Chapter — III
Shaw and Psychoanalysis

3.1 Modern Drama and Psychoanalysis:

After a profound insight into the varieties of psychoanalytic criticism, one is emboldened to ponder over the matter in some new light. The proposed study dwells into psychoanalytic insights into Shavian drama and thus it is inevitable to trace the history of literary criticism down to the point of departure where psychoanalysis influenced the plays, playwrights and the literary (drama) criticism. But the notion that has to be imbibed in the insight is that whether or not a theory has directly or indirectly come in close enough to a particular playwright, so that an interactive forte could be expected, is not of any significance at all. The criticism or the theories of criticism that keep emerging in literature from time to time are themselves the product of interminably enriched field. The interminability is marked in the literary theory too; for it is near impossible to give a particular juncture where one can safely stand to look into future forgetting the past. Despite the fact that Shaw and Freud were contemporaries, their direct interaction at the level of their ideologies is scarcely witnessed, but then such critiques can be expected retrospectively too. A very formidable work that comes from the psychoanalysis to drama is from Sigmund Freud. Freud in his literary ventures took up English and Greek plays for the purpose of studying them through psychoanalytic criticisms. The debate on Hamlet/Oedipus complex as projected by Freud is still the most prolific contribution to the psychoanalytic literary criticism as the critics have been finding it affine for their intellectual and critical endeavors in contemporary psychoanalytic literary criticism.

George Bernard Shaw with his multi-layered prowess in intellectual fields was unlikely to be negligent towards Psychoanalysis which was a rage among the intelligentsia. But the fact, as inferred by the critics, is that it took Shaw a long time to come up with his own views and impressions regarding psychoanalysis. Before that no doubt the drama of the last century had started emanating psychoanalytic essences through its textual, critical and practical insights. What follows now is a brief discussion about the influence of psychoanalysis on drama, in its very primary stages. The study does not take account thence for it is beyond its pursuits.
3.2 History of Drama and Psychoanalysis Interactions:

Allardyce Nicol in *World Drama* records the entry of psychoanalysis in drama as the common introduction. Although he discusses, psychoanalysis vis-a-vis European drama and not just English drama, but his observation is important in that it gives the point of departure for a critical insight. Psychoanalysis, as is well-known, came to the fore as an institutionalized approach to all the different ideological practices in the early half of the 20th century. According to Nicol, Hensi-Rene Lenormand stands forth as a prime representative of those dramatists who would acknowledge psychoanalysis in the plans for their drama. Lenormand comes before us as the brutal naturalistic dramatist turned in ward. According to Nicol, in his scenes are sensational crudities that remind us of the early Haptmann's imaginings - with this difference, that the forms is always less on the events themselves than upon the subconscious workings of the characters' beings. One of his better known dramas, *Le mangeur de rives* (*The Eater of Dreams*, 1922), indeed, goes so far as to psychoanalyze a psychoanalyst, the central figure being a professional exponent of this 'science' who himself is so unbalanced as deliberately to drag from his patients' souls secrets which should never have been brought to light: he thus demonstrates to a young girl that a display of jealousy in her childhood (which she had entirely forgotten) was responsible for her mother's death. In *Les rates* (*The Failures*, 1920) two wretched people, an author and his actress wife, both of them wholly unsuccessful, are relentlessly brought from step-wise down the ladder until the man murders the woman and commits suicide. The inner life of a Don Juan is revealed in *L'homme et ses fantômes* (*Man and his Phantoms*, 1924), with the psychoanalytic explanation that the hero has been unconsciously seeking his mother. A perverted soul is dissected in *L'ombre du mal* (*The Red Tooth*, 1925), the story is told of a
sophisticated girl's marrying an unlettered mountaineer, finding herself surrounded by the fantastic demons of the popular imagination as she visits virtually alone in her snow-bound hut, and finally being accused of witchcraft. *Le simoun* (1920) narrates, in the arid setting of the Arabian Desert, the story of a father's incestuous love of his daughter; *Le lache* (*The Coward*, 1926) cruelly analyses the soul, terrors and weaknesses of a man who, during the war, has sought escape in Switzerland. There is not, perhaps, very much of real worth in Lenormand's work, and occasionally we may suspect there is a good deal of nonsense, but his position in the history of the drama is an important one and his influence has not been by any means meager.

Not unlike in spirit is Paul Raynal, author of *Le maître de son coeur* (*The Master of his Heart*, 1920), *Le tombeau sons V Arc de Triomphe* (*The Tomb beneath the Arc de Triomphe, or The Unknown Warrior*, 1924), *An soliel de l'instinct* (*In the sunshine of Instinct*, 1932), and *La Francerie* (1933). The first of these deals trenchantly with the affection of two friends broken by the machinations of a woman; the second, a very powerful drama shows a soldier on leave from the front and carries its tense scenes forward with merely three persons - the soldier himself, the girl to whom he is betrothed, and his father. Unlike Lenormand, Raynal is rather a romanticist of psychoanalysis than its naturalist. Lenormand's words are bare; Raynal's full of a wild torment; his figures, although also laid on the dissecting table, have their nakedness wrapped up in the folds of his lyrical utterance. Besides these, two other French playwrights contributed to the psychoanalytic drama. Steve Passeur, whose *Suzanne* (1929), *L'achetense* (*The Woman Buys*, 1930), *La chaine* (*The Chain*, 1931), *Les tricheurs* (*The Cheats*, 1933), *Je vivrai un grand amour* (*I shall have a Great Love*, 1935), and *Le château de cartes* (*The House of Cards*, 1937) all present dismal, brutal pictures of life, with love a kind of frenzied hatred, has carried his
earlier style unto the post-war period with his melodramatic La traitresse (The Traitress, 1946). Gledererode enters into the sphere with the tumultuous scenes of his Hop, Signor! (1938).

Besides Lenormand, there are a few others like Jean-Jacques Bernard, whose plays: L’âme en peine (The Soul in Pain, or The Unquiet Spirit, 1926), L’ i an invitation voyage (The Invititation to a Voyage, 1924), Le Feu qui reprend mal (The Sulky Fire, 1921), Martine (1922), Le printemps des antres (The Springtime of Others, 1924), and Devise Marette (1925), have characters who personify various psychoanalytical traits.

Closely associated with Bernard is Charles Vidrac (Charles Messager), author of Le Paquebot Tenacity (S.S. Tenacity 1920), Madam Beliard (1925), Le pelerin (The Pilgrim, 1926), La bronille (The Estrangement, 1930), and L’ air du temps (The Atmosphere of the Times, 1938), provides with psychoanalysis of love in all his plays.

The psychoanalysis of love is the general theme of nearly all works of Paul Geraldy: Les noces d’argent (The Silver Wedding, or The Nest, 1917), Aimer (To Love, 1921), Marianne (1925), Christine (1932), Do-Misol-do (1934) and Duo (1938).

Jean Sarment’s works like T?tes de rechange (Spare Heads, 1926), Simon Gautillon’s Maya (1924) and Musset’s Le p?cheur d’ombres (The Fisher of Shades, 1921) are all based on queen insights into the character’s psyche. Musset’s work recalls the psychological studies of Pirandello. Another famous play of Sarment Le manage d’ Hamlet (Hamlet’s Marriage, 1922) where Ophelia, her father, and the hero are given a second chance; Hamlet endeavors to accept his trials less passionately, but soon tires of his static role. All these plays in one way or the other seem to be under the spell of psychoanalysis as they are based on the characters and
character studies which are manifestations of psychoanalytic principles regarding human unconscious. The English dramatist who perhaps approaches more closely than any other to these French Playwrights is Charles Morgan. His plays like *The Flashing Stream* (1938), *The River Line*, (1952) and *The Burning Glass* (1954) - all intent upon the exploration of human characters set against dominant social, political and philosophical problems of our age. Pregnant thought and subtle analysis of emotions psychologically give distinctions to all of these.

