

Brad Kent

## Tides of Influence: Bernard Shaw, the Irish Writer, and World Literature

For many Irish writers, their Irishness is an accepted fact while their importance to world literature is more debatable. In the case of Bernard Shaw, the opposite holds: his *bona fides* as a major world literary figure are acknowledged, while his importance to Ireland has long been questioned. Much of this began with the canon-formation efforts of such narrow-gauge nationalist critics as Daniel Corkery, who in *Synge and Anglo-Irish Literature* (1931) claimed that for writers like Shaw and Jonathan Swift, 'Ireland was never a *patria* in any sense'.<sup>1</sup> Writing that very same year, Shaw admitted that he could not be acclimated to such circumscribed views: 'I am a tolerably good European in the Nietzschean sense, but a very bad Irishman in the Sinn Fein or Chosen People sense'.<sup>2</sup> Corkery and others of his ilk have long complained that Shaw was not Irish because he left the country while he was young and that Ireland was not his prime concern and focus; instead, his attentions were more occupied by the wider world. Yet because of how he was influenced by and celebrated writers from elsewhere and his successful determination to leave his imprint on and to change the direction of global culture, Shaw is a fascinating case study for the myriad manners and processes by which the Irish writer joins the currents of world literature. Moreover, considering Shaw through this critical lens challenges orthodoxies within the field of world literature pertaining to how both he and other Irish writers have been conceptualized.

Indeed, Shaw's place in world literature has been grossly misunderstood. At the heart of this misunderstanding is Pascale Casanova, who, in the touchstone book *The World Republic of Letters*, argues that Shaw was not an avant-garde rebel, but rather an assimilated writer who was behind the times because London, not Paris, was the centre of his literary life. Just as the world is divided into lines of latitude and longitude with a central meridian in Greenwich, so too, Casanova suggests, is the literary world defined by capitals that are aligned along meridians, thereby creating zones of activity that determine the value allocated to writers and national corpuses. For Casanova, the dominant centres are

Paris and London, with Paris being *the* global literary capital – the literary Greenwich meridian – because of the number of authors of different linguistic and national traditions who have regarded it as such and because of how it has influenced the international reception of writers. In this sense, just as the Greenwich meridian is the point from which standard time is set around the world, so too does the Parisian literary meridian function as the standard for literary values, with other capitals and zones of literary activity measured in temporal and stylistic terms by how far they are behind Parisian fashion.

Since its publication more than two decades ago, Casanova's work has not received due attention in the field of Irish Studies despite the fact that she proposes an Irish paradigm to explain how writers from peripheral countries accrue literary capital and circulate within the world literary system. Noting that Irish writers have historically been drawn to both London and Paris, Casanova labels those who recognized and lived in London as their literary capital 'assimilators' and those who recognized and lived in Paris as their literary capital 'rebels'. Literary rebels, she claims, reject the imperial metropole's literary standards, collect national folk tales, and found national theatres. In contradistinction, assimilators are those who embrace imperial values, adopt neo-colonial contempt for colonized peoples, and reflect the metropole's social and political conservatism in their writing.<sup>3</sup> For Casanova, Yeats is the pre-eminent rebel, while Shaw is the quintessential assimilator because he went to London and found success there. According to this logic, Shaw became a world literary figure because he adopted metropolitan, colonial values, whereas Yeats rejected these and found inspiration instead in Paris and Ireland.

Shaw recognized the literary capitals and meridians that Casanova outlines. In a lecture that he gave in London on 26 October 1918, he noted that it was when George Moore – and, following in his footsteps, Yeats, Synge, and Joyce – went to Paris that Irish literature started to develop into a force.<sup>4</sup> However, he was also 'convinced that there was no more Irish literature – no literature that was more Irish – than his own works' and advised Irishmen 'who could to go over to England by the next boat, or until they did they would not have any real understanding of what Ireland is'.<sup>5</sup> Some years later, he elaborated on his own reasoning in leaving Dublin for London:

I had to go to London just as my father had to go to the Corn Exchange. London was the literary centre for the English language, and for such artistic culture as the realm of the English language (in which I proposed to be king) could afford. There was no Gaelic League in those days, nor any sense that Ireland had in herself the seed of culture. Every Irishman who felt his business in life was on

the higher planes of the cultural professions felt that he must have a metropolitan domicile and an international culture: that is, he felt that his first business was to get out of Ireland. I had the same feeling. For London as London, or England as England, I cared nothing. If my subject had been science or music I should have made for Berlin or Leipsic. If painting, I should have made for Paris: indeed many of the Irish writers who have made a name in literature escaped to Paris with the intention of becoming painters. For theology I should have gone to Rome, and for Protestant philosophy to Weimar. But as the English language was my weapon, there was nothing for it but London.<sup>6</sup>

It would be a far stretch from what he says here to suggest that Shaw was an assimilator. Rather, London eventually assimilated itself to Shaw. Or, as Shaw might have it, he conquered London.

One of the paradoxes of Casanova's notion of assimilation is that it adopts the nationalist perspective that her concept of world literature simultaneously challenges. Because she defines one as an assimilator or rebel based on the degree to which one adheres to, defends, and constructs nationalist ideals and objectives, Casanova ignores a galaxy of other markers that could contribute to such distinctions. Indeed, her labelling of Shaw as an assimilated writer is perplexing in the extreme. One could point to his life-long challenge to the English theatre as he found it in the late nineteenth century, from the point of view of both the economy of the commercial theatre that hindered the development of a modern sensibility and the reigning unintellectual fare of melodrama, romance, farce, and heavily redacted productions of Shakespeare. Or one could point to his promotion of women's rights to vote and economic independence, his agitations for Fabian socialism that struck against the core of traditional British political values and helped to bring about the Welfare State, and his pariah status during the First World War for having dared to criticize British jingoism as merely the flipside of German aggression. Casanova herself admits at one point that Shaw subverted English norms, but she tempers this by claiming, erroneously, that he rejected Irish national values.<sup>7</sup> Shaw defended Irish national values, but it depends upon which of those national values one chooses and Casanova, unhelpfully, never defines what these are. In the end, she implicitly aligns herself with critics like Corkery to suggest that Shaw is somehow lacking as an Irishman and Irish writer and that he turned his back on his homeland and adopted England. However, as many studies have shown, Shaw was indeed an Irish writer, remained connected to his country's political and cultural community from the time that he immigrated in 1876 to his death in 1950, drew much upon his Irishness and Irish tradition, and in return influenced the development of

significant strands of Irish literature.<sup>8</sup> The result is that just as Corkery suggests that Shaw is somehow lacking as an Irish writer, Casanova suggests that Shaw is somehow lacking as a world literary figure. However, both Corkery's and Casanova's misreadings of Shaw reveal their own anxieties and prejudices rather than help to elucidate Shaw's position in the fields of either Irish or world literature.

