

Myth, Archetype and Complex in *Man and Superman*

Bernard Shaw's *Man and Superman* is a complex text that is problematic in many ways. From the standpoint of the writer on the history of ideas it is interesting because it is the first of several Shavian dramas on evolutionary themes.¹ From the viewpoint of the dramatic critic it is problematic because of the dream episode, which is frequently detached and played as a separate drama entitled *Don Juan in Hell*. The four act structure of *Man and Superman* violates the three or five act convention that can be found in plays such as Wilde's *The Importance of Being Ernest*, or Shaw's *Major Barbara* and *Candida*.² If the dream sequence is not simply a detachable sequence but rather an integral and organic part of the whole play it is necessary to establish the relationship between the two parts and to see how the inter-relationships between these parts affect the whole.

Eric Bentley has said "Take away the episode in hell, and Shaw has written an anti-intellectual comedy" (Bentley, xviii). The question for the critic, however, is not simply one of intellectualism or anti-intellectualism but of the relationships between the parts. One can establish a dialectical relationship between dream and waking states perhaps and suggest that the longed for Superman will be the synthesis of Tanner and Don Juan or it may be possible to look for other relationships that may be fruitful in elucidating the organic relationship between dream and drama.

Approaches that have been useful in dealing with dreams and their relationships to the waking state may be helpful in explicating the relationship between dream and dreamer in Shaw's play. They may shed some light on the functioning of the characters or even on their sources in Shaw's psyche.

The approaches that would seem of some use in evaluating the relationship here would be those of mythic criticism, especially as approached through the work of Carl Jung on archetypes, and the psychoanalytic criticism that derives from Sigmund Freud.

It must be said at the outset that the dream sequence is obviously not a dream such as is commonly described by psychoanalysts or diarists. It is far longer and more complex on the intellectual level than actual dreams usually are. It is also dramatically complete and has a resolution in itself whereas actual dreams are frequently concluded by "and then I woke up".³ The dream does, I shall argue, contain the mythic elements that Jung recognizes as coming from the collective unconscious and it also contains elements of wish fulfillment and the projection of an ego ideal that we see as having their source in Freud.

Carl Jung's work on psychology has gained some currency and has to some extent been popularized through the work of critics and scholars, particularly folklorists and mythologists

such as Joseph Campbell. Jung's primary contribution has been through several key concepts such as his theory of personality types and his theory of archetypes and the collective unconscious.⁴

Jung postulates that there is a collective unconscious and he says that:

The collective unconscious is a part of the psyche which can be negatively distinguished from a personal unconscious by the fact that it does not, like the latter, owe its existence to personal experience and consequently is not a personal acquisition. While the personal unconscious is made up essentially of contents which have at one time been conscious but which have disappeared from consciousness through having been forgotten or repressed, the contents of the collective unconscious have never been in consciousness, and therefore have never been individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity. Whereas the personal unconscious consists for the most part of *complexes*, the content of the collective unconscious is made up essentially of *archetypes* (Jung, *Archetypes*, 42).

Jung distinguishes between the personal unconscious and its complexes and the collective unconscious and its contents in an earlier passage:

The contents of the personal unconscious are chiefly the *feeling-toned complexes*, as they are called; they constitute the personal and private side of psychic life. The contents of the collective unconscious, on the other hand, are known as *archetypes* (Jung, *Archetypes*, 4).

There are several varieties of archetypes, among which Jung recognizes the animus/anima pair, the mother, the maiden, the shadow and the wise old man. These archetypes it should be noted are not in and of themselves meaningful; the archetype is merely a form into which the meaning is poured by the individual. Jung makes this clear when he counters:

...the mistaken notion that an archetype is determined in regard to its content, in other words that it is a kind of unconscious idea...It is necessary to point out once more that archetypes are not determined as regards their content, but only as regards their form and then only to a very limited degree. A primordial image [Jung's synonym for the archetype] is determined as to its content only when it has become conscious and is therefore filled out with the material of conscious experience. Its form...might perhaps be compared to the axial system of a crystal.... The archetype in itself is empty and purely formal, nothing but a *facultas praeformandi*, a possibility of representation which is given *a priori* (Jung, *Archetypes*, 79).⁵

The concept of the archetype then is one that expresses a relationship between a universal form, the archetype, and the individual who fills the form with meaning. Archetypes

such as mother or anima have the meaning put into them by the individual so that even if a character in a drama can be shown to be an archetype the character must be studied not in isolation but in relation to either the individual creator or to a social context in which the individual creator participates. The process of interpreting the meaning of the archetypes when they appear in a work of literature becomes a process of extrapolating on the basis of existing data and of making inferences about the relationships of the archetypes both within the drama and as they relate not only to the author but also to other myths or works of literature that embody the same archetypes. Thus, for example, the appearance of Tiresias in “The Wasteland” may lead us to investigate his appearance in Ovid, as indicated by Eliot’s note, to Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannos* and to Homer’s *Odyssey*, not to mention other appearances of androgynous male seers in a variety of literatures. These appearances of the archetype suggest that these are something universal and not products of a specific culture. If the archetype can be seen to act in a certain manner in some circumstances its reappearance in the work of an author, whether consciously as in the case of Eliot, or unconsciously as in the work of naive or folk authors, may be suggestive.

Jung indicates that the archetype is concerned with mythological motifs. Mythology is usually thought of, to the extent that it is thought of at all in modern society, to be the product of ancient and anonymous Greek and Roman poets. In a very broad and general sense mythology can be more accurately seen as the formation of symbolic stories that reveal something of the relationship between the human and the divine, or between that which is wholly self and that which is wholly other. In this sense literature can be read as a form of myth.

Myths and the archetypes that appear in them frequently appear in different versions. In some cases, for example folk epics such as the *Ramayana* or the *Mahabharata* in which the composition took place over several hundred years, it can be argued that the multiple overlays provide a close approximation to a real product of the collective unconscious.⁶ In the same fashion a story that has been told and retold by different authors, each with a slightly different version, has approached the status of myth, even if all of the authors are known. Faust is one literary myth whose origins can be traced back to a primal text and whose descendants can be found in Marlowe, Goethe, Spengler, and Mann.⁷ Don Juan has, like his relative Faust, appeared in a number of guises subsequent to his original appearance in Tirso de Molina. Notable uses of the Don Juan character can be found not only in Shaw but also in Byron, Moliere, Mozart and even in popular cinema, where he has been incarnated by Errol Flynn. Don Juan and his story have ceased to be merely literary artifacts but have become incorporated into popular culture and myth.

Joseph Campbell, in his works on mythology, particularly the *Creative Mythology* volume of *The Masks of God* series, has argued that mythology and myths serve four purposes:

reconciliation to the universe as it is; “to render an interpretive total picture of the same, [universe] as known to contemporary consciousness”; enforcement of moral order; and orientation of the individual with respect to culture, nature and the transcendent (Campbell, *Creative*, 4-6). The Don Juan myth in Tirso de Molina’s hands and in the hands of the librettist of *Don Giovanni* explicitly serves the second purpose; the Don is condemned for his immorality and the moral, that the seducer is damned, is obviously oriented towards the third of Campbell’s purposes.⁸ Shaw’s purpose in using the myth of Don Juan in *Man and Superman* has both an interpretive aspect, Campbell’s second purpose, and an aspect of orientation towards a transcendent force, Campbell’s fourth purpose.

The appearance of the original archetypes from Moliere and Tirso in Shaw’s play, albeit in the dream sequence, suggests that the interaction of the archaic archetypes with their more modern counterparts may provide some of the dramatic tension and unity in the play. This method of approaching the play and its two main parts, the late Victorian drama and the late Renaissance dream, may be fruitful in providing a clue as to the text’s internal unity and coherence.

Archetypal criticism of a text may seem nebulous at best. The theory posits that there is in existence a vast treasure house of forms, somewhat reminiscent of the Platonic forms, that exist somewhere *out there*. The *out there*, of course, is a vague, non-referential entity that can be neither perceived nor deduced on the basis of solid evidence. A more concrete procedure would be to suggest that the tension in the play arises because of an inner tension within the author and the characters represent an acting out of the unconscious drives of the author. This would be a more classically psychoanalytic approach in which the characters are seen as fragmented representations of the author’s self, or possibly, as in the case of the dream sequence, the characters’ selves. This last point ultimately reduces itself to the author, so it is simpler to proceed with the assumption that we are working with material that emerges from the author’s psyche and that in some way is related to his unconscious needs, desires, wishes and instinct.

