



*Implication as an Instrument
of Communicating Themes
Elaborately in G. B. Shaw's Arms
and the Man*

Asst. Prof. Dr. Taha Khalaf Salim

drtahasalim@tu.edu.iq

drtahasalim@gmail.com

من الامور المتفق عليها ان اللغة اهمية بالغة في عكس خصائص اي عمل مسرحي والذي هو بدوره يمثل ميدانا خصبا لاستخدام اللغة بهدف اصال الافكار المراد اوصولها وهذا ما مكن المسرحيين بشكل خاص من تحقيق اغراضهم المتمثلة في اوصول المفاهيم التي تتمحور حولها مسرحياتهم للجمهور بنجاح. الكثير من المسرحيين وبضمنهم الايرلندي جورج برنارد شو قاموا بأستخدام التضمين لاوصول افكارهم بصورة غير مباشرة. ان هدف هذه البحث هو ليس القيام بدراسة براغماتية لمسرحية شو الرجل والسلاح بالاعتماد على نظرية غرايس في التضمين انما الهدف هو دراسة مدى نجاح شو في توظيف مفهوم التضمين بمعناه العام كوسيلة درامية لمساعدته في اوصول افكاره الى الجمهور بصورة غير مباشرة وبذات الوقت اطالة الحوارات بين الشخصيات التي كان قد زودها بالقدرة على مناقشة الكثير من المفاهيم ومن وجهات نظر وزوايا مختلفة خدمة للغاية الرئيسية وهي انتاج ما يسمى بمسرحيات الافكار. الباحث توصل الى ان الكاتب نجح في استخدام التضمين للاسهاب في طرح افكاره وبالنتيجة فان التضمين يجب ان يضاف كوسيلة درامية الى بقية الوسائل مثل الرمزية والاختلاف وغيرها.

ABSTRACT

It is universally admitted that language is of high importance in forging the fundamental particularities of each dramatic work which represents an opulent field of utilizing language for delivering one's ideas. Employing language effectively by the dramatists enable them to achieve their purposes represented by transmitting their themes to the audience prosperously. Including the Irish dramatist George Bernard Shaw, many playwrights used to convey their ideas tacitly rather than directly exploiting what is called implication. The objective of this research is not to carry out a pragmatic study of Shaw's Arms and the Man depending on Herbert Paul Grice's theory of implicature which represents an endeavour to grant this term a more linguistic standing. The plan is to examine the extent to which Shaw was successful in recruiting the idea of implication, in its general meaning, as a device that empowers him to communicate his conceptions and, at the same time, to elongate the conversations using characters who are provided with the abilities to do so and the intention is to serve the final end, to create a type of plays that can be recognized by their copiousness of ideas and especially in the mentioned play. A conclusion, which is followed by end notes and a bibliography, comes at the end to recommend that implication must be annexed to the main devices of drama.

Key Words: Arms and the Man; implication; ideas; heroism; social rank; themes

Shaw and His Diction of Writing

Born in Dublin on the 26th of July, 1856, George Bernard Shaw is a prominent name in the history of English literature. He is one of the greatest prolific authors of the modern age. He obtained desultory learning in the local schools for believing that the entire educational system is worthless. He stated, "I never learn anything at school, but took refuge in total idleness. My parents went their own way and let me go mine. Thus the habit of freedom, which most Englishmen never acquire and never let their children acquire, came to me naturally."¹ Shaw left school when he was fifteen years old to be employed as a clerk in a land-agent's office. His mother, an endowed lady, was of great influence on formalizing Shaw's cultural background. In 1876, he joined her in London where he became an energetic member of the Fabian Society and that was what helps him cultivate his talent of discussing exploiting the tribunes that he had to establish for the aim of propagating the conceptions of Fabian Socialism.

Shaw, who fetched a bulky alteration in the domain of drama by dragging life on the stage, is able to enjoin his conceptions upon "theatre less out of special liking for the theatre than out of a moral passion for the establishment of righteousness in social relationships. Therefore when he dragged life into the theatre, it began at once to talk about housing conditions, religion, finance, prostitution about everything that Shaw thought to be muddled and mismanaged and pernicious."²

As a dramatist, Shaw's fame excels that of being a journalist, essayist, novelist, and an esteemed critic. He produced brand-new drama in shape along with content. Shaw does not like to give precedence to the traditional drama that can be recognized by its rife events as well as the stereotyped characters that have no opportunity for imagination. In the company of the coming of the Norwegian dramatist Henrik Ibsen to England with Shaw's The Quintessence of Ibsenism, an extended article devoted to grant an elaborate analysis of Ibsen's works, a recent type of drama named plays of ideas started to manifest itself. "Plot is subordinated to dialogue for which the characters themselves though often clearly drawn are but mouthpieces."³