3.3 Shaw and Psychoanalysis:

The above discussion gives an account of the immediate impact of psychoanalysis on the drama. The psychoanalytic criticism has found nuances in the some plays produced in the past retrospectively much before the advent of the theory. Usually the studies of critical analysis based on a definite theoretical perspective depend exclusively on either the text or the author; the present study of Shaw's plays within the Psychoanalytical framework definitely depends on the texts and the theory as its vital component but even then it seems obligatory to talk about Shaw's encounter (by virtue of his being a litterateur) with psycho-analysis briefly and then analyzing the texts in the light of the psychoanalytic theory as there are some very interesting interrelations in Shaw's knowledge of Psychoanalysis that provide with significant impacts on the critical analysis of the plays. Another aspect of insight into psychoanalysis from the Shavian point of view is to revitalize Shavian ideological canons which owing to tendentious Shavian influence have hardly treaded out into some different pastures. Critics during and after Shaw's life-time have barely been marked with a spirit to seek and add another edge to their muse 'Shaw'. This aim persuades the study towards a brief account of Shaw's tete-a-tete with psychoanalysis. Following quote holds significance here:
It is no unusual social or psychological phenomenon to find the members of each new age, especially its artists, preening themselves on their newness, though sometimes they are self-critical enough to allow a note of irony to intrude into their claims. (Nethercot 356)

This is very much relevant to Shaw for he himself opines in his preface to the Independent Theatre edition of *Widowers' Houses* in 1893 quoting from his former collaboration, William Archer's review of the play in *The World* where he alludes to five New Drama, New Criticism and New Humor.

Shaw reached dizzy heights in his iconoclasm and open-mindedness to new ideas. Critics find it very surprising that Shaw was almost completely apathetic toward psychoanalysis then known as the New Psychology. Shaw was, by the time Psychoanalysis became familiar to all educated people, no longer young and the glamour and novelty of the reputation of being an Advanced Thinker were getting a little thin and also he perhaps felt that such a reputation no longer needed to be promoted by egregious self-advertising which had been an important of Shaw earlier.

Considering Shaw's reiterated theory of characterization in his plays one might expect him to have been immediately and powerfully attracted to the new doctrines of Freud. Shaw himself and always advocated the doing away with the masks, which human beings far too often place before their faces to hide the unbearable truth. The insistence on tearing away these masks that differentiates his Realist from his Idealist is explicitly imbibed in *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891). In the revelations of the various characters at the end of *Heartbreak House* (1919), poor, shocked Alfred Mangan, preparing to tear off his clothes, exclaims:

Shame! What shame is there in this house? Let's all strip stark naked ...

We've stripped ourselves morally naked; well, let us strip ourselves
physically naked as well, and see how we like it... How are we to have any self-respect of we don't keep it up that we're better than we really are?. (Complete Works 797)

And at the end of Too True To Be Good (1934) Aubrey Bagot, the Clergyman-Burglar, centers his whole final soliloquy-sermon on the question that Shaw puts into his mouth:

...what storyteller, however reckless a liar, would dare to invent figures so improbable as men and women with their minds stripped naked? ...

But how are we to bear this dreadful new nakedness: the nakedness of the souls who until now have always disguised themselves from one another in beautiful impossible idealism to enable them to bear one's company. (1167)

Though in this case, as Shaw presents the situation, it is the war rather than Freud which as brought about this dreadful new stripping, Shaw's theory of the dramatist's turning his characters inside out for the examination of the audience is essentially the same as Freud's way of getting at the inner truth and motivation of his patients.

At first, in his use of certain phrases and terms which later came to be associated closely with psychoanalysis, it is difficult to determine, just where and when he discovered them and added them to his vocabulary.

It is obvious that he was using the word 'neurosis' in its earlier sense, before it has become substituted for 'psychoneurosis'. Similarly, when for instance in the 'Maxims for Revolutionists' appended to Man and Superman in 1903, he captioned one of his maxims 'The Unconscious Self' and commented, 'the unconscious self is the real genius. Your breathing goes wrong the moment your conscious self meddles with it', (Complete Prefaces 193). It seems unlikely that he was aware that the phrase
had any technical associations. Similarly when he wrote his preface to *Androdes and the Lion* in 1916, with its brilliant analysis of Christianity, the Gospels and Jesus himself, he analyzed the latter's ultimate conviction that he was the Son of God by simply saying, without using any technical terms like "megalomania", or 'theophary', or 'paranoia':

if Jesus had been indicted in a modern court, he would have been examined by two doctors; found to be obsessed by a delusion: declared incapable of pleading; and sent to an asylum.(549-50)

To be 'obsessed' meant something different here.

The first direct evidence of Shaw's clear acquaintance with psychoanalysis appeared, not in any printed work, but in a letter he wrote in 1921 to prevent publication of the Irish-American Professor Thomas D. O'Bolger's objectionable biography of him, which contained certain opprobrious charges about the Shaws that Shaw resented. In a letter, now at Harvard, Shaw wrote to O'Bogler that psychoanalysts would ascribe the professor's peculiar mental condition to a "Resentment Complex" and recommended that he go to psychoanalyst (if he could find one who was not a quack). In this way O'Bogler might find the real origin of his complex, exercise it, and ultimately cure himself by writing his autobiography. O'Bogler biography of Shaw still remains in manuscript even though he had rebuffed Shaw's advice.

This quite explicit allusion was followed the next year by Shaw's essay on "Imprisonment", which appeared as a preface to Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *English Local Government* in 1922 and dealt with the various causes of crime and treatment of criminals. Here, in a section headed "Possibilities of Therapeutic
Treatment", he stated in a condescending manner which revealed his early basic doubt and skepticism of the new 'science':

Psychoanalysis, too, which is not all quackery and pornography, might conceivably cure a case of Sadism as it might cure any of the phobias. And psychoanalysis is a mere fancy compared to the knowledge we now pretend to concerning the function of our glands and their effect on our character and conduct. (Sixteen Self Sketches 296)

By 1928, however, when Shaw published his Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, he was beginning to admit, to say about the dangerous relations of parents and teachers with children. Here, in his chapter on "Socialism and Children", he wrote:

Modern Psychological research, even in its rather grotesque Freudian beginnings, is forcing us to realize how serious is the permanent harm that comes of this atmosphere of irritation on the one side and suppression terror and reactionary naughtiness on the other. Even those who do not study psychology are beginning to notice that chaining dogs makes them dangerous and is a cruel practice. (Shaw 416)

Only four pages later, however, Shaw returned to his earlier repugnance and skepticism when he referred to "the morbidities of psychoanalysis" (420). This is taken up later in study elaborately.

So far, Shaw had confined his rather scanty and certainly superficial comments on psychoanalysis to his non-dramatic works. In the middle thirties, however he found occasion to drop a few ambiguous allusions to Freud's most famous doctrine into some of the comedies which have become known, not too fairly, as his "dotages". For instance, in the show-down duel between Alderwoman Aloysia
Brollikins and her perspective father-in-law, Prime Minister Sir Arthur Chavender, at the end of *On the Rocks* (1933), Aloysia sums up young David Chavender, whom she proposes to marry, as 'such a queer boy. He says he's never loved anybody but his sister, and that he hates his mother.' The newly-tolerant Sir Arthur remonstrates mildly, and gives his diagnosis of his son's maternal distal:

He had no right to tell you that he hates his mother, because as a matter of fact he doesn't. Young people nowadays read books about psychoanalysis and get their heads filled with nonsense. (1215)

Aloysia with her usual brash omniscience responds:

Of course I know all about psychoanalysis I explained to him that he was in love with his mother and was jealous of you. The Edipus complex, you know. (1215)

To Sir Arthur's query, "what did he say to that?" she admits, "He told me to go to Jericho. But I shall teach him manners." In such a simple equating of psychoanalysis merely with the Oedipus complex for a fairly ingenuous theatre audience, both Aloysia and Shaw no doubt reveal a certain naivete toward the subject.

With this reference to Freud's most famous doctrine, it is interesting to compare Shaw's earlier failure to suggest such a relationship between Hamlet and his mother, even in the most general of terms, in his preface to *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets* in 1910. In this review of Frank Harris' and Thomas Tyler's books on Shakespeare, Shaw - as a self-admitted Shakespearean authority - dogmatically stated:

There is only one place in Shakespeare's plays when the sense of shame is used as a human attribute; and that is where Hamlet is ashamed, not of anything he himself has done, but of his mother's
relations with his uncle. This scene is an unnatural one: the son's reproaches to his mother, even the fact of his being able to discuss the subject with her, is more repulsive than her relations with her deceased husband's brother. (*Complete Prefaces* 761)

But in this passage Shaw is obviously completely oblivious of any suspicion that Hamlet may be least partially motivated by the same sexual feelings towards his mother as drew his uncle to her. But this reflects the direction where his mind led without the support of any Freudian doctrine.

