

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

ELIZA UNDERMINED: THE ROMANTICISATION OF SHAW'S *PYGMALION*

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

at Massey University, Turitea Campus,

New Zealand

Derek John McGovern

2011

Few twentieth-century plays have been adapted into as many media as Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*. First performed on stage in 1913, it was published in book form (1916), turned into a series of screenplays and films (1934–38), modified for a stage musical (*My Fair Lady*, 1956) and for a film musical (*My Fair Lady*, 1964). In addition, the original text was revised in 1939 and 1941.

This thesis examines the ways in which the play's core themes have been reworked for these adaptations through a nexus of interpreters' and adapters' intentions, the formal conventions of the various media, and the interventions of Shaw himself.

Throughout his screenplay and (stage) textual revisions, Shaw strove to emphasise the anti-romantic nature of the original play and its central concerns of class, independence, and transformation. On the stage, in Shaw's retelling of the *Pygmalion* myth, the point was not that the "creator" (Higgins) and "creation" (Eliza) fall in love, but rather that the latter achieves independence from her autocratic Pygmalion. Marriage between the two, Shaw declared, was unthinkable. To his dismay, however, audiences and critics alike inferred otherwise, often influenced by the interventions of the play's interpreters. So via his prose sequel of 1916 and his 1934–38 screenplay, Shaw emphasised a marital future for Eliza with Freddy Eynsford Hill (a minor character in the original play) in an attempt to satisfy these expectations of romance without compromising Eliza's or Higgins's independence. Despite this, filmmakers continued to imply a Higgins–Eliza romance, whereupon Shaw responded by changing the ending of his stage text and aggrandising Freddy's role for his 1941 "definitive" version. Ultimately, however, this damaged the original play's structural and tonal unity.

Oddly enough, the musical adaptations of *Pygmalion* that appeared after Shaw's death were more successful in portraying Freddy as a credible romantic foil to Higgins. *My Fair Lady* differs significantly from Shaw's *Pygmalion*, however, by suggesting that Higgins's independence undergoes a transformation as profound as Eliza's.

This thesis explores the life cycle of *Pygmalion* and the tensions of authorship caused by adaptations, and, in particular, Shaw's attempts to assert his own conception of the text, and others' determination to modify it.

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge my sincere gratitude to the following individuals for their assistance during the writing of this thesis.

Mr David Grossberg, Executor of the Estate of Alan Jay Lerner, for allowing me permission to reproduce in full Higgins's speech from page 86 of Lerner's *My Fair Lady* libretto. Dr Leonard Conolly, Professor of English at Trent University, for his invaluable information regarding the various published editions of Shaw's *Pygmalion* and the location of the Pascal *Pygmalion* screenplay, and for his generosity in allowing me to read his Introduction to the 2008 Methuen edition of *Pygmalion* prior to its publication. Dr Richard F. Dietrich, Professor Emeritus of English at the University of South Florida, for his invaluable advice on all matters Shavian. Concertmaster Isidor Saslav of the Longview Texas Symphony for providing me with information regarding post-*My Fair Lady* Shavian musical adaptations. Mr Ellwood Annaheim, Lecturer in Musical Theatre at the Catholic University of America, for elaborating on his article regarding Oscar Straus' *The Chocolate Soldier*. Dr Michel Pharand, Director of the Disraeli Project, Queen's University, Canada, for providing me with a copy of Shaw's then-unpublished 1939 letter to William Maxwell. Mr Jeremy Crow, Head of Literary Estates for the Society of Authors, for allowing me to quote from the aforementioned letter. Dr Mary Alemany-Galway, retired Lecturer of the Department of Media Studies at Massey University, for assisting the supervision of my thesis during its formative stages and for providing me with invaluable insight into film theory. Dr Ian Huffer, Lecturer in Media Studies at Massey University, for assisting the supervision of the latter stages of my thesis and for helping me to clarify its ultimate focus. And finally Dr Richard Corballis, Professor of English at Massey University, my principal supervisor, for his expert criticism and extraordinary degree of support throughout the gestation and writing of this thesis.

I also wish to acknowledge my gratitude to the following institutes and organizations. Alfred Publishing Co., Inc., for allowing me to reproduce lyrics from the songs of *My Fair Lady*. The Archival and Special Collections Division of the University of Guelph

Library, for providing me with a copy of Gabriel Pascal's unpublished *Pygmalion* screenplay. The Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, the University of Texas at Austin, for providing me with a copy of Bernard Shaw's 1938 revised *Pygmalion* screenplay, and for allowing me to quote extensively from it.

Copyright notice

WOULDN'T IT BE LOVERLY?