Shaw did not hesitate to operate far from Aristotle's rules promoting characters to occupy the highest rank of importance rather than plot which is of the thinnest for the reason that they are characters who donate life to the sequence of the events of which any play is composed. Shaw's great cleverness is represented by his brilliant ability to create characters that have the power to discuss notions from different points of view. Shaw's inclination of characters comes as a result of his purpose to employ them as a vehicle to transmit the wanted concepts. Although they are mere mouthpiece for what the writer intends to inform the audience, "they are also painted in very strong colours, are frequently comic and very rarely lack interest."⁴ Edward Albert states, "After Shakespeare no English dramatist equals Shaw in the variety and vividness of his characters."⁵

For the purpose of imparting his characters the distinctness that they need, Shaw engenders the proper dramatic situations which are replete with "inversions, paradoxes, exaggerations, and his characters have to react to these strange situations and thereby acquire extraordinary vividness and individuality."⁶ The best example to be mentioned in this respect is the unusual confrontation accomplished in *Arms and the Man* between Raina, the beautiful Bulgarian girl who is already engaged to one of the prominent Bulgarian military leaders, Sergius Saranoff, and Bluntschli, the Swiss mercenary soldier who fights with Raina's country enemy, Serbia.

Shaw persistently assails the traditional drama for being sentimental. He thinks that the dramatist has to appeal to reason rather than emotion. Sentiment, for him, is something false. "He saw the need for a new school of acting, which merely required that actors shake off their sentimental stock roles. A selfish idealist was not necessarily a villain, nor an unselfish realist a hero."⁷ In conformity with Shaw's conception, there is no villain but the ordinary people who are used to play the part of creating the deformed vision, viciousness and endurance within a community to express their ineligibility to carry out any reaction against the criminal acting being achieved.

Shaw's fondness in debating is the main cause behind choosing such type of plays in which there are many ideas to discuss with nominal action. "Shaw is not primarily interested in action, and so he does not trouble to devise suitable action. He is interested in discussion, and the flow of ideas."⁸ In his book, *Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle and an Introduction*, Robert Fleming Rattray pleads Shaw opposite the insufficiency of action, specially violent action, claiming that action in Shaw's plays "is largely spiritual action: people are affected and altered by it."⁹ Actually Shaw is the master of administering dramatic conversations. His plays are satiated with notions debated at a noticeable length and that is what influences the development of the characters that used to discuss these notions in addition to the created situations in which they are exhibited. The aim is to exploit the argumentative plays to stimulate the audience intellectually. Shaw used to originate and then to develop the sequence of the events permitting the characters to convey his dispatch by means of long conversations. Most of Shaw's plays are designed as including no specified end for the reason that he wants to enable the reader to institute the end that he believes adequate to be united with the play.

A momentous end of Shaw's drama is to encounter the audience with integrally fresh opinion and modern procedures of looking closely at themselves as well as their society which comes to be the central theme of the composed plays of this playwright and is always shown as it is. Shaw "discusses all the problems prevalent in society with the help of speeches and discussion."¹⁰ He is a fiercely didactic author who used to express very firm things in all of his plays. At the end of each play, the audience are to be quitted with no suspicion about what he likes to advise them. Drama, in accordance with Shaw's doctrine, represents the most powerful instrument to converse with the masses and to lead them in terms of moral issues which are not merely correlated to cases that deal with delinquent actions but also to shed light on social dilemmas that are in need for special moral heed. Attention is given to interests such as advocating rights of women, cases of matrimony and some other heeds. Although the fact that the audience are entertained by Shaw's plays, entertainment is not the end that Shaw is looking for. He believes that the world is imperfect and as a result he is satisfied that employing social criticism for achieving the purpose of reforming society should be the most significant task of all types of art and specially drama. Theatre, for him, is the ideal place of assembly for demonstrating malice to the people and to throw much more light on it.

