In fact Shaw mischievously portrays Mrs Clandon with her Ibsenite emancipation as already old-fashioned and suggests that the theatre is the only place left where 'her opinions would still pass as advanced'. But Shaw is true to his understanding of Ibsen in showing Gloria as a character who must reject her mother's image of her (however liberally and untraditionally conceived) in order to fulfil her own individuality. In the midst of the caricatures and distortions of farce, Shaw intended to introduce characters and situations of recognisable human reality. The scene between Valentine and Gloria at the end of the second act, he regarded as crucial to the success of the play. He was triumphant when the farce actor Allen Aynesworth, who had been so successful in *The Importance*, was, as he had predicted, unable to perform this scene convincingly.<sup>14</sup> It is not perhaps a very convincing scene in itself, and is one among many which might be used to illustrate Shaw's problems in handling love. But significantly what he wanted to do with it was to show the moment of emotional revelation which shatters the artificial self-images of the two characters. This is in some ways closer to the mood of Shakespearean comedy than of Ibsen, but it is consistent with Shaw's complaints against the heartless humour of *The Importance*, and it may remind us that even in a play as fantastic as *You Never Can Tell* he was committed to what he thought of as realism.

I shall be returning to *Mrs Warren's Profession* in more detail in the next chapter, but here it can be conveniently used to demonstrate what is Wildean in Shaw's most Ibsenian manner. In his 'Author's Apology' for the play, written in 1902, Shaw roundly rejected claims of influence: 'I never dreamt of Ibsen or De Maupassant, any more than a blacksmith shoeing a horse thinks of the blacksmith in the next county' (CP, I, 271). Maybe, but plays are written more distinctively than horses are shod, and the blacksmith in England worked on strikingly similar lines to the blacksmith in Norway. *Mrs Warren* is Shaw's equivalent to *Ghosts*, a deliberately shocking and provocative attack on the sacred nineteenth-century institution of sexual morality enshrined in marriage. Shaw and Ibsen exploited the then unspeakable aspects of sexuality, prostitution and venereal disease, to provide metaphors for what was wrong with their society, to illustrate the relation between hypocritical ideals and actual degradation. *Mrs Warren* moves, like *Ghosts*, from revelation to revelation, each one taking us further from the comfortable



appearances of the first act. It is one of the few plays in which Shaw used Ibsen's characteristic 'strong curtains' to conclude each act. Central to *Mrs Warren* and to *Ghosts* is the misunderstanding and mutual discovery of the parent/child protagonists. The only partially closed gap between Oswald and Mrs Alving matches that between Mrs Warren and Vivie. The extent of Shaw and Ibsen's defiance of conventional attitudes is indicated by their common apparently unblinking acceptance of the possibility of incest.

And yet, and yet, and yet. The 'unpleasantness' of *Mrs Warren* is fresh air and sunshine in comparison with the horrors of *Ghosts*. Representative of the difference is the contrast between the two possibly incestuous relationships. However much Mrs Alving may overcome her squeamishness at the idea of incest, there remains something permanently repulsive in the flirtation between the sickly Oswald and his calculating half-sister. With Vivie and Frank Gardner, the revelation that they might be related only makes them 'babes in the wood in earnest'; their relation ends, as it began, in fairy-tale fantasy. Frank Gardner, above all, is the Wildean joker in *Mrs Warren*. His affectation of complete detachment from moral judgement, his precocious wit, align him with a tradition which runs from Wilde's epigrammatists to Saki's unbearable young men. Frank is an idler and proud of it, setting aside the pieties of industry or filial respect with debonair charm. His is a light-hearted immoralism of style and manner. One would not want *Mrs Warren* to be without the deft and deflating humour which he represents, but he makes it a play far from the tone and atmosphere of *Ghosts*. In being like Wilde and Ibsen simultaneously, Shaw is not the least bit like either of them.

Taking Wilde and Ibsen as alternative precedents for Shaw is not to suggest that they were the only two, or even necessarily the major two, influences on his work. When it comes to establishing sources of influence on Shaw, the critic is likely to suffer from an embarrassment of riches. But his attitude to Wilde and Ibsen may stand for coordinates within which his comedy of ideas was developed. Looking at his work in this light may help to explain why, as a playwright, he has suffered from two, apparently incompatible, forms of negative criticism. To some he has seemed the incorrigible clown whose work, amusing and brilliant as it may be, does not finally take itself seriously, the most distinguished example being Tolstoy who found Shaw's levity painful.<sup>15</sup> And yet equally persistent, if not more so, has been the myth of Shaw the preacher rather than the playwright,