One of the frustrations of Casanova's Irish paradigm of the conservative assimilationist Shaw going to London while the nationalist rebel Yeats went to Paris is that it has been adopted by the few scholars working in Irish Studies who have engaged with her work despite their qualms about her Paris-centrism. Joe Cleary was the earliest and most sophisticated Irish critic to engage with Casanova's study in this vein, importantly suggesting that even formal radicals like Joseph Conrad, Henry James, T. S. Eliot, and Ford Madox Ford were largely assimilated in London, as were Albert Camus, Eugène Ionesco, Hélène Cixous, Jacques Derrida, and Julia Kristeva in Paris, which, like London, was an imperial metropole.<sup>9</sup> Yet Cleary, like Casanova, deems both Shaw and V. S. Naipaul as assimilationists who have "'second-rate' reputations' and 'a conservative style or aesthetic', while the others listed above, 'in contrast to Shaw or Naipaul', were 'stylistic radicals and literary innovators'.<sup>10</sup> As this essay will show, contrary to Casanova and Cleary, Shaw was a stylistic radical and literary innovator, but one's view depends upon how limited, traditional, or conservative the conceptualization one has of stylistic and formal innovation and even Shaw's oeuvre. Moreover, it is difficult to accept that London is the site of literary assimilation for Irish writers as Yeats lived and worked in England for much longer than he did in France and he co-founded the Irish Literary Society in 1892 in neither Dublin nor Paris, but the English capital. However, as Cleary insists, Casanova's work – and indeed his own – serves as an important launching point for understanding the place of Irish writers in the world literary system and should not simply be jettisoned because of its inherent lacunae and biases.

When discussing Shaw in relation to world literature, it is important to keep in mind that definitions of the field have undergone significant historical change. Most critics cite Johann Wolfgang Goethe as having coined the term *Weltliteratur* in a series of journal entries, essays, and interviews in the 1820s and 1830s. In 1828, for example, at the Congress of Natural Scientists in Berlin, he ventured 'to announce a European, in fact a universal, world literature'.<sup>11</sup> Fritz Strich notes that Goethe's 'house in Weimar was the actual headquarters, the visible centre, of world literature, where French, English, Italian, Scandinavian, Russian and Polish authors met, spoke of their homes and their native literatures, and discussed the differences and the common factors of their nations'.<sup>12</sup> Despite the 'welt' in *Weltliteratur*, the literary world for Goethe – and for

many of those who have followed in his wake – was therefore Europe. This in some ways explains the Eurocentrism (telescoped to Paris-centrism) in Casanova's work as perhaps an inevitable bias that has traditionally undergirded the field. Theo D'haen observes that a significant shift only came about in the 1980s and 1990s with the rise of postcolonial literary studies leading to rigorous reconsiderations of inclusivity and exclusivity and what exactly defined world literature. While some research agendas had branched out to include literatures from polities beyond Europe and North America, these tended to be appendages and were handled far more briskly.<sup>13</sup> The recent questioning of Eurocentric biases has resulted in a far more capacious understanding and study of world literature in the twenty-first century, leading to similar recalibrations in related fields, such as the advent of the New Modernist Studies.<sup>14</sup>

It should not be surprising that what Shaw would have defined as world literature and culture tends to have the European bias of an earlier period. In recognizing the origins of modernism, Shaw saw it as sparked by Arthur Schopenhauer, Richard Wagner, Henrik Ibsen, Friedrich Nietzsche, August Strindberg, and carried on into the twentieth century by Henri Bergson, Maxim Gorky, Anton Chekhov, and himself.<sup>15</sup> 'The larger truth of the matter', claimed Shaw, 'is that modern European literature and music now form a Bible far surpassing in importance to us the ancient Hebrew Bible that has served us so long'.<sup>16</sup> While from a more contemporary position it might be tempting to label Shaw as conservative because of his Eurocentrism, it must be kept in mind that he wrote these words in 1913, as bellicose nationalisms divided the continent and peoples retreated into patriotic defences of national canons and cultures. In light of his own context, Shaw was thus considerably cosmopolitan, embracing the notion of *Weltliteratur* that Goethe had introduced a century earlier.

Shaw's boosterism of foreign authors was one of his most important contributions to world literature. This began with his earliest monograph, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891). *The Quintessence* has its origins in a lecture that Shaw gave for the Fabian Society in a series on 'Socialism in Contemporary Literature' in the summer of 1890 that included Sergius Stepniak on Russian fiction and Sydney Olivier on Émile Zola. At the time in England, Ibsen was only read in intellectual circles, but there was a movement afoot to produce his plays. Shaw's lecture created some momentum and by the next spring, through the newly founded Independent Theatre Society, of which Shaw was a prominent member, Ibsen's *Ghosts* was produced, with promises of further productions of other continental masters, including Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, Strindberg, Leo Tolstoy, Théodore de Banville, and Edmond Goncourt. Once knowledge of the production spread, the mainstream

conservative press warned that 'Ibsenility', a blend of atheism and socialism contrived to undermine 'our religion, and our constitutionalism', would infect English society.<sup>17</sup> Having watched the premiere of *Ghosts*, critics were incensed: they denounced a play that engaged so openly and tragically with adultery, incest, and inherited syphilis as 'naked loathsomeness' and 'about as foul and filthy a concoction as has ever been allowed with impunity [...] to disgrace the boards of an English theatre'. 'Ibsenity', they claimed, 'looks very much like obscenity'.<sup>18</sup> Such fevered reaction provoked Shaw to rework his lecture into what would become *The Quintessence*, seeing the necessity to explain and promote Ibsen as a 'pioneer' who provided a template for theatrical modernism.<sup>19</sup> Shaw's study remains an oft-quoted work and just as Ibsen's plays were innovative, *The Quintessence* was groundbreaking for its thorough socio-political readings of Ibsen's oeuvre while being equally attuned to the ways in which he forged a new dramatic structure in inventing the discussion play.

There is something to be said for the timeline of Shaw's publication of *The Quintessence* in 1891 and the writing of his first play, *Widowers' Houses*, the next year. As many critics have suggested, Shaw's book was as much of a study and promotion of Ibsen as it was a manifesto for his own drama to come.<sup>20</sup> Yet he was consistent in his admiration of Ibsen throughout his career, and he did much to instigate public recognition of other European writers in the English-speaking world. In 1898, for example, Shaw published *The Perfect Wagnerite*, in which he argues that Wagner's *Der Ring Nibelungen* (The Ring Cycle) is not merely fantastical escapism but Marxist allegory and social criticism. However, the impetus for writing each of the books was different: while Ibsen was notorious and some of his plays were banned from public performances on British stages, Wagner had long been popular. In *The Perfect Wagnerite*, Shaw does not therefore need to make the case for Wagner's importance and can instead devote himself to teasing out the Marxist critique of a writer who had once been a politically radical participant in the Dresden Uprising of May 1849.

Shaw's promotion of foreign writers therefore stemmed from a mix of two impulses: firstly, the desire to use them as important wedges for socio-political and aesthetic reform and, secondly, a reassessment of artists who were unfairly ignored or who were popular but, in Shaw's view, misunderstood. Examples of such promotion abound in Shaw's writings and public statements. Just as he was an early, prominent, and persuasive apostle of Ibsen, so too did Shaw help popularize the work of Nietzsche in the English-speaking world. In 1896, he reviewed the first volume of the *Collected Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, which was translated by Thomas Common. While he thought that Nietzsche was naïve with regards to politics and perverse in championing privilege

and inequality, Shaw saw in him a great stylist and wrecker of moral platitudes. In terms that echo what many critics would later say of himself, Shaw noted Nietzsche's 'pungency; his power of pitting the merest platitudes of his position in rousing, startling paradoxes; his way of getting underneath moral precepts which are so unquestionable to us that common decency seems to compel unhesitating assent to them, and upsetting them with a scornful laugh'.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, Shaw later helped Common find a publisher for his book *Nietzsche as Critic, Philosopher, Poet and Prophet: Choice Selections from His Works*.