Including Shaw's dramatic achievements, the headline of the first two volumes, *Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant*, is carefully selected to indicate an important reality that his drama is something disparate from the old main classification of drama, tragedy and comedy. Tragedy should comprise a great person who violently falls towards a tragic end at the time that comedy is designed to amuse the audience. Shaw deems that the serious unpleasant conditions of a society that cause people's misery can be changed by laughing

on them and that is what makes the Shavian pleasant plays, comedies, stand as “a class by itself and is like nothing in English or continental drama.”¹¹

The Use of Implication to Hand on Themes in Arms and the Man

Written in 1894, Arms and the Man is Shaw’s earliest pleasant play of thought in which humour is employed to throw light on the fruitlessness of war and to censure society by means of the contrived situations along with the successful discussion of many ideas achieved by the well qualified characters. Believing that comedy is a good medium even to deal with the vehement actualities of a society, Shaw exploits his pleasant plays to expose various aspects concerning society problems. In this play, he tries to mock “the popular romantic conception of the professional soldier’s courage and incidentally the pretensions of the aristocracy.”¹²

Using a matchless style of expressing conceptions, Shaw is able to impliedly equip his audience with the intended themes and that is what helps him be prosperous in originating such types of plays that can be recognized by having long conversations among the characters.

Early in the opening scene of Arms and the Man at the time when the Slivnitsa battle takes place between Serbia and Bulgaria, Catherine Petkoff, Raina’s mother, reaches Raina’s room to report new tidings about Sergius Saranoff who infringes the order of his regiment, the Russian officer, to take the initiative leading the Bulgarian cavaliers to attack the Serbian gunners and that he is able to defeat them and to achieve a splendid triumph and that is what makes him the idol of his military unit. Catherine tells Raina saying:

"You cant guess how splendid it is. A cavalry charge! think of that! He defied our Russian commanders__acted without orders__led a charge on his own responsibility__headed it himself__was the first man to sweep through their guns. Cant you see it, Raina: our gallant splendid Bulgarians with their swords and eyes flashing, thundering down like an avalanche and scattering the wretched Serbs and their dandified Austrian officers like chaff. And you! you kept Sergius waiting a year before you would be betrothed him. Oh, if you have a drop of Bulgarian blood in veins, you will worship him when he comes back."¹³

In this speech which consists of repeated thoughts concerning Sergius, Catherine, who seems delighted, brags the bravery of her daughter’s fiancé stating long representation of his heroic performance and the aim is that she wants to originate specific ideas in Raina’s mind about Sergius heroism. The implicated theme that the writer tries to convey is that Sergius is a patriotic hero and that is what offers a good occasion for Raina to take a rapid pace to marry him. Shaw wants to bring up the first theme of his play which is with respect to heroism.

In the very situation of dealing with Sergius’s bravery, Raina says: "It comes into my head just as he was holding me in his arms and looking into my eyes, that perhaps we only had our heroic ideas because we are so fond of reading Byron and Pushkin, and we were so delighted with the opera that reason at Bucharest. Real life is so seldom like that! Indeed never, as far as I knew it then. [Remorsefully] Only think, mother: I doubted him: I wondered whether all his heroic qualities and his soldiership might not prove mere imagination when he went into a real battle. I had an uneasy fear that he might cut a poor figure there beside all those clever officers from the Tsar’s court." (p. 17) Catherine’s preceding speech about Sergius’s glorious triumph that he has achieved in Slivnistza arouses Raina’s romantic sensation towards Sergius and that is what leads her to say an informative utterance which is used for the aim of reinforcing what was already introduced by the dramatist about the theme of heroism along with the idea of romantic love which is repeated several time using dissimilar expressions so as to put the readers in the position to notice Shaw’s intended dispatch. Raina, who distrusts Sergius’s ability to be devoted to their love and heroic ideals, states that in the scene of departure, when he is about to leave to reach the battlefield on the borders with Serbia, Sergius had cuddled Raina and begun to gaze at her eyes. This scene makes her believe that this mode of assembly and going away is no more than romanticism that comes as a result of perusing together some romantic poems written by Byron and Pushkin as well as watching romantic dramas in Bucharest, the capital city of Romania. Raina believes that they are far from actuality and their romance is not real and exists only in the imagination of the mentioned poets and that of the playwrights. Raina suspects Sergius’s courage and proficiency as a warrior thinking that he would combat badly in the battle compared to the adept Russian soldiers sent by king Tsar. Referring to Byron, a famous English poet, and Pushkin, a great Russian poet, who composed so many poems of which the main theme is love, indicates that Shaw aims to share this knowledge with the readers and that is what represents another method of clarification of the intended meaning of the writer.