It was not until 1935, that Shaw actually used the name of Sigmund Freud. Previously he had merely used general terms such as "psycho-analysis" and "Freudian". At the beginning of the second act of *The Millionairess* (1936) Mrs. Epifania Ognisanti di Parerga Fitzfassenden is engaged in a rather mild affair with the publisher, Adrian Blenderbland. Blenderbland, with more than his usual perspicacity and boldness, undertakes to tell the Millionairess the truth about her relations with her father:

> Everything you have told me about your father convinces me that though he was no doubt an affectionate parent and amiable enough to explain your rather tiresome father fixation, as Dr. Freud would call it, he must have been quite the most appalling bore that ever devastated even a Rotary Club. (1267)

This insult to her revered parent goads Eppy "to deliver a straight left" to the chin of her "Sunday husband", followed up by a "savage punch with her right", which knocks him writhing to the floor. She indulges in some self induced convulsions, which bring in an Egyptian doctor in a fez, who also diagnoses her case as "a father fixation", analyzes her characteristics as "Enormous self-confidence. Reckless
audacity. Insane egotism. Apparently sexless", and sums her up as a 'psychological curiosity.' She reciprocates by informing him of some of her business principles, and he responds by reducing his previous label and calling her simply a "psychologist" rather than a "curiosity", and when she answers, "Nonsense! I know how to buy and sell, if that is what you mean," gives his cynical conclusion, "that is how good psychologists make money". Eventually this remarkable doctor, reacting negatively to Epifania's declaration that she wants to marry him, asserts that he himself has a "mother fixation", but this desperate invention fails to effect his escape from her clutches. Never before or since Freud find his name and his terminology appropriated for more farcical purposes. (1267-71) 

It was only when Shaw reached his ninety-third year - that is, in 1948 - which he felt he had attained a sufficient grasp of psychoanalysis, its practitioners, and its basic principles to dare to indulge in a general review of the subject. In the preface to Farfetched Fables, his intellectual last will and testament, he surveyed his acquaintance with this new kind of psychology from his first experience with it to what was practically the end of life. Although he gives no date for this introduction, he tells a personal anecdote as to how the early Freudian technique of free association of words failed in his case - or at least he maintained that it did. As he described the process:

The first Freudians used to recite a string of words to their patients, asking what they suggested, and studying the reaction, until they wormed their way into the sufferer's subconscious mind, and unveiled some forgotten trouble that had been worrying him and upsetting his health. By bringing it to the light they cured the patient. (883)
Incidentally and indirectly thus confessing that he himself had once been subjected to this process, he divulged:

... when this Freudian technique was tried on me it failed because the words suggested always something fictitious. (895)

That is, when the word "ass" was given him, he did not first think of an actual experience he had once with "a handsome and intelligent donkey" on the salt marshes of Nertolk, but promptly replied, "Dogberry", and Badlam". "Dagger" suggested nothing but Macbeth; "highway", Autolycus; "interpreter", The Pilgrim's Progress; and "blacksmith", Joe Gargery. Putting aside Shaw's conclusion that the test had failed just because his mind responded to fiction rather than facts and experiences, one can see how, at ninety three, his mind had become preoccupied with the subject, since he headed this section of the preface "Am I a Pathological Case?"

His answer to his own question, "is literary genius a disease?", was that since born storytellers are needed he was "therefore not a disease but a social necessity."

In 1921 Shaw had subtitled *Back to Methuselah* a "Metabiological Pentateuch" (855). Now, in 1948, he wrote of "The New Psychobiology" (894) and claimed, "Nowadays biology is moving in my direction". Pointing out that the medical profession had split violently into two camps, the psychotherapists and the "old-fashioned pill and bottle prescribers backed by surgeons practicing on our living bodies as flesh plumbers and carpenters," he sauged himself with "the more intelligent, observant, and open-minded" practitioners who had been "wakened up by an extraordinarily indelicate adventurer named Sigmund Freud, and by the able Scotch doctor Scott Haldane (J.B.S. Haldane's father) ..." He even cited a just published "treatise on Mental Abnormality by Dr. Millais Culpin", which "would have been impossible when I wrote the Doctor's Dilemma". Shaw also recognized
that the primitive technique of the early Freudians had been improved by "the professional psychotherapists" since his purely literary response to the word "ass", and referred to "the post-Freudian psychoanalyst" who "relieves his patient of the touncuts of guilt and shame by extracting a confession of their hidden cause". Nevertheless, Shaw queried mischievously, "what else does the priest do in the confessional, though the result is called cure by one and absolution by the other" (894-5, 904, 911)? It is worthy of note, however, that in spite of this advance in his knowledge and in spite of his greater respect for psychoanalysis Shaw's observations on the subject remain essentially general. He uses phrases like "the first Freudians" and "the post-Freudian psychoanalyst" without naming a single example. Jung, Adler, Brill and all the rest might never have lived, experimented speculated, and written for all that Shaw had to say about them. Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy to him meant Freud and Freud alone. But of Freud's work too he failed to name a single specific title. These lacunas are all the more surprising when one recalls the remarkable scope of Shaw's general reading.

The tiny majority of Shaw's biographers and critics have thought the subject of Shaw's opinions on the mental science of psychoanalysis even worth mentioning, which is a very disillusioning fact. As early as 1916, however, Richard Burton had written:

He believes in the will to live of Schopenhauer, the will to power of Nietszche, and the wish of Freud; his philosophy, like theirs, is a willful one. (222)

But there, so far as Freud was concerned Burton dropped his comparison, with no attempt at documentation. By 1948, however, an Italian, Piero Rebora, in his Bernard Shaw/Comico e tragico, had become sufficiently aware of the problem to mention it
several times, especially in connection with Misalliance, St. Joan, and Too True to be Good. Without considering it very deeply or correctly, Rebora concluded that Shaw was in most aspects "quasi un anti-Freud", and devoted half a dozen pages toward the end of his book to discussing and comparing the relative influence of the two men on modern thought (Rebora 12,42,154,209,226,240, 246,250-6).

Sex and education of children were two of the main aspects of Shavian and Freudian thought that impressed Rebora. They have also impressed a few English and Americans, one of the latter being Barbara Bellow Watson in her Shavian Guide to the Intelligent Women seems to be misled by an ambiguity she came across in Stephen Winsten's Jesting Apostle: The Private Life of Bernard Shaw. In a passage on Getting Married Winsten had remarked in passing:

This was the time when Shaw came across the writings of Sigmund Freud and his attitude toward this psychologist was the same as to all pioneers: T have said it all before him. (139)

There is no evidence to show that Shaw was even aware of the evidence of Freud at the time of writing Getting Married in 1908.

Arthur H. Nethercot does not concede to this view of Watson; he feels that unlike Watson's belief with reference to Winsten's statement on Getting Married, that when he first came across the writings of Freud, about 1911, he boasted, 'I have said it all before him'. Nethercot rather affirms that there is actually nothing at all about Freud or Freudianism in this preface. Watson on the other hand opines that:

In The Quintessence of Ibsenism, which appeared four years before Freud's first psychoanalytic work, Studies in Hysteria, Shaw makes a statement which seems to express metaphorically Freud's view of the genital origin of all erotic feelings in the broadest sense.... (367)
The statement which Watson feels comes as the base to the aforesaid is:

Taunhauser may die in the conviction that one moment of the emotion he felt with St. Elizabeth was fuller and happier than all the hours of passion he spent with Venus.... (132-133)

Critics like Nethercot, feel it to be farfetched and too generalized. But Watson prophetically feels:

it may some day become clear that Shaw created an early literary parallel of Freudian psychology. In a paper published in 1908, Freud drew some quite Shavian conclusions about the morality of marriage, the capacities of women, and the need for social reforms. (132-33)

She contrastingly admits that "according to Ernest Jones, Freud never came to like Shaw's writings, "probably because of their widely differing conceptions of womanhood". Their Freud's biographer leaves the matter" (Jones 291-4, 314).

