

Elwira M. Grossman

WITKACY AND SHAW'S STAGE STATUES

The names of Bernard Shaw and Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz (known also as "Witkacy") are never juxtaposed since they are considered playwrights who not only have little in common, but also represent contradictory views on philosophical and artistic issues. Although broadly true, this opinion should not be taken at face value. In fact, Shaw's and Witkacy's drama, albeit from radically different cultures, can be perceived as complementary, especially in their uses of fantasy.

Many of the strategies typical of speculative fiction are exploited by both dramatists. In Shaw's as well as in Witkacy's plays can be found dreamlike conventions, non-realistic mixtures of comic and tragic elements, unexpected twists in plot, the blending of standard dramatic modes with parodied genres, the rejection of traditional psychology in dramatizing behavior, and the creation of fantastic characters, including petrified bodies and theatricalized statues.

Shaw freely applies these devices in plays he collected as "tomfooler-ies": *The Glimpse of Reality*, *The Music Cure*, *Passion*, *Poison*, and *Petrifaction*, and other short plays. He also uses them in portions of some of his full-length plays, such as *Man and Superman*, *Back to Methuselah*, *Too True to Be Good*, and later self-described "extravaganzas." While he admits to his attempts to break with realistic conventions while employing many of their strategies, Witkacy openly advocates a theater of sophisticated fantasy and produces plays that illustrate his theory of "Pure Form." Both playwrights' ideas coincide more in practice than in theory.

Even in theory, however, there is some meeting of minds. While

Witkacy stresses the necessity of creating theater that can make the audience "experience the mystery and strangeness of existence," Shaw contends that he is not only interested in the conflict of ideas, but also sees the theater as a place for transcendent experience, observing in the preface to his 1907 collection of dramatic reviews that he considered the theater the successor to the church as a venue for experiencing metaphysical feelings, and, as well, "a factory of thought, a prompter of conscience, an elucidator of social conduct, an armory against despair and dullness, and temple of the Ascent of Man."¹ Witkacy ascribed magical and ritual functions to the theater as well and saw it as an antidote to the absurdity of human life that, unlike other arts, was still alive with potential to make men wonder at the universe and themselves. In his essay "On a New Type of Play" (1920), Witkacy argues, "What is essential is only that the meaning of the play should not necessarily be limited by its realistic or fantastic content, as far as the totality of the work is concerned, but simply that the realistic element should exist for the sake of the purely formal goals—that is, for the sake of the synthesis of all the elements of the theater: sound, decor, movement on the stage, dialogue, in sum, performance through time, as an uninterrupted whole—so transformed, when viewed realistically, that the performance seems utter nonsense."²

In the same essay, Witkacy explains that "artistic freedom" for the playwright can be equivalent to "nonsensicality" in painting, as long as it is "adequately justified and . . . valid for the new dimension of thought and feeling into which such [a] play transports the spectator."³ This is his "Theater of Pure Form" and is akin to the parodies of the realistic tradition that one finds in many of Shaw's plays.

Witkiewicz (1885-1939) remains largely unknown in English despite translations and criticism, much of both by Daniel Gerould, who has also written on Shaw. Like Shaw, Witkacy was very versatile and was also a painter, novelist, philosopher, and critic. His numerous trips to Italy, Germany, and France, as well as to Australia—the latter (1914) with Bronisław Malinowski, whom Shaw also admired—influenced his life and thought. During World War I he served as an officer in the Russian army, witnessing, from Petersburg, the decay of the empire and the revolution. Returning to Poland in 1918, he began his first mature works of drama and criticism, and between 1918 and 1925 he completed the major plays and sketches by which he is known although he kept writing and painting until his death. At the outbreak of World War II he fled Warsaw to the east, away from the attacking Nazis. When on 18 September 1939 he learned of the Russian invasion of Poland in concert with the Germans, he committed suicide in the village of Jeziory (now part of Ukraine).

