Afterword
Tributes to Stanley Weintraub by Fellow Bernard Shaw Scholars

The size of Stanley Weintraub’s writing legacy is what first boggles the mind, especially when you realize that over half of it was done on typewriters. One gets the impression that seldom a day went by when he didn’t get considerable writing done. As a Shaw scholar, I appreciated all the Shaw work he did, to which I constantly refer, but I’m well aware that only about half of his books and articles were on Shaw. He was more an historian and biographer than a literary critic and so covered VIPs and very important events for their historical value, providing the world some of the best in that line of scholarship. But never mind the number of books and articles he wrote; all you need to get a measure of his impact on Shaw Studies is to just count up the number of references to his works contained in the works of others in Shaw Studies. Conversely, to get a gauge from the other end, count up how many books and articles published in Shaw Studies do not have at least one footnote or endnote citing a Weintraub work; they will be few and far between. And this phenomenon will go on and on because he provided a bedrock from which Shaw Studies will continue to live and develop. Stan will be remembered with much awe and appreciation for many years to come. He was indeed our “lodestar.”

—Richard Farr Dietrich
Professor Emeritus, University of South Florida
Webmaster and Founding President, International Shaw Society

§ § §

As readers of this book know, Stanley Weintraub’s writings about Shaw and his editions of Shaw’s writings are prolific and remarkable. I first knew him professionally over half a century ago when he accepted
a novice article of mine for the Shaw Review, of which he was editor, which he also was for its successor, SHAW: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies. Shavians are grateful for both. I do not remember when we met—probably a decade or more after my article appeared in the former. I wish I had got to know him other than professionally. As it is, I applaud the numerous Shavian works he wrote and edited. At the start of some of my Shaw projects, I knew I should “consult Weintraub.” After I had begun others, I sooner or later realized that I had better consult him. I think “indispensable” is the word for his accomplishments. He is one of the preeminent Shavian writers.

—Bernard F. Dukore
University Distinguished Professor of Theatre Arts and Humanities
Virginia Tech

§ § §

I am Bob Gaines, representing The International Shaw Society, of which Stan was an All-Star member. I knew him as a scholar, mentor, and just as importantly, a friend. I remember meeting him over 15 years ago. I posed a question about an article he had written. A broad smile filled his face as he shook my hand and said: “Bob, let’s sit down and discuss it.” He was in his element as professor/mentor extraordinaire. When we were done, he offered his hand and said: “I think we have both learned something.” Education comes from Latin and means “to lead out.” To me, Stan embodied that definition.

In 2016, a group of us was gathered in Niagara-on-the-Lake after a Shaw conference. We were buzzing with intellectual excitement, discussing all our take-aways from the papers and performances. Stan listened silently, and when the conversation slowed, he sat up in his chair and leaned on his cane. He masterfully wove together each of our individual ideas and seasoned them with his own blend of insight and wisdom. He unified our half-articulated and disparate comments into a fully completed and illustrated essay. I am certain no group of his students was ever as enthralled as we were that night.

All of us who engage in Shaw scholarship have a very short list of trusted researchers we call on when we can’t find that crucial piece of information we know is out in the ether. Stan was always, without fail, the first one to answer my queries, not just with the book I needed,
but with the author, publisher, date of publication, page numbers, and sometimes even the ISBN number.

The final memory I want to share comes from the New York City Shaw Conference at Fordham University, where Stan shared with us his introduction to Shaw. Being a freshly minted Second Lieutenant on the Korea Peninsula, he asked his brother to send him something to read. In the midst of a crucible of blood and pain, Stan received a ray of hope: two plays by Bernard Shaw. And with those his nearly 70-year devotion. Following that story, several of us asked him what might have happened if his brother had sent him Zane Grey novels instead. Without a moment’s hesitation, he replied, “I guess I would have become the fastest gun in the west.” Luckily, Stan was sent Shaw’s plays—and those engaged in Zane Grey Studies do not realize the extent of their loss. But we in Shaw Studies fully understand ours. As Shakespeare said, “We shall not look upon his like again.”