Sergius, who is able to verify that he is actually a brave combatant, leads his fiancée to reach the conclusion that her fear and suspicion are something phoney. Raina states that the world in which she is living is really glorious and romantic for including such courageous men, like her suitor, who are capable to achieve heroic exploits and as a result to get gleam renown. Women, Rains starts to believe, should be of significant imagination so as to be able to esteem the glory of their world otherwise they will be similar to Raina, prosaic and coward. Expressing her regret for doubting her fiancé's heroism and being blind to regard his noble peculiarities, Raina says:

"I was only a prosaic little coward. Oh, to think that it was all true! that Sergius is just as splendid and noble as he looks! that the world is really a glorious world for women who can see its glory and men who can act its romance! What happiness! what unspeakable fulfilment!" (pp. 17-18)

In the situation when Serjius comes back home from the war, Catherine reiterates to utter her satisfaction of Serjius' heroism and the deed that he has carried out telling him that all the Bulgarians are zealous concerning the cavalry assault of slivnitza fight for being the main reason of achieving victory. She says, "you look superb. the campaign has improved you, Sergius. Everybody here is mad about you. We were all wild with enthusiasm about that magnificent cavalry charge." (p. 41)

Sergius, who does not like to express the expected delight that may occur after accomplishing victory, ironically comments on Catherine's speech saying, "it was the cradle and the grave of my military reputation." (p. 41) Here, metaphor is used to indicate specific import. Serjius, of course, does not purpose the literal meaning of what he has said. He wants to say that he has no fame at all. He, then, informs Raina's mother, who asks him about the causes behind his state of pessimism, that it is not questioned that he was able to vanquish the enemy, but the fact is that he has used the incorrect way to carry out this deed. He has infringed the orders of the Russian leaders and that is what makes him nonconformist. Breaking down the military teachings affects their plans badly. Serjius states:

"I won the battle the wrong way when our worthy Russian generals were losing it the right way. In short, I upset their plans, and wounded their self-esteem. Two Cossack colonels had their regiments routed on the most correct principles of scientific warfare. Two major-generals got killed strictly according to military etiquette. The two colonels are now major-generals; and I am still a simple major." (p. 41)

It means that Sergius, who was of low military rank, had committed a big mistake represented by violating the rules which were accurately followed by the Russian officers who were commissioned to steer the campaign. Leading the cavalry to defeat the Serbs came to be the commencement and, at the same time, the termination of Sergius' military celebration.

The stance that keeps pace with Sergius' heroism as it is shown in this play is "proud and even arrogant." It "is magnificent in appearance and gesture and swashbuckling on the battlefield, where it flings itself into action regardless of danger."¹⁴ Some military officers including the Bulgarian major risk carrying out acts with no attention to the perils for the reason that they wish to crop up intrepid. Their aim is to get reputation and to be described as champions after doing hazard.

Sergius' performance during the war with Serbia is highly considered by Raina and her mother as a heroic exploit, but Bluntschli, a Swiss mercenary officer within the Serbian army, demonstrates that it was no more than an action of sheer idiocy. Believing that her suitor, the leader of the cavalry charge, is "the bravest of the brave," (p. 27) Raina asks Bluntschli to tell her about this attack. She thinks that she will hear stunning news. The man answers her saying, "it's a funny sight." (p. 27) he describes the command of the assault as a moron who was acting without senses. He appeared as if he intended to lead his men to be killed thinking that he had achieved a very valiant exploit, but it was really delinquent. "He and his regiment simply committed suicide; only the pistol missed fire: thats all." (p. 28) His regiment could not be able to come back existent had the Serbian soldiers fired their rifles. The truth is that they were mistakenly provided with invalid gunshots and that is what makes guns do not operate. As a result, they have to run away for keeping themselves alive.

Comparing him to the hero of the Spanish novel Quixote de la Manch composed by Miguel de Cervantes, Don Quixote who used to commit some silly mistakes during the events, Bluntschli asserts that the first one of this band "ought to be court-martialled for it." (p. 28) He breaks down the precepts that should be followed and he has placed the lives of his men in jeopardy. Although he brings out his apology to Raina after knowing that the man he was talking about is her fiancé, Bluntschli suggests an idea that Sergius used this stupid way to carry out this attack for he may got previous information concerning the wrong ammunition. "Most likely he had got wind of the cartridge business somehow, and knew it was a safe job." (p. 28) He

did so for being cognizant that it is completely secure and that is why he appears as if he pretends showing exceeding heroism. As Raina protests against the disgraceful, Bluntschli declares, "it is no use, dear lady: I can't make you see it from professional point of view." (p. 29)