Witkacy's philosophical and aesthetic views, considered advanced in his time, anticipated postmodernism and deconstructionism. In parallel in the West, Shaw's experimental practice, as in his "tomfooleries," anticipated Absurdism.⁴ The drama of both playwrights created a theater in which farcical and grotesque vision displaces the orderly universe, where laws of causality and logic are violated in thought-provoking yet amusing ways. Hence it is not surprising that their theatrical imaginations sometimes led them to similar and often fantastic dramatic solutions, one example of which is *Don Juan in Hell*, the independent third act of *Man and Superman* (1903), and *The Cuttlefish* (1922).

In both plays a statue is introduced as a character. In Witkacy's comedy it is Alice d'Or, the main female character, classified by many Polish critics as the femme fatale of the play,⁵ although she is clearly described in the stage directions as a "living" statue rather than an actual woman. The description of Alice, who is dressed in "a tight-fitting sheath resembling alligator skin," indicates that her appearance is supposed to draw the audience's attention to the animalistic, carnal part of her personality, but, being a statue, she can only represent the idea of the femme fatale; she cannot actually be one. In Gerould's words, Alice is now "a monument of fossilized desire."⁶ As a statue, she cannot enter into any physical relationship with Paul Rockoffer, an artist and philosopher, the main character in the play; she can only stimulate him mentally or intellectually from a distance, unlike any flesh-and-blood archetype of the femme fatale. Consequently, Rockoffer is tormented by her ideas, thoughts, and judgmental statements about his own behavior, not by her sex appeal.

The idea of introducing a statue as a character brings to the Polish reader's mind a drama by Stanisław Wyspiański (1869-1907) who was also a painter, designer, and theater visionary. Inspired by the Greco-Latin world as well as Polish romantic drama, Wyspiański developed his own unique style, overcoming many provincial traits dominating Polish art at that time. In his 1903 historical play *The November Night* [Noc listopadowa] monuments and statues of Greek gods and goddesses come to life, while in *Acropolis* [Akropolis] (1904), historical figures come down from the canvases and mythological deities perform their roles like other dramatis personae.⁷ Witkacy himself admired Wyspiański and considered him a precursor of Pure Form theater.⁸ However, it is in Shaw's and Witkacy's plays that characters close to living persons onstage are statues who interact with, and converse with, flesh-and-blood figures.

In *Don Juan in Hell*, Doña Ana's father is presented as "a living statue of white marble, designed to represent a majestic old man."⁹ For the English reader, a living statue as an active character is usually associated with

Shaw's play, derived, of course, from two sources: Tirso de Molina's drama and Lorenzo da Ponte's libretto. The similarities between Shaw's and Witkacy's statues are not only revealed in the way they function in the plays—largely their intellectual and mental influence on others—but also in the subject matter they discuss. For example, the conversation between the Statue and Rockoffer in *The Cuttlefish* clearly resembles Don Juan's situation:¹⁰

STATUE: Think how many women you could still have, how many nameless mornings, softly gliding through the mysteries of noontime, then finally how many evenings you could spend in strange conversations with women marveling at your downfall.

ROCKOFFER: Don't talk to me about that. Don't rip open the innermost core of strangeness. All that is closed—forever closed, because of boredom: galloping, raging boredom. (627)

As the idea of having many more women does not excite Rockoffer, the idea of sensual love no longer fascinates Don Juan. They both find themselves in a similar existential situation and reveal their self-awareness in the following lines:

ROCKOFFER: . . . I've wasted my life. Two wives, working like a madman—who knows why—after all, my ideas are not officially recognized, and the remains of my paintings were destroyed yesterday, by order of the head of the Council for the Production of Handmade Crap. I'm all alone. (626)

DON JUAN: I am really very sorry to be a social failure. (258)

In addition, both characters appear to be overwhelmed by a boredom, ironically caused by love, the same force that motivated their active lives in the past. Don Juan exclaims,

DON JUAN: [*impatiently*] Oh, I beg you not to begin talking about love. Here they talk of nothing else but love: its beauty, its holiness, its spirituality, its devil knows what!—excuse me; but it does so bore me. They don't know what they're talking about: I do. They think they have achieved the perfection of love because they have no bodies. Sheer imaginative debauchery! Faugh! (253)

Boredom as an indispensable element of love and life is warned of by Rockoffer when he describes to his fiancée, Ella, their inevitable future together:

ROCKOFFER: Love? Shall I tell you what love is? In the morning I'll wake you with a kiss. After the morning bath, we'll drink coffee. Then I'll go paint, and you'll read books, which I'll suggest for you. Then dinner. After dinner, we'll go for a walk. Then work again. Tea, supper, a little serious discussion, and finally you'll fall asleep, not too fatigued by sensual pleasures, to conserve strength for the next day.

