

Chapter 5

The Sugar and the Pill : Plays Pleasant

" 'Not by wrath but by laughter doth one kill' — Thus speakest thou once, O Zarathustra, thou hidden one, thou destroyer without wrath, thou dangerous saint — thou art a rogue."

Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*

Since idealism is the chief villain in Shaw's demonology, it can be relied upon to be deadly when it feeds like a parasite on war. The categories of *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* have distinctly influenced Shaw's attitude to *Arms and the Man* and he takes great care to explain that he is in deep earnest regarding it not as a farcical comedy but as serious drama :

I claim that the dramatic effect produced by the shock which the realities give to the notion of romantic young ladies and fierce civilians is not burlesque, but legitimate comedy, none the less pungent because...the romantic young lady was on the stage and the fierce civilians in the stalls.¹

Contemptuously refuting the charge that the character of Bluntschli is taken not from life but from popular extravaganza, he explains :

...the much criticised Swiss officer in *Arms and the Man* is not a conventional stage soldier. He suffers from want of food and sleep; his nerves go to pieces after three days under fire, ending in the horrors of a rout and pursuit; he has found by experience that it is more important to have a few bits of chocolate to eat in the field than cartridges for his revolver. When many of my critics rejected these circumstances as fantastically improbable and cynically unnatural, it was not necessary to argue them into common sense : all I had to do was to brain them, so to speak, with the first half dozen military authorities at hand, beginning with the present Commander-in-Chief.⁴

Indeed, Shaw had reasons to be disappointed when his critics threw his denunciation of farcical comedy back in his teeth, and the audience howled with laughter at what they thought was a first-rate burlesque on the code of chivalry. He did not conceive the play as the representation of a risible action: the author of *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* wished to go beyond Ibsen by not only showing the perniciousness of Brand's code of conduct but also by presenting in his play a worthier code to replace that of Brand.

As an avowed realist he diagnosed that the chief obstacle to moral progress was idealism, which blocked the healthy impulses of the normal individual by putting outdated ideals in their way :

I can no longer be satisfied with fictitious morals and fictitious good conduct, shedding fictitious glory on robbery, starvation, disease, crime, drink, war, cruelty, cupidity...On the other hand, I see plenty of good in the world working itself out as fast as idealists will allow it, and if they would only let it alone and learn to respect reality...At all events, I do not see moral chaos and anarchy as the alternative to romantic convention...³

He was aware that the consequences of pursuing romantic ideals were "sometimes terrible, sometimes ludicrous",⁴ and while Sergius's behaviour tends to make him appear ludicrous, Shaw takes care to stress his tragic potential in the stage directions :

By his brooding on the perpetual failure, not only of others, but of himself, to live up to his ideals, by his consequent cynical scorn for humanity; by his jejune credulity as to the absolute validity of his concepts and the unworthiness of the world in disregarding them...he has acquired the half tragic, half ironic air, the mysterious moodiness, the suggestion of a strange and terrible history that has left nothing but undying remorse, by which Childe Harold fascinated the grandmothers of his English contemporaries.⁵

For *Arms and the Man* to be serious drama, Sergius has to be

more than a Jack-in-the-box, he must be a worthy foil to Bluntschli, who is created to uphold the principle of realism that fills up the vacuum left by idealism. Thus Shaw attempts to humanise Sergius by making a clear distinction between his natural impulses, which Sergius distrusts, and his absurd romanticism, which he ridiculously attempts to live up to. It is his power of introspection and his continuous self-criticism that makes him the Hamlet of Shaw's attempted comedy. Though Bluntschli is the Shavian hero, it is Sergius who is the fulcrum of the play because the conflict in his soul reflects the central contest in the play, the contest between romanticism and realism over the conquest of Raina, who in the context of the play is the prize to be won by the victor. Sergius is conceived, therefore, not as a panjandrum but as Manfred. Ibsen's disciple knew well enough that to succeed where Brand and Rosmer had failed, Bluntschli had to be more than a Punchinello, and to be worthy of his steel, Sergius had to be more than a figure of burlesque. The weaning away of Raina from Sergius to Bluntschli can be worthwhile only if the action of the play can recreate some value that the audience recognise as precious.