—Robert A. Gaines
Professor Emeritus at Auburn University Montgomery
President of the International Shaw Society

§ § §

When I was working on my first book on Shaw in the late 1960s a friend told me that I had “a rival” in Shaw studies in America. I already knew in fact that I had several not exactly rivals but superiors in the field in that country. It took me a while to ascertain that the rival referred to was a chap named Stanley Weintraub who was then well on his way to becoming one of the leading Shaw scholars in the world. It also took me some time to discover the extraordinary range of Weintraub’s interests and achievements. He was not only a Shaw expert, he was also a Queen Victoria expert (and quite an authority on the love life of her son Edward VII), a Disraeli expert, a Lawrence of Arabia expert, a Golding, Whistler and Beardsley expert, and a writer on an amazing number of other subjects. Stan had a great knack for thinking up good titles, such as Journey to Heartbreak: The Crucible Years of Bernard Shaw and Private Shaw and Public Shaw. His writing was punchy and confident with characteristic touches of humor and dramatic revelation.

A scholarly work of his that I, along with countless others, have been greatly indebted to was his two-volume edition of Shaw’s early diaries.
Together with the copious notes supplied by Weintraub, these volumes contain one of the most important primary sources of information about Shaw’s life and associations in early manhood. This work alone would have been enough to establish the editor as an outstanding contributor to Shaw scholarship. D1 and D2, abbreviations for the first and second volume, are two of the most frequently employed references in the early sections of my *A Bernard Shaw Chronology*.

Stanley’s marriage to Rodelle was also a fine literary partnership. Rodelle is a distinguished contributor to Shaw studies, and her collection of essays *Fabian Feminist: Shaw and Woman* was a ground-breaking and timely book. Future conferences of the International Shaw Society will be the poorer without the presence of the Weintraub duo, as indeed is the whole community of Shaw scholars with the loss of Stanley.

—A.M. Gibbs
Emeritus Professor of English, Macquarie University, Sydney

§ § §

Many Shavians probably remember Stan’s talk at the Ayot St. Lawrence Conference in 2013, on the stage of the stately Palladian Church. Reading excerpts from Shaw’s music criticism, Stan valiantly fought a losing battle against a fit of giggles, taking the audience down with him until the whole room collapsed into the kind of laughter that brought tears streaming down everyone’s face. It was a profoundly communal, Shavian moment.

Stan had a gift for creating community. At my first Shaw conference, I was overawed to meet such a renowned scholar, but Stan quickly interrupted my starstruck gushing to assure me he wasn’t infallible, offering as proof a blunder from *Journey to Heartbreak*. During the war, men returning from the front advised Shaw and Charlotte to put “bromo paper” in the care package they were sending actor Robert Loraine. Knowing that Loraine was an avid photographer, Stan thought this must be a reference to “bromide paper,” a fast-printing photographic stock, and added a footnote in his book to that effect. Then he flashed one of those wicked twinkling smiles. He’d since learned that “bromo paper” was a high-quality toilet paper! He then suggested I help him correct that footnote in every copy of the book. I promised to do so in the copy in the University of Guelph library when I got home, which
steered the conversation to its superb Shaw Collection in the L. W. Conolly Theatre archives and from there to other Shavian topics. It wasn’t until later that I appreciated how kindly and effortlessly Stan had put me at ease and treated me like a colleague.

I’ve amended the footnote on page 80 of my copy of *Journey to Heartbreak* and the one in the UG library. I know Stan would be pleased if every Shavian with access to a copy would do likewise.

—D.H. Hadfield  
Guelph, Ontario, Canada

§ § §

I would like to begin by acclaiming the following accolade: “Stanley Weintraub was one of the most brilliant scholars of his or any other generation. He will remain an inspiration for us all.”—Professor Leonard Conolly, FRSC, FRSA, Past President of the International Shaw Society, on behalf of the Sagittarius-Shaw Literature Digitizing Program (Leonard Conolly, Richard Dietrich, Suzanne Merriam, Kay Li).