Shaw also praised and promoted the giants of Russian literature, in particular Leo Tolstoy, Anton Chekhov, and Maxim Gorky.<sup>22</sup> He was prominent in getting the Stage Society, the successor of the Independent Theatre Society, to produce several of Tolstoy's and Chekhov's plays in the earlier twentieth century in what were their first English-language productions. When his comrades declaimed 'How Russian!', Shaw rather saw something more universal and worldly: 'Just as Ibsen's intensely Norwegian plays fitted every middle and professional class suburb in Europe, these intensely Russian plays fitted all the country houses in Europe in which the pleasures of music, art, literature, and the theatre had supplanted hunting, shooting, fishing, eating, and drinking. The same nice people, the same utter futility'.<sup>23</sup>

At times, Shaw criticized renowned writers from other countries to bolster his own credentials as someone who was at the cutting edge of aesthetic innovation. The drama of Victorien Sardou and Eugène Scribe is notable in this regard, Shaw derogatorily referring to their stagecraft as 'Sardoodledom' and 'the Scribe formula'.<sup>24</sup> For Shaw, the two French playwrights were interchangeable as the arch purveyors of the well-made play. He lamented that they had thus contributed to the propagation of a conservative theatre structure, imposing a rigid plot pattern of exposition, followed by a situation leading to a climax and an unravelling conclusion. However, he argued, this sort of writing 'could produce only an artificial entertainment and not a natural dramatic growth. My plays are miracles of dramatic organization because I have never constructed them: there is not an ounce of dead wood in them: every bit of them is alive for somebody. To me constructed plays are all dead wood, bearable only for the sake of such scraps of sentiment or fun or observation as the artificer has been able to stick on them'.<sup>25</sup>

It was in this regard that Ibsen's plays were exemplary for Shaw, and they reveal how – in conjunction with his reaction against the strictures of the French well-made play – Shaw both promoted and was deeply influenced by world literature in his own writing. Not only had the Norwegian challenged social mores and norms, but he was a pioneer of a new dramaturgy that Shaw admired, imitated, and developed to its natural extremes. Instead of the tripartite structure of Scribe and Sardou,

Ibsen's plays lead from exposition and situation to discussion, and, Shaw claimed, 'the discussion is the test of the playwright'.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, Shaw argued that post-Ibsen plays – and especially his own – introduce the discussion earlier, resulting in 'its development until it so over-spreads and interpenetrates the action that it finally assimilates it, making play and discussion practically identical'. Such plays also reject the stage tricks that were necessary to hold people's attention, instead relying on 'a forensic technique of recrimination, disillusion, and penetration through ideals to the truth, with a free use of all the rhetorical and lyrical arts of the orator, the preacher, the pleader, and the rhapsodist'.<sup>27</sup> Shaw modelled such works as *Mrs Warren's Profession* and *Pygmalion* on Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, with his characters engaging in lengthy heart-to-heart talks. In *Man and Superman*, he expanded discussion in the 'Don Juan in Hell' scene, a lengthy dream sequence he referred to as a Shavio-Socratic dialogue wherein characters philosophize and debate metaphysics and social norms with invigorating verve to give deeper meaning to the more traditional comedic frame play. And in *Getting Married*, *Misalliance*, and *Heartbreak House* he created the disquisitory play, a drama in which, as he suggests above, the conflict and action are entirely discursive in nature, signalling this in such subtitles as 'A Conversation' and 'A Debate in One Sitting'. In addition to the stylistic and formal innovation of the play of ideas and the disquisitory play, Shaw created other genres, including the anti-melodrama and the political extravaganza, and completely overhauled the tired conventions of the history play in such works as *The Man of Destiny*, *Caesar and Cleopatra*, *Saint Joan*, *The Six of Calais*, and *In Good King Charles's Golden Days*. This pioneering work should put to rest the claims of such critics as Casanova and Cleary that Shaw was an aesthetically conservative assimilator who, at best, merely imitated Ibsen.<sup>28</sup>

In 1903, Shaw claimed that he had been influenced by English and European writers in equal measures: 'Bunyan, Blake, Hogarth, and Turner (these four apart and above all the English classics), Goethe, Shelley, Schopenhauer, Wagner, Ibsen, Morris, Tolstoy, and Nietzsche are among the writers whose peculiar sense of the world I recognize as more or less akin to my own'.<sup>29</sup> Yet with the exception of Shakespeare and Dickens, whose immense variety of characters and technical virtuosity he much admired, and Shelley, whose iconoclasm and proto-socialism he imitated, Shaw's most important models and influences and most imposing adversaries came from the continent. While he had skirmishes and debates with English contemporaries and picked apart the reputations of the literary lions of England's past, he considered that, in the balance, his own reputation and legacy would be defined in relation to the world's greatest writers. Indeed, the influence of and his competition with world literature defined Shaw's



drama. This is evident throughout his oeuvre, but a brief survey of three of his major works, *Man and Superman*, *Heartbreak House*, and *Saint Joan*, can best illustrate this phenomenon.

When Shaw embarked on writing *Man and Superman* at the outset of a new century, he sought to push the limits of theatre. In 1899, he confessed to the esteemed actor Ellen Terry: 'And now no more plays – at least no more practicable ones. None at all, indeed, for some time to come: it is time to do something more in Shaw-philosophy, in politics & sociology. Your author, dear Ellen, must be more than a common dramatist'.<sup>30</sup> With *Man and Superman*, he inaugurated the play of ideas, which centres around an idea-plot as opposed to an action-plot. This was the aesthetic innovation of his own work, breathing life into a form of discussion play that would not rest upon social problems alone, but take as its conflict opposing opinions on more philosophical subjects. However, like many of his contemporary modernists, Shaw transformed aesthetics while drawing upon a lineage of European myths and literary archetypes. While the play's philosophy is informed by a mix of Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and Samuel Butler, Shaw adapted the Don Juan myth as a means of propagating his notion of the world being powered towards Creative Evolution by an unremitting Life Force. A year after writing to Terry, Shaw announced: 'My next play will be a Don Juan – an immense play, but not for the stage of this generation'.<sup>31</sup> He indicated this in the play's provisional title, 'The Superman, or Don Juan's great grandson's grandson'.<sup>32</sup> In the 'Don Juan in Hell' scene, Creative Evolution and the Life Force are discussed at length by Don Juan, the devil, Donna Anna (one of the women whom Juan seduced in his past life), and the statue of Donna Anna's father whom Don Juan killed in a duel. Shaw knew the Don Juan myth from having read and listened to several versions, beginning with the original play, Tirso de Molina's *The Trickster of Seville*. Although he came to life in de Molina's seventeenth Spain, the legend of Don Juan quickly spread across the continent, with versions appearing in Italy, France, Germany, and England.<sup>33</sup> Shaw drew upon several of these for inspiration, including Molière's *Dom Juan* and Mozart and Da Ponte's *Don Giovanni*, the latter of which Shaw repeatedly claimed was the most influential work on his dramaturgy.<sup>34</sup> He was not drawn to the myth's sex appeal, but rather saw in it a condemnation of the wastefulness of devoting one's life to seduction instead of human evolution and social progress. And yet he also embraced its central figure who importantly flouts social norms and mores and refuses to be cowed by threats of eternal damnation. Don Juan thrills, said Shaw, in 'the heroism of daring to be the enemy of God'.<sup>35</sup> This was the true attraction: the Promethean rebelling against authorities and staid conventions that leads to enlightenment for humankind.