Positive value is sought to be derived from the distinction between not only manner and substance, but also between overt action and the significance of that action. Bluntschli's manners are those of a commercial traveller but then it must be remembered that the creator of Julius Caesar (in *Caesar and Cleoptra*) disguised even true heroism behind a conspicuously anti-heroic

mask.

By making Bluntschli conspicuously anti-heroic Shaw seeks to create the perfect antithesis of Ibsen's heroes who, with all their sterling virtues, succeeded only in inviting disaster. Brand "caused more intense suffering by his saintliness than the most talented sinner could probably have done."⁶ Rosmer was responsible for the "monstrous sequel of asking the woman to kill herself in order to restore the man's good opinion of himself."⁷

Shaw dispenses with the high nervous energy of tragedy because according to him the test of virtue does not lie in heroic defiance but in its friendliness to life. Thus quite early in the play Bluntschli presents the credo of the author when he tells Raina that it is one's duty to live as long as one can. Shaw's priorities are made clear when he attempts the transformation of an Ibsenite tragedy into a Shavian comedy by changing Hedda Gabler into Sergius. Hedda "is a typical nineteenth century figure, falling in the abyss between the ideals which do not impose on her and the realities she has not yet discovered."⁸ In other words, she is the soul-mate of Sergius, who, with the climate of comedy to protect him, manages to avoid the former's end.

Not only is tragic potential made comic, but the scales of popular morality are also reversed. In popular estimation nothing can be more noble than patriotism or chivalry, nothing is more exalting than the higher love, conversely few things are looked down upon with as much contempt as the profession of the

mercenary. Yet as Bluntschli tightens his grip on the play and begins to re-educate both Raina and Sergius, one is reminded of Shaw's remarks on Ibsen :

He protests against the ordinary assumption that there are certain moral institutions which justify all means used to maintain them, and insists that the supreme end shall be inspired, eternal, ever growing one, not the external, unchanging, artificial one...And because the will to change our habits and thus defy morality arises before the intellect can reason any rationally beneficent purpose in change, there is always an interval during which the individual can say no more than that he wants to behave immorally because he likes and because he will feel constrained and unhappy if he acts otherwise.⁹

Bluntschli is the free spirit in comic disguise, the Shavian rebel who rides roughshod over institutions when they come in the way of his vital impulses. Yet his rebellion is not against life but against the romantic code that narrows and chokes life. Therefore though he scorns chivalry, the fiction of higher love and the romance of warfare, he surpasses Sergius in military skill and beats him in love. The weakness of Sergius is that he is not enough of a soldier and not much of a lover; he mistakes the gilt of the gingerbread for the gingerbread. The strength of Bluntschli is that he can augment the substance by cutting out the frills. At the end of the play when it is revealed that he is as much a

victim of illusion as any one else, a romantic who does not know a woman of twenty-three from a girl of eighteen, the shock of the revelation cannot nullify the qualitative difference between his illusion and that of Sergius, for Bluntschli is the victim of "necessary illusion," which is "the guise in which reality must be presented before it can rouse a man's interest."¹⁰ The illusions of Sergius are not induced by nature, but by the conventions of the opera, thus they leave him ill-equipped to cope with the real world.

Bluntschli's romantic illusion, on the other hand, helps him to neutralize the deflationary tendency of objective knowledge and leads him to court Raina even after her pretensions have been torpedoed by him. To anticipate the language devised by Shaw some years later, Bluntschli's illusion makes him the servant of the Life Force. The difference between the healthy illusion of Bluntschli and the morbid illusion of Sergius is summed up by Shaw in a different context when he avers that "upto a certain point, illusion... is, more or less, precious and indispensable; but beyond that point it gives more trouble than it is worth..."¹¹

Thus Shaw's acute disappointment, when critics dismissed the play as a farcical comedy, was understandable. Leading the pack was William Archer, who called it "a fantastic psychological extravaganza, in which drama, farce, and Gilbertian irony keep flashing past the bewildered eye..."¹² When Archer remarked that the play made him laugh hysterically, not soberly, he was articulating in a remarkably similar language Shaw's own

denunciation of farcial comedy :