ELLA: And so, on and on, without end?

ROCKOFFER: You mean: to the very end——(630)

Thus love, whether discussed in its earthly or spiritual terms, is always associated in its final stage with endless boredom, and consequently is dismissed by both playwrights as the main motivating force in human life. Discarding love, Rockoffer and Don Juan turn to the world of ideas, namely philosophy, where they begin their search for truth and more inner strength. Don Juan becomes an Apollonian character praising the intellect and Life Force, while Rockoffer concentrates on creating a new reality (not art!): "Together, we'll create pure nonsense in life, not in Art" (637). He feels compelled to carry out his mission on this planet, which is to rule the Kingdom of Hyrcania as Paul Hyrcan V. As Gerould points out, "the Hyrcanian world view is the most powerful of all temptations, for it offers the power to transform life."¹¹ Hyrcania, having its equivalent in history (it was a province of the ancient Persian Empire located on the Caspian Sea),¹² is the artificial kingdom created by Hyrcan IV, Rockoffer's friend from his youth.

The philosophical idea of Hyrcania—as defined in the monologues of Hyrcan IV—is inspired by Nietzsche's concept of the Superman, but its artistic prototype can be found in *Enrico IV* by Luigi Pirandello. Julius II from *The Cuttlefish* is a resurrected Renaissance Pope, and his character is based on Giuliano della Rovera (1445-1513), who was elected Pope in 1503. Being a patron of the arts, he commissioned Michelangelo to paint the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel.¹³ Julius II points out the importance of Nietzsche's inspiration:

JULIUS II: But, sire, as I see it, Your Royal Highness is a follower of Nietzsche, at least in social questions. Nietzsche himself recognized Art as the most important stimulus for personal power. (632)

Although Hyrcan IV denies this influence, his vision clearly resembles Nietzsche's ideas and as such becomes the main target of Witkacy's socio-political criticism. Like Shaw, Witkacy realizes that twentieth-century society is in a desperate search for a new direction for its development, but unlike Shaw, Witkacy does not accept the idea of the

Superman as the ultimate solution. Witkacy raises and then ultimately dismisses Nietzsche in the argument between Hyrcan IV and the protagonist. Rockoffer speculates on possible improvement through examining the basic political mechanisms of Hyrcania and abolishing those principles that interfere with his own version of a new world. According to Rockoffer, the concept of the Superman cannot result in anything better than "an ordinary theatrical hoax, a regime in the old style, a disgrace, 'bezobrazia* a la maniere russe, or simply dictatorship" (634). As the argument between the characters progresses, it becomes increasingly more obvious that Witkacy deals with specific historical and political circumstances of his own country. Yet, Gerould extends this allusion widely, arguing that "*The Cuttlefish* has remained perennially fresh and contemporary, equally applicable to conditions under Hitler, Stalin, or any oppressive regime of whatever ideology, country or historical period."¹⁴ Still, it is probable that Witkacy conceals his catastrophic vision concerning the future of Poland behind the mask of Nietzsche's philosophy and Hyrcan's imaginary kingdom. Using quasi-Aesopian language, Witkacy predicts the communist regime and dictatorship, and he warns the reader against their specific political consequences for Poland. When Hyrcan IV announces that in his kingdom, religion has come to an end and he believes only in himself, but is ready "to believe in anything if he ever needs to," Julius II concludes, "Without religion there are no countries in the old sense of the word. There can only be an anthill" (632). Hyrcan IV corrects the Pope:

HYRCAN IV: No, no—not an organized anthill, only the great herd of straggling cattle, over which I and my friends hold power. (632)

To this response, Rockoffer and Julius II add their own opinions:

ROCKOFFER: Bandit. You are actually a petty robber baron, not an important ruler. You're only great given the extremely low level of civilization in your country. Nowadays, Nietzsche's superman can't be anything more than a small-time thug. And those who would have been rulers in the past are the artists of our own times. Breeding the superman is the biggest joke I've ever heard of. (633)

JULIUS II: Your Hyrcania, Sire, strikes me as a kind of sanatorium for people sick of society. The way you describe it, of course. Actually it's the lowest kind of whorehouse for the playboys in life. ... (634)

in 1922, one cannot ask for a better description of the upcoming totalitarian ideology followed by the Stalinist regime in both Russia and Poland.

Witkacy's double intention is missing in the dramatic vision of Shaw, who discusses the Nietzschean concept through his characters in more abstract and general terms than does Witkacy. Realizing this essential difference between the two playwrights, it comes as no surprise that Shaw presents a significantly more favorable reading of Nietzsche than Witkacy. This is how the Devil explains to the Statue who "that German Polish madman" is:

THE DEVIL. Well, he came here first, before he recovered his wits. I had some hopes of him; but he was a confirmed Life Force worshipper. It was he who raked up the Superman, who is as old as Prometheus; and the 20th century will run after this newest of the old crazes when it gets tired of the world, the flesh, and your humble servant....

THE STATUE. Good. [*Reflectively*]: All the same, the Superman is a fine conception. There is something statuesque about it. (293)

Thus, the same philosophical idea that serves for Shaw as a point of arrival and a possible answer to what direction contemporary society should choose for its development, becomes only a point of departure for a quasi-political discussion initiated in Witkacy's play.

These two visions of future worlds share a similar hierarchy of values in which the highest priority is given to philosophy. Don Juan, in the following monologues, shows the advantages of using one's brain in a thoughtful existence, analyzes the current state of fashionable philosophical ideas on earth, and concludes that the Superman (who has not been created yet!) might save the species from the dissolution of earlier forms of life:

DON JUAN. . . . I said with the foolish philosopher, "I think; therefore I am." It was Woman who taught me to say "I am; therefore I think." And also "I would think more; therefore I must be more." (276)

DON JUAN. . . . The great central purpose of breeding the race: ay, breeding it to heights now deemed superhuman: that purpose which is now hidden in a mephitic cloud of love and romance and prudery and fastidiousness, will break through into clear sunlight as a purpose no longer to be confused with the gratification of personal fancies... (281-82)

DON JUAN. . . . my brain is the organ by which Nature strives to understand itself. . . . The philosopher is Nature's pilot. And there you have our difference: to be in Hell is to drift: to be in Heaven is to steer. (290)

Like Don Juan, Rockoffer wishes to be in charge of his future life. In order to protect the universe from unexpected events that cannot be controlled, Rockoffer demands to be given the whole world and plans to create "something diabolical" (636). This is how he presents his vision:

ROCKOFFER: . . . I'll create a really cosy little nook in the Infinity of the world. Art, philosophy, love, science, society—one huge mishmash. And not like groveling worms, but like whales spouting with sheer delight, we'll swim in it all up to our ears. The world is not a rotten cheese. Existence is always beautiful if you can only grasp the uniqueness of everything in the universe. Down with the relativity of truth! . . . Long live finiteness and limitations. God isn't tragic; He doesn't become—He is. Only we are tragic, we, limited Beings. (636)

Consequently, both protagonists become Apollonian and finally eliminate the unpredictable artistic parts of their personalities. Don Juan calls the reality of art a "Palace of Lies" and reserves no room for it in a world ruled by the Superman. Rockoffer realizes that "as an artist I have been pretending up to now, and all my art is a hoax, a deliberate, carefully planned hoax" (628). On the surface, Rockoffer struggles to maintain a high status for art in Hyrcania, but it appears to be more wishful thinking on his part than a serious plan. Julius II, who is going to join Rockoffer, calls the existence of art into question: "I wonder if I'll be able to create a new artistic center in this infernal Hyrcania" (637). Thus, both characters leave the former places of their existence with the deep conviction that they will be successful if they remain faithful to their own principles. As the motto of Witkacy's play indicates, "Don't give in even to yourself" (626). The innermost struggle of Rockoffer and Don Juan ends in hope and the belief that progress is possible, and this belief constitutes another important similarity between their world views.