In spite of that he flees from the battle field, it is impossible to describe Bluntschli as coward for he is forced to do so in order to save his life. The writer succeeds in employing this character to convey another type of heroism which is, of course, tempered by sapience in assessing situations and that is what makes the ventures committed in the course of the fighting will not be carried out randomly. Supported by professional drilling that enables soldiers to create rapid evaluation for serious cases and to acquire the wanted expertise of how to use their weapon perfectly, specific and accurate affairs should be put in consideration including soldier's stamina, climatic circumstances, and the availability of firepower. Shaw craftily commence his play employing Sergius' character to present such variety of heroism that leads the audience to interact with the excitement created by its bold actions. The writer, then, tries to criticize drawing soldiers into unnecessary jeopardise using another type of hero, Bluntschli, who appears to be unheroic figure. He purposely converses with the heroin in such a way of which the aim is to make Raina along with that of the audience pay attention that the first sort of heroism is something impossible in real life and it represents no more than guiding soldiers towards their tragic end.

Shaw, who aims to recruit banter as an effective instrument to make concentration on the vainness of war and, at the same time, to censure society throughout the originated episodes, uses the following occurrence to implicate the purport of his aim.

"BLUNTSCHLI. Stop! [she stops]. Where are you going?

RAINA. [with a dignified patience] Only to get my cloak.

BLUNTSCHLI. [passing swiftly to the ottoman and snatching the cloak] A good idea! I'll keep the cloak; and you'll take care that nobody comes in and sees you without it. This is a better weapon than the revolver: eh? [He throws the pistol down on the ottoman]

RAINA. [revolted] It is not a weapon of a gentleman!

BLUNTSCHLI. It's good enough for a man with only you to stand between him and death. Do you hear? If you are going to bring those blackguards in on me you shall receive them as you are." (p.21)

At the night of the combat and after making sure that her house is peaceful, Catherine departs Raina to sleep. Bluntschli, who was able to run away from the battlefield, enters Raina's chamber through the window. At the time that Raina attempts to dress her cloak, a long piece of clothes without sleeves, to be decent, Bluntschli grabs the cloak taking it as an armament to keep himself alive. The logical interpretation of Bluntschli's idea that the cloak is more significant than a gun is that as long as Raina is not well dressed, it is impossible to allow the Bulgarian to come into her room looking for the man and that is what keeps the fugitive in the green side. Raina becomes disgusted because of this impudent action. She believes that Bluntschli is far from being a gentleman for using such a means for his defence. Bluntschli, on the other hand, does not hesitate to operate anything to rescue himself. He is not abashed of his deportment. He candidly states that it is true that the cloak of a lady is not suitable to be a weapon, but there is no other choice to resist death. Bluntschli reflects the real nature of a human who has to have the sensation of fear as an instinct. The previous conversation exposes the practical disposition of the Swiss mercenary soldier along with his realism which is clearly compared to Raina's romantic view point about war and valour.

"RAINA. Your revolver! It was starting that officer in the face all the time. What an escape!

BLUNTSCHLI. Oh, is that all

RAINA. I am sorry I frightened you. [she takes up the pistol and hands it to him]. Pray take it to protect yourself against me.

BLUNTSCHLI. No use, dear young lady: there's nothing in it. It's not loaded.

RAINA. Load it by all means.

BLUNTSCHLI. I've no ammunition. What use are cartridges in battle? I always carry chocolate instead; and I finished the last cake of that hours ago.

RAINA. [outraged in her most cherished ideals of manhood] Chocolate! Do you stuff your pocket with sweets like a schoolboy even in the field?

BLUNTSCHLI. [grinning] Yes: isn't it contemptible? I wish I had some now.

RAINA. Allow me. [she sails away scornfully to the chest of drawers, and returns with the box of confectionery in her hand]. I am sorry I have eaten all except these. [she offers him the box]." (p. 25)

Raina questions Bluntschli to load his gun in order to be able to defend himself. He surprises her saying that he carries chocolates instead of pistol gunshots. He adds that he has eaten the last piece some hours earlier. Raina mocks Bluntschli comparing him to a school boy for she is shocked as a result of knowing that he has filled his pockets with food rather than ammunition. The quest for the implicated idea of what is said in the preceding conversation can be activated that Shaw has a definite theme to deliver. He wants to say that food, in the battle, is of high importance similar to ammunition. Therefore, unlike the young soldiers, the old ones who have a considerable experience in fighting use to fill most of their pockets with food while going to the battle. "You can always tell an old soldier by the inside of his holsters and cartridge boxes. The young ones carry pistols and cartridges: the old ones, grub." (p. 26) Actually, "Raina's ideals of the heroism of a soldier are hurt by these words of the Swiss soldier. She has romantic ideas of the courage and bravery of soldiers. Now her romance is shattered."¹⁴ Bluntschli's realism causes Raina's romance concerning war to be smashed.