The very dullest drama in five acts that ever attained for half a moment to some stir of feeling, leaves the spectator, however it may have bored him, happier and fresher than three acts of farcical comedy at which he has been worried into laughing incessantly with an empty heart...¹³

With such an unfavourable disposition to farce, Shaw found the comparison with Gilbert particularly offensive. He wrote to Archer that *Arms and the Man* was not a Gilbertian play :

Gilbert is simply a paradoxically humorous cynic. He accepts the conventional ideals implicitly but observes that people do not really live up to them. This he regards as a failure on their part at which he mocks bitterly. This position is precisely that of Sergius in the play...I do not accept the conventional ideals...Sergius is ridiculous through the breakdown of his ideals, not odious from his falling short of them. As Gilbert sees they dont work : but what Gilbert does not see is that there has been something else that does work, and in that something else there is a completely satisfactory asylum for the affections.¹⁴

The critical standard applied here is less controversial than the play itself and Shaw is absolutely right when he insists

that the play, to be satisfying, must provide a "satisfactory asylum for the affections." By the same token it was unnecessary for him to defend the reality of the play by vouching that many of the incidents, dismissed as implausible by critics, were taken from actual life; for dramatic truth is by no means dependent on its correspondence to statistical reality. To be perceived as serious, the seriousness of the dramatic action must be self-evident, not dependent on the author's intervention as commentator or on a detailed knowledge of the intellectual schemata behind the play. If a play deals with pure feeling, the feeling must have sufficient strength to be transmitted to the audience. A play lives or dies as a play in the theatre and not on the critic's desk.

Shaw hoped that *Arms and the Man* would radiate seriousness but his hopes were thoroughly belied by the nature of the play's success. The play could not convince the audience that it constituted a new Bible, or that it was a riposte to Ibsen's *Brand*. It was certainly enjoyable, but both the war, which formed the play's background, and the reality which *Arms and the Man* was supposed to uphold dissolved into a fantasy which was no more real than the operas that shaped Sergius's sensibility.

Shaw wished to change the nineteenth-century extravaganza into its opposite, the result showed that the conventions of the extravaganza defeated the purpose of the realist who chipped away at the illusion separating drama from reality. It is quite possible that some East European nobles considered it a luxury to

have a wash every day, it is not impossible either that veteran soldiers rely more on chocolate than on revolvers, that they feel as frightened as mice when they are at the end of their tether; it may even be conceded that a cavalry charge reminds some of them of the slinging of a handful of peas against the window-pane, but a dramatist who incorporates these things into the nucleus of his play cannot prevent his audience from believing that the world thus portrayed is not Bulgaria but Clouduckooland.

Did the controversy over *Arms and the Man* centre on mere misunderstanding and an error of judgment? Was Shaw's failure only an artistic lapse, the inability to capture the right emotional tone? I feel that the failure involved something more. The "plenty of good in the world working itself out"¹⁵ is not quite evident in the play. If Sergius is Shaw's Hamlet, then the audience's feeling must be stirred by the conflict between his real self and his self-perception. The play is bound to crumble as serious drama the moment Sergius is perceived as a dunderhead. And surely a dramatic critique of romanticism, in order to be taken seriously, must go beyond burlesque. The biggest weakness of *Arms and the Man* lies in making Sergius not a romantic but a Trojan horse in the camp of romanticism. Shaw reminds the readers through his stage direction that Sergius's prototype is Byron, but would a Byron or a Pushkin ever behave as Sergius does—like a nincompoop? Burlesque is of course a legitimate weapon of the comedist but then who can hope to learn the truth about Hitler from Chaplin's *the Great Dictator* or claim that Aristophanes gives us a true picture of Socrates in

the *Clouds* ? Arms and the Man does not fail as extravaganza or farcical comedy, it only fails to live up to Shaw's claims about the play.

The fate of the play was indeed strange : Shaw had written a play which his audience did not understand, the audience went ecstatic over a play Shaw claimed he had not written. He said that he had written a "drama of pure feeling",¹⁶ but regretted that there was no audience for the play. Shaw thought that through Bluntschli he presented the prophet of a new religion; the audience, on the other hand, thought that it got a clown who was intensely amusing and whose success it attributed to the climate of the circus, which enables the clown to perform the most difficult trick on the trapeze, and to the laws of farce, which make it possible for the little man to knock a hole into the stone wall with his head. A more classic example of mutual misunderstanding would be difficult to find.