Witkacy's concealment of his political message in the dialogues—which on the surface deal exclusively with Art and an artist—becomes quite obvious in the monologue of Julius II. The resurrected Pope explains to Rockoffer how his art is the "sole Truth" and as such can become a comment on the nature of reality regardless of the artist's intention and awareness:

JULIUS II: (*With his finger pointing toward the ceiling*) Up there, where I come from, they know about it better than you do, you miserable speck of dust. But after all, an artist's worth comes from either rebellion or success. What would Michelangelo have been if it weren't for me or other patrons of the arts (may God punish them for it). A few madmen eager for new poisons raise up the man who concocts them to the apex of humanity, and then a crowd of non-entities adore him, gaping at the agony and ecstasy of the ones who've been poisoned. Isn't the fact that the Council of the Production of Handmade Crap burned your works a proof of your greatness? (628)

Julius II undermines Paul's assumption that all art is a lie and establishes a visible link, in the form of Truth, between the artistic and political aspects of reality.

This introductory discussion on the nature of art between Julius II and Paul Rockoffer continues when the artistic/theatrical nature of Hyrcania is revealed to the crowd present. The question of what is false and what is true about the legendary Hyrcania and its ruler puzzles not only the characters but also the reader. The way this concept is depicted by Witkacy makes the reader wonder about the deceptive nature of reality in general. This is how the Emperor Hyrcan IV is described in the stage directions: "*Tall, thin. Vandyke beard, large mustache. A bit snub-nosed. Large eyebrows and longish hair. Purple cloak and helmet with a red plume. A sword in his hand. Under his cloak a golden garment. (What he has on under that will be revealed later on)*" (626). At first, his appearance bears an obvious resemblance to some kind of an historical king rather than a twentieth-century dictator or an embodiment of Nietzsche's idea of the Superman. On the news that Hyrcan IV has arrived, Rockoffer exclaims, "You know he was a classmate of mine at school. He was always dreaming about an artificial kingdom in the old style" (630). Everybody listens in suspense to his "powerful, commanding footsteps" before the King enters the stage and the actual discussion of Hyrcania begins. Rockoffer questions Hyrcania's real nature from the very beginning: "Isn't your Kingdom only a badly disguised form of insanity, my friend?" (631). To this, however, Hyrcan IV responds in a truly Pirandellian fashion:

HYRCAN IV: ... Our life is Truth.

ROCKOFFER: So it's a question of Truth. Is Truth also an integral part of the Hyrcanian worldview?

HYRCAN IV: Of course. But if all humanity wears a mask, the problem of truth will disappear all by itself. I and my two friends,

Count de Plignac and Rupprecht von Blasen, are creating just such a mask. Society masked and we alone who know everything. (633)

As the real mechanisms of Hyrcania are slowly yet consistently revealed, its similarities to the dramatic world of Pirandello's *Enrico IV* become really astonishing, especially since *Enrico IV* was performed in Cracow and in Warsaw in 1925. It is highly unlikely that Witkacy had access to the text earlier.¹⁵ The false theatricality of this kingdom is also ridiculed by Ella's mother:

MOTHER: I've read about that Hyrcania of yours in the newspapers. It's the theatre critics who write about it. Not one decent politician even wants to hear it mentioned. It's an ordinary theatrical hoax, that Hyrcania of yours. A depraved and degenerate band of madmen and drunkards took it into their heads to simulate a regime in the old style! You ought to be ashamed, Mister! (635)

The monologue comments on the real nature of Hyrcania, and at the same time it brings the visions of Pirandello and Witkacy into close correspondence. Through this and other monologues, it becomes quite obvious that the image of Hyrcania carries a serious message regarding the political future of Poland. Rockoffer clearly predicts that the popular trend of socialism can develop into a dangerous form of dictatorship with no room for artistic creativity or individual human values. Rockoffer's questions about what a regular work day looks like in Hyrcania and what really occupies its rulers are answered directly:

HYRCAN IV: Power—we get drunk on power in all its forms from morning till night. And then we feast in an absolutely devastatingly glorious fashion, discussing everything from the unattainable heights of our reign.