Psychoanalysis, it should be observed at the outset, is not primarily a method of literary criticism. It arises out of a therapeutic situation, primarily the treatment of neurotics and was first used in the treatment of hysterics.⁹ As a form of therapy the aim of psychoanalysis is the restoration of the human personality and not the criticism of works of art.

Psychoanalysis and its doctrines then do not arise on the basis of *a priori* reasoning but on the basis of the physician’s or analyst’s encounter with the patient in the consulting room. As such its methodology is inductive and scientific. It is on the basis of encounters with neurotics that Freud formulates doctrines such as the Oedipus complex, the superego, the id, the libido, and the death wish. As a therapeutic method it seeks to resolve the conflicts within the personality by working back to a situation in which the original fixation occurred. A well-known example of

this Freudian methodology can be found in Robert M. Lindner's classic text *Rebel Without a Cause: The Hypnoanalysis of a Criminal Psychopath* in which the patient, Harold, is regressed to the age of six to eight months and recounts his witnessing of the primal scene with its attendant castration threat.¹⁰ The abreaction to the primal scene, which was incomplete before, enables the patient to be restored to health and to function normally in society once more. As Freud remarks in his "Observations on 'Wild' Psychoanalysis"

The pathological factor is not his ignorance in itself, but the root of this ignorance in his *inner resistances*; it was they that first called this ignorance into being, and they still maintain it now. In combatting these resistances lies the task of therapy... (Freud, *Great*, 129-30).

Freud goes on to emphasize that psychoanalysis requires a "fairly long period of contact with the patient" and that the technique of psychoanalysis cannot be learned from books but must "be learnt, like other medical measures, from those who are already proficient in it" (Freud, *Great*, 130). This observation must be kept in mind when working with psychoanalytic interpretations of literature, it is not enough to have read Freud, Lacan, et alia; it is also necessary to have undergone the rigorous training of psychoanalysis itself.

The interpretation of literature through psychoanalysis differs from the approach of psychoanalysis as therapy. It is deductive and philosophical. It is these things because it starts from a pre-existing theory which it uses to confirm its own presuppositions. As such it is not a method of scientific discovery. There is no patient to provide a stupendous revelation; there is only the text which apparently never alters its way of speaking to us.

The material for the psychoanalytic interpretation of literature is not given *viva voce*, as such the critic who wishes to work with this approach is limited in his materials. He has, of course, the literary text itself; if the author is living he may write to him and the author may or may not reply; he may have autobiographical material such as letters, diaries, recordings and so on; he may have secondary sources from people who knew the author, but these give only a partial and incomplete picture; finally, he may have critical and scholarly works that suggest various themes and ideas that can be found in the author's works and that other scholars have linked to the author's psychic development. In the case of Shaw the primary material would be, aside from *Man and Superman*, his diaries and letters, and the secondary material might include any number of biographies and critical studies, such as Michael Holroyd's or Archibald Henderson's biographies. The crucial material, however, is the infantile material, that material of which the older Shaw was unconscious but which served to motivate him and through him the characters in his dramas. This crucial material went to the grave with Shaw in 1950 and so we can only conjecture as to what it may contain. The conjecture itself, though, is based on the

experience of psychoanalysis so that if our approach is correct then the conjecture may be assumed, within limits, to be correct also.

The earliest psychoanalytic approach to a literary work is probably Freud's study of *Gradiva*. In the essay on this work Freud justifies the approach on two grounds: that storytellers use dreams and realize their significance and that the psychoanalytic approach may tell us something of the creative process itself (Freud, *Delusion*, 25, 27).

Freud's work on dreams and dream symbolism may also be relevant in assessing the relationship between the Shavian drama and the Shavian dream. Freud, in his essay on *Gradiva* asserts that a dream is a wish-fulfillment (Freud, *Delusion*, 25-6). Given that this is so to what extent is the dream sequence a representation of a possible dream? If one accepts that the dream is apparently shared by Tanner and Mendoza, and possibly by Ann and Ramsden, then one may reasonably conclude that the dream *personae* represent the ego-ideals of the dreamers. (Shaw, III 650). The following pairs exist within the dream: Tanner/Don Juan, Ann/Anna, Ramsden/Statue, Mendoza/Devil. The mythological counterpart to each of the "real" individuals portrayed in the drama is in essence the ego-ideal of the dreamer.

Julia Kristeva in writing about Don Juan, in *Tales of Love*, does not deal with Shaw at all and concerns herself with Mozart's opera and with a psychoanalytic summary of one of her cases. Her remarks, however, are insightful. She contrasts Mozart's music with Da Ponte's libretto and remarks that:

...one need only have Mozart's joyful and stately music ring out above that edifying story, born of a medieval morality play in a state of decay, and the entire point of view changes; instead of the sullen claims of the victim, the air resounds with the pure jouissance of a conqueror, to be sure, but a conqueror who knows that he has no object, who does not want one, who loves neither triumph nor glory in themselves, but the passing of both—the eternal return, infinitely so (Kristeva, 193).

Kristeva distinguishes the Don of Mozart, "the seducer who is basically an artist" from his actual progeny, the satyrs of modern life, those who are "imitators of Don Juan". She sets the literary Don "apart from those who confuse the fantasy of phallic allmightiness with an athletic performance of their genital system and seek, in the reality of feminine conquests, to appease an imaginary, symbolic impotence" (Kristeva, 204-5). The "imitator of Don Juan" whose case history she sets forth is a perversion, she says, that "is bordered by sadistic anal drive on the one hand, and on the other by an idealizing and terrifying identification with an immediately superegotistic ideal Ego who orders impotence" (Kristeva, 208). This seems immensely provocative, especially when dealing with Shaw.

Humor has rarely been noted for its gentleness. There is always an aspect of the ridiculous and of an underlying sadism in the things we laugh at whether the humor be of a sexual nature or political or literary or simply that of situation comedy on television. but sadism is also a clinical perversion, a derivation of sexual pleasure from the infliction of pain on others. Does that element exist in Shaw? Certainly not in the same fashion that it exists in the Marquis de Sade or in Victorian pornography. In a broader sense there is a denigration of the other at the expense of the self and that might be seen to exist in Shaw and in *Man and Superman* or in its ancillary materials. In the same manner the elevation of the “superegotistic ideal Ego”, may or may not exist in the same fashion but it show up in Shaw’s life and/or work in any of a number of ways.

Shaw stated in his preface to *Man and Superman* that it was a Don Juan play (Shaw, III, 485). Since he refers explicitly during the dream sequence to Mozart’s score (e.g., the opening in which he prints a few bars, the reference to Mozart’s statue music, the music heralding the appearance of the Devil, “grotesquely adulterated with Gounod’s”, the citation of “*Vivan le femmine*”, and the Statue’s preference for Mozart over Wagner (Shaw, III 600-1, 608, 610, 612, 648)). it may reasonably be surmised that the primary source for Shaw’s adaptation of the myth was *Don Giovanni*. Louis Crompton, however, lists the following sources for Shaw’s play: Tirso de Molina, Moliere, Da Ponte, Byron, Dumas père, De Musset, Hoffman, Mérimée, Manuel de la Revilla, Francisco Pí y Margall, Felipe Picatoste, Antoine de Latour, Philarète Chasles, Gustave Larroumet, and Maurice Barrès (Crompton, 49).

The multiple renditions of the myth of Don Juan and the endless commentaries on it (the authors cited after Mérimée are commentators on the myth) suggest that the myth exists not as a purely literary work of art but as one that has resonances in the popular imagination. Joseph Campbell says that in creative mythology:

...the individual has had an experience of his own—of order, horror, beauty, or even mere exhilaration—which he seeks to communicate through signs; and if his realization has been of a certain depth and import, his communication will have the value and force of living myth—for those, that is to say, who receive and respond to it of themselves, with recognition, uncoerced (Campbell, *Creative*, 4).

The Don Juan myth, in its original form and in its various transformations at the hands of various artists, has become a part of our psychological makeup so that we recognize the motif of the seducer even in the Don’s distant descendants.