Shaw was still the outsider struggling, without great success, to plant his foot on the ground trodden by the mass of the people. He blamed his audience for making it difficult for him to do so and railed at "the mass of people, too stupid to relish the wit, and too convention-ridden to sympathize with real as distinct from theatrical feeling."¹⁷ When he lamented that the whole affair was a "ghastly failure"¹⁸ he was letting out his frustration at not being able to establish a meaningful contact with his audience. As the failure of the audience to recognize the prophet in Bluntschli revealed, the outsider had a long way to go

before he could find his way to men's hearts. Meanwhile he would have to be content with the knowledge that his abilities were not equal to his aspirations. After all, what was a ghastly failure was the play he had intended to write, not the play he had actually written.

II

We have seen that the dominant theme in Shawian drama is the protagonist's rejection of love. This eagerness to outgrow love is actually an attempt to rise above human community, to exist as a monad. Behind this anti-romanticism is intense, though warped, romanticism. In *Candida* we have a glimpse of the hidden adolescent mind exalting the Virgin Mother, a dramatisation of the crypto-romantic timidity that chooses the regressive joy of adolescence instead of the demanding relationship between two adults.

Candida is ostensibly Shaw's reply to Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. In a letter to the *Evening Standard* Shaw claimed that the play was "a counterblast to Ibsen's *Doll's House*, showing that in the real typical doll's house it is the man who is the doll."¹⁹ Yet the new equation between husband and wife is actually far less important than the author's fascination with *Candida*. Nora is the representative of the New Woman in a male-dominated society, *Candida* is a unique woman who satisfies the author's ambivalence

and contradictory cravings.

In rough and external details *Candida* conforms to the comic pattern. It can be read as a domestic comedy in which the love triangle dissolves to form a happy ending as the loving husband embraces his idealised wife at the end of the play and the outsider goes out into the night. Superficially, the same conservative spirit, the same vindication of hearth and home over bohemian abandon and unbridled romance is presented in the Shavian distillation of Pre-Raphaelitism because unlike Mary Bruin of Yeats's *The Land of the Heart's Desire*, the Pre-Raphaelite play whose theme and structure Shaw closely parallels in *Candida* before subverting the pattern decisively in the end,²⁰ *Candida* chooses the prosaic husband instead of the spritely spirit who comes to take her away.

Shaw's attitude towards Morell and *Candida* is far more ambiguous than his remarks about the play's relationship to *A Doll's House* indicate. Joseph Wood Krutch is less absurd than he sounds when he maintains that "the author's sympathies are principally on the side of the clergyman husband."²¹ Shaw's description of Morell is instructive: "The Reverend James Mavor Morell is a Christian Socialist clergyman of the Church of England, and an active member of the Guild of St. Matthew and the Christian Social Union. A vigorous, genial, popular man of forty, robust and goodlooking, full of energy, with pleasant, hearty considerate manners, and a sound unaffected voice...a wide range and perfect command of expression."²² Stewart Headlam is the most

obvious model of Morell, though in his letter to *The Evening Standard* Shaw claims that Morell is modelled after Stopford Brooke with touches of Canon Shuttleworth and Fleming Williams.²³ But what Shaw does not say is that he himself closely resembles Morell. Maurice Valency discovers the essential kinship between Shaw and the clergyman. The action takes place in October 1894, the play is written in 1895. Shaw would be Morell's age in a year. Morell's description, his manners and talents suited Shaw almost to the ground. As Valency remarks: "The Shaw who wrote prefaces and lectured in workmen's Halls was unquestionably much more Morell than Marchbanks."²⁴

When Morell's home turns out to be a doll's house, the audience is not presented with an expose' by an author soaring above the action, instead, the author reveals his own uneasiness, fears and secret cravings. With the knowledge of the author's own home that was not quite a home, his unsatisfied childhood cravings for maternal love, and his fear that his father's rights as a husband may have been infringed, one is able to see that the extraordinary tension of the play is generated, at least partly, by the reenactment of the drama of the author's life, a drama that the change of names and circumstances does not sufficiently disguise.²⁵

The play is built around the change in the relationship among the three principal characters. The audience, accustomed to the paradigm of domestic comedy, receives a jolt as *Candida* moves from an atmosphere of pleasant satiety to sudden dreariness. The

almost lovable "great baby, pardonably vain of his powers and unconsciously pleased with himself"²⁶ is changed into a pitiable creature clinging to his wife's apron strings.