I am personally truly grateful to Professor and Mrs. Weintraub for advising me to work on Bernard Shaw and China, enabling me to explore the lasting significance behind transient meetings and to recognize that history is made through the permutation of fleeting moments. Their immense scholarship and open-mindedness allowed me to venture into new areas, such as exploring Shaw and artificial intelligence, or linking Shaw to Chinese operas and paintings.

Knowing Professor Weintraub’s scholarship had no bounds, I attended my dissertation defense without expecting to know all the answers to his questions. Indeed, he began by asking me about Shaw and Joseph Needham, one of the foremost sinologists of the twentieth century. He was trying to help me out by mentioning someone I might have known about! Only later did the Sagittarius Literature Digitizing Project discover that in the Preface to *Back to Methuselah*, under the section “The Early Evolutionists,” Shaw wrote: “Our contemporary Joseph Needham will certainly not be the last.” As Professor Conolly said, Professor Weintraub “will remain an inspiration for us all.”

Please go to https://sagittarius.apps01.yorku.ca/weintraub/ for a tribute from the Sagittarius-Shaw Literature Digitizing Program to Stanley Weintraub, in appreciation of the crucial role he played in founding
the program. The Shaw Bot was the last project graced by Professor Weintraub’s advice.

—Kay Li
York University, and the Sagittarius Literature Digitizing Program

Stan Weintraub was a unique presence in the life of the Shaw society and its members. When we try to assess what his passing has taken from us, we can start with memories of Stan the humorist, entertaining us with his stories of the very human foibles of the celebrated people he studied and often knew personally. Whether he was speaking to an audience or talking to a few of us, his face would be animated by barely contained laughter; he enjoyed telling the stories as much as we enjoyed listening to them. His humor was never cutting or dismissive; it was civilized: knowing, smoothly phrased, tolerant and appreciative of the frailties common to us all, in a word, gentlemanly—like Stan himself. A gentleman like Stan puts everyone he meets at ease; his courtesy and genial interest encourage others to behave the same way. And when we also consider Stan’s amazing achievements as a scholar and writer—all the books, prefaces, articles, and speeches, ranging from Shaw studies to biographies and histories—I believe we must call him not just a distinguished “man of letters,” but an American public intellectual, helping to shape our culture and discourse, doing for us what Fintan O’Toole does for Ireland.

Still, when I think of Stan, I keep returning to his kindness. Every time I talked to him, his friendly manner, his interest in what I was saying, made me forget momentarily that he was a renowned scholar, and I was an aging, relative newcomer to Shaw studies. I think everyone he met had something like that experience. Perhaps that is why such an impressive man, our “lodestar,” became our dear friend.

—John McInerney
Professor Emeritus, University of Scranton

My testimonial is entitled “Bernard Shaw Studies and the particular immanence of Stanley Weintraub” and knit with a singular refrain: “Another of Stan’s students.” By most fortunate and mystifying (hence,
“immanence”) default, without ever sitting in his classroom, I became one of them.

In 1971, while still a member of the U.S. Air Force Academy English Department, I was offered the opportunity to author “A Continuing Checklist of Shaviana,” then published as an installment three times a year in Stanley Weintraub’s The Shaw Review (SR). The invitation came through a then senior Academy English Department colleague, Lt. Col. Michael Mendelsohn—himself a life-long Shavian and a member of the SR editorial board. Stan, as he did many others whom he invited to the society of Shaw studies, shepherded me and encouraged me as he continued to edit SR and then SHAW: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies, which debuted in 1981, wherein the “Checklist” continued to appear annually. As the years followed, the length of the Checklist increased—from three and a half pages in eight-point font and three editorial sections to its iterations in 2012, 2013, and 2014 of as many as forty pages in eight subject sections. The incomparable Stan would send me Checklist nominations during my forty-two years of writing it. Richard Winslow, another of Stan’s students, grown older with the rest of us, sent enough potential entries over the years that a byline for him as a special contributor to the Checklist was often warranted.