The characters of the myth as developed by Tirso de Molina do not remain constant. In Byron, for example, the Don is comic and satiric, a young man more reminiscent of Byron himself than of a Spanish nobleman. In Da Ponte’s libretto he is the seducer and rake. The character of the Don is not a given but rather something into which the author projects a part of himself. This projection, or filling of the pre-existing concept, is exactly what Jung describes as

happening in relation to the archetype.¹¹ The skeletal structure of the archetype is fleshed out by the author's imposition of meaning onto it.

Shaw has defined his characters in relation to the Don Juan legend. He is at pains to do this in his preface in which he distinguishes between the vulgar conception of Don Juan as a libertine and the philosophic conception of Don Juan as a rebel and an enemy of God. Shaw even recognizes Kristeva's concept of *jouissance* in Mozart's music.¹² Shaw reduces the *mille e tre* adventures to "two immature intrigues leading to sordid and prolonged complications and humiliations" (Shaw, III 492). Shaw is even at pains to construct names that are echoes of the names in the myth, he signals this characteristically in the opening stage direction for the dream sequence, "The name too, Don Juan Tenorio, John Tanner". Clearly he equates Tanner with the Don. Ann becomes Ana, Mendoza the Devil and Ramsden the Statue. Even Octavius, who does not appear in the dream, corresponds to Ana's would-be lover Ottavio.

Shaw has kept the characters of the myth but he has trivialized them in his drama. Tanner's great scandal is not that he is a rake and seducer, the Victorian era was full of these, at least in drama, but in his publication of a revolutionary tract. His sexual escapades are reduced to "kissing little girls I didnt care for" and kissing a girl named Rachel Rosetree (Shaw, III 547-8). This reduction of the sexual escapades trivializes Tanner to an extent. One can hardly regard the Shavian concept as a story of "the deeds of the penis" (Kristeva, 201). This diminishment of the Don into Tanner is essentially comic. Tanner is inadequate in most ways; despite his professed intellect he fails to recognize the true goal of Ann's desire as himself. His intellect is also singularly unproductive. He produces a book which no one reads, his speeches are greeted with scorn, as when Violet rejects his compliments to her, and his final word, "Talking" is greeted with "universal laughter" (Shaw, III, 559, 686).

It is in his portrayal of Ann that Shaw portrays, as he suggests in his preface, Everywoman (Shaw, III 507). If Ann is Everywoman, what kind of woman is that Everywoman? One important aspect of the feminine is tied up with the maternal function. This is not to repeat what modern feminists regard as the Freudian fallacy that "biology is destiny" but simply to state that one of the great mythic archetypes is that of the Mother Goddess. Sally Peters Vogt in an essay on Ann as an archetype inquires as to the character of Ann and bases her discussion on insights gleaned from Eliade, Campbell, Jung, Cirlot, and Frye (Vogt, 106). Vogt isolates two structures in the play, the surface one that is a conventional comedy and a deep structure that is mythic in "both content and origin" which directs the surface action. The deep mythic structure is primary and determines the course of the surface drama.

In this world, according to Vogt, the women, even though they have no outlets for their energies outside of the biological one of reproduction exert an influence that causes the men to be "defined through their relationships with women". Tanner's flight, his confession to Ann, his

defense of Violet, and so on are essentially *reactions* to things that are forced upon him from the outside. The drama then becomes one that is essentially controlled by the women (Vogt, 107-8).

The dream sequence has a dialectical structure in which a number of dualities, heaven/hell, illusion/reality, and so on, face off. These dualities are, according to Vogt, who is following Frye on this point, a pattern that unifies the work. The dialectic involved is an unending process and it is this process that is the heart of the Shavian doctrine of Creative Evolution.(Vogt, 108).

Vogt identifies the characters of the dream sequence with their larger mythic prototypes and makes the following identifications: Tanner/hero, Ann/goddess, Mendoza/Devil, Ramsden/Holdfast. She further identifies Hell with a version of the “sacred center of the universe”. Vogt maintains that the vigor of the Don Juan myth, its reappearance in versions subsequent to Tirso de Molina attests to both its mythic status and to man’s “perennial longing for an earthly paradise”. It is precisely this earthly paradise that Shaw’s doctrine of Creative Evolution hopes to achieve. The fact that Don Juan is associated with sexuality and that Creative Evolution is tied in with Shaw’s conception of sexual energy links the two together (Vogt, 111).

Ann is a woman; she is also a goddess. Which woman; which goddess is she? Vogt answers that Octavius, who sees her as an Earth Mother, is correct. Ann incorporates a number of roles, those of daughter, sister, virgin, temptress, bride, mother; all of which can be subsumed into that of “Queen Goddess of the World”. Tanner sees in Ann only the temptress; it is this aspect of her that he flees from. Tanner characterizes Ann through a number of animal comparisons. Vogt suggests that the lioness, to whom Ann is compared, is a symbol of the Great Mother, while the queen bee is symbolic of both the mother goddess and the Virgin Mary (Vogt, 114).

Vogt points out that Ann is referred to as a snake on four separate occasions and links the snake with Eve. The stage business with the feather boa is linked to Eve as well (Vogt, 115). This identification, however, seems misplaced. Harry M. Geduld in an article written prior to Vogt’s entitled “The Lineage of Lilith” identifies the business with the feather boa as being related to Lilith. Shaw, according to Geduld, may well have known Shelley’s translation of *Faust* and may have patterned the incident in *Man and Superman* in which Ann Whitefield drapes a feather boa around Jack Tanner’s neck after a similar incident in *Faust* (Geduld, 58, 60). This identification is, if anything, even more appropriate than the identification with Eve. Lilith is the predatory female *par excellence* and is, in Shavian mythology, the source of the creative and evolutionary impulse.

Ann is further associated with the moon and a variety of lunar goddesses through the comparisons to the cat, the bear, and the tiger. These animals are implicitly connected with primal instincts that “preclude spirituality”.The association of Ann with the moon is furthered

by her inability to consciously explain herself (Vogt, 115). One might add that Ann is the least self-conscious of all of the participants in the dream colloquy.

Ann is identified as the goddess, in fact as the Mother Goddess, and Tanner is implicitly the hero who is loved by the Mother Goddess. Tanner's flight from Ann in fact has parallels to an earlier hero's aversion to a goddess. When Ishtar offers Gilgamesh her love he rejects her and says:

Your lovers have found you like a brazier which smoulders in the cold, a backdoor which keeps out neither squall of wind nor storm, a castle which crushes the garrison, pitch that blackens the bearer, a leaky skin that wets the carrier....Which of your lovers did you ever love for ever? (Gilgamesh, 84).

Tanner's flight, once he realizes that he is Ann's desired mate, parallels the earlier rejection of the goddess by the earlier hero. Like Gilgamesh and Odysseus, however, Tanner too must make a descent into hell. Vogt sees this as Tanner's "descent into his unconscious". The creatures of the Sierra Nevadas, the anarchists and syndicalists and social democrats, are parallels to the dangerous creatures of mythology (Vogt, 118). When Tanner sleeps he undertakes the mythic journey through hell and emerges into heaven, that is to say into the realization of his true, spiritual self.

The topics of the hellish colloquium, which Vogt lists as "civilization, morality and progress", are, according to her, intimately related to those of the romantic comedy that surrounds it, "love, marriage, sex and Woman" because all are involved in an understanding of Creative Evolution. It is in the union of Ann and Tanner that the Superman can evolve. Ann is the "world-embracing goddess-mother" and Tanner is the "world renouncing hero-saint" but Tanner must return to the world, he must be summoned back to the community and wakened from his dream. That Tanner is in sacred space is indicated by the presence of the mountains and the patches of olive trees; the olive that is sacred to Jupiter and the mountain that is the center of the world are both related to concepts of the holy and sacred. Even the location of act 4, which is situated near the Alhambra suggests a sacred place. The Alhambra's Fountain of the Lions is linked with Tanner because the lion is associated with both the sun and the masculine principal. Further, the fountain uses water both statically and dynamically which suggest both death and rebirth. Tanner's dream "affirms the possibilities of a regenerated society, even while it satirizes vice and folly". Tanner's personal journey has enabled him to come to self-knowledge. In a sense then *Man and Superman* is a variant of what Campbell has called the "monomyth" (Vogt, 118-21; Campbell, *Hero*, 30).¹³ The marriage between Ann and Tanner becomes what Vogt terms a "mystical marriage"¹⁴ This marriage unites heaven and earth, sun and moon. Tanner is finally integrated into the social unit by the arrival of the family and friends, which reinforces the status

quo, but which, through the fertile union of the two, promises to be a regenerative event. Vogt says that Ann is thus the embodiment not of women but of Woman and that she subsumes all roles. Ann is thus a pivotal character whose presence enables Tanner to express his philosophy within a societal framework (Vogt, 122-3).