Morell's early advice to Lexy to "get married to a good woman and have a foretaste of what will be best in the Kingdom of Heaven we are trying to establish on earth"²⁷ sounds, on second reading, like a grotesque irony by a cynical misogynist.

Marchbanks too is equally effusive about love: "We all go about longing for love: it is the first need of our natures, the first prayer of our hearts."²⁸ Morell calls Beaumarchais a rotten cynic, and wholeheartedly agrees with Marchbanks on the value of love and happiness. The bone of contention is not love but their common object of love and adulation.

In no other play of Shaw is there such apparent unanimity about the ennobling quality of love and the worth of happiness. This elevation of love is necessary for the shattering disillusionment at the end. In the context of Shaw's larger design, the description of Marchbanks assumes significance. He is "a strange shy youth of eighteen, slight, effeminate, with a delicate childish voice, and a hunted tormented expression."²⁹ Marchbanks's immaturity gives us an early hint that he will soon outgrow his romantic faith in a feminine saviour. Morell's vivid expressions of uxoriousness for the first time bring the faint touch of decadence into the earthly paradise.

As the cocoon of false security bursts around him, Morell makes a pathetic attempt not to see it by trying to bribe

Marchbanks with a counterfeit token : "Some day I hope and trust, you will be a happy man like me."³⁰ Not to be taken in, the younger man contemptuously refuses the bribe : "Is it like this for her always? A woman with a great soul, craving for reality, truth, freedom; and being fed on metaphors, sermons and perorations, mere rhetoric."³¹ As the ground of his confidence is cut from under his feet, Morell speaks like a lost soul : "It is easy—terribly easy—to shake a man's faith in himself. To take advantage of that to break a man's spirit is devil's work."³²

It is only natural that the central character of the play, the source of so much ambiguity, the catalyst of Morell's crisis as well as that of Marchbanks, should herself be the mystifying factor of a play subtitled "A Mystery." Expectedly enough, the heroine of a play that has been called "the Hamlet of Shaw criticism,"³³ has been the most debated character of the play. Shaw likens Candida to the Virgin of the Assumption.³⁴

The Virgin Mother image is complicated by strong sexual undertones. Shaw's Virgin Mother is after all the result of the incomplete sublimation of his own ambivalence. This becomes clear from his letter to Ellin Terry :

You say I'd be sick of you in a week. But one does not get tired of adoring the Virgin Mother. Bless me ! you will say, the man is a Roman Catholic. Not at all : the man is the author of Candida; and Candida, between you and me is the Virgin Mother and nobody else.³⁵

We have seen while discussing *An Unsocial Socialist* that Shaw's fear of disappointment in love was often translated into a nervous denial of love and a search for compensation through a sense of power over women. As his remarkable relationship with Ellen Terry showed, another method of compensation was an attempt to change a man-woman relationship into a mother-son relationship. This regressiveness released him from the obligation to participate in a love affair. It could thus not only remove his anxiety and obviate the fear of rejection, it could also provide him with a mother surrogate to compensate for the indifference of his actual mother. Bentley is therefore justified in remarking: "Into Morell Shaw can put that part of himself (a child) which Candida finds irresistible."³⁶ But Shaw's own attitude to Candida is far from simple. After all the reader feels uneasy mainly because of her. The Candida of the play, as distinct from the Candida of Shaw's letters, is dangerous and destructive.

The first thing that Candida destroys is her husband's faith in love. The other casualty is Morell's manhood. The change from wife to mother is accompanied by a definite suggestion of castration of the man. She systematically unmans her husband. In the second act she goes about her act of subversion by apparently universalising love when she tells Morell off : "It seems unfair that all the love should go to you and none to him."³⁷ She celebrates her facile victory by pulverising Morell with these words of protectiveness : " My boy shall not be worried : I will protect him."³⁸ As a result of her 'mothering' a pathetic and

unnerved Morell is not left with any chance of salvaging even a little of his lost self-respect. Marchbanks, with the poet's instinctive revulsion against coarseness and cruelty, protests against the shabby treatment of Morell: "I shudder when you torture him and laugh."³⁹

The negative aspect of Candida's character was not hidden from Shaw's view. He wrote to Ellen Terry that Beatrice Webb had called Candida "a sentimental prostitute."⁴⁰ To James Huneker he wrote :

Candida is as unscrupulous as Siegfried : Morell himself sees that 'no law will bind her.' She seduces Eugene just exactly as far as it is worth her while to seduce him. She is a woman without 'character' in the conventional sense. Without brains and strength of mind she would be a wretched slattern or voluptuary.⁴¹

The conversion of Candida into the Virgin Mother, albeit with a pronounced sadistic undertone entirely foreign to Titian's painting, is not unexpected. For reasons we have already discussed Shaw needed to make Candida renounce, after coming perilously close to adultery, the role of the lover in favour of that of the mother. A clue to Candida's inexplicable behaviour is provided by Shaw in a letter to Ellen Terry that reveals the close kinship between Candida and Shaw :

My pockets are always full of the small change of

love-making, but it is magic money, not real money. Mrs. Webb, who is a remarkably shrewd woman, explains her freedom from the fascination to which she sees all the others succumb, by saying, "You cannot fall in love with a sprite; and Shaw is a sprite in such matters, not a real person."...It is certainly true; I am fond of women (or one in a thousand, say); but I am in earnest about quite other things...Doubtless, dear Ellen, You've observed that you can't act things perfectly until you have got beyond them, and so nothing to fear from them. That's why the women who fall in love with me worry me and torment me and make scenes (which they can't act) with me and suffer misery to destroy their health & beauty, whilst you, who could do without me as easily as I do without Julia (for instance) are my blessing and refuge and really care more for everybody (including myself) than Julia cared for me.⁴¹

Thus Shaw wanted to make Candida a forerunner of Julius Caesar and Don Juan by investing her with a higher kind of egoism. She could care for everybody because she did not love anyone. Obviously the author of *The Irrational Knot* and *An Unsocial Socialist* was not prepared to disown his past. It is understandable, therefore, that Candida's husband shares, to some extent, the fate of Trefusis's wife.

Candida completes the education of both Morell and Marchbanks. At the end of the play Morell is like a man broken

under the wheel and the education of the younger man is no less negative. Marchbanks learns to stand alone : the Virgin Mother teaches him her own secret, the ability to live without love. At the end of the play Candida and Morell embrace : tacitly accepting his impotence and regression, the latter embraces "with boyish ingenuousness."⁴² Though Shaw says that "they do not know the secret in the poet's heart"⁴³ he is obviously wrong about Candida, who certainly does, and that is what makes her embrace so nauseating, for it becomes the embrace of a parasite sucking the life blood of the one locked in her embrace. By turning the Ibsenite parable upside down, she celebrates her triumph over one who has conclusively been exposed as the doll of the piece. About the so-called secret, Shaw said to the members of the play-reading club at Rugby :

The secret is very obvious after all provided you know what a poet is, what business has a man with the great destiny of a poet with the small beer of domestic conflict and cuddling and petting at the apron strings of some dear nice woman ? Morell cannot do without it...To Eugene, the stronger of the two, the daily routine of it is nursery slavery...When Candida brings him squarely face to face with it, his heart rolls up like a scroll; and he goes proudly into the majestic and beautiful kingdom of the starry night.⁴⁴

Candida chooses Morell because she knows that Marchbanks's

education has been complete. "He has learnt to live without happiness"⁴⁵ and without love. At the end of the play the strong woman and the strong man behave similarly by redefining their roles and reasserting themselves. Each disentangles her or his self from the action : Marchbanks prefers his loneliness to Candida, and Candida shows that she has always been heart-whole, not losing the smallest part of it to either man. Her immutability and insensitivity to love is her strength. The embrace she offers her husband is an act of alms-giving. Morell is reduced to the level of a limpet clinging to Candida even after it is apparent to him that the clinging means the loss of self-respect, forfeiture of exaltation and permanent exclusion from the heaven he mentioned to Lexy.

Shaw delicately maps out his world, and delineates the status of love and human friendship in that world through the revealed fate of the apparently strong man regressing to the life of an infant. A few intelligent critics like Margery Morgan find out that this "pleasant" play affects us with "touches of unease and revulsion" and "works subversively"⁴⁶ but it subverts not merely Victorian values as Morgan supposes, but also the quest for companionship and happiness.

Chapter 5 : Notes and References

1. *Shaw on Theatre*, p. 34.
2. CP I, p. 383-84.
3. CP I, p. 385.
4. Ibid.
5. CP I, p. 419.
6. *Major Critical Essays*, p. 44.
7. Ibid., p. 82.
8. *Major Critical Essays*, p. 85.
9. *Major Critical Essays*, p. 122.
10. *The Illusion of Socialism*, p. 2.
11. Ibid, p. 21.
12. *Shaw : the Critical Heritage*, p. 61.
13. *Our Theatre in the Nineties*, vol. II. p. 230.
14. *Collected Letters*, vol. I, p. 427.
15. CP I, p. 385.
16. *Collected Letters*, vol. I, p. 462.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Reprinted in CP I, p. 603.
20. See Arnold Silver, *Shaw : the Darker Side*, pp. 79-115, also Elsie B. Adams, "Bernard Shaw's Pre-Raphaelite Drama", PMLA 81 (1966) : 428-38.
21. Joseph Wood Krutch, "A Review of *Candida*," *The Nation* 162 (1946) : 487. Reprinted in Stephen S. Stanton (ed.), *A Casebook on 'Candida'*, p. 213.

22. CP I, pp. 517-18.
23. Ibid., p. 602.
24. Maurice Valency, *The Cart and the Trumpet*, p. 126.
25. Arnold Silver argues that in the play Shaw recreates the incident of his mother's life and through the denouement exonerates his mother from the charge of adultery. Silver, op. cit., p. 102. This may be too facile an argument but it cannot be gainsaid that at several points the play and Shaw's life inter-penetrate to make *Candida* a kind of personal statement.
26. CP I, p. 518.
27. Ibid., p. 521.
28. Ibid., p. 548.
29. Ibid., p. 354.
30. Ibid., p. 542.
31. Ibid., p. 543.
32. Ibid., p. 542.
33. Arthur Nethercot, *Men and Supermen : the Shawian Portrait Gallery*, p. 8.
34. CP I, p. 532.
35. *Collected Letters*, vol. I, p. 623.
36. Eric Bentley, *Bernard Shaw*, p. 177. The controversy raised over the model of Eugene Marchbanks is not very helpful. Colin Wilson believes that Marchbanks is modelled after Yeats. It is true that at one level *Candida* is a parody of Yeats's *The Land of the Heart's Desire*. At the initial stage Yeats's fairy child is changed into the type of aesthete with whom Shaw has little

patience. Marchbanks, before his transformation, is such an aesthete. It is possible that a little of Yeats has crept into Marchbanks. See Colin Wilson, *Shaw: a Reassessment*, p. 138. But Yeats was not the only, possibly not even the main, model. Shaw himself said that he derived Marchbanks from De Quincey's account of his adolescence in his *Confessions*. See Raymond Mander and Jo Mitchenson, *Theatrical Companion to Shaw*, p. 43. In external details there is a great deal of similarity between the two, for both are imaginative, hypersensitive and nervous. But at a deeper level Marchbanks's complex attitude to Candida reflects Shaw's own complex attitude to romantic love. He creates both Morell and Marchbanks out of his own self. A comprehensive review of the models is found in Arthur Nethercot, "Who Was Eugene Marchbanks?" *The Shaw Review*, 15.1 (1972) : 2-20.

37. CP I, p. 563.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 581.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 567.

40. *The Terry Letters*, p. 108.

41. *Collected Letters*, vol. I, pp. 801-802.

42. CP I, p. 593.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 594.

44. George A. Riding, "The Candida Secret" *The Spectator*, 185 (1950) : 506. Riding's article is reprinted in Stephen S. Stanton (ed.), *A Casebook on 'Candida'*, pp. 166-69.

45. CP I, p. 593.

46. Margery Morgan, *The Shawian Playground*, p. 82.