The view of British professor and educator A.S. Neill, as expressed in his essay on "Shaw and Education" in Winsten's Festschrift, G.B.S. 90/Aspects of Bernard Shaw's Life and Work, in 1996, are considerably substantial. Here Winsten's argument in 1957 seems wavering for his contributor Neill in 1946, had asserted in second paragraph, in connection with the preface to Misalliance:

*The Parent and Children Preface* dates back to the year 1910 that is to the time when Freud was unknown, when psychology was to most people a peddling science divorced from all that was dynamic. (Neill 183)

It was left, however to Archibald Henderson, Shaw's American "official biographer", to come closest to coping with the question of Shaw's real knowledge of psychoanalysis, though only in the third version of his biography, entitled *George
Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century (1956). Presumably in this official capacity Henderson had opportunities which most of ten others did not have to discuss this subject personally and intimately with his author, and to record Shaw's remarks and his own analyses of Shaw himself from this point of view. These random passages when brought together constitute a revealing commentary on Shaw's reactions to what at first plenty of people seemed only another new fad or fashion in the history of ideas. Unfortunately these conversations are undated. Moreover, nowhere in any of these did Henderson quote Shaw as referring to Freud or any other psychoanalyst or any of their works, by name. It was only the terminology and vocabulary of the school that he sometimes adopted. The whole peculiar situation almost leads one to speculate seriously on whether Shaw had actually read anything specific by Freud or was merely relying on the general popular discussions he had heard or read of the subject.

For instance, Henderson records, "one day we were talking about schizophrenia and its treatment in literature," and tells how Shaw:

...took down a copy of Oliver Wendell Holmes's Autocrat of the Breakfast Table, and read the famous passage" on the minimum of at least six personalities involved in any dialogue between any two persons, such as John and Thomas. In accepting Holmer's discrimination between the three different Thomases really present, Henderson and Shaw cited as examples "Browning, Robert Louis Stevenson, Israel Zangwill and Shaw himself in Arms and the Man with Sergius Saranoff. (Henderson 835)

This unexpected and voluntary late recognition by Shaw himself of one of his most original early characters (the play was produced in 1894) as falling into a psychoanalytical category calls attention to the fact that many other of his dramatis
personae lend themselves patently to the same treatment, though Henderson certainly
overstates his case when he speaks of Shaw's creating "hundreds of dramatic
characters who are psychoanalytical studies of contemporary class types" (64). But
even before Shaw had ever heard of an Oedipus complex he had created at least two
extraordinary characters obviously suffering from one: Professor Henry Higgins in
*Pygmalion* (produced 1913) from one of the worst cases in all literature. And, though
neither Shaw nor Henderson ever mentions the term, the antithetical Electra complex
is incarnated in Epifania of *The Millionaire*SS, with her father fixation (nothing is said
about her feeling found her also presumably dead mother), and "Mops" Mopply, the
patient in *Too True to be Good* (1932), with her mother hatred and her lament, "If
only I had had a father to stand between me and my mother's case."

Shaw and his biographer also talked about "fixations", and Henderson relates
how Shaw "often quoted with apparent approbation Wilde's remark that Shaw had
not an enemy in the world, and that none of his friends quite liked him". In
explanation of his acceptance of this somewhat barbed description, Shaw told
Henderson that "he was too well aware that a too devoted affection - a fixation on
himself as he called it - is a tyranny that is bad for both parties" (854). Several times
in the course of his biography Henderson uses terms like "subconscious" in a way
that suggests that they were part of the ordinary working vocabulary of their talks on
Shaw's methods of dramatic characterization. To realize his desire to create a new
form of play beyond the old realism, called "ultra realism" or "supra realism", Shaw
found it necessary to create characters who in a strictly realistic setting, uttering truths
as naked thoughts from the "subconscious". As Shaw put it:
my sort of play would be impossible unless I endowed my characters with powers of self-consciousness and self-expression which they would not possess in real life. (64)

This was the main reason why Shaw was struck by the plays of O'Neill, whose "concept of bringing the inner life into parallel with the outer life interested Shaw deeply." Though he realized the presence of both an inner and an outer man, speaking with different voices, he felt that "the schizophrenia was too glaring for the stage", and that for his own kind of play the solution was:

... to have the individual, in the realm of the conscious and on the plane of daily living, speak with but a single tone and voice the uninhibited impulse to truth of the subconscious. (755)

As far as the role of Freud in this process, Henderson admits freely that Shaw had an aversion to Freudian psychoanalysis, at least in one of its major aspects. He disliked and rejected a theory of life that placed its major emphasis on sex, on the libido, as a means of diagnosing human motivation and of both causing and curing man's mental illness. Though Shaw regarded sex as a natural human pleasure and even recreation, and had no objection on moral grounds to its practice, he felt that after all it is only one element in a normal life and should not be overemphasized or distorted. Henderson describes his attitude in this way:

A natural philanderer, he was pursued by the 'new' women who were resolved to 'live their own lives', which almost invariably meant freedom from conventional inhibitions as to sex relations ... Uninhibited by religions scruples, he felt no delinquency regarding sexual indulgence, and his philandering were comic adventures in sentimental exploration. (809-10)
Of course, his love affairs were trivial, according to Henderson, in comparison with his own Don Juan's, and he "never cuckolded his friends", but he got "huge satisfaction" from narrating the stories of his adventures to them. Still, according to Henderson, he never experienced real human love, and instead "for many years devoted himself to adoration of the Uranian Venus, the classic love of the aesthetic" 809-10. After all, he had entitled his third volume of plays *Three Plays for Puritans* and as far back as 1900 had written in its preface,

> I have, I think, always been Puritan in my attitude toward Act.... And when I see that the 19th century has crowned the idolatry of Art with the deification of love, so that every poet is supposed to have pierced to the hold of holies when he has announced that Love is the supreme, or the Enough, or the All, I feel that Art was safer in the hands of the most fandical of Cromwell's major generates than it will be if it ever gets into mine. (744-5)

On the other hand, one should not overlook speeches in Shaw's plays such as the one he, at the age of seventy six, put into mouth of Aubrey in the second act of *Too True*. Speaking in the reference to the highly sexed Sweetie, Aubrey points out - "to put it as nicely as I can" - that we all have "our lower centres and our higher centres" which "act with a terrible power that sometimes destroys us". These lower centres act without speaking, but in the great literature of the world the higher centres become vocal. They are also the ones which dominate all respectable conversation, even when it is saying nothing or even telling lies. "But the lower centres are there all the time: a sort of guilty secret with all of us, though they are dumb". And then Aubrey-Shaw tells how he once asked his tutor to at college whether, "if anyone's lower centres began to talk, the shock would not be worse than the one Baalam got when his donkey
began talking to him". It is true that Shaw attributes the new volubility of the lower centres, as in Sweetie's case, to the war, with its effect like an earthquake; but, if there is anything at all in the psychoanalytical theory of association of ideas out of the subconscious, the incursion of Shaw's recollection of the story of Baalam and the ass into the midst of this passage should create at least a suspicion that it was not the war only which he felt was responsible for the corrupt state of society, but that the popular adoption of Freud and his view on the libido also had contributed. For Aubrey makes Sweetie symbolical of the modern world, since "her lower centres speak", and

.. .they speak truths that have never been spoken before - truths that the makers of our domestic institutions have tried to ignore. And now that Sweetie goes shouting them all over the place, the institutions are rocking and splitting and sundering. They leave us no place to live, no certainties, no workable morality, no heaven, no hell, no commandments, and no God. (1149)

Though the eloquent Aubrey confesses that he can preach on any subject, and not only what he really believes, he is here indubitably Shaw's mouth-piece in most of his speeches. Substitute "Freud" for "Sweetie" in Aubrey's diatribe, and Shaw's own opinions on the condition of man are clearly reflected. Just before his death in 1950 Shaw brought together what he called Sixteen Self-Sketches, consisting of several autobiographical essays and fragments he had published earlier, augmented by a few new ones and some comments on the old. In 1901, under the title: "Who I am, and what I Think", he had made several interesting confessions in the form of a "catechism ... in a short-lived magazine called the The Candid Friend". In this, among other kinds, he described himself as a boy who had "exhausted somatic
daydreaming” before he was ten years old. Among these boyhood fantasies was that of sex.