The hell scene functions then as a source of dramatic tension within the play. The characters, especially Tanner, when they start the drama, are essentially diminished versions of their mythic/heroic selves. It is the encounter with the unconscious, through the archetypes represented in the dream sequence that enables them to fulfill their roles in the drama. The elements of Campbell's monomyth are clearly present. Tanner's flight from Ann, ostensibly in order to break an automobile record, is the first step on the hero's journey. Like many heroes Tanner sets out on a journey with no clear idea of what his goal is or what he will discover when he reaches the goal. Tanner's journey is further complicated by a descent into the underworld, a descent that echoes the underground journeys of Gilgamesh, Orpheus, Heracles, Aeneas and others. He encounters various temptations, as personified by Mendoza and his pack of bandits. Finally, he journeys back and is united in a sacred marriage with the mother goddess. The characters in the dream thus charge the principal characters in the drama in such a way that the purely Victorian characters, with their diminished sensibilities and capacities, become vitalized and enlarged into a more universal significance.

Ann's eventual capture of Tanner is a triumph for the maternal archetype that she embodies. Tanner is the means for her fruition and the instrument of her fulfillment. Tanner, who has presumed that he could survive by sublimating his instincts to his intellect, has come to realize that he must be integrated into a whole person, a unity achieved through union with Ann. He has also come to realize the futility of his sublimation, a futility that is summed up in his final word "Talking" and the universal laughter that greets it.¹⁵

This approach to *Man and Superman* through the archetypal criticism pioneered by Jung and his disciples places the drama within a universal context. In situating it in this fashion, however, it seems that a smaller entity has been lost sight of, namely the author, Shaw. It could be argued that the drama was not really written by Shaw, that he was merely the agent of an impersonal force, and in fact Shaw himself has said as much on numerous occasions. Whether he would have accepted an identification of that force with the collective unconscious is doubtful.

There is a school of criticism that focuses on the psychology of the individual author and that is the psychoanalytic criticism that derives from Freud. This criticism is properly done only by those who have had training in psychoanalysis, otherwise the practitioner remains open to the criticism that he is indulging in "wild" psychoanalysis. The basic principles can be learned and applied and that can be fruitful and suggestive of avenues for further study.

Julia Kristeva, as mentioned earlier, devotes considerable space to an analysis of the Don Juan myth as it appears in Tirso de Molina and in Mozart's *Don Giovanni*. As indicated earlier she sees in the actual case that she presents traces of sadism and of the incorporation of a powerful "superegotistic ideal Ego". Perhaps even more interesting, as regards Shaw at least, is that she points out that "nothing is ever said about Don Juan's mother". This suggests that Don Juan is basically acting out Oedipal drives, a supposition confirmed by "everyday 'Don Juans' who truly adhere to the maternal image". Don Juan could also be the "fantasy of an elder brother", determined to show his younger siblings that he can have all women. This element may not be too relevant to Shaw and to *Man and Superman* but the notion that the son is tied to the mother and the combination of sadism and the "superegotistic ideal Ego" may be fruitful when applied to drama and dramatist.

Tanner seems to have no parents. This is strangely characteristic of most of the young people in the play. Ann has just lost her father, Octavius is an orphan, and Tanner seems to have been all but adopted by Ann's family. This situation is not unique to this play. There seem to be an unusually large percentage of children from what one may call "defective" families in Shavian drama. Frank Crofts and Vivie Warren may or may not be related due to *Mrs. Warren's Profession*; Eliza Doolittle is an illegitimate child; *The Devil's Disciple* opens with a child being orphaned; the *Simpleton* deals with the products of genetic experimentation; Barbara Undershaft and Adolphus Cusins are both products of irregular family unions; the children in the last play of *Back to Methuselah* are born oviparously; some of the characters in *Far-Fetched Fables* have no conception of sex; Joan of Arc has a relationship with her father, but it is her heavenly father. It may be that a dramatist will occasionally misplace a parent or two, but to do it consistently borders on the pathological.

Tanner exhibits a sadistic drive, not in the drama as such but in the ancillary material that Shaw has appended to the printed version of the drama and presented as the work of Tanner. Tanner says of the adoption of the Fabian policy that if it were carried out "it would be carried out by brute force exactly as our present property system is". The lengthy catalog of atrocities offered a bit later by Tanner smacks not of aversion but of a horrible fascination with barbaric punishments (Shaw, III 710, 716-18).¹⁶ Tanner also proclaims that "bad breeding is indispensable to the weeding out of the human race" (Shaw, III 694). This statement, although not overtly sadistic, is callous. This evident callousness was to stay with Shaw most of his life.

Equally telling is Shaw's long fascination with strong men. Noyes, Cromwell, Napoleon and Julius Caesar are all admitted, at least temporarily, to the rank of Supermen. The *Preface on Bosses* that precedes *The Millionairess* is full of praise for Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin and Lenin. It is in this preface that Shaw terms Hitler's anti-semitism "a craze, a complex, a bee in his bonnet, a hole in his armor, a hitch in his statesmanship, one of those lesions which sometimes prove

fatal”. The last phrase did, in fact, prove perceptive and prophetic, and despite his deprecation of Hitler’s anti-semitism, which he did denounce quite eloquently in the immediately preceding pages, Shaw could not see past Hitler’s reputed Socialism and see that the reduction of man to a member of class was part of the same collective process whether it wore the label Socialist, Communist, or racist (Shaw, VI 192).

Shaw’s apparent callousness also shows up in his preface to *On the Rocks* in which he glosses over “the slaughter of millions of quite innocent persons” (Shaw, V 479). The preface to *Geneva* also glosses over the administration of the death camps by saying of the German prisoners then on trial at Nuremburg and elsewhere:

These Germans had to live in the camps with their prisoners. It must have been very uncomfortable for them. But they had been placed in authority and management, and had to organize the feeding, lodging and sanitation of more and more thousands of prisoners and refugees thrust upon them by the central government. And as they were responsible for the custody of their prisoners they had to be armed to the teeth and their prisoners completely disarmed....They were not fiends in human form; but they did not know what to do with the thousands thrown on their care (Shaw, V 637-8).

When Shaw, on the next page, refers to the Nazi party as a “cellar debating society” we must either accept that he is joking or ask what these jokes mean. He seems to have missed the point that the National Socialist German Workers Party was more than a debating society and that the death camps were organized murder rather than administrative incompetence. Also overlooked is the fact that these people were dispossessed because of their ethnic background.

What would lead Shaw, who was otherwise intelligent and non-prejudiced, to overlook or to shut his eyes to these facts? Not sadism as popularly understood. Shaw evidently received no sexual pleasure from the administration of pain to others, which is sadism as it is usually understood. The ultimate critique of sadism, however, is perhaps not sexual as much as it is philosophical. The sadist regards the other not as an end in and of him or herself but as a means. That which is wholly other to the individual and which has become the instrument of the self’s pleasure and purpose is regarded as something less important than the self, or the ego and its goals. When this is coupled with a “terrifying identification with an immediately superegotistic ideal Ego who orders impotence” it is not impossible that the result will be worship of dictators and a facility in excusing their worst sins.

Do we find traces of this sadism and ideal Ego in Shaw’s life and in his work, more particularly in *Man and Superman*? Are there traces of an unresolved Oedipus complex in Shaw, one that would be characterized by pursuit of women?

The answer to both questions is yes.