*Heartbreak House* owes a debt of a different kind to world literature. Around the time of the First World War, when he wrote the play, Shaw shifted his enthusiasm from the plays of Ibsen and Strindberg, whom he still held in high regard, to the plays of Tolstoy and Chekhov. Having advocated for the Stage Society to perform their works as a member of their Council of Management, Shaw attended their productions of *The Cherry Orchard* in May 1911 and *Uncle Vanya* in May 1914, as well as another company's production of *The Seagull* in March 1912.<sup>36</sup> The Stage Society also produced Tolstoy's *The Power of Darkness* in 1904 and Ivan Turgenev's *The Bread of Others* in 1908. All of these were English-language premieres. In *Heartbreak House*, which Shaw subtitled 'A Fantasia in the Russian Manner on English Themes', he tipped his hat to the influence of these Russian dramatists on his work. He refused the view that his play was particularly English despite being set there and incorporating a cast of English characters; it is a representation, rather, of all 'cultured, leisured Europe before the war'.<sup>37</sup> *Heartbreak House* explicitly draws upon Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* for its atmospherics, but Shaw combined this with the aesthetics of Chekhov's formless, ensemble drama, which suited Shaw's episodic and patchwork disjunctive play.

While *Man and Superman* shows Shaw looking to world literature for source texts and inspiration and *Heartbreak House* reveals his debt to other dramaturgies, *Saint Joan* offers a third type of influence that world literature had on Shaw. Although it is drawn from historical fact and not fiction, *Saint Joan*, like *Man and Superman*, has a continental origin-story. However, as opposed to drawing upon aspects of his precursors as he does in *Man and Superman*, in *Saint Joan* Shaw challenges the historical visions of those who had written prior versions of Joan's story. In this sense, for Shaw, the play becomes a competition for who best understood her story and its implications for world history. In examining his precursors, Shaw accused them of seeing Joan as a heroine or a villain from melodrama. Just as the English patriot Shakespeare cast her in a negative light in *Henry VI, Part 1*, Voltaire used Joan in his 21-canto *La Pucelle*, which is part Rabelaisian extravaganza and part fantasy, as a vehicle for his anti-clericalism, featuring monks attempting to rape a sleeping Joan, Joan falling in love with Dunois and stripping herself naked before him, and the devil incarnating Joan's donkey to seduce her into bestiality before incredibly ending with Joan riding off into the sunset with Dunois. Shaw joked before writing his play that 'one of my scenes will be Voltaire and Shakespear running down bye streets in heaven to avoid meeting Joan'.<sup>38</sup> Friedrich von Schiller's *The Maid of Orleans* is no better, casting Joan as a beautiful leading woman, despite contemporary accounts that pointed to her unexceptional looks, and turning her into a killing machine who dies on the battlefield after

escaping from the English. All the others, including Tom Taylor and Percy Mackaye's melodramas, Mark Twain's fictional life of Joan, and Anatole France's biography of the saint, similarly missed the mark. Such predecessors, he said, 'are second-rate opera books. I felt personally called on by Joan to do her dramatic justice'.<sup>39</sup> Shaw indeed hewed somewhat closer to the historical mark, using T. Douglas Murray's 1902 translation of Jules Quicherat's transcription of Joan's 1431 trial and her 1456 rehabilitation as a source for much of his information and lifting several of her responses almost word-for-word in his play.<sup>40</sup> As opposed to seeing Joan's story as the struggle of a heroic underdog or her prosecutors and judges as seeking only to crush her, Shaw insisted that there are no villains in his play, that the historical figures acted according to the requirements of their duties and responsibilities and that they tried to bring Joan to salvation.<sup>41</sup> For Shaw, the important legacies in Joan's story were rather her three heresies – her proto-feminism, her proto-Protestantism, and her proto-nationalism – which would influence the direction of Europe in the coming centuries, making Joan's story not of national, but of global importance.

*Man and Superman* and *Saint Joan* point to another aspect of Shaw's relationship to world literature: he was an Irishman who lived much of his life in England, yet in his drama he engaged with the larger world. Aside from Spain and France, he set plays in and featured characters from the United States (*The Devil's Disciple*, *Man and Superman*, *The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet*), Bulgaria (*Arms and the Man*), Russia (*The Great Catherine*), Morocco (*Captain Brassbound's Conversion*), Switzerland (*Arms and the Man*, *Geneva*), Italy (*The Man of Destiny*, *Caesar and Cleopatra*, *Androcles and the Lion*), and Egypt (*Caesar and Cleopatra*, *The Millionairess*). In many regards, these countries reflect the boundaries that Shaw had for world literature: Europe with the odd nod to America and the Mediterranean basin.

Shaw's introductions to foreign peoples and cultures were, as is the case for many people, facilitated by translation. David Damrosch notes that 'A work enters into world literature by a double process: first, by being read *as* literature; second, by circulating out into a broader world beyond its linguistic and cultural point of origin'.<sup>42</sup> Scholars have long recognized this dependence on translation. In 1899, for example, the Danish critic Georg Brandes claimed that it is impossible to replicate a work of art in another medium, but he was also pragmatic in admitting that for great works to cross linguistic borders, they require translations, especially in the case of writers working in minor languages.<sup>43</sup> In 1945, Fritz Strich claimed that when a work is said to have joined world literature, it means 'that such a work of art has passed the frontiers of the nation within which it originated, and the limits of the language in which it was written; that it has been translated into the languages of at

least the most important civilised nations and belongs to the common treasury of human culture; that it has therefore gained for itself inter-national significance'.<sup>44</sup>

Shaw was acutely aware of how translation affected one's global reputation and the spread of one's ideas.<sup>45</sup> Most importantly, he grasped that as his works increasingly circulated elsewhere, his reception in English-speaking countries was positively impacted, telling his French translator: 'The English never know what to admire until some foreigner tells them; but when they are at last told what to do, it is astonishing how obediently and zealously they do it'.<sup>46</sup> He was contacted by translators early on in his playwriting career and by 1908 he was working with translators in eight European languages.<sup>47</sup> Over time, Shaw established close associations with them, including Hugo Vallentin in Sweden and Floryan Sobieniowski in Poland. But by far the most complex and important of these relationships were with Augustin Hamon in France and Siegfried Trebitsch in Austria. Although Shaw was a micromanager, most of his translators were relatively out of harm's way as he could not understand their language. However, as Shaw could read both French and German, and was fluent in the former, Hamon and Trebitsch received more feedback than others.

The case of Hamon is an odd one.<sup>48</sup> Despite being concerned with how he was received abroad, Shaw appears to have chosen Hamon purely on the basis of his being a political fellow traveller, rather than for his literary skills or contacts in publishing and theatre circles. He regularly dispensed advice to his translators, but he was more copious in his detailed comments to Hamon. In one letter, Shaw told him to pay attention to moments in *Mrs Warren's Profession* wherein characters would tutoyer and vousvoyer, that is, address one another in French with, respectively, informal and formal second-person pronouns to signify the degree of intimacy in their relationships.<sup>49</sup> Shaw also suggested alternatives for the names of his plays and their characters to those proposed by Hamon. *The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet*, for example, should not be *Le Vrai Blanco Posnet* (*The True Blanco Posnet*) but rather *Blanco Posnet Desmasqué* (*Blanco Posnet Unmasked*), and in *Pygmalion*, Higgins should not be named Lemaître (a French surname that means 'the master'), but rather something more common, like Hamon.<sup>50</sup> At times, he became exasperated with Hamon's reading of his work, which in turn affected how Hamon translated Shaw. At one point, Shaw felt it necessary to instruct Hamon, who was preparing to give a public lecture on Shaw in Brussels in conjunction with a production of *Candida*, that he had better not say that Shaw was a naturalist writer:

If you tell the world that the essential idea in my works is Determinism, I solemnly swear that I will go over to Brussels &

murder you. If a man has nothing more to say in this world than 'what will be will be', [rather] than 'what must be must be', he had better give up literature & sweep a crossing.<sup>51</sup>

It was unfortunate for Shaw that he stuck by Hamon, whose lack of literary quality and inability to produce a literate translation that went beyond conveying surface meaning resulted in French audiences losing much of Shaw's wit, intertextual allusiveness, and sparkling dialogue and thereby contributed to Shaw's relatively poor reputation in France when compared to his reception in many other European countries.