ROCKOFFER: A reign over a heap of idiots incapable of organizing themselves. An ordinary military dictatorship. Under favorable conditions a really radical state socialism can do the same thing. (633)

Although Hyrcan IV radically disagrees with Paul, he encourages him to leave for Hyrcania immediately so that he can experience this curious phenomenon in person. He tries to persuade Rockoffer that Hyrcania is a reality that is the "incarnation of Hyrcanian desires" (631) and the place where he—as a ruler—creates supermen: "Two, or three—that's enough. The rest is a pulpy mass—cheese for worms" (631). However, this vision does not appeal to Rockoffer, who finally admits,

But isn't there something of a comedy in it all? You know what's chiefly discouraged me? Your costume.

HYRCAN IV: But that's nothing. I thought you were more impressed by scenery and that's why I dressed up this way. (633)

Beneath his fancy costume, Hyrcan wears a well-tailored, normal cut-away, and his hidden clothes confirm the serious political message that Witkacy conceals under theatrical props. Thus, an imaginary Hyrcania with its King becomes far more real than appearances suggest. A strange mixture of past and future, philosophy and art, truth and trickery becomes a vehicle to convey a more profound thought.

The way Witkacy reveals the political mechanisms of Hyrcania offers the reader a far more insightful analysis of what the practical consequences of the concept of Superman can be than Shaw's more positive reading of the same idea. Again, one should keep in mind that Shaw promotes the ideas of Nietzsche in abstract philosophical terms without using them as a vehicle for a concealed political message. However, the very same device of using an imaginary figure to elaborate on the future image of the world is applied by Shaw in *Back to Methuselah* (1918-20) in the second act of Part 4. The Emperor of Turania, who claims that his name is Napoleon, but who may be a madman, appears in mysterious circumstances and has many traits similar to features of Enrico IV and Hyrcan IV. As happens in Witkacy's vision, the character is a mixture of an historical and a literary figure who plays an important role in suggesting the image of a future world. His identity is also called into question by other characters who are not easily misled by his props:

ZOO: (*to Napoleon, severely*) What are you doing here by yourself? You have no business to go about here alone. What was that noise just now? What is that in your hand? *Napoleon glares at her in speechless fury; pockets the pistol; and produces a whistle.*¹⁶

Unlike Witkacy, Shaw has no artistic intention of concealing the anti-war or anti-dictatorial message that the Napoleon figure personifies, but Shaw's dramatic solution for conveying certain political concepts clearly indicates that both playwrights thought along similar lines.

One may wonder today why the common link between Witkacy and Shaw has not been noticed and discussed before. The habitual way of looking at the writings of these two influential playwrights may answer this question. Critics seem to avoid examining Witkacy's plays in ways other than he himself demanded. Witkacy's critical view of Shaw and Pirandello later became accepted by many Eastern European and West-

era critics. This is how Witkiewicz concludes his thoughts on modern drama in his essay "On Pure Form" (1921):

Realism is presently going through a crisis due to complete exhaustion, and it shows up in the theatre as a feverish search for new subjects. Typical manifestations of this process—and they are manifestations of decadence in the full force of its expression—are Bernard Shaw, Pirandello, and to a certain degree, Evreinov. . . . I do not see in these authors—in spite of all the recognition awarded the first two—the beginning of a new creativity, only the final, powerful twitch of a long process of dying. The curiosities in both Shaw and Pirandello, whether strictly naturalistically or symbolically justified, have a strong aftertaste of decadence, of futility, of hopeless impasse.¹⁷

Witkacy's opinion of Shaw, based on what he saw as Shaw's old-fashioned dramaturgy, does not prevent his own thoughts and concepts from being influenced by the vision of making the conflict of ideas a core element of drama.