Tanner has his roots deep in the Shavian psyche. Shaw was uncertain of his parentage and harbored lifelong doubts about this parentage. Shaw's family life was irregular. His mother very early on established a relationship with her music teacher, George Lee, a relationship that developed into a *ménage à trois* involving Shaw's mother and his father. Michael Holroyd, in his recent biography of Shaw, quotes a diary entry, date 12 May 1911, by Beatrice Webb in which she says:

The photograph published in the Henderson Biography makes it quite clear to me that he was the child of G.J.V. Lee—that vain, witty and distinguished musical genius who lived with them. The expression on Lee's face is quite amazingly like G.B.S. when I first knew him. One wonders whether G.B.S. meant this fact to be communicated to the public (Holroyd, 24).

Holroyd observes that “the themes of consanguinity and illegitimacy recur obsessively in his plays” (Holroyd, 24). This observation, while obviously true of a play such as *Mrs Warren's Profession*, in which Vivie can't marry Frank because of his possible relationship—that of half-brother—to her, is also true of *Man and Superman*. Tanner, of all the young people in the play, is the only one whose parents are not mentioned explicitly. It is Octavius, however, who is commonly supposed to be Ann's intended, who is the orphan and who stands in a special relationship to Ann and her family. Octavius says Ann's father “...did everything for me that my own father could have done if he had lived”. Ramsden, a little later on, quotes Ann's father as saying of Tavy “I realize how much better than a son he's been to me” (Shaw, III 519). Tavy is not genetically consanguineous to Ann but he is psychologically. He is her brother, her father's son, even if only by adoption. As the father's son he is a stand in for the father and hence forbidden by custom and morality.

The presence of this kind of familial relationship within Shaw's plays, the child who is a part of the family but who is not related by blood to the family, must be motivated by his own inner doubts and uncertainties as to his parentage. The fact that he detested the name George and used only the “G” suggests that he wants to eliminate the relationship with the father, George, who contributed to his conception. This elimination of the father through the elimination of the father's name, the deliberate attempt to remove the father from his being, is a psychic form of murder.

Shaw desired to supplant the father, or at least to be rid of him; did he also have yearnings towards his mother? Holroyd quotes a letter that Shaw wrote to Gilbert Murray:

I very seldom dream of my mother...but when I do, she is my wife as well as my mother. When this first occurred (well on in my life), what surprised me when I awoke was that the notion of incest had not entered into the dream: I had taken it as a matter of course that the maternal function included the the wifely one; and so

did she. What is more, the sexual relation acquired all the innocence of the filial one, and the filial one all the completeness of the sexual one...if circumstances tricked me into marrying my mother before I knew she was my mother, I should be fonder of her than I could ever be of a mother who was not my wife, or a wife who was not my mother (Holroyd, 20).

Holroyd does not give a date for this letter, it was obviously written when Shaw was not a young man, but there is a surprising evasion in it. Shaw implies that in the course of the dream there was some kind of sexual activity, whether explicit or not, and that his mother, in the dream, shared that attitude. Shaw's father is absent from the dream, an absence that suggests his disappearance, perhaps even his murder and replacement by the son. That Shaw was on hostile terms with his father we know from various sources. We also know that he was a virgin until after the death of his father when his mother arranged for Jenny Patterson to seduce Shaw on the occasion of his 29th birthday. As Holroyd describes her she was:

Some fifteen years older than Shaw, she was closer in age to Mrs. Shaw than to her son and may have known the family in Ireland where she had been married to a well-to-do country gentleman (Holroyd, 159).

The fact that Shaw delayed consummation of any physical relationship with a woman until after the death of his father and that he was pushed into a liaison with a woman who could have been his mother suggests that the woman may in fact have been a substitute for his mother. This is clearly the Oedipal situation that is at work in the Don Juan syndrome as described by Kristeva. That Shaw was later to enter into a marriage that was apparently unconsummated, allegedly because Charlotte feared for her health if she were to conceive a child, certainly suggests a form of impotence (Holroyd, 437–65). Impotence, in this case not being a sexual dysfunction but a mandated form of restraint that inhibited the fulfillment of desire. Shaw's flirtations, by letter, with various actresses, such as Ellen Terry and Mrs. Patrick Campbell, are again suggestive of the desire for an object that is inhibited by some fierce parental injunction.

Tanner is like Shaw in his apparent rejection of sexual passion. He tells Ann that he would have found his budding relationship Rachel Rosetree boring and that he was helped out of his adolescent, romantic fantasies by the growth in him of the "moral passion". Ann deliberately misunderstands him and responds by saying "All passions ought to be moral, Jack". Shaw has trivialized the Don's *mille e tre* affairs into a case of schoolboy puppy love. This idealization of women and love, however, is paralleled in Shaw's own life. Shaw, in a letter to Frank Harris claimed to have been enamored of the Uranian Venus and said that he had had no sexual experience until he was twenty-nine (Harris, 242-3). In another letter to Harris, dated 24 June 1930, Shaw describes his sexual experience as releasing:

...a celestial flood of emotion and exaltation of existence which, however momentary, gave me a sample of what may 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 (Demeray, 265).

Tanner prefers to shunt aside the romantic and sexual connection with women and to idealize it and intellectualize it. Henry Higgins does something of the same sort a decade later when he refuses to recognize that Eliza and he are connected not just in a pedagogic way but also in a sexual way.

William Irvine, in his book on Shaw, found that Ann Whitefield had her roots in Shaw's relationship with Jenny Patterson, as he says:

...from her he first experienced the acute and oppressive sensation of being pursued by a female. Characteristically she lingered in his memory chiefly as a theory. She typified the Vital Woman. Julia Craven was a photograph, somewhat touched up. Ann Whitefield was a quintessential abstraction, sublimated by comedy. Jenny Patterson became an important aspect of the Life Force (Irvine, 152).

Shaw was at considerable pains, once he had been seduced by Jenny Patterson, to attempt to disentangle himself from her clutches. Holroyd's discussion of the relationship is distinctly reminiscent of the Shavian depiction of Don Juan, as one who *flees* from entanglement with women. Even the phrase about the "barriers" that appears in the dream sequence is taken from a letter that Jenny wrote to Shaw as he was trying to disentangle himself from her (Holroyd, 161-66; Shaw, III 629).

Tanner emerges as a portrait of Shaw. Like Shaw he has a callous side; one that cheerfully acknowledges that Fabianism will be accompanied by brutality and force. Like Shaw he has a side that pursues women but one in which the sexual impulse is sublimated to the intellectual impulse. We have seen that Shaw did suffer from an unresolved Oedipus complex. When his father died the castrating force was removed and he was able to take possession not of the mother but of a mother substitute, Jenny Patterson. This, however, because the father still lingered, in the form of the superego, was sublimated and redirected in intellectual ways and in ways that mandated the non-consummation of his eventual and very late marriage. The intellectual sublimation is represented in Tanner; this side is essentially the masculine Shaw.

The feminine, sexual side, of Shaw is represented in Ann. Essentially Shaw has split his self into two or more portions which are represented dramatically in the sexual struggle between Tanner and Ann. Ann represents the rejected portion within Shaw, the mother, who in the person of Jenny Patterson threatened to entrap Shaw.

It is within the dream sequence that the relations among the dream personae and the dramatic personae and Shaw become clear. The dream is in some sense a collective experience since both Mendoza and Tanner evidently share the same dream.¹⁷ It seems reasonable to suppose that Ann and Ramsden also share the same dream. In that case the dream personae become not mythic archetypes but projections of the unconscious ego ideals of the dreamers. The fact that the dream is collectively experienced in no way mitigates this position since each dreamer interacts with the others on the basis of a shared idealization of their respective selves. Tanner, therefore sees himself not as the ineffectual windbag that he inwardly knows himself to be, a portrait that suggests Shaw's inner doubts as to efficacy of his work as a Fabian reformer, but as an intellectual force capable of changing the course of human evolution. Ann's projection of her ideal self is as the eventual mother for the Superman.

The two principal dreamers then constitute elements within Shaw that must be brought into union. The dream constitutes an antithetical weight to the ironic, trivialized portrait of Shaw that emerges through Tanner. As such the fragmented, dissociated self must be brought into union through the dream. The dream, while not an actual dream in either form or content, by providing us with a series of symbols, gives us a clue to the process of integration of the divided self. The Don must go to the heaven of intellect while Ana must become the mother of the Superman. The union that takes place is symbolized through the desire of Ana to become that mother. It is in essence a fertility ritual that must be enacted to ensure the union of intellect and sex. The dream then affects the actions of the dreamers and brings them closer to self-realization.