WITH A LITTLE BIT OF LUCK

I'M AN ORDINARY MAN

JUST YOU WAIT

THE RAIN IN SPAIN

I COULD HAVE DANCED ALL NIGHT

ASCOT GAVOTTE

ON THE STREET WHERE YOU LIVE

YOU DID IT

A HYMN TO HIM

SHOW ME

WITHOUT YOU

I'VE GROWN ACCUSTOMED TO HER FACE

Lyrics by ALAN JAY LERNER Music by FREDERICK LOEWE

© 1956 (Renewed) ALAN JAY LERNER and FREDERICK LOEWE

All Rights Administered by CHAPPELL & CO., INC.

All Rights Reserved

Used By Permission of ALFRED PUBLISHING CO., INC.

Table of Contents	Page
Introduction	2
Adaptations of <i>Pygmalion</i>	5
A feminist and socialist play	6
The approach taken in this thesis	9
Scholarly precedents and interventions on <i>Pygmalion</i> and its adaptations	11
Film adaptation theory	23
Chapter One: Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i> : Influences and Textual History	32
Ovid's <i>Pygmalion</i> and subsequent variations	32
Ovid and other mythological influences on Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i>	35
Other (non-mythological) influences on Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i>	36
Similarities to other Shavian works	39
The gestation of <i>Pygmalion</i>	41
The textual history of <i>Pygmalion</i>	45
Chapter Two: Analysis of Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i>	49
<i>Pygmalion</i> : characters	49
<i>Pygmalion</i> : themes and interpretive issues	67
The romanticisation of <i>Pygmalion</i> — and Shaw's initial attempts to constrain it	87
Chapter Three: Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i> Screenplay	97
Introduction	97
A preamble: Shaw's changing theory of adaptation — and two early Shavian films	103
The structure of Shaw's <i>Pygmalion</i> screenplay	112
A note on the screenplay texts	116
Analysis of Shaw's screenplay	118
How Shaw thwarts notions of a Higgins–Eliza romance	132
The ending	139

Conclusions	144
Chapter Four: The 1938 <i>Pygmalion</i> Film	146
Introduction	146
British cinema in the 1930s: prevailing concerns and genres	148
British film censorship in the 1930s — and the unusual case of <i>Pygmalion</i>	153
The Pascal <i>Pygmalion</i> screenplay: an introduction	155
Pascal's screenplay and Shaw's 1938 scenario: a textual comparison	159
Romanticisation in the Pascal screenplay	163
The marginalisation of Freddy	169
Other changes	171
The 1938 <i>Pygmalion</i> film: cast and crew	176
Aesthetics of the 1938 film: an introduction	177
How the film's aesthetics enhances romanticisation	181
The American print of <i>Pygmalion</i>	189
The <i>Pygmalion</i> film's reception	195
Conclusions	199
Chapter Five: The 1939 and 1941 Versions of <i>Pygmalion</i>	204
Introduction	204
The 1939 version	206
The 1941 version	209
How the 1941 version discourages the notion of a Higgins–Eliza romance	218
Minor changes in the 1941 version	225
Conclusions	229
Chapter Six: <i>My Fair Lady</i> (stage version)	235
Introduction: Shaw on musical adaptation, and the genesis of <i>My Fair Lady</i>	235
A preamble: musical adaptation, and the function of music in drama	243
<i>Pygmalion</i> and <i>My Fair Lady</i> : A structural comparison	249

Romanticisation	257
The marginalisation of Freddy	280
Thematic differences between <i>My Fair Lady</i> and <i>Pygmalion</i> (1941 version)	285
<i>My Fair Lady</i> in relation to Broadway musical genres	290
Conclusions	296
Chapter Seven: <i>My Fair Lady</i> (film version)	300
Introduction	300
Hollywood film musicals in the twentieth century: history and sub-genres	302
<i>My Fair Lady</i> the film in comparison with <i>My Fair Lady</i> the stage musical	309
Aesthetic elements of the film: general observations	321
Ways in which the film's aesthetics encourages romance	326
<i>My Fair Lady</i> in comparison with other Hollywood musicals of its time	331
Conclusions	337
Conclusions	340
Appendices	346
Bibliography	383

Key to Abbreviations of Frequently Cited Shavian Sources in the Thesis

- P* *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*. London: Constable, 1916.
- P39* *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*. London: Constable, 1939.
- P41* *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*. London: Constable, 1941.
- CL I-IV* *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt.
- Vol. I (1874–1897) published 1965.
- Vol. II (1898–1910) published 1972.
- Vol. III (1911–1925) published 1985.
- Vol. IV (1926–1950) published 1988.