Although Shaw's theoretical arguments are less prominent and his solutions are less drastic than Witkacy's, Shaw's theatrical impact has been strong. His views on "theatrical shock treatment" confirm this. As Stanley Weintraub observes, "Shaw believed that indifference in audience or playwright was a major sin, and that the playwright's clear duty was to shock audiences out of that state whenever necessary—and, in fact, more than necessary."¹⁸ To support his statement, Weintraub quotes Shaw: "The plain working truth is that it is not only good for people to be shocked occasionally, but absolutely necessary to the progress of society that they should be shocked pretty often" (348). Witkacy parallels this proposal in his "New Forms in Painting" (1919) when he argues, "For people nowadays, the forms of the Art of the past are too placid, they do not excite their deadened nerves to the point of vibration. They need something which will rapidly and powerfully shock their blase nervous system and act as a stimulating shower after long hours of stupefying mechanical work."¹⁹ Sharing that conviction, Witkacy and Shaw devoted much of their art to putting the extraordinary onstage, creating plays and designing a theater intended to change the face of the world.

Notes

1. Bernard Shaw, "The Author's Apology," in *The Drama Observed*, ed. Bernard F. Dukore (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1993), p. 1134.

2. S. I. Witkiewicz, "On a New Type of Play," *Four Decades of Polish Essays*, ed. Jan Kott, trans. C. S. Durer and Daniel C. Gerould (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1990), pp. 99-100.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
4. Paul Silverstein, "Barnes, Booths, and Shaw," *Shaw Review* 12:3 (1969): 111-16.
5. (1) Jan Błoński, introduction, *Wybór Dramatów* by S. I. Witkiewicz (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1974), pp. iii-cxi; (2) Jerzy Ziomek, "Personalne dossier dramatów Witkacego," *Studia o Stanisławie Ignacym Witkiewiczu*, Michał Głowiński and Janusz Sławiński, eds. (Wrocław-Warszawa: Ossolineum, 1972), pp. 83-105; (3) Adam Ważyk, "O Witkiewiczu," *Dialog* (1965, no. 8), pp. 70-75; (4) Jan Kłossowicz, "Teoria i dramaturgia Witkacego," *Dialog* (1959, no. 12), pp. 81-93; (5) Michał Masłowski, "Bohaterowie dramatów Witkacego," *Dialog* (1967, no. 12), pp. 84-98.
6. Daniel Gerould, *Witkacy as an Imaginative Writer* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1981), p. 190.
7. Czesław Miłosz, *The History of Polish Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 351-58.
8. Gerould, *Witkacy*, p. 333-34.
9. Bernard Shaw, "Don Juan in Hell," *The Portable Bernard Shaw*, ed. Stanley Weintraub (New York: Viking, 1977), p. 254. Subsequent references to this edition appear parenthetically in the text.
10. *The Cuttlefish*, trans. Daniel C. and Eleanor S. Gerould, *A Treasury of the Theatre*, ed. J. Gassner and B. Dukore (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970). Subsequent references to this edition appear parenthetically in the text.
11. Gerould, p. 193.
12. *The Cuttlefish*, p. 626.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 626.
14. Gerould, p. 186.
15. Alicja Forsyjak-Strazzanti, *Teatr Pirandello w Polsce* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1993), p. 76.
16. Bernard Shaw, *Back to Methuselah* (New York: Penguin, 1962), p. 239.
17. Witkacy, "On Pure Form," *Aesthetics in Twentieth-Century Poland*, ed. and trans. Jean G. Harrell and Alina Wierzbianska (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1973), p. 55.
18. Stanley Weintraub, "The Avant-Garde Shaw," *Bernard Shaw's Plays*, ed. Warren S. Smith (New York, London: W. W. Norton, 1970), p. 348.
19. Gerould, p. 208.