Twenty-nine years later, when his friend Frank Harris was composing his biography, Shaw, answered some of his biographer's questions in a series of letters, most of which Harris included in his book. The most famous of these, which Harris printed in a chapter headed "Shaw's sex Credo" and Shaw in Sixteen Self Sketches reprinted under the title "To Frank Harris on Sex in Biography", confirmed what Shaw had previously confessed to the few readers of The Candid Friend. After admitting that from his youth, "I was entirely free from the neurosis (as I call it) of "Original Sin" in the matter of sexual intercourse", Shaw added:

But as between Oscar Wilde who gave 16 as the age at which sex begins, and Rousseau who declared that his blood boiled with it from birth, my personal experience confirms Rousseau and confutes Wilde. Just as I cannot remember when I could not read and write, I cannot remember any time when I did not exercise my imagination in daydreams about women. (Harris 234-8)

Reflecting on this matter at the age of ninety three, after me and all the rest of the world had been subjected to the influence of the doctor from Vienna; Shaw had added a bracketed not to the earlier passage from The Candid Friend:

When I wrote this in 1901, I did not believe that an author so utterly devoid of delicacy as Sigmund Freud could not only come into human existence, but become as famous and even instructive by his defect as a blind man might by writing essays on painting, nor that the ban could ever be lifted from the ponderous sex treatises of Havelock Ellis.

(Sketches 86-7)
Shaw's final confession of a partial but grudging acceptance of at least some of the principles of psychoanalysis also came in 1949 in another of the sketches he wrote for his collection. He entitled this "Shame and Wounded Snobbery/A Secret kept for Eighty Years". This secret concerned his boyhood stay in the Central Model Boys' School in Dublin. The reasons for his "Shame" need not be gone into here, since he gives them in answer to his own question, "Why did the Model School afflict me with a shame which was more or less a neurosis?" More important here is his frank admission of the death:

... Finally, a point to be scored by our psychoanalysts. Although for eighty years I could never bring myself to mention the Marlborough Street episode, yet now that I have broken through the habit of ashamed silence, and made not only a clean breast of it but a clear brain, I am completely cured. That is not a vestige of my boyhood shame left: it survives not as a complex but a habit flicked off without the slightest difficulty. This illustrates the failures and success of psychotherapy. Inculcated habits being traumatic are curable, in born complexes, no.... (45-7)

By the end of his life Shaw willingly adopted not only the vocabulary but the main principle of psychoanalysis of Freud. Henderson, in spite of his tremendous admiration for Shaw, was forced to conclude as a result of his study that, because Shaw's voluminous outgivings are often unreliable and unconvincing, because of internal contradictions and irreconcilable antimonies (Henderson 64).

Shaw himself "presents a rich subject for the psychoanalyst" (64). Even more specifically, thought Henderson, the playwright would be "an ideal subject for the psychoanalyst as a love-thwarted being" (810). At the same time he reminded his
readers that as early as 1932, when he had written the second version of his Biography, *Bernard Shaw: Playboy and Prophet*, he had expressed his opinion that Shaw as an author was essentially a "dramatic psychoanalyst" (755). This opinion he repeated and developed at more length in *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century*, asserting that in spite of Shaw's distrust and dislike of:

... certain of the methods of psychoanalysts, ...strangely enough, he became an amateur psychiatrist of great power and intuitive precipicance" himself. (64)

Though this observation is probably again somewhat of an exaggeration and disproportioning of the facts, particularly from the technical and scientific point of view, it nevertheless points up the fact that for many years Shaw expressed his lack of faith in psychoanalysis, practiced it in varying degrees and senses in his dramatic characterizations, and offered, in his person, fascinating material for psychoanalytical biographical treatment.

What follows now is an important component of the discussion which hereby provides a look at one of the most appropriate psychoanalytical analysis of Shaw in that the further analyzes that have been done vis-a-vis *Man and Superman* (chapter 4 in the thesis) and *Candida* (chapter 5 in the thesis) are drawn on the similar dynamics of the Shavian discourse.

### 3.3.1 Norman Holland's Study of Shaw:

Norman N. Holland in his book *The Aesthetics of I*, presents an absorbing study of Shaw through psychoanalytic perspective. According to Holland, Shaw made radical changes in his life, both literary and political, and he was sufficiently, if carefully, frank about his life so that one can, explore his style from infancy to the end of his extraordinarily long life. There are many psychoanalytic studies of Shaw.
Daniel Dervin's study of Shaw, *Bernard Shaw: A Psychological Study* finds Shaw, like Holland, as "one of the most elusive, most unbelievably expansive, contradictory, and achieved lives of recent times" with "organic unity". He feels him to be "a unified personality with a centre out of which it acted and created... [and] brought to life the variety of works we call Shavian" (33,207).

Shaw being a multifaceted personality can retrospectively be assumed never to be averse towards any new literary encounter. This fact is emboldened by the preceding elaborate discussion which talked virtually about all the encounters involving Shaw and Psychoanalysis up to 1963. Holland took up Shaw as a focus while discussing psychoanalysis in his book in 1978. Before that his study *The Dynamics of Literary Response* is on Shaw through various psychoanalytical views. Richard M. Ohmann's book *Bernard Shaw: The Style and the Man* is an intriguing study of Shaw where the author reaches many psychological conclusions on linguistic grounds. Shaw's one interminable approach in all his works come out as his novel way of rectifying English language by taking up various syntactical, lexical and linguistic tools. 'Pygmalion' as a structuralist study has been attempted on linguistic grounds owing to its phonetics lent to it by Shaw. Coming back to psychoanalysis, Holland in *The Dynamics of Literary Response* talks about Shaw under a head which is somewhat similar to Ohmann's title (1962). A psychoanalyst while speaking of a man often speaks about his "life style". This usage can be imbibed in literary terms as the critic might find a useful model for his concept of style in the psychoanalyst's concept of character. "The style", critics say "is the man" and in pure literary terms we coin terms like Miltonic or Flaubertian or Kafkesque or Shavian. Ohmann's analysis in *Bernard Shaw: The Style and the Man* talks about something which is style of Shaw and which is Shavian. Studying a style in psychoanalytic terms means to put up with
the three dimensional mode of style's study by a critic, first is the study of writer's words for e.g. Shawian wit or Joycean wit. Second factor is that a critic while deciding about a writer's style, includes a writer's choice of material and his characteristic form for handling it, finally the third, where a critic seems to include in the notion of style a writer's way of dealing with his audience. According to Holland, a psychoanalyst defines "character" (the classic statement is Fenichel's, 467) as "the habitual mode of bringing into harmony the tasks presented by internal demands and by the external world" (226). Holland believes that there is a rough correspondence between the elements the literary critic includes in style and the three terms the psychoanalyst includes in character. That is, the "internal demands" are the Triebe, the drive that might lead a writer to a certain kind of material. The habitual mode of bringing into harmony refers to a man's defenses; they in turn correspond to a writer's ways of dealing with his material—form and structure on the large scale, sentence on verse manner on the small. Finally, the "external world" for a writer is his reader. Naturally in man, as in a work of literature, these three things interact and modify one another, but one can set up a kind of rough comparison: content is to drive as form is to defense style is to character (defined as the habitual interactions of drive, defense, and external reality). Applying these onto Shaw refers to the process of psychoanalytically studying Shaw, the writer with "organic unity". While taking up the case of Shaw, who stands as a centre to the circumference which defines a world of literature based on 'style' of Shaw, a psychoanalyst critic can fruitfully dare to venture into the aforesaid three dimensional system of insight. The "drive, defense and external reality" trilogy enables one to be versatile in one's psychoanalytic approach to Shaw. The text-centred, writer-centred and reader-oriented researches in psychoanalysis cannot be compartmentalized for the three forms a man altogether
which is his style. (Shaw being viable for all the three modes fits into this criteria).