- CS* *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. London: Prior, 1980.
- BSC* *Bernard Shaw on Cinema*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997.
- ST* *Bernard Shaw's Letters to Siegfried Trebitsch*. Ed. Samuel A. Weiss. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.
- GP* *Bernard Shaw and Gabriel Pascal*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. Toronto: U of T Press, 1996.
- CP 4* *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw: Collected Plays With Their Prefaces, Volume IV*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1972.

ELIZA UNDERMINED: THE ROMANTICISATION OF SHAW'S *PYGMALION*

“I shall not deprecate the most violent discussion as to the propriety of meddling with masterpieces. All I can say is that the temptation to do it, and sometimes the circumstances which demand it, are irresistible” — Bernard Shaw, Foreword to *Cymbeline Refinished*, 1945.¹

¹ From *Geneva, Cymbeline Refinished, Good King Charles* (London: Constable, 1946), 136.

Introduction

Second only to novels, plays have provided the source material for innumerable adaptations into a variety of media, ranging from ballets to symphonic representations. In the twentieth century, the plays of Shakespeare dominated the field of adaptations, serving as the basis for, among other works, operas,² musicals,³ ballets,⁴ and numerous feature-length films.⁵ Few twentieth-century plays, however, have been adapted into as many media as Bernard Shaw's 1912 comedy *Pygmalion*, which was filmed three times in the 1930s and then musicalised for the stage and screen as *My Fair Lady* in 1956 and 1964, respectively.⁶ Noting the enduring popularity of *Pygmalion* as a play, an English-language film (1938), and as a musical, Charles A. Berst argues that, "No other modern play has matched its distinction across these three mediums" (*Pygmalion* 9–10).⁷

Nevertheless, there are significant differences between *Pygmalion*, as Shaw conceived it in 1912, and the cinematic and musical adaptations of the work that appeared between 1935 and 1964. The most striking of these changes is the play's metamorphosis from an anti-romantic social satire to a love story.

² E.g., *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Benjamin Britten, 1960), *Lear* (Aribert Reimann, 1978).

³ E.g., *The Boys from Syracuse* (Richard Rodgers and Lorenz Hart, 1938) and *West Side Story* (Leonard Bernstein and Stephen Sondheim, 1957); these musicals are based on *The Comedy of Errors* and *Romeo and Juliet*, respectively.

⁴ E.g., *Romeo and Juliet* (Sergei Prokofiev, 1935).

⁵ These range from Laurence Olivier's relatively faithful screen versions of *Henry V* (1944), *Hamlet* (1948), and *Richard III* (1955) to Gil Junger's *10 Things I Hate About You* (1999), an adaptation of *The Taming of the Shrew*.

⁶ *Pygmalion* has also been adapted for television on a number of occasions. See Appendix Six for production details of these adaptations.

⁷ One possible exception is Ferenc Molnár's *Liliom* (1909), which was adapted (twice) into a sound film (*Liliom*, Frank Borzage, 1930 and Fritz Lang, 1934), then into a Broadway stage musical (*Carousel*, Rodgers and Hammerstein, 1945), and finally into a Hollywood musical (*Carousel*, Henry King, 1956). Unlike *Pygmalion*, however, all of the *Liliom* adaptations were in different languages from the original (Hungarian), and, in the case of *Carousel*, the setting and the names of most of the characters were radically changed.

This process had in fact begun as early as the first English-language production in London in 1914,⁸ when the actors portraying the lead roles of middle-aged phonetician Henry Higgins and his pupil the teenaged Cockney flower-seller Eliza Doolittle had improvised lines and stage business to imply that a romantic union was inevitable between their respective characters. These modifications obscured the culminating point of the play, namely, that Eliza achieves independence from the bullying Higgins. Indeed, to Shaw, an Eliza–Higgins marriage would have been “a revolting tragedy” (*CL* IV 311).

And yet Shaw had unwittingly encouraged expectations of an eventual marriage between these characters by titling his play “A romance”. In his (1916) prose sequel⁹ to *Pygmalion* — written in response to the efforts of successive stage interpreters to romanticise the relationship between Higgins and Eliza — Shaw sought to clarify his use of the term, stating that the play was “a romance” in the sense that “the transfiguration it records seems exceedingly improbable” (*P*191).¹⁰ However, it is debatable whether theatregoers unfamiliar with the sequel would have inferred Shaw’s intended meaning from his subtitle alone. As David Macey observes, although the term *romance* had in the late eighteenth century assumed the definition of “describing improbable events in highly-blown language” — thus differentiating it from the “broadly realist terms” that had come to define the novel — “*Later usage* [has been] strongly influenced by the shifting semantics of the word ‘romantic’, once used to designate a poetic tradition but *increasingly synonymous with ‘romantic love’* [my emphasis]” (334). Macey goes on to write that,

In contemporary usage, ‘romance’ can be defined as a subgenre of popular fiction

⁸ *Pygmalion* was first performed in a German-language translation in Vienna the previous year.