By contrast, in Siegfried Trebitsch, Shaw was blessed with a capable German translator who had a vast network of contacts in the theatre communities of Austria and Germany. Shaw's good friend William Archer suggested to Trebitsch that he buy Shaw's first three volumes of plays – *Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant* and *Three Plays for Puritans* – while he was visiting London. Believing in the force of Shaw's work, Trebitsch attempted to find a German translator, but when he came up short, he contacted Shaw on his next trip to London and asked him for permission to translate them himself. As a playwright, novelist, and poet, Trebitsch approached Shaw's works from a completely different perspective than did Hamon. However, Shaw's plays being his first attempts at translation, he had to negotiate the notoriously difficult and demanding Shaw and learn to get under the skin of his drama. The result was that as for Hamon, there was a period of apprenticeship, which was evident in the earliest exchanges between author and translator. In returning Trebitsch his initial translation of *Arms and the Man*, which Shaw found had made an anti-romantic melodrama into a romantic play, Shaw wrote: 'No doubt some of the passages I have marked cannot be done in my way without spoiling their effect in German; but some of them are the crimes – the unashamed, intentional crimes – of a classically educated Viennese litterateur'.<sup>52</sup> Shaw also rebuked him for his inconsistency: 'The way in which you translate every word just as it comes and then forget it and translate it some other way when it begins (or should begin) to make the audience laugh, is enough to whiten the hair on an author's head'.<sup>53</sup> At the same time, Shaw found much to praise in Trebitsch's style: 'As a work of art, your translations seem to me better than the originals in several ways, and to have a certain charm of style and character that cannot be purchased for money or contrived by corrections & the like'.<sup>54</sup> Shaw was likewise careful to guide Trebitsch through the importance of the titles of his plays. For example, *Man and Superman*, Shaw insisted,

will have the same title all over the world. Mensch und Übermensch is precisely right. Such a title as Der neue Don Juan,

or Donna Juana, would mislead the public & create furious disappointment. Die Jagd nach dem Mann [The Manhunt] would belittle the play & drag it down to the level of the silliest & vulgarest of the critics. Mensch und Übermensch affirms its essentially philosophic quality & dignity. It has been so enormously successful merely as a title that the phrase has become a proverb in England & America; and so it shall in Germany.<sup>55</sup>

The echoing of Nietzsche's *übermensch* in Shaw's superman was thus vitally important for indicating Shaw's philosophic intentions and credentials. Indeed, at the outset of their relationship, he told Trebitsch that in general, but especially in relation to *Man and Superman*, 'I want the Germans to know me as a philosopher, as an English (or Irish) Nietzsche (only ten times cleverer), and not as a mere carpenter of farces like Helden [*Arms and the Man*] and nursery plays like *Candida*'.<sup>56</sup>

Shaw's investment in translation went beyond propagating his own works abroad. Many of his close friends and colleagues were translators themselves. Gilbert Murray, who was the model for Adolphus Cusins in *Major Barbara*, translated the drama of ancient Greece so skilfully and sensitively that his work led to professional productions and a new appreciation of their power and beauty. Archer, who had spent much of his childhood living in Norway, was the most important early translator of Ibsen. Constance Garnett, a fellow Fabian socialist, was the most renowned translator of modern Russian literature, including the works of Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Nikolai Gogol, Chekhov, and Turgenev. Shaw's wife Charlotte and his colleague St John Hankin published the first English translations of Eugène Brieux's drama. As for himself, Shaw returned the favour that Trebitsch had done in popularising his work in the Germanic world by translating *Frau Gitta's Sühne*, one of Trebitsch's plays, as *Jitta's Atonement*, although Shaw readily admitted that his rudimentary German meant that his version was more of an adaptation than a translation. The reality is that if a translator had done such a job on one of his plays, he would have been apoplectic. Shaw confessed that he altered Trebitsch's work to make it fit with current London tastes despite the fact that Shaw's own plays were rather written to pull London tastes in his own direction.<sup>57</sup> However, Shaw's name on the play impacted its production by theatres in the Anglophone world, *Jitta's Atonement* receiving its world premiere at New York's Comedy Theatre in 1923, one month before its German-language premiere at Vienna's Burgtheater, and a run at London's Grand Theatre in 1925. Yet Shaw's most selfless act of supporting translation was his use of the funds that he received from winning the Nobel Prize. As opposed to pocketing the money, Shaw created and bankrolled the Anglo-Swedish Literary Foundation, which finances the Society of Author's Bernard

Shaw Translation Prize that is awarded triennially for the best translation of a Swedish work into English.<sup>58</sup>

Such international relations and reception were essential in establishing Shaw as a writer. In fact, he was only able to give up his work as a journalist in the late nineteenth century and take up playwriting as a profession because of his fortunes abroad. In a 1904 review of the Court Theatre's premiere of *John Bull's Other Island*, Max Beerbohm, who had taken over from Shaw as theatre critic at the *Saturday Review*, attested to this situation:

Had Mr. Shaw been born in France, or in Germany, he would be at this moment the most popular playwright in Paris, or in Berlin. There is not the shadow of doubt about that. As it is, he is becoming popular in Berlin. In New York he is popular already. Another decade will, with luck, see him popular in London.<sup>59</sup>

Shaw acknowledged his popularity elsewhere by allowing foreign countries to have the world premieres of fourteen of his plays, several of them his most enduring. These include the United States (*The Devil's Disciple*, *Caesar and Cleopatra*, *How He Lied to Her Husband*, *Heartbreak House*, *Back to Methuselah*, *Saint Joan*, *Too True To Be Good*, *Village Wooing*, *The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles*), Austria (*Pygmalion*, *The Millionairess*), Poland (*The Apple Cart*, *Geneva*), and Switzerland (*Buoyant Billions*).<sup>60</sup>