The pervasive theme of style, as aforesaid, corresponds to psychoanalytic method of holistic interpretation from particular acts (or "behaviors") to a whole life. Holland opines that writers are particularly good for instancing style, because in every work they leave behind hundreds of choices from which one can state holistic patterns of sameness and difference. In his study of Shaw in _The Aesthetics of I_, Holland adopts the phrasing: 'to find or to be a purposeful and fulfilling opposite' which according to him brings together a series of terms, each of which can be used to 'encompass a cluster of traits of Shaw' (sec. 57). Shaw lures a psychoanalyst (critic) into a process of criticism which is very enriching in terms of insights. The three dimensional study of Shaw's style lends a systematic method of studying him. The phrasing of Holland dwells into interminable factors which go into the making of Shaw what he is. Sometimes Shaw sought an outer force to put his trust in and sometimes he because that purposeful i.e. mentally directed and willed: the way Shaw always tried to impose his own will on the raw, bodily material on life. In 'fulfilling' Holland includes not only mental fulfillment but also Shaw's deep concern with physical wellbeing, quite literally he and others would be fulfilled with food and drink and warmth and ideas. By 'opposite' he intends any other person or force, 'really, lovers as well as enemies, but always seen through Shaw's eye for change and reversals'. Holland believes that he (Shaw) might be the opposite himself, or he might seek an opposite in same outer force. The "identity theme", the head under which Holland discusses Shaw, the style and the man, captures the concept of identity. From this version of identity, a "sense of identity", really, has come a great deal of admirable work in psychiatry and psychoanalytic sociology, as in "This week I'm having an identity crisis". Holland adds a literary critic's precision to Erikson's "identity". He defines identity by an
operation or procedure for examining the style in which particular individual functions. He believes that in one sense he is refining the key term of Fenichel's classic definition, "habitual". Into the concept of I (identity) Holland adds the most exact of the modern theories of identity, that of Heinz Lichtenstein. Identity according to him has three simultaneous meaning, as:

1. an agency
2. a consequence
3. a representation.

The "I" represented by "an identity" is the I that is the subject of sentence like "I see", "I remember", or "I repress". This "I" tends to disappear in abstract discussions with norms like "vision", "memory", or "repression"; one reason that abstracting away from the person in philosophy sometimes leads to confusion. If "vision" makes a person vanish, imagine what "intertextuality" or "intersubjectivity" do. Identity, in the first act, is the agent initiating the actions that systematically create identity. One needs therefore to think of identity as a system. Identity is not only the active principle of such a system but also the passive self that system creates as it interacts with the world. Hence, identity is also a consequence (Identity is what is being created as the individual brings an already existing identity in the first sense) to new experiences. Identity in this second sense is the "I" that results because "I see", "I remember", or "I repress". Identity is what is created by living is necessarily correlative to identity in the first sense of agency. Hence identity is, if not paradoxical, at least circular. We shall need to resort to feedback when we wish a fuller model. The "we wish" and "model" reminds however, of the third term: identity as a representation. Identity is a way of putting into the dialectic of sameness and
difference that is a human life. The poets have long recognized that unifying dialectic between sameness and difference.

Given a myth or "identity theme" like this, Holland goes on to say how Shaw made the great, fertilizing ideas of his day (and, indeed, our own) functions of his personality. For example he rejected the principle of natural selection because it was (he said) a "fatalism" leading only to chance and randomness. He insisted on the Lamarckian idea that acquired characteristic can be inherited (which had no more scientific backing then than 2000) and on what he came to call creative evolution. Biology, to suit Shaw, had to have a purpose and direction, the improvement of the human species.

The pattern according to Holland is that Shaw rejects "blind" determinisms in favour of a fulfilling purpose. Then he spoke of "the horror of [Darwinism's] banishment of mind from the universe" (sec. 57). He substituted creative evolution, which Shaw often imagined as feminine, a muse-matriarch who would lead us to greater knowledge, understanding and power over ourselves and our circumstances. Shaw was so opposed to determinism that he scarcely even accepted death as reality.

According to the psychoanalytic perspective Shaw did not deal with the death in his plays until he answered William Archer's challenge to do so with The Doctor's Dilemma in 1906; even in that play, death has surely lost its sting. Next, comes 'to find or to be a purposeful and fulfilling opposite':

If this identity theme truly enables us to say the consistency in what Shaw did and thought, then we should be able to see a rational not only behind Shaw's intellectual style but also the strangest aspect of the man, his sex life, notably his much vexed virginity, much vexed by his biographers anyway. (Holland sec. 58)
Holland observes Shaw's attitude towards sex in his life in the light of the theme based on 'a purposeful and fulfilling opposite'. He feels that Shaw's phrasing is quite chemical when he talks about his sex life. Shaw's mode of experimentation involves himself as a case and thus he is least bothered to talk about sex as any thematic concern vis-a-vis the drives of his characters in almost all their struggles in life. The romantic associations in his life, surprisingly, have been taken up by Shaw rather openly and objectively than his characters' discussion. This may be taken up as a notion which points towards Shaw's conviction that instincts and drives (psychoanalytic) lead to various manifestations in active life.

Thus, Shaw perhaps never seemed to apparently believe but almost all his characters stand as testimony to this; Tanner in *Man and Superman* symbolizes Shavian ideology whereby projecting the process through which a man undergoes as a part of the universal movement of creativity by virtue of his capacity to produce forth the race of Superman. Ann, 'the boa-constrictor', successfully chases him owing to his suitability for the purpose of fulfilling her natural duty as a perperuator of the creative process. Both are moved by their id, which on the level of ego creates clash and thus forcing one to run away from the other. Tanner, but finally, succumbs to Ann's charm and is under the spell of love that is cast obviously onto him for he himself possesses an affinity for that. The sexual urge is again the motivating factor (the words sexual and sex have to be done away with their usual crude connotation ch. 1) and its manifestations are Tanner's intellectual capacities which tend to lure Ann into a relationship which on the surface seems on the side of Tanner as something which he is always trying to run away from. This leads to the notion that the apparent decisions taken up by a human being have some different import in the psyche or
'psychical apparatus' as it is torn between the tussle (and subsequent negotiations) among Ego, Id and Super-ego. Hence Tanner does what he always despised to do.

Coming back to Shaw's confession regarding his sex life one finds that at the age of forty three he entered in a marriage marked, so he reports, neither by sexual intercourse nor infidelity. Shaw's only period of sexual activity, then according to Shaw, was the fourteen years, from twenty nine to forty three. In that time, he tells us, "there was always some lady in the case and I tried all the experiments and learned what was to be learnt from them" (qtd. in Holland sec. 58).

In the opening play of *Back to Methuselah*, Shaw and Eve finish the first act with an expression of repugnance at the serpent's revealing the secret of sexual activity, and (according to Pearson) Shaw explained her expression to St. John Ervine as her reaction to God's incredible "combination of the reproductive with excretory organs, and consequently of love with shame". When Shaw himself designed men and women, in the final play of pentalogy, he had them not excrete at all, come from eggs rather than childbirth, and leave sex to the young and unthinking. This observation by Norman N. Holland in his contemplation through the theme of 'identity' (or I) relates back to aforesaid comments regarding *Man and Superman*. What Holland states further is in equation with it directly:

In his fastidiousness, I think, Shaw is expressing a fear of being closed or trapped by his lover. He is saying, 'I will keep that sexual opposite truly an opposite - separate, away from me — unless I can give myself to it or her as a part of my purpose, unless I can be fulfilled, too'.

(sec.58)

Thus Shaw did not prize sexuality as an end in its physical self. He wrote Frank Harris:
I liked sexual intercourse because of its amazing power of producing a celestial flood of emotion exaltation of existence which, however momentary, gave me a sample of what one day be the normal state of being for mankind in intellectual ecstasy. I always gave the wildest expression to this in a torrent of words, partly because it due to the woman to know what I felt in her arms, and partly because I wanted her to share it. (qtd. in Holland sec. 58)

Holland observes that for Shaw, physical not mental ejaculation was something that received only contempt from him. His language treats ejaculation as a defeat or a mutilation of his body, the sort of thing lack of mental purpose leads to. The striking feature of Shaw's expressions regarding sexual pleasure is that he has his own combinations (like every other thing in the world) of it which are not referred to at the level of eroticism. Holland's observations suffice: Shaw, according to him, explicitly based the importance of sexuality, of everything really, in its enabling him to enter into a larger, controlling force. This is characteristic of Shaw as he always vows to explore beyond the definitive constructs be they are social, political, religious, literary or psychical.