Soon enough, Stan wanted to surrender his role as SHAW editor. He did so by enlisting the acceptance of it by his brilliant student, Dr. Fred Crawford, who, after ten years (1989–99) as editor, passed away suddenly and too soon. Fred’s wife MaryAnn Crawford filled in as a very able substitute editor for a few years, after which Michel Pharand, also one of Stan’s students, agreed to take over as editor. For forty-two years, in my formal association with the Shaw periodicals with each event of publication, I was identified as “Bibliographer” in its credits. Stan proliferated this allegation of important scholarship that I was credited with by including my name not only on the Shaw journals’ title pages but also by making me a member of the editorial board of the Shaw journals in the listings of the publishers that produced journals for other authors and related scholarly forums. The result was to accord me an international recognition for importance to Shaw scholarship. Without Stan as my advocate, none of this would have happened.
By the most fortunate default, then, without ever sitting in his classroom, I became another of Stan’s students.

—John Pfeiffer
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan

§ § §

From 1982 to 1990, I was at Penn State University doing my best not to finish my Ph.D. in Comparative Literature. And I would have succeeded had it not been for my advisor Stanley Weintraub. Although I did all I could to make his job easier by prolonging my research and avoiding his office in the Institute for the Arts and Humanistic Studies, my procrastination was cut short when I retrieved from my campus mailbox a small note typed on Institute letterhead: “Dear Michel, shouldn’t you be visiting me for some reason or other? Stan.” That understated summons masterfully ended my avoidance behavior.

Thus, thanks to Stan’s forbearance and pragmatism—he also put an end to my dissertation inertia by suggesting a manageable topic—I finally graduated. In Eisenhower Auditorium on 12 May 1990, diploma in hand, I took my seat beside Dr. Weintraub, as I had addressed him for some eight years. He turned to me and said, “We’ve both got Ph.D.s from the same place: call me Stan.” That was a milestone for me.

We stayed in touch for three decades and saw each other every few years, on occasion sharing gin martinis. For all his amazing scholarly productivity, Stan also loved to socialize—and he had a terrific sense of humor.

I owe Stan a great deal, as do countless scholars. We’ve consulted his books, quoted and acknowledged them in our research. His legacy, therefore, comprises not only his numerous works but our own. And that’s exactly how Stan would want to be remembered: as the impetus to ongoing scholarship. Generous to a fault, Stan above all else wanted to be useful. He used the word often. Over the years I received countless articles and clippings bearing little yellow sticky notes: “This might be useful” or “Can you use this?” He’d often tell me (as he told so many others), “Let me know how I can be useful.”
I count myself immensely fortunate to have made full use of Stan Weintraub: of his mentorship, his friendship, his counsel, his wisdom. He was, and remains, an inspiration.

—Michel Pharand
Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Stan’s generosity as a teacher and mentor is not as often as celebrated as his brilliance as a writer and researcher. Although I don’t want to minimize the importance of his vast body of scholarship, I believe Stan’s greatest professional contribution was his teaching: the work that made him a “priceless social treasure” (as Shaw called “born teachers”) to all who were so fortunate as to benefit from his brilliant teaching and the unfailing generosity of his mentorship.

This magnificent benevolence was evident from the first day I met Dr. Weintraub. I had chosen Penn State primarily because he taught there, having discovered his Shaw scholarship during my master’s program in California, but I hadn’t contacted him. Nevertheless, when I arrived, he graciously put aside his work, came out from behind his massive rampart of a desk, and seated himself across from me as if we were already colleagues. After an intense hour or so of talk about Shaw, my fall classes, and my first impressions of Pennsylvania, Stan not only gave me some books but also a character reference for the apartment manager who had demanded a co-signer from me that morning!