The culmination of the drama comes with the closing news of the impending marriage of Tanner and Ann. This comic *gamos* functions to complete the comic dialectic that was laid out in the dream sequence. Tanner's newly acquired self-knowledge enables him to realize the lack of efficacy of his struggles and his comic inadequacy in relation to the primal, instinctual and sexual urges represented by Ann. The fact that his final word "Talking", is greeted by "universal laughter" suggests that he has attained an ironic self-awareness that he had not previously possessed.¹⁸ In this sense the dream has, for Tanner at least, proven to be a road to the unconscious. Ann's strong sexual instincts are to be united with Tanner's intellectual drives. This suggests that the perfect man, the perfect Shaw, is a union of these two elements and the aim of the comedy has been the integration of the primal, instinctual and libidinous drives represented by the Ann/Ana characters with the intellectual, moral drives represented by Tanner and his ego ideal Don Juan.

Shaw exhibited the sadism, although in muted form, and the "identification with an immediately superegotistic ideal Ego who orders impotence" that we have seen Kristeva identify as two of the components that make up the Don Juan syndrome. Did he also exhibit the more

common characteristic of the syndrome, the pursuit of women? Holroyd has classified Shaw's relationships in terms of three categories:

...flirtations with single women, usually at this time [the 1880's and 90's] young Fabian girls; philanderings with the wives of friends, usually socialist colleagues; and a consummated love affair with a divorced or separated lady (Holroyd, 151).

The philanderings were, if one accepts the implicature of Holroyd's statement, as unconsummated as the flirtations. A possible model for the kind of philandering that Shaw indulged in is the triangular and impossible relationship with the Salts; triangular because of Shaw's intrusion into the marriage as an interloper; impossible because of Mrs. Salt's lesbianism. Equally significant is the "Mystical Betrothal" that took place between him and May Morris. May was, apparently, never aware that the betrothal "was registered in heaven" (Holroyd, 221-24). The philanderer is, according to Shaw,

...a man who is strongly attracted by women, He flirts with them, falls half in love with them, makes them fall in love with him, but will not commit himself to any permanent relation with them, and often retreats at the last moment if his suit is successful—loves them but loves himself more—is too cautious, too fastidious, ever to give himself away (Holroyd, 288).

Shaw's philanderings and his Don Juanism, to the extent that it existed, seems to have taken the form of one or two liaisons of extended duration with women such as Jenny Patterson and Florence Farr. Indeed the image of Shaw as a phallic superman is somewhat grotesque.

It is in Kristeva's case study that we see an echo of the Shavian Don Juanism. Her "Emile" says that he behaves with his wife as if she were his mother and that "If love has a meaning, I love only her. The others, the secret ones, give me a hard-on...[Ellipsis in original] (Kristeva, 207). Shaw has been effectively ordered into, not impotence but its close relative, sterility. That he was able to entertain romantic interests, although of a non-sexual nature, with Ellen Terry, Mrs. Patrick Campbell and other women parallels "Emiles" experience of having an erection with "the others". Shaw, Emile and Tanner are linked in their rejection of sexuality. That Tanner finally succumbs to marriage, like Shaw, suggests that in the ideal world of his imagination Shaw was able to find fruition and to achieve an integration of the intellectual and the sexual which escaped him in real life.

In contrast to the Jungian/archetypal portrait of the characters in *Man and Superman* as emanating from a somewhat nebulous *out there* there is a certain solidity in this portrait. Tanner is Shaw's ironic self-portrait and the Don is the idealized representation of what both Shaw and Tanner would like to be. Ann becomes a representative of the primal instinctual and libidinous drives and Ramsden is relegated to a relatively ineffective role, in the dream, of the superego, the

castrating father that threatens to dispossess Tanner/Shaw from the longed for paradise in which the libidinous drives have a place but one which is subordinated to the hero's own perceptual/conscious system. The hell scene thus functions as a means of achieving the integration of the hero's various drives. Freud described the task of the analyst as that of bringing certain repressed material to light and attaching the patient to the analyst through the transference.¹⁹ The process of bringing this material to light necessarily involves the elimination of the repression that brought about the neurosis in the first place. When this material has been brought to light and reacted to the integration of the personality can take place. This happens in *Man and Superman* through the medium of the dream. The dreamers are brought into contact with their ideal egos and come back into the real world and the comedy concludes with the most fitting of unions, the comic *gamos* of Ann and Tanner that unites the surface ego and intellect of Tanner with the maternal depth of Ann and restores and dissolves the Oedipal conflicts in "universal laughter".

These approaches to *Man and Superman* have a number of strengths and weakness that can be seen quite easily. The Jungian approach, exemplified by Vogt's essay, establishes the relationship of the play to the primary literary myth. This, however, is not the only thing that it does. Behind the literary myth lies a series of archetypes that are apparently as old as mankind. These archetypes have the nature of universals, in fact one might say that they are modern equivalents of the Platonic forms. Like the Platonic forms they are perceived dimly but in dreams they are filled with significance and by their content reveal something of the unconscious life of the dreamer. Since they are universals the fact that they can be responded to by different peoples and different cultures suggests that they can also reveal something of a universal human nature. This is, of course, meaningless if one suggests existentially that it is impossible to formulate a universal human nature. The concepts of the archetypes and of a collective unconscious becomes useless. Indeed, one cannot successfully postulate a collective unconscious since all are determined by their own actions and the unconscious ceases to exist as a viable concept whether in terms of the individual or in terms of the human collective.²⁰

The existential standpoint is not the only one from which the Jungian approach can be attacked. It is also vulnerable from the scientific standpoint in that it rests on a premise that can not be validated, that there is a universal called the collective unconscious. The concept seems as nebulous the "ancient religion" of the "Force" in the movie *Star Wars*. The collective unconscious apparently exists independently of the presence or absence of one or of any number of human beings, but its origin, how and when it was constituted is never explained by Jung and his disciples. The archetypes are "just there" but the location of the "there" is never defined.

Vogt's interpretation is also vulnerable since she misidentifies the stage business of the boa and links it to Eve rather than to Lilith. This is also significant in that what is a purely

literary allusion, Shelley's translation of Goethe, is taken for an emanation from the collective unconscious and a reflection of an archetype.

The collective unconscious and the archetypes are not a necessary hypothesis. The appearance of things in different cultures, times, places, and individuals can be explained in several ways without having reference to a collective unconscious. First, human beings share the same biology and their response to their environment must necessarily be similar in some ways. This response is conditioned by their biology and the fact that one person notices that corn, for example, must be planted and buried before it can be resurrected in fresh ears of corn means that another person can also notice the same thing. These two people will express the notion of burying corn and its resurrection in similar but not identical ways. The concept of the collective unconscious, however, while it notices the differences, reduces the similarities to identities and this reduction is not necessarily valid. Also ideas can be spread from one person to another and from one culture to another. On the interpersonal level this process can be referred to as "education" and on the intercultural level as "acculturation". This dispersal of ideas, concepts, and values results in things such as can be seen in the alteration that takes place in Indian art after Alexander's conquest.²¹ The concept of the collective unconscious maintains that there is a spiritual or psychological entity that exists independently of any individual human being. The existence of biological similarity, necessitating similar responses to similar events eliminates the necessity for this psychological concept. The concept of dispersal or diffusion likewise can explain the appearance of similar motifs. If, for example, Indians cross a land bridge from Siberia into Alaska and then move down to Yucatan, similar motifs will appear in Yucatan and in Siberia. This likewise eliminates the need for the hypothesis of a collective unconscious.

It would also seem that since biology determines certain things, such as reproduction, eating, elimination and so on that there is a certain number of very small things that will appear to human beings as universals. This set of things, perceived by a set of human beings, who are larger in number than the set of things, should produce a number of permutations that though large is still finite and hence, in principle, repeatable. The repetition and variance of these permutations should produce things that appear to be universal and hence emulate the workings of the collective unconscious.