The next important thing is Shaw's life comes in the wake of his relationship with his father and his influence on him. Two important studies in psychoanalysis — Holland's and Erikson's take up this aspect. Holland, in continuation with the 'Identity' theme-spotlight projected on Shaw feels that since Shaw could talk so freely about himself and his childhood, he lets us imagine how such a personal core might start. He tells us, observes Holland, that he saw in his family's snobbish pretensions (which they had not a fraction of the money they needed to keep up) the same kind of anticlimax that he liked in his own writing. He traced it to his father's inability to
resist capping a serious lecture to his son with a final, deflating joke. Shaw's father was weakened in still another, by the presence of the voice teacher G. J. Vandaleur Lee, who took up residence in the house. From him, Shaw says, he learned, "the skepticism as to academic authority which still persists to me." Erikson and Holland both correctly agree that Shaw's relation to his father is crucial. Shaw's relationship with his mother, on whom he was economically and not so emotionally dependent, also plays an important role in shaping out his relationship with his father. The emotional bonding that normally exists between a mother and a son was of peculiar nature in Shaw's case. He observes that in reaction against the repression faced by his mother from her aunt when she was a child, she allowed her own children every opportunity to develop naturally and freely. Shaw, as observed by his biographer Archibald Henderson, was not sentimental about his parents: he took them as a matter of course as a child should; and the notion that he was consciously in close spiritual harmony with his mother, admiring and adoring her for her musical gifts, receives no countenance from him (George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century). He was left back with his father in Ireland at the age of fifteen when his mother went to settle in London along with her daughters to work G. J. V. Lee. Shaw started working as a clerk and was with his father who succumbed to drinking. The broken home and his struggle to make both ends meet in the company of his father is something which holds a contextual importance. The two men in his family, Shaw's father and G. J. V. Lee, had perception in Shaw's mind which came late after the impression of his relation with his mother who left him to servants who fed and otherwise treated him poorly. Holland opines that Shaw learnt from her mother that he could not rely on ineffectual, anticlimactic others opposite. He himself had to create himself. Late in life he said in a playful way that his mother was "the worst in the world", "the worst
mother conceivable ... within the limits of the fact that she was incapable of unkindness" (sec. 60). For a psychoanalyst these things hold immense significance for Shaw the artist went through a lot of rigorous designing and that took a toll in his literary enterprises too. To draw any equation between his characters and the constructs of his experiences is definitely too simplistic for this endeavor to dwell in exclusively. But what holds inherent significance is that the subconscious that was constructed over a period of time lent Shaw a versatile framework which portrays characters with strokes of reality and ideology. The manner in which characters interact in a text of more important vis-a-vis any thematic concern in psychoanalysis and an author/playwrights subconscious endearing may be of some help. The ongoing argument regarding Shaw in psychoanalytic terms is bound to provide assistance in the study of texts, for Shaw's characters are explicitly the constructs of his ideology and hence a human being's subconscious mind's play.

Holland from the preceding ideas regarding Shaw's mother concludes that Lucinda Gurley Shaw must have been Shaw's first great disappointment, the prototype for his later sense of his father as an anticlimax and his persistent efforts in the face of such indifference to create his own nurturing world.

Shaw, who was left by his mother at the mercy of servants and was fed by them, according to Holland, possesses a trait owing to which the style of his early relation with his mother persisted throughout his adulthood. All of us first meet life in terms of body activities like eating, handling standing, walking, talking and seeing. Holland observes that Shaw's dominant body mode was the very first way we take in the world, especially as it is represented in the persons of our mothers: eating. Years later, he would have Jack Tanner proclaim in Man and Superman: "There is no love that the love of food", and suggest to the lover Tavy, "Your head is in the lioness's
mouth: you are half swallowed already", only to find that, he (Tanner) himself is the "bee, the spider, the marked down victim, the destined prey" for Ann the "boa constrictor". This, however, his Don Juan says, is what ought to happen: "Life seized me and threw me into [the lady's] arms as a sailor throws a scrap of fish into the mouth of a seabird", (all qtd. in Holland sec.60); again, that fantasy of being swallowed, contained, or enclosed.

Eating, in terms of conventional psychoanalysis, is related to oral zone of the physical territory of the human psyche. Oral intake or eating is another form of allowing some foreign element in the body. Also, eating is opposite process of physical ejaculation which as above mentioned was something despicable for Shaw. The psychical apparatus here tries to do away with some despicable process by vehemently putting up with its opposite and in Shaw's case eating is that opposite of despicable physical excretion. Holland observes his trait in a manner similar to the aforesaid argument: Shaw was a lifelong teetotaler, a nonsmoker and a vegetarian. He was a man much concerned with his mouth, but less with taking in (like the usual baby or adult, also it is opposite to taking out), more with keeping things out of it. This was a man who never shaved and who in the privacy of his home, every night before he went to bed, heard only by his mother or his wife or those who cared for him, he sang. Opera, folksong — he used anything at all for his mandatory constitution. This was a man who first made headway in the world as a compulsive orator of truly astonishing power. At the end, his cook Alice Laden reports (in her salutary collection of vegetarian recipes), he would dawdle over breakfast for two and a half hours and lunch for another two and a half. He was constantly nibbling on mango, chutney, marzipan and thickly iced cakes. All of this suggests that a man
whose life-style from beginning to end might well be a response to an absent mother and an empty mouth. To quote Holland:

Focusing down to just Shaw's 'mouth' identity like the earliest psychoanalytic characterology. Looking backward into infantile mode, I can use the concept of identity, however, to trace Shaw's development upward and onward from that baby, who seems never to have been an *infans*, unspeaking and helplessly dependent, to the hardworking but unsuccessful novelist, the overpowering Fabian speaker, the sparkling music and drama critic, and finally the magnificently quirky dramatist. Through all those charges, I can phrase a persistent style — an identity theme, (sec. 61)

As already mentioned, Shaw chose to counter his aversion to the process of taking out the things from the body, by his vehement and persistent use of vocabulary, images and analogies related to taking in mouth i.e. eating. Holland observes that Shaw's childhood may have had particular deprivations, but from them Shaw must have built some extraordinary strength. In Shaw's works he finds that he responded to hunger and perhaps a fear about things coming into his mouth by deciding to make things go out of his mouth. His father's early letters describe him as another noise-maker in the family of noisemakers. Instead of being the usual dependent child, he became a do-it-yourselfer. He would himself create the nurturing mother and stable father his family did not provide. This type of independence in this survival and sustenance in mental make-up made Shaw create a world for himself that sought his boundless imagination and idealism. This is the bodily root for a mind that could imagine other people, places, and even universes (Holland). Shaw's early life defines a pervading impact on
the rest of his life. The child Shaw felt anger and loss at the absence of nurturing people. To quote Shaw:

The fact that nobody cared for me particularly gave me a frightful self-sufficiency, or rather a power of starving on imaginary feasts, that...leaves me to this hour a treacherous brute in matters of pure affection"; again 'starting', 'imaginary-feasts', i.e. images related to eating, (qtd. in Holland sec. 60)

The neglect and carelessness towards Shaw, the child, by his mother created a lack. Due to the absence of someone who was purported to cater his hunger created a lack in Shaw; a lack that his mother would have fulfilled. Shaw, the literary artist, and a social iconoclast fretted hard and created a whole lot of world full of his own idealism and set in his fantasia. Holland comments that "frightful" and "treacherous" is perhaps because of the fearful knowledge that his parents were not what they purported to be, that whatever is, is not as it ought to be (including, perhaps, Shaw himself). Such a belief would provide an emotional base both for his ambition (to be something other) and his intellectual fury. Out of the early disillusionment perhaps, came that strange combination of idealism and realism that reveals Shaw as a disappointed romantic. This further takes onto his style. Out of the early disillusionment, Shaw emerged as a hard-hitting iconoclast who dared every canon and set up of the modern civilization and subsequently providing with an alternate to hold onto least the civilized world may live in the spell of that lack and oblivion which he lived in and through.