Only a year before he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1925, Shaw was asked if he would consider himself a 'world dramatist'. He responded: 'No, but I *am* a world dramatist [...] because they play me, with or without my leave, everywhere from London to Japan, both ways round, and at all the intermediate stations. It is a question not of merit but of raw fact. My currency is as universal as that of Sherlock Holmes or Charlie's Aunt or Mary Pickford or Bill Hart or Charlie Chaplin'.<sup>61</sup> Here Shaw strikes upon one of the most important aspects that contribute to an author's place in the canon of world literature: popularity in countries beyond one's own. His first success was Richard Mansfield's production of *The Devil's Disciple*, which enjoyed a highly praised eight-week run at New York's Fifth Avenue Theatre in late 1897 before Mansfield took it on tours of the country from 1898 to 1900. Arnold Daly and Richard Frohman next struck gold with their productions of *Candida* and *You Never Can Tell*. These ran on Broadway, respectively, for 133 performances in 1903–4 and 129 performances in the winter of 1905. Robert Loraine, backed by Frohman, directed and played the lead in *Man and Superman* at New York's Hudson Theatre in the 1905–6 season for a whopping 196 performances, the show becoming such a massive hit that it netted a larger weekly box office

than the *Ziegfried Follies*.<sup>62</sup> The financial windfall brought by these early productions effectively gave Shaw a great deal of freedom, granting him more time to work on his plays and allowing him to continue his experiments with form, the first decade of the twentieth century being the time when he pushed the limits of the discussion play and developed the play of ideas. Many of his later successes in the United States would be a mix of financial and aesthetic achievements. His fellow Irishman, friend, and later biographer St John Ervine recommended to Shaw that he collaborate with Lawrence Langner's Theatre Guild, having had success with the Guild's production of his own play, *John Ferguson*, in 1919. In late 1920, the Guild produced the world premiere of *Heartbreak House* at New York's Garrick Theatre, where it enjoyed 125 performances. Comparatively, when the Irishman J. B. Fagan opened the play at London's Court Theatre in October 1921, it was plagued with staging difficulties, the reviews were mixed, and it lost money. Seeing the difference in artistry and reception, Shaw then gave the Guild the world premieres of five more of his plays, including *Saint Joan*.<sup>63</sup>

While his success was relatively immediate in the United States, it was rather more staggered in Germany at the outset. Although Trebitsch only began to translate Shaw's plays in late 1902, they quickly found a fan in Max Reinhardt, the most innovative director in the Germanic countries in the first three decades of the twentieth century. When Granville Barker caught Reinhardt's production of *Caesar and Cleopatra* while on his honeymoon in 1906, he informed Shaw that it was subpar. That spring, Shaw sent Trebitsch copious instructions for how Reinhardt should direct and publicize *Man and Superman* to ensure its success when it opened that December at Berlin's Kammerspiele.<sup>64</sup> Despite the rocky beginning of their relationship, Reinhardt remained a devoted director of Shaw's plays in German. Meanwhile, Shaw's savaging by English theatre critics, who bemoaned his inability to write a well-made play, caused him no end of grief. He recognized that the negative press was affecting his ability to secure productions of his plays on the continent as theatres tend to be wary of financing plays that are considered sure-fire commercial flops. When he wrote *Pygmalion* in 1912, Shaw knew that he had a hit on his hands. Seeing that he was embraced by critics and the public in Germanic countries while he was castigated and misunderstood in Britain, he agreed with Trebitsch's idea that the play should have its world premiere at Vienna's iconic Burgtheater, where it opened on 16 October 1913 to a glittering audience that included the Archduke Franz Ferdinand.<sup>65</sup> As Shaw explained: 'Reuters always reported the London production as a failure, and forced them to put off production abroad for months until the evil report was forgotten'.<sup>66</sup> This led him to premiere his plays abroad. The formula



paid dividends: when the British premiere of *Pygmalion* followed in the spring, it was just as well received as the Austrian production, the advance publicity of the play's rapturous Austrian reception, coupled with its infamous use of coarse language and the star power of the London production's cast, leading to Shaw's greater reputation in Britain.

Another indication of Shaw's drama as world literature is his reception in China. On 16 October 1920, *Mrs Warren's Profession* became the first Western play to be performed in the country when it was staged at the New Shanghai Theatre. It was translated the year before in *Xin chao* (*New Tide*), a prominent journal of the Intellectual Revolution of 1917–23 that had followed the fall of the conservative Qing dynasty in 1911. *Xin chao* published a translation of *Widowers' Houses* the next spring while *Wen xue zhou* (*Literature Weekly*), another liberal periodical, published translated excerpts of *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. Alongside Ibsen, Shaw was considered a major influence on the development of the Chinese spoken drama (*huaju*) that developed in the late 1910s and throughout the 1920s. Spoken drama, which was instrumental in establishing a modern Chinese literature, focused socially on challenging the patriarchal norms of a conservative Confucian society and aesthetically on countering the popularity of idealistic opera. In this way, Chinese dramatists shared Shaw's dual objective of creating new theatrical modes and using the theatre as a means of promoting social and political reforms, signalling this in their promotion of Shaw and Ibsen in very much the same way as European playwrights such as Shaw did thirty years earlier by championing Ibsen.<sup>67</sup>

Shaw's theatre has similarly flourished and been influential in the theatre cultures of many countries around the world.<sup>68</sup> As the aforementioned examples suggest, an important part of Shaw's reception is not only its consumption by readers and theatregoers, but how it has been appreciated and has in turn influenced writers in other places and times. In many regards, how one's work resonates in and influences other cultures and writers is an essential criterion for achieving the status of world literature. In England and Ireland, no one had a greater impact than Shaw on the direction of theatre in the twentieth century.<sup>69</sup> The works of Sean O'Casey, St John Ervine, Lennox Robinson, Denis Johnston, Harley Granville Barker, Githa Sowerby, John Galsworthy, Noel Coward, Terence Rattigan, J. B. Priestley, Edward Bond, David Hare, Caryl Churchill, and Tom Stoppard, to name but a handful, all bear a debt to Shaw. In the United States, Shaw remains an inspirational force in the theatre. This is especially evident in the works of Tony Kushner, who has indicated Shaw's influence on his work in his adoption of the discussion play and the play of ideas in *Angels in*

America and the distinctly Shavian *The Intelligent Homosexual's Guide to Capitalism and Socialism with a Key to the Scriptures*.<sup>70</sup>

While Shaw drew enormous inspiration from continental playwrights, novelists, and philosophers, his own drama then circled back and influenced many European dramatists, perhaps none more so than Bertolt Brecht. Brecht appears to have first encountered Shaw while working on Reinhardt's production of *Saint Joan* in 1924, later writing his own Shavian play *Saint Joan of the Stockyards*, a hybrid of Shaw's *Saint Joan* and *Major Barbara* that also draws upon Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle*. Most importantly in terms of radical dramaturgy, Shaw's work has instances of what Brecht would later develop into his notion of *Verfremdungseffekt*, the alienation that he cultivated to provide the critical distance necessary for the audience to engage in thoughtful reflection and political action. This is most evident when Shaw's drama gestures to the audience as knowing insiders and when he charges them with culpability for the circumstances that some of his characters denounce. As Brecht would have noticed while working with Reinhardt, Shaw's use of alienation is evident in the epilogue of *Saint Joan*, where the audience becomes aware that the burning of Joan was not merely an act of a formerly barbaric time, but rather one that they would tacitly support if not actively undertake themselves should a Joan-figure come amongst us again.<sup>71</sup>

Jorge Luis Borges reminds us that Shaw's influence spreads well beyond dramatists to include writers of all genres. The Argentine considered Shaw a vital writer on the themes of philosophy and ethics. Moreover, he admired the diversity and complexity of Shaw's gallery of characters that surpasses any other 'imagined by the art of our time' and admitted that Shaw was a major inspiration for his own work.<sup>72</sup> Borges first read Shaw when as a young man he came upon *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, which stirred him to read all of his plays and essays. Shaw revealed to him that it was possible to bridge the writer and the thinker, effectively enlarging Borges's own concept of literature.<sup>73</sup>

As the example of Shaw illustrates, the position of a writer in world literature is a moveable feast, the result of a matrix of factors that are in constant flux. This is because the meaning of world literature goes beyond establishing a canon that simply accounts for a selection of authors from different ethnic, religious, linguistic, national, class, gender, and sexual backgrounds. Instead, it can be best understood as a combination of multidirectional processes and relations. For his part, Shaw always saw himself in relation to writers of the past, the present, and even of the future, wavering from statements on his eternal greatness and timelessness to his hoped-for irrelevance as literature and socio-political ideas continued to develop. He recognized the importance of translation and his own reception abroad, did much to promote the work

of foreign-language writers in the English-speaking world, and adopted and adapted writers from across time and geopolitical frontiers while he has in turn inspired a similarly diverse constellation of authors. He was and is worldly in the greatest sense. In engaging with Shaw's oeuvre and its influences, reception, and impact on the direction of letters, we can better understand the how and the what of world literature as well as the place that Irish literature and writers have in it.