When Jung draws a conclusion from the existence of the "sun's penis" in the delusion of a schizophrenic and the existence of a similar motif in a Greek papyrus that was part of Mithraic liturgies, he seems on relatively shaky ground.²² The motif appears not in a major culture but in what is a variant and deviation from Zoroastrianism. The fact that this is a minor variant with few fruits in the development of religious doctrine seems to suggest that it is not of universal appeal. The major religions, because of their survivability and adaptation over time would seem

to be more fruitful areas to search for the appearance of archetypes rather than deviants such as Mithraism and alchemy.

When Vogt says that the references to Ann are references to mythological beings, she also seems to be on shaky ground. The appearance of archetypes in Shaw's play depends on his ignorance of what he was doing, on his conscious unawareness of his connection with the collective unconscious. If Shaw was consciously alluding to Lilith's seductiveness with the stage business involving the boa, and if this comes not from an unconscious archetype but from Shelley, then the presence of the archetype comes not from Shaw but from Shelley. If Shelley was also alluding to a literary text, then the archetype gets pushed back a further step. The same holds true of the mythological monsters, in the form of the bandits of Sierras. Shaw recognized this not as an image of archetypal struggle and difficulty but as a mirror of the St. Pancras vestry, of which he was a member (Holroyd, 423-4). Ultimately the process of identifying the archetypes involves an infinite regression and we never get to the collective unconscious. The concept can only work by eliminating intermediary steps and texts and saying that they all come from the collective unconscious. The element of intertextuality is therefore removed and the fact that the author wrote the text is reduced to his being an unconscious secretary of the collective unconscious.

The relegation of the author to role of unconscious secretary of some pre-existing language or concept, such as the collective unconscious, effectively eliminates what is most distinctive about literary and aesthetic works, that they are the product of an individual who works and suffers in the course of producing them. These approaches do not see the alcoholic behind *The Sound and the Fury*, or the complex individual who educated himself at the British Museum reading room behind *Man and Superman*.

An aspect of Jung's theory that Vogt does not utilize, and which has been neglected here as well, is Jung's theory of psychological types and its relationship to the drama. This part of Jung's theory, at least as explained in *Psychological Types*, is opaque at best (Jung, *Types* 433-6, 453-4, 461-3, 481-3, *et passim*). It does seem that a relationship can be drawn between the characters in the dream sequence and the four Jungian functions of feeling, sensation, intuition, and thinking and their dramatic counterparts. The Tanner/Don Juan pairing could be assigned to the thinking function; Ann/Ana to intuition, possibly, and the remaining functions could be assigned to the Mendoza/Devil and Ramsden/Statue pairings (feeling and sensation respectively).

This aspect of Jung's theory has proven attractive to many people and a variety of popular tests and books have been published that derive from this concept of Jung's. The essential problem in dealing with this part of the theory in relation to the characters of *Man and Superman* is that though it seems clear that Tanner is an extrovert and that he is a thinking type it still is necessary to establish the nature of the relationship between the dream character and the

character in the drama. If Don Juan is a projection of an aspect of Tanner's ideal self he is essentially a wish-fulfillment and this brings us back to the Freudian hypothesis of the dream as a fulfilled wish. If the Don is a pure example of Tanner's dominant function then we are still left with the concept of wish-fulfillment since Tanner obviously wishes to *be* the Don and to be a purely *thinking* being.

A further objection to this part of Jung's psychology is that it is reductionist. It takes a perceived infinity of possible individuals and reduces them to a number of types. This has been an historically popular position and Jung comments on the four temperaments while contending that his own theory is an advance on the ancient and medieval division into sanguine, choleric, melancholic, and phlegmatic temperaments (Jung, *Types*, 10). Jung's typology has been expanded and is widely known through the use of the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) and has been introduced to a popular audience through books such as *Please Understand Me* by Kiersey and Bates. This merely represents an expansion of personality types from the four humours of the Renaissance to sixteen types as defined by the MBTI and as explained by Kiersey and Bates. It is still reductionist and only multiplies essences, a violation of Occam's principle, by multiplying types. It is also possible to object to it on the humanistic and poetic grounds that it reduces the human being to little more than a labelled specimen, rather unpleasantly like a *blatta orientalis* with a pin through it in an exhibit case and a printed explanation as to the origin of this particular cockroach.

More to the critical point, however, is the question of whether the theory of types is needed or adds anything to the exploration of the relations between the two parts of *Man and Superman*. The characters of the dream, as we said earlier, stand in relation to each other as symbolic representations of the preferred functions, thinking, feeling, and so on; of the dramatic characters, but that is to say that they are idealizations of what the dramatic characters want to be. Since they are representations of the ego ideals of the characters we can safely dispense, in this instance at least, with the theory of personality types and approach the text in a more classically psychoanalytic way.

The psychoanalytic approach, as typified by Freud, restores the individual to a place of some prominence, but at the same time it reduces him to a product of the psychological forces that produced him. The struggles of Tanner to extricate himself from Ann's webs are reduced to inner conflicts within Shaw and these conflicts are traced back to a primal scene that determined the course of Shaw's life.

As a purely deductive approach it lacks the immediate relevance of a psychoanalysis of Shaw. We start out from the psychoanalytic concepts of ego, id, superego, libido, primal scene and so on and we examine Shaw's life and *Man and Superman* to see how they fit the theory. We have already determined the theory to be true so any facts that we discover must fit the theory.

We therefore take an existing work, such as *Man and Superman*, and because we have predetermined that we are Freudians anything that we come across will be forced into the Procrustean bed of Freudianism. (This is, of course, true of any critical practice that starts from deductive principles and loses sight of the multiplicity of works or text that may not conform to the theory.) The psychoanalytic approach then cannot be a means of discovery. The patient lying on the couch may reveal something about himself that will shake the therapist's theoretical foundations because he can bring to light previously unknown material. The text, once it is submitted to analysis, is always known and unvarying, which is not the situation with the patient. The text must be approached deductively and result in confirmation of the already believed and known. The patient can be a means of discovery. The text never invalidates the assumptions with which the analyst approached it. It therefore functions as a projective medium, one upon which the analyst projects the contents not of his discoveries but of his own unconscious.

The psychoanalytic approach does restore the author to a place of relative prominence, but, at the same time it focuses on the products of his work as coming from forces largely outside of himself. This determination of the work by infantile forces may be true but in both of these approaches certain things are missing.

One item that is noticeably missing is any means of ascertaining the literary value of the work. One can argue, for example, that certain verses by Emily Dickinson use clitoral imagery.²³ One can then extrapolate from this and make comments on the psychological and sexual maturity of Dickinson, but one cannot evaluate the poems as poems and come to any evaluation of their literary merit by asserting that Dickinson was fixated at a given stage of psychological development and failed to move to a vaginal sexuality. Likewise, it is possible to point out correspondences, whether real or imagined, with various mythological beings and stories. It has been a contention of scholarship, however, that it must be determined that an author had knowledge of something before its presence could be postulated in his work. If it can be shown that Shaw knew Shelley and admired his poetry and thought, it might be possible to see traces of Shelley in some of Shaw's work, but it is not necessary to show that Shaw knew of the association of an animal with a female lunar divinity in order to assert that it came to him through the collective unconscious.

These approaches do serve to explicate the symbolism of this particular play. Their validity, however, is open to question. The assumptions of each of these approaches rest on hypotheses that are not verifiable in any realistic sense. We assume that because the snake is referred to in *Man and Superman* that he is the snake of the Garden of Eden and that this snake is similar and hence identical to the snake of Gilgamesh, if we are Jungians. If we are Freudians, we assume that the snake is a phallic symbol and that like the phallus it can bring life, i.e.,

unrepressed sexuality, to those it visits. We also make certain assumptions about the contents of Shaw's unconscious and of his infantile life. Of course, we have no basis for this since he did not record his infantile memories or undergo psychoanalysis, so we argue backwards and if Shaw does not fit into our theory then we say that he was repressing certain material. The repressed material is expressed in a symbolic way through his dreams and this is further interpreted through his writings, which manifest the unique atmosphere of his household.

In actual fact, it is highly likely that Shaw did suffer inner doubts about his parentage due to his mother's liaison with Lee. It is also likely that, given the extent of his reading, there was some conscious use, and possibly even unconscious use of material that had been read during his process of self-education, including the various mythological symbols found by Vogt.