That first encounter set the pattern for our relationship. With his inimitable blend of Olympian dignity and princely graciousness, Stan unstintingly provided the help and guidance I needed—even when I became an ABD dropout, fleeing back to California to reconsider my career options: although disappointed, he didn’t give up on me. When I eventually told him I was back in the classroom and had decided to complete my dissertation after all, he sprang into action, reassembling my dissertation committee and sending my second chapter to an editor (who published it), giving me the impetus to bear down and finally finish the (damn) thing. I passed my defense one day before Stan’s seventieth birthday, his last year of teaching.

Although daunted by Stan’s unmatchable example, I have always tried to give to my own students some measure of the hard work, con-
tagious enthusiasm, and genuine interest in their development that Stan offered me. Even now, in semi-retirement, I use Stan’s *Portable Shaw* with the students I tutor. I have truly come to appreciate what Stan always showed with me: that the most important work of teaching happens not in the lecture hall, nor even in the seminar room, but in one-on-one conversations, mentor to apprentice. I remain grateful indeed for having once been Stan’s apprentice.

—Julie Sparks
Sunnyvale, CA

§ § §

I first met Stan in 1978, appropriately enough in the manuscripts room of the British Museum. Dan H. Laurence had suggested I contact Stan, whom he had already asked to edit the *Heartbreak House* volume in the Garland Shaw Facsimile project. The upshot was that Stan invited me to carry out in situ a forensic analysis of the heavily revised typescript; we would jointly compose the introduction, as co-editors. Thus began several years of collaboration. But even more important was the lasting family friendship that developed. Each year Stan and Rodelle would make a research trip to England, and we would all go to the theatre together, or to the birthday celebrations at Shaw’s Corner.

Over the next fifteen years we moved from Hertfordshire, first to Liverpool in 1986 and then in 1990 to Sunderland in the North East. Stan and Rodelle followed us around the country with their annual visits. Stan was working on one major biography after another—of Queen Victoria (1987), Benjamin Disraeli (1993) or Prince Albert (1997)—and we would drive our guests to view key places for their research. We prided ourselves on locating even more statues than Stan knew about, and he duly sent signed copies of each new publication.

We lost touch in the early years of the new century, after we had moved back to London via Sheffield. However, in 2013 the Shaw at Home Conference drew us back to Ayot St Lawrence, where we met up once more. Stan immediately launched into an account of his latest project—*Young Mr. Roosevelt*—as if not a moment had passed since our last meeting. I had thought he was prolific back in 1978, but now he had added scores more publications to his tally. I thought he was a
‘natural’ for a film interview, and the National Trust agreed to support the project.

In the spring of 2014, following their 60th wedding anniversary trip to Europe, Stan and Rodelle joined us in London. For three days in a bitingly cold Shaw’s Corner we filmed Stan—eight hours of recording in all, with never a note or a falter. It was a tour de force. From that came a virtual tour of Shaw’s Corner, with interactive inserts, and themed interviews in which Stan covered Shaw’s life and oeuvre, and also gave insights into his own life and career. The films were premiered at the Shaw Symposium in New York in October 2015, with Stan and Rodelle present, and can now be viewed online as a permanent resource (https://shaw-institute.com/welcome/weintraub/).

Stan was a brilliant, world-class scholar with a prodigious knowledge of Shaw and an even more prodigious memory: he was also a born storyteller and raconteur, with a sharp wit, a flair for irony and ever-present sense of humour. His gift was to uncover the human story behind historical and biographical facts. Always immaculately dressed, and always deeply courteous, it was a delight to be in his company. I was privileged to collaborate with him, learn from him, and call him a friend. Stanley Weintraub was a pioneering Shavian—simply one of the Shaw greats—and we all follow gratefully in his footsteps.

—Dr. Anne Wright CBE
Chair, The Shaw Society