Louka, Petkoff's family valet, who is already engaged to Nicola, another valet of this family, is a strong woman who hasn't the spirit of a servant and that is what makes her dream to be on a par with her mistress, Raina. She does not like to accede her position. As a result, she assails Nicola for admonishing her to be compliant and to obey whatever the principal wants. She addresses him, "you have the soul of a servant Nicola." (p. 37) Shaw uses the idea of implication to present this matter which is directly related with the theme of social status and that of money. Using a very long conversations between the two servants, the writer succeeds to provide his characters with the ability of implicating the idea they want to convey and the aim is to yield long utterance. In the incipience of Act II, Nicola and Louka appear doing their monotonous daily labour. Louka states a question to Nicola asking him whether she will get his support or not if she starts strife with Raina:

"NICOLA. Be warned in time, Louka: mend your manners. I know the mistress. She is so grand that she never dreams that any servant could dare be disrespectful to her; but if she once suspects that you are defying her, out you go.

LOUKA. I do defy her. I will defy her. What do I care for her?

NICOLA. If you quarrel with the family, I never can marry you. It's the same as if you quarrelled with me!

LOUKA. You take her part against me, do you?

NICOLA. [sedately] I shall always be dependent on the good will of the family. When I leave their service and start a shop in Sofia, their custom will be half my capital: their bad word would ruin me." (pp. 35-36)

Nicola's answer is informative. He does not like to reply using yes or no. He shows several vindications about the reasons that lead this servant to shun any type of conflict with the family for which he is working and that is what enables him to avert the immediate answer. Nicola wishes to keep his job and as a result to go on collecting money. In the very situation and as a complement to the preceding conversation, Louka once more asks Nicola concerning the consequences of breaking a real struggle with Petkoff's family, "what could they do?" (p. 36) Using some extra rhetorical inquiries that stated in Act II page 36, Nicola, who mirrors his nature as a loyal valet, wants to focus on the idea that Louka has to be aware and not to try to defy Raina for the reason that Louka will be fired. Although he gives her advices how to comport as a servant if she wants to avoid the bad upshots, the best way to convince Louka, Nicola believes, is to originate such type of questions and that is what enables him to give a very long answer. Nicola's aim, of course, is that he tries to protect Louka who comes to be non-sedate for having a tiny secret concerning Raina. He informs her that he has many mysteries about all the members of this family but it is a big mistake to leak them and the cause is that no one believes a servant. If Louka infiltrates what she knows, it means that she intends to penalize herself along with her family which will be forced out of Petkoff's farm. She will be describes as a lair who disseminates untrue speech for being fired and as a result it becomes difficult to get another job. In Act III, a second time the dramatist tries to consolidate the theme of social rank and that of money using a long discourse between the same characters, Nicola and Louka, who get a bit of time to stay alone. As customary, Nicola starts giving advices to Louka how to behave as a servant. Louka, then, becomes uncomfortable for telling her that he has got thirty levas in that day, "I've some good news for you. See! A twenty leva bill! Sergius gave me that, out of pure swagger. A fool and his money are soon parted. Theres ten levas more. The Swiss gave me that for backing up the mistress's and Raina's lies about him." (p.67) Nicola describes Sergius as a proud fool who donates his money simply out of his self-conceit. As a man who knows very well the worth of his money, Bluntschli, in accordance with Nicola's view point, gives the ten levas to be a reward for getting a precious service. Unlike Nicola, the realist who even does not like

to deny the fact that he has the spirit of a valet saying, "Yes that's the secret of success in service." (p. 37), Louka appears as a woman who has romantic notions about infringing barriers to jump higher than her class. Louka fiercely lectures Nicola, the sensible man who always proffers her significant counsels. But she does not take care of his advices. She looks at him contemptuously as it is shown in the following conversation. "LOUKA. Yes: sell your manhood for 30 levas, and buy me for ten! [Rising scornfully] Keep your money. You were born to be a servant. I was not. When you set up your shop you will only be everybody's servant instead of somebody's servant.

NICOLA. Ah, wait til you see. We shall have our evenings to ourselves; and I shall be master in my own house, I promise you.

LOUKA. You shall never be master in mine." (p.67)

Nicola reaches the conclusion that Louka is extremely aspirant and will not be a proper wife for him and that is why he intends to retain this woman as a customer in the future rather than a wife. He ironically mentions three terms that should be achieved so as to be able to ensure her dream of marrying a noble man. He says, "I've often thought that if Raina were out of the way, and you just a little less of a fool and Sergius just a little more of one, you might come to be one of my grandest customer, instead of only being my wife and costing me money." (p. 68) Once more, in this play, Shaw deals with status from dissimilar angle.