Both of these approaches to *Man and Superman* seem to have some use in evaluating possible symbolism of either a universal or personal nature. They have limited or no value in assessing the merit of a literary work. The most that can be done is to assess the literary work in relation to the products of dissimilar times and periods and to assert that these works reveal a psychological truth that is universal and enduring whether on the collective level through the approach of archetypes and the collective unconscious or on the personal level through asserting the universality of the existence of the Oedipus complex and so on.

¹ These dramas would include not only *Man and Superman* but also *Back to Methuselah*, *The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles*, and *Far-fetched Fables*. The evolutionary plays vary in quality as well as length. The later two, *The Simpleton* and *Far-fetched Fables* are poor dramatic texts and *Far-fetched Fables* is merely a series of dramatic sketches.

² This is not to imply that all contemporary plays other than *Man and Superman* had either a three or five act structure; Pinero's *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray*, for example has four acts, as does Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. I simply wish to point out that the dream sequence can, and frequently has been, detached, and that the drama can be played as a three act drama.

³ See for example the dream that Jung records in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. (Jung, 34)

⁴ For Jung's theory of personality types and inferior functions and so on see the volume *Psychological Types*. For Jung's theory of the collective unconscious and the various archetypes see *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*.

⁵ Jung's comments on the primordial image concentrate primarily on its archaic quality and on its connection with mythological motifs:

I call the image primordial when it possess an archaic (q.v.) character. I speak of its archaic character when the image in is striking accord with familiar mythological motifs. It then expresses material primarily derived from the collective unconscious (q.v.), and indicates at the same time that the factors influencing the conscious situation of the moment are collective (q.v.) rather than personal. A personal image has neither an archaic character nor a collective significance, but expresses contents of the personal unconscious (q.v.) and personally conditioned conscious situation. (Jung, *Types*, 443)

⁶ For the thesis that the *Ramayana* was composed over an extended period of time see J. L. Brockington, *Righteous Rama: The Evolution of an Epic*. For a discussion of the genesis of the text of the *Mahabharata* see J. A. B van Buitenen's introduction to his translation of the *Mahabharata*. The argument that successive layers of composition represent an approach to a work that can be truly said to be a product of the collective unconscious is, of course, my own.

⁷ The appearance in Spengler is his concept of Faustian culture as advanced in *The Decline of the West*.

⁸ Julia Kristeva, however, points out that the music of *Don Giovanni* contradicts the morality of the libretto. See her rather enthusiastic discussion of the Don Juan myth in *Tales of Love*.

⁹ See Freud's lecture "The Origin and Development of Psycho-Analysis" (Freud, *Great*, 1). Note that Freud denies that he is the creator of the treatment, that honor he awards to Breuer.

¹⁰ Lindner's book has no relation to the better known movie directed by Nicholas Ray. For a detailed discussion of the primal scene in this book see Lindner, 256-281.

¹¹ See page 2, above.

¹² Shaw says that Mozart reveals:

...the hero's spirit in magical harmonies, elfin tones, and elate darting rhythms as of summer lightning made audible. Here you have freedom in love and in morality mocking exquisitely at slavery to them, and interesting you, attracting you, tempting you, inexplicably forcing you to range the hero with his enemy the statue on a transcendent [sic] plane, leaving the prudish daughter and her priggish lover on a crockery shelf below to live piously ever after. (Shaw, III 490)

¹³ Campbell's summary of the monomyth is as follows:

A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from his mysterious venture with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man. (Campbell, 30)

This is precisely the situation in *Man and Superman*.

¹⁴ Obviously, this must be sharply and radically distinguished from the term as used by Christian mystics such as Sts. John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila to whom it meant the flooding of the human personality by divine grace to such an extent that it became "God through participation". (John of the Cross, 377 *et passim*).

¹⁵ See page 9 above.

¹⁶ Perhaps equally telling is Shaw's description of the Czarina Catherine who was "forced to liquidate poor Peter very much against her own easy good nature, which prevented her from scolding her maids properly". (Shaw, VI 178).

¹⁷ See page 6 above.

¹⁸ See page 9 above.

¹⁹ See Freud's remarks in the essay on "wild" psychoanalysis cited above. (Freud, *Great*, 128-30).

²⁰ See the discussion in Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*, particularly the chapters on "Bad Faith" and "Existential Psychoanalysis". These were excerpted in another volume entitled *Existential Psychoanalysis* and provided with an introduction by Rollo May, who comments on Sartre's elimination of the unconscious. (May, 15-16). See also the essay by Sartre entitled "Existentialism", collected, along with excerpts from *Being and Nothingness* in *Existentialism and Human Emotions*.

²¹ See the discussion in H. W. Janson's *History of Art* of Western influences on Oriental art. (Janson, 548–50)

²² See Jung's discussion in *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. (Jung, *Archetypes*, 50–53)

²³ This was the topic of a paper given at the convention of the Modern Language Association on December 27, 1989 by Paula Bennet. The comment on sexual maturity is my own. Bennet did not, as far as I can recall, make any such comment. I have merely used this as an illustration of a classically Freudian interpretation of female sexuality that is fixed at the clitoral rather than the vaginal stage of development.

Works Cited

- Anonymous. *The Epic of Gilgamesh: An English Version With an Introduction*. Trans. N. K. Sandars. Hammondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1964.
- Bennet, Paula. "The Pea That Duty Locks': Clitoral Imagery and Masturbation in Emily Dickinson." MLA Convention. Washington, D.C. 27 December 1989
- Bentley, Eric. Foreword. *Plays by George Bernard Shaw: Mrs. Warren's Profession, Arms and the Man, Candida, Man and Superman*. NY: The New American Library, 1960.
- Brockington, J. L. *Righteous Rama: The Evolution of an Epic*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with A Thousand Faces*. Bollingen Series XVII, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968
- _____. *The Masks of God: Creative Mythology*. NY: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Crompton, Louis. "Don Juan in Hell". *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Bernard Shaw's Man and Superman*. Ed. Harold Bloom. NY: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 49-60.
- Demeray, John G. "Bernard Shaw and C.E.M. Joad: The Adventures of Two Puritans in Their Search for God". *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 78 (1963): 262-270.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Delusion and Dream: and Other Essays*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1956.
- _____. *The Major Works of Sigmund Freud*. Great Books of the Western World, vol 54, Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1952.
- Geduld, Harry M. "The Lineage of Lilith". *Shaw Review*, 7 (1964): 58-61.
- Harris, Frank. *Bernard Shaw: An Unauthorized Biography Based on First Hand Information*. Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., 1931.
- Holroyd, Michael. *Bernard Shaw: The Search for Love*. NY: Random House, 1988.
- Irvine, William. *The Universe of G. B. S.* NY: Russell & Russell, 1968.
- Janson, H. W. *History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present Day*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall; NY: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1967.
- John of the Cross. *The Collected Works of St. John of the Cross*. Trans. Kieran Kavanaugh, O.C.D. and Otilio Rodriguez, O.C.D. Washington: Institute of Carmelite Studies. 1979.

Jung, Carl Gustav. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Bollingen Series XX. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969

_____. *Psychological Types: A Revision by R. F. C. Hull of the Translation by H. G. Baynes*. Bollingen Series XX: Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Kiersey, David and Marilyn Bates. *Please Understand Me: An Essay on Temperament Types*. Del Mar: Prometheus Nemesis Books, 1978.

Kristeva, Julia. *Tales of Love*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. NY: Columbia University Press, 1987

Lindner, Robert M. *Rebel Without A Cause: The Hypnoanalysis of a Criminal Psychopath*. NY: Grove Press, 1956.

May, Rollo. Introduction. *Existential Psychoanalysis*. by Jean Paul Sartre. Trans. Hazel Barnes. NY: Gateway-Henry Regnery, 1962.

Sartre, Jean Paul *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Trans. Hazel Barnes. NY: Washington Square Press, 1966.

_____. *Existentialism and Human Emotion*. Trans. Bernard Frechtman and Hazel E. Barnes. NY: Philosophical Library, 1957.

van Buitenen, J. A. B. Introduction. *The Mahabharata: Book I The Book of the Beginning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Vogt, Sally Peters. "Ann and Superman: Type and Archetype". *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Bernard Shaw's Man and Superman*. Ed. Harold Bloom. NY: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 105-24.