NOTES

1. Daniel Corkery, *Synge and Anglo-Irish Literature* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1947), p.3.
2. Shaw, 'Preface,' *Immaturity* (London: Constable, 1931), p.xxxv.
3. See Casanova's two chapters on assimilators and rebels in Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by Malcolm DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), pp.205–53.
4. Bernard Shaw, 'Literature in Ireland,' in *Bernard Shaw, The Matter with Ireland*, ed. by Dan H. Laurence and David H. Greene, 2nd edition (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2001), p.176. The quotes are a report of his lecture as they appeared in the *Irish Times*, not the actual text that he read.
5. Shaw, 'Literature in Ireland,' p.176, p.179.
6. Shaw, 'Preface,' pp.xxxiv–xxxv.
7. Casanova, p.313.
8. See, for example, Vivian Mercier, in *Modern Irish Literature: Sources and Founders* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); Declan Kiberd, in *Inventing Ireland* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995) and *Irish Classics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); the 2010 issue of *SHAW: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies* dedicated to the topic of 'Shaw and the Irish Literary Tradition,' ed. by Peter Gahan; Nelson O'Ceallaigh Ritschel, *Shaw, Synge, Connolly, and Socialist Provocation* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2011); Anthony Roche, *The Irish Dramatic Revival 1899–1939* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); David Clare, *Bernard Shaw's Irish Outlook* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Brad Kent, 'Missing Links: Bernard Shaw and the Discussion Play,' in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish Theatre*, ed. by Nicholas Grene and Chris Morash (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp.138–51; Fintan O'Toole, *Judging Shaw: The Radicalism of GBS* (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2017); *Bernard Shaw and the Making of Modern Ireland*, ed. by Audrey McNamara and Nelson O'Ceallaigh Ritschel (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020); and Peter Gahan, 'History and Religious Imagination: Bernard Shaw and the Irish Literary Revival – An Overview,' in *SHAW: The Journal of Bernard Shaw Studies* 42.2 (2022), 267–98.
9. For the only other major consideration of how Casanova's work relates to Irish Studies, see Michael Malouf, 'Problem with Paradigms: Irish Comparativism and Casanova's *World Republic of Letters*,' *New Hibernia Review* 17.1 (2013): 48–66. As Malouf's title suggests, he sees Casanova's study as laying the important groundwork for Irish comparative literature to consider the country in relation to other peripheral countries.
10. Joe Cleary, 'The World Literary System: Atlas and Epitaph,' *Field Day Review* 2 (2006): 196–219 (p.207).
11. Quoted in Fritz Strich, *Goethe and World Literature*, trans. by C. A. M. Sym (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949), p.352.
12. Strich, p.10. Strich explicitly acknowledges that little had changed by his own day with regards to Eurocentric notions of world literature (p.16).
13. Theo D'heena, *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature* (London: Routledge, 2012), pp.20–7.

14. For works that reflect this shift in modernist studies, see *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* ed. by Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); *The Modernist World*, ed. by Stephen Ross and Allana Lindgren (London: Routledge, 2015); and *A New Vocabulary for Global Modernism* ed. by Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).
15. J. L. Wisenthal, *Shaw and Ibsen: Bernard Shaw's The Quintessence of Ibsenism and Related Writings* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), pp.125–6.
16. Wisenthal, p.221.
17. 'Ibsenility,' *The Era*, 28 February 1891.
18. 'The Drama', *Daily News* 14 March 1891; "'Ghosts,'" *The Era*, 21 March 1891; and *Pall Mall Gazette*, 8 April 1891.
19. Wisenthal, pp.107–17.
20. See, for example, Christopher Innes, *Modern British Drama: The Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.16. For the most comprehensive consideration of Shaw's book on Ibsen, see Joan Templeton, *Shaw's Ibsen: A Re-Appraisal* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).
21. Bernard Shaw, 'Nietzsche in English,' in *Bernard Shaw's Book Reviews, 2 (1884–1950)*, ed. by Brian Tyson (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), p.190.
22. For discussions of Shaw's engagement with Russian literature, see Anna Obraztsova, 'Bernard Shaw and Russian Culture,' in *Bernard Shaw: On Stage*, ed. by L. W. Conolly and Ellen M. Pearson (Guelph, Ontario: University of Guelph, 1991), pp.43–59; and Olga Soboleva and Angus Wrenn, *The Only Hope of the World: George Bernard Shaw and Russia* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2012).
23. Bernard Shaw, 'Heartbreak House', in Bernard Shaw, *Pygmalion, Heartbreak House, and Saint Joan*, ed. by Brad Kent (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2021), pp.113–14.
24. Bernard Shaw, 'Sardoodledom', *Our Theatres in the Nineties*, 1, pp.133–40; letter from Shaw to William Archer, 8 June 1923, in *Bernard Shaw and William Archer*, ed. by Thomas Postlewait (Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press, 2017), p.373.
25. Letter from Shaw to Archer, 8 June 1923, in Postlewait, p.373.
26. Wisenthal, p.210.
27. Wisenthal, pp.219–20.
28. More recently, Cleary has implicitly admitted that Shaw is less conservative than he had originally deemed him in writing that 'Shaw was the pioneer of the new Ibsenite drama in London', but Cleary does not suggest that Shaw was anything more than derivative of his Norwegian predecessor. Joe Cleary, *Modernism, Empire, World Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), p.105.
29. Bernard Shaw, 'Man and Superman', in Bernard Shaw, *Man and Superman, John Bull's Other Island, and Major Barbara*, ed. by Brad Kent (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2021), p.20.
30. Letter from Shaw to Ellen Terry, 1 August 1899, in Bernard Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1898–1910*, ed. by Dan H. Laurence (London: Max Reinhardt, 1972), p.96.
31. Letter from Shaw to Mrs Richard Mansfield, 12 June 1900, in Bernard Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1898–1910*, p.174.
32. New York Public Library, Berg Collection. Scenario of *Man and Superman*.
33. On this subject, see Leo Weinstein, *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1959). On Shaw's debt to the Don Juan legend, see Carl Henry Mills 'Man and Superman and the Don Juan Legend', *Comparative Literature* 19.3 (1967): 216–25; and Arthur Ganz, 'Don Giovanni Shavianized: Man and Superman as Mozartian Commentary', *Opera Quarterly* 13.1 (1996): 21–8.
34. Examples abound in Shaw's letters and essays. See, for example, letter from Shaw to Siegfried Trebitsch, 1 July 1902, in *Bernard Shaw's Letters to Siegfried Trebitsch*, ed. by