The following conversation between Raina and Bluntschli is dedicated to implicate the meaning that rich families, including Raina's family, consider themselves higher than the others and that possessions are of gravity in originating one's position. Raina, who decides to save the escapee saying, "I'll save you." (p. 30), arrogantly brings to Bluntschli's knowledge that she belongs to the most famous and the richest family and her father is major Petkoff who always "holds the highest command of any Bulgarian in our army." (p. 31)

She, then, expresses her boast for having the only library in Bulgaria in spite of the fact it includes no more than three ledges of dusty books. Raina claims that she intends to let the man know 'these things to shew you that you are not in the house of ignorant country folk who would kill you the moment they saw your Serbian uniform, but among civilized people. (p. 31) Regardless of the important truth that one's good attributes should be the real criterion to gain reverence rather than belongings, Petkoff's family belief of social level is based on materialist values. In the situation where he is able to reach Raina's room, Bluntschli falls in love with the beautiful girl who hazards to save his life. In Act III, after signing a peace treaty to put an end to the war, Bluntschli, who has got Raina's help as well as that of her mother to flee out Bulgaria using Petkoff's coat, returns claiming that he wants to bring back the coat. His real intention is to see the lovely lass to express his gratitude and to propose her. Meanwhile, Raina becomes offended for the reason that Sergius starts to irritate her for flirting her maid, Louka. Invited by Major Petkoff to be their guest, Bluntschli accepts to stay for he is planning to get a chance to converse with Raina although he is aware that her mother will not be delighted if he remains for she is frightened that her husband may detect the truth of Bluntschli's concealment in their house. Catherine says, "I shall be only too delighted if Captain Bluntschli really wishes to stay. He knows my wishes." (p. 56) At the beginning, Bluntschli's proposal is rejected because of his financial affairs as well as his status which is not equivalent to that of Raina. All of Petkoff's family members, especially Catherine, are content that Sergius' wealth represents a matchless cause that makes Bluntschli cannot emulate Sergius as a suitor for their daughter's hand and that is the reason that Catherine declares, "I doubt, sir, whether you quite realize either my daughter's position or that of Major Sergius Saranoff, whose place you propose to take. The Petkoffs and the Saranoffs are known as the richest and most important families in the country." (p. 83) She annexes, "My daughter, sir, is accustomed to a first-rate stable." (p. 83) Subsequently, when Bluntschli reveals the huge patrimony that he has received after his father's death, everything is changed as it is reflected in the following conversation which used by the writer to convey the idea that Bluntschli comes to be rich. Bluntschli mentions long details concerning his wealth for the aim that he wants to tell Petkoff's family that he becomes the most suitable man for their daughter depending on one's opulence. Bluntschli intends to read the letter that presents that he inherits a large amount of possessions in front of them and that is what makes him the new possessor of a sizeable property. Again the themes of money and that of social position are implicated here.

"BLUNTSCHLI. Oh well, if it comes to a question of an establishment, here goes! [He darts impetuously to the table; seizes the papers in the blue envelope; and turn to Sergius]. How many horses did you say? SERGIUS. Twenty, noble Switzer.

BLUNTSCHLI. I have two hundred horses. [They are amazed] How many carriages? SERGIUS. Three

BLUNTSCHLI. I have two hundred horses. [They are amazed] How many carriages? SERGIUS. Three

BLUNTSCHLI. I have two hundred horses. [They are amazed] How many carriages? SERGIUS. Three

BLUNTSCHLI. I have two hundred horses. [They are amazed] How many carriages? SERGIUS. Three

BLUNTSCHLI. I have seventy. Twenty-four of them will hold twelve inside, besides two on the box, without counting the driver and the conductor. How many tablecloths have you?

SERGIUS. How the deuce do I know?

BLUNTSCHLI. Have you four thousand?