⁹ This was appended to the first English-language publication of the play in book form, and thereafter retained in all subsequent editions of *Pygmalion*.

¹⁰ I.e., that of Eliza Doolittle, from Cockney flower-seller to high society debutante (and assumed duchess). Shaw went on to write that, “Such transfigurations” are “common enough”, and “have been achieved by hundreds of resolutely ambitious young women since Nell Gwynne set them the example by playing queens and fascinating kings in the theatre in which she began by selling oranges” (*P*191).

written primarily for a female audience, dealing with the emotional tribulations of a heroine, usually beautiful and virginal, and ending with her marriage to a hero who initially spurns her. The classic romance plot . . . traces the transformation of the hero from a distant, insensitive figure who is coldly superior to the heroine, into her tender lover. . . . [T]he goal of the narrative is always monogamous, heterosexual marriage. (334)

Clearly, Shaw did not want his audiences to assume that *Pygmalion* was “a romance” in this sense. Indeed, he had long despised the genre (in the modern sense of the meaning), telling a friend in 1887: “Don’t talk to me of romances. I was sent into the world expressly to dance on them with thick boots — to shatter, stab, and murder them” (*CL* I 163). One could argue, however, that Shaw’s references in his *Pygmalion* sequel both to “Romance”, by which he implicitly meant the popular twentieth-century concept of the genre, and to “a romance”, in the sense of his subtitle — coupled with his descriptions of Higgins and Eliza as “hero” and “heroine”, respectively (*P191*) — did little to elucidate his intentions.

In the interest of clarity, therefore, all subsequent references in this thesis to “romance” denote *romantic love* in the sense of a *love affair* (or reciprocated feelings of strong attraction) or *love interest*, and it is my assumption that all of the non-Shavian writers cited herein share this definition. Similarly, whenever employing the term “romanticisation”, I do so to denote the various attempts by Shaw’s adapters and/or interpreters — whether textually or through specific aesthetic means — either to imply the existence of romantic love or to create a romantic ambience between Higgins and Eliza where Shaw’s text¹¹ does not encourage such an interpretation.

¹¹ By “text”, I mean the specific Shavian text in each instance that is being discussed. As will be seen, these include not only Shaw’s stage editions of *Pygmalion*, but also his own screenplay adaptation of the play.

Adaptations of *Pygmalion*

Ironically, in light of the romanticised screen versions of *Pygmalion* that appeared in the 1930s, it was the continuing romanticisation of the play by stage interpreters that in all likelihood convinced Shaw to allow its film adaptation. Shaw saw in the cinema the potential for permanent, *faithful* records of his stage works. To this end, he elected to write his own screenplay adaptation in 1934 for the first (German) film version of *Pygmalion* (Erich Engel, 1935) making it a contractual requirement that the film-makers adhered to his (translated) scenario. Without having seen the resulting film, Shaw also granted screen adaptation rights on the same condition to Dutch- and English-language productions (*Pygmalion*, Ludwig Berger, 1937; *Pygmalion*, Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard, 1938). For the latter, he revised his screenplay in 1938, depicting what is strongly implied in the 1934 version, but only suggested in the play: that Eliza marries Freddy Eynsford Hill, her youthful admirer. However, the makers of these film versions ignored their contractual obligations, and to varying degrees implied a romantic resolution between Higgins and Eliza.

All three films were domestic commercial successes, but it was almost certainly the international popularity of the *British* film — and its associated potential to influence future stage productions of the play — that compelled Shaw to revise his published stage text twice in 1939 (for, respectively, his 1939 and 1941 editions), on both occasions emphasising (again) that Eliza did not marry Higgins. Following Shaw's death in 1950, the executors of his Estate — ignoring their late client's oft-stated opposition to the musicalisation of *Pygmalion* — granted the musical adaptation rights to the play to Gabriel Pascal, producer of the 1938 film version. The resulting Broadway musical, *My Fair Lady* (Frederick Loewe and Alan Jay Lerner, 1956) was essentially an adaptation of this film, albeit a more romanticised version, while its subsequent *screen* musical incarnation (*My Fair Lady*, George Cukor, 1964) was in some respects more Shavian than its stage counterpart.

However, in each of these English-language stage and screen adaptations — all three of which comprise the central focus of this thesis — Eliza returns to Higgins in the final scene, rather than walking out on him, as she does in Shaw’s play and screenplay. Moreover, to make Eliza’s return to Higgins palatable to audiences, each of these adaptations foreshadows the event through a variety of