- Samuel A. Weiss (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1986), p.19; 'Mr. Shaw on Mr. Shaw', *New York Times*, 12 June 1927; and 'The Play of Ideas,' *The New Statesman and Nation* XXXIX, 6 May 1950.
35. Shaw, 'Man and Superman', in Shaw, *Man and Superman, John Bull's Other Island, and Major Barbara*, p.6.
  36. Ronald Bryden, 'The Roads to *Heartbreak House*,' in *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*, ed. by Christopher Innes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp.180–94 (p.182).
  37. Shaw, 'Heartbreak House', in Shaw, *Pygmalion, Heartbreak House, and Saint Joan*, p.113.
  38. Letter from Shaw to Mrs Pat Campbell, 8 September 1913, in Bernard Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1911–1925*, ed. by Dan H. Laurence (London: Penguin Viking, 1985), p.202.
  39. Archibald Henderson, *Table-Talk of G.B.S.: Conversations of Things in General between George Bernard Shaw and his Biographer* (New York: Harper, 1925), p.36.
  40. See *Jeanne D'Arc, Maid of Orleans, Deliverer of France: Being the Story of her Life, her Achievements, and her Death, as attested on Oath and Set forth in the Original Documents*, ed. by T. Douglas Murray (New York: McClure, Phillips, 1902). For a detailed account of Shaw's use of Murray's book, see Brian Tyson, *The Story of Shaw's Saint Joan* (Montréal, Québec: McGill-Queen's Press, 1982).
  41. Shaw, 'Saint Joan', in Shaw, *Pygmalion, Heartbreak House, and Saint Joan*, p.284.
  42. David Damrosch, *What is World Literature?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), p.6.
  43. Georg Brandes, 'World Literature', in *The Princeton Sourcebook in Comparative Literature: From the European Enlightenment to the Global Present*, ed. by David Damrosch, Natalie Melas, and Mbongiseni Buthelezi (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), pp.61–6.
  44. Strich, pp.3–4.
  45. For recent essays on this subject, see the 2022 issue of *SHAW: The Journal of Bernard Shaw Studies* dedicated to the topic of 'Shaw Translation,' ed. by Miguel Cisneros Perales.
  46. Letter from Shaw to Augustin Hamon, 2 July 1908, in Bernard Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1898–1910*, p.798.
  47. Letter from Shaw to Siegfried Trebitsch, 20 January 1908, in Weiss, p.130.
  48. For a longer account of the Hamon-Shaw relationship, see Michel Pharand, *Bernard Shaw and the French* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2000), pp.101–28.
  49. Letter from Shaw to Hamon, 22 January 1906, in Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1898–1910*, pp.601–2.
  50. See the letters from Shaw to Hamon on 24 January 1910 and 26 July 1922, in Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1898–1910*, p.895, and Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1911–1925*, p.781.
  51. Letter from Shaw to Hamon, 9 January 1907, in Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1898–1910*, p.669.
  52. Letter from Shaw to Trebitsch, 26 December 1902, in Weiss, p.30.
  53. Letter from Shaw to Trebitsch, 26 December 1902, in Weiss, p.30.
  54. Letter from Shaw to Trebitsch, 10 December 1902, in Weiss, p.26.
  55. Letter from Shaw to Trebitsch, 19 July 1906, in Weiss, p.107.
  56. Letter from Shaw to Trebitsch, 26 December 1902, in Weiss, p.31.
  57. See his translator's note to the play in Bernard Shaw, *Translations and Tomfooleries* (London: Constable, 1932), pp.3–7.
  58. See the Foundation's website for more details: <<https://www.swedenabroad.se/en/about-sweden-non-swedish-citizens/united-kingdom/anglo-swedish-literary-foundation/>>.
  59. Max Beerbohm, *Saturday Review*, 12 November 1904, p.608.

60. *O'Flaherty, V.C.* premiered in Belgium, but it was performed by British troops at the front during the First World War.
61. Henderson, pp.68–9, original emphasis.
62. Winifred Loraine, *Robert Loraine: Soldier, Actor, Airman* (London: Collins, 1938), p.85.
63. For a study of Shaw's relationship with the New York Theatre Guild, see L. W. Conolly, *Bernard Shaw on the American Stage: A Chronicle of Premieres and Notable Revivals* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022), pp.317–70.
64. For Shaw's concerns about Reinhardt in these early years, see his letters to Trebitsch from May 1906 to May 1907, Weiss, pp.101–20.
65. *The Times*, 17 October 1913. The mention of the plays' 'excellent reception' before people of such importance would not have been lost on the paper's British readership.
66. Letter from Shaw to Barry Jackson, 10 March 1939. Bernard Shaw, *Collected Letters, 1926–1950*, ed. by Dan H. Laurence (London: Penguin Viking, 1988), p.99.
67. For studies of Shaw's influence on Chinese spoken drama and modern Chinese literature, see Kay Li, *Bernard Shaw's Bridges to Chinese Culture* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) and Kay Li, *Bernard Shaw and China: Cross-Cultural Encounters* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2007). For more on spoken drama and its debt to western drama more generally, see Xiaomei Chen, 'Introduction,' in *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Chinese Drama*, ed. by Xiaomei Chen (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), pp.1–55.
68. For examples of studies that discuss Shaw's relationships with the peoples, cultures, and literatures of countries beyond England and Ireland, see Pharand, *Bernard Shaw and the French*; Soboleva and Wrenn, *The Only Hope of the World*; Li, *Bernard Shaw's Bridges to Chinese Culture*; Li, *Bernard Shaw and China*; Rosalie Rahal Haddad, *Bernard Shaw in Brazil: The Reception of Theatrical Productions, 1927–2013* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2016); *Bernard Shaw and the Spanish-Speaking World*, ed. by Gustavo A. Rodríguez Martín (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022); Rhoda B. Nathan, 'A Fabian Down Under: Shaw's Plays in the Antipodes', *SHAW: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies* 14 (1994): 167–76; Peter Conolly-Smith, 'Germany and Austria,' in *George Bernard Shaw in Context*, ed. by Brad Kent (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.21–8; L. W. Conolly, *The Shaw Festival: The First Fifty Years* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Conolly, *Bernard Shaw on the American Stage*; and *Bernard Shaw: On Stage*, ed. by L. W. Conolly and Ellen M. Pearson (Guelph, Ontario: University of Guelph, 1991), which includes essays on Shaw and Russia, Egypt, Japan, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Sweden.
69. See, for example, Innes, *Modern British Drama*; and Kent, 'Missing Links.'
70. The title nods to Shaw's *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*.
71. For an excellent insight into Brecht's appreciation of Shaw early in his career, see Bertolt Brecht, 'Ovation for Shaw,' trans. by Gerhard H. W. Zuther, *Modern Drama* 2.2 (Summer 1959): 184–7. The article originally appeared in *Berliner Borsen-Courier*, 25 July 1926, on the eve of Shaw's seventieth birthday as a celebration of Brecht's idol.
72. Jorge Luis Borges, 'A Note on (toward) Bernard Shaw,' in Jorge Luis Borges, *Labyrinths: Selected Stories & Other Writings*, ed. by Donald A. Yates and James E. Irby (New York: New Directions, 1964), p.215.
73. See Seamus Heaney, Richard Kearney, and Jorge Luis Borges, 'Borges and the World of Fiction: An Interview with Jorge Luis Borges', *The Crane Bag* 6.2 (1982), 74–5.