SERGIUS. No." (pp. 83-84)

Bluntschli, then, proudly starts to reckon huge numeral of different types of belongings such as desserts of forks, knives, spoons, and blankets in addition to three hundred valets and some personal estates including a large private domicile and that is what agitates Mr. Petkoff's astonishment who asks saying; "Are you Emperor of Switzerland?" (p. 84) Bluntschli answers that he is a man who occupies the best standing in country, he states, "I am a free citizen." (p. 84)

As it is expected, Catherine's reaction comes to be a confirmation of her family belief that one's position relies on his wealth. She clearly expresses this idea saying, "I shall not stand in the way of her happiness. [Petkoff is about to speak] That is Major Petkoff's feeling also. (p. 84)

At the end of Act one, after a very long conversation which is devoted by the author to discuss the idea of heroism, Raina, who has taken the daring risk to facilitate Bluntschli's flight out of Bulgaria using her father's military coat, starts to admire the man who enters her bedroom without asking permission. She even excites her mother who wants to arrange his departure quickly as reflected in the following dialogue:

"CATHERINE. [shaking him] Sir! [shaking him again, harder] Sir!!

RAINA. [catching her arm] Dont, mamma: the poor darling is worn out. Let him sleep.

CATHERINE. [letting him go, and turning amazed to Raina] The poor darling! Raina!!!" (p. 34)

Although her admiration to Bluntschli and the truth that Sergius begins flirting Louka, Raina does not like to cancel her engagement because she believes in her family's standpoint that Sergius' wealth is peerless. Finally, when he reveals his huge possessions, Bluntschli becomes accepted by the family and the daughter who declares that she will not give her bedstead to sleep in "to the Emperor of Switzerland," but "to my chocolate cream soldier." (p. 85)

Conclusion

It becomes clear that the dramatist, Georg Bernard Shaw, is successful in creating such new type of plays by employing the idea of implication to serve his purpose to set up dialogues between the originated forces of realism and that of idealism. He is able to discuss many conceptions from different points of view as a result of having the potency to implicate these notions within so long debate invented among his characters that are provided with the chances to do so. The researcher, then, wants to conclude that implication should be added to be one of the important devices of drama just as irony, symbolism, soliloquy, and the others.

End Notes

1. William J. Long, English Literature (Delhi: A. I. T. B. S. Publishers, 2007), p. 606
2. William Henry Hudson, An Outline History of English Literature (Noida: Maple Press, 2010), p. 277
3. John Mulgan and D. M. Davin , An Introduction to English Literature (Great Britain: O. U. P., 1947), p. 164
4. Martin Stephen, English Literature: A Study Guide (England: Longman, 2000), p. 266
5. Edward Albert, History of English Literature (Delhi: O. U. P., 1979), p. 465
6. George Bernard Shaw, Arms and the Man Ed., Raghukul Tilak (Delhi: Rama Brothers, 2009), p. 55
7. J. I. Styan, Modern Drama in Theory and Practice (New York: 1988), p. 63
8. Raghukul Tilak, p. 53
9. Robert Fleming Rattray, Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle and an Introduction (London: Kemp Hall Press Ltd., 1934), p. 245
10. Syedah Maryam Iqbal, G. B. Shaw's Conception of Drama in URL: <http://writcrit.wordpress.com/2016/07/17/g-b-shaw-concept-of-drama>. p. 3 of 9
11. R. D. Trivedi, A Compendious History of English Literature (Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 2010), p. 738
12. Ibid. P. 742
13. George Bernard Shaw, Arms and the Man Ed., by A. C. Ward (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd., 1955), p. 16. All subsequent references to this play will be to this edition.
14. George Bernard Shaw, Arms and the Man Ed., by Geoffrey Parker with a personal essay

by John Russell Brown (England: Longman, 1984), p. xxii.

Bibliography

- Albert, Edward. History of English Literature. Delhi: O. U. P., 1979.
- Hudson, William Henry. An Outline History of English Literature. Noida: Maple Press, 2010.
- Iqbal, Syedah Maryam. G. B. Shaw's Conception of Drama. In URL: <http://writercrit.wordpress.com/2016/07/17/g-b-shaw-concept-of-drama>.
- Long, William J. English Literature. Delhi: A. I. T. B. S. Publishers, 2007.
- Mulgan, John and D. M. Davin. An Introduction to English Literature. Great Britain: O. U. P., 1947.
- Rattray, Robert Fleming. Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle and an Introduction. London: Kemp Hall Press Ltd., 1934.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Arms and the Man Ed., by A. C. Ward. London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd., 1955.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Arms and the Man Ed., by Geoffrey Parker with a personal essay by John Russell Brown. England: Longman, 1984.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Arms and the Man Ed., Raghukul Tilak. Delhi: Rama Brothers, 2009.
- Stephen, Martin. English Literature: A Study Guide. England: Longman, 2000.
- Styan, J. I. Modern Drama in Theory and Practice. New York: 1988.
- Trivedi, R. D. A Compendious History of English Literature. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 2010.