A child's feeling and realization of the hard fact that the world was not as it ought to be would have led him to resolve to do or be that world himself, with a fierce
sense of opposition which took the bodily form of putting things out of his mouth instead of taking them in. Holland to quote:

   All this (aforesaid things) could have been the first body version of the distinctively Shavian style of the later life. Sensing it, we can unwind Shaw. We can unfold that inferred identity theme as Shaw transforms himself into the adult genius, (sec. 62)

Referring back to his focus on the mouth's image and its subsequent relation to 'taking in' as its opposite puts forth the notion that 'an audacious Shaw' was a subconscious attempt to seek cover for 'an intimidate Shaw'. To quote Holland: 'The young Shaw was a thoroughly disagreeable young man by all accounts, especially his own, precisely because of this fierce spirit of opposition for the sake of young independence' (sec.63). 'Never spare the feelings of touchy people", he told Pearson, "Hit them bang on the nose, and let them hit back: Then they can't quarrel with you"; surely a remarkable audacity in someone as 'unwardly timid as Shaw. Yet he did not show the timidity — just the opposite in his search for opposites. "I had ... an unpleasant trick of contradicting everyone from whom I thought I could learn anything in order to draw him out and enable me to pick his brains" (qtd. in Holland sec.63).

Shaw's persistent attempt at carving out an opposite niche for himself culminated in his being an opponent himself. The iconoclast vehemently tried a tireless case in order seek an opposite of everything under the sun. This is probably due to his expectations, as he himself and, 'our expectations and not our experiences make the life...' Hence his expectations when juxtaposed with his experiences take a heavy toll and thus tend to create a lasting impetus on his psychological make-up. His achievements are always counted as battles won over some opponent. Because Shaw
made it an exclusive goal of his life to try and seek revenge in terms of iconoclasm that is his superior and accepted mode of opposition. This ambivalence, which is again an important trait of psychoanalytic criticism, creates a different focus on Shaw. Shaw's attitude as a litterateur stands through as a tested notion of ambivalence for he had always been trying to live through his opposites. He always put forth the ruling opposite and put back the crushed subject that was an intimidated Shaw.

Holland feels that:

... this fierce opposition so as to feed on his elders so displeasing in the brash young Irishman newly arrived in London, was to become one of the great English prose styles. (62)

He wrote in Everybody's Political What's What, 'It is always necessary to overstate a case startlingly to make people sit up and listen to it, and to frighten them into acting on it' (qtd. in Holland sec. 63). It was Shaw's persistent attempt to put forth his views in the most 'startlingly' fashion probably for the reason that his aim was to satisfy his search for the opposite and this urge lured him into a style full of iconic temptations.

Holland says that Shaw's need to find an opposite made his discovery of Marx no merely an intellectual event, but, in his own words, a "conversion". He became, he said, "a speaker with a gospel". He "sermonized". This man who based his motives in his physical needs found a theory that said the whole world ran by need. Shaw now could say that economics played the same role in his characters as anatomy in the figures of Michelangelo"

Marx promised the fulfillment of still another deep wish of Shaw's, the need to feel that whatever is, is not as it purports to be. In particular, said Shaw, "Marx convinced me that what the [socialist] movement indeed was ... an unveiling of the official facts of capitalist civilization". "I had no ... difficulty ... understanding that
private property produces a government of 'damned thieves', who cannot help themselves, and must, willy-nilly, live by sobbing the poor" (qtd. in Holland sec. 63).

Upto a great extent Shaw found in the theory (Marx) as an idealization all-powerful, all-giving parent he never had. Further because it was a theory that embraced not only contemporary politics and economics but all of human history, it provided Shaw with the sense of purpose he so deeply needed. Even more, it was a theory of opposition, set out in the dialectic of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Hence it could provide structure for any play he wanted to write or even any one sentence. Some well made cliche would provide the thesis; Shaw would turn it inside out into an amusing antithesis, and finally resolve the conflict into a not quite so revolutionary final synthesis.

Marxism also provided Shaw enough stimuli to come up with a methodical rectification of his desire to be 'the purposeful opposite to his audiences' (Holland sec. 63). Marxism was a determined movement and a thought process which was in the stage of becoming a set notion manifested in all social constricts, thus Shaw had an inclination to oppose as an innate part of his psychological make-up. As Holland opines in this regard, 'Shaw revised orthodox Marxism away from the revolutionary stance into its milder, Fabian, constitutional, and less inevitable form. To quote Shaw himself, "my mind does not work in Hegelian grooves"' (Holland sec. 63). Through Marxist inclination Shaw got to be-friend people like Sidney Webb. This friendship provided Shaw furthermore with scope to successfully seek his opposite. Shaw found this friendship fulfilling for the reason that it filled his need for an opposite. Shaw's unconscious bias towards opposing stimuli in his life is rooted in his basic preference for the opposite ends of the human system. He, as discussed earlier, prefers to talk about food, mouth etc. in order to do away with the anxiety that downs on him due to
the other opposite of human biological make-up that is excretory system (anus, vagina etc.). Shaw tries to resist this through his modes of characterization and his speeches. In his plays he ends up talking decisively about the food-image, the terminology related to mouth (for e.g. Ann in Man and Superman is a boa-constrictor whose prospect with Tanner seems to be the mouth of lion in which Tanner should not head in). Thus when Shaw talks about Marxism he is unconsciously led to project a mode full of opposing strives. His friend Sidney Webb and his Marxist conversions were new ventures for Shaw to drive forth the iconic status out of the oppositions.

Shaw went on to become an astonishing political orator due to the influence of Webb, Marx and the Fabians from 1879 to 1898. Speech or oratory was something which was bound to be Shaw's forte because it involved mouth and thus a medium of gratifying his inner opposing zeal as against his despise and anxiety to the other extreme of mouth. Shaw has confessed that at first he was a "... coward, nervous and self-conscious to a heart breaking degree", but once he had the experience of delivering the speech he became an undaunting spirit. The purposeful opposite: that Shaw always wanted to be was possible to become through oration for him. To quote him:

I spoke in the streets, in the parks, at demonstrations, anywhere and everywhere possible. In short, I infested public meeting like an officer afflicted with cowardice, who takes every opportunity of going under fire to get over it and learn his business, (qtd. in Holland sec.63)

It was like a battle for him in which he poured the energy which matched 'his inner need to become a purposeful opposite' (Holland sec. 63). Shaw had decided to make people sit up and listen to [the case], and to frighten them into acting on it. Thus
Shaw's search for an opposite and to be an opposite was fulfilled as he was the purposeful opposite to his audiences and he had his own purposeful opposite in Webb.

When one juxtapose child and adult Shaw we find that as a child Shaw was gratifying his deepest needs in their most primitive mode he was putting something out of his mouth while as an adult he was a successful dramatist in the making someone similar to the Shavian hero.

Norman Holland observes that such statement from Shaw is full of identity of both the young and the old Shaw. Shaw as a child (through this passage) seems to be running away from the indifference of his world into an imagined world where he could be what he wanted. Shaw's confession, "I was at ease only with the mighty dead", seems to give the sense of the great unresolved relation for this man which is between parent and child.

The above analysis of Shaw and Psychoanalysis provides various enriching insights that have paved the way for the further analysis in the present thesis. Holland's critique has been instrumental in providing with various suggestions of the two plays that have been taken up in chapter 4 and 5.
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Application of Psychoanalysis to

*Man and Superman*
Summary

This chapter presents the study of Shaw's *Man and Superman* based on the two-level study of the text. The first level is based on the individualized perspective (i.e. one to one study of characters) in the play: the individuals and their 'drives' vis-a-vis their being male or female, the mutual conflict of the sexes, and the basic instincts that work in this conflict. The second level is that of an individual and society (world). Man being a social animal learns to convert/repress his desire's gratification. The postponement of gratification in an incessant way leads to a search for the appropriate time when no more postponement would be required. Thus the real gratification comes in the form of Death. The play within the play deals with this notion. In the Don Juan Scene the depiction of Hell/Heaven seems to provide with an accepted manifestation of the culmination of the search for the life's other i.e. Death since Death leads one to Heaven/Hell in pure worldly terms. The psychoanalytical framework that confines this study is based on the Classical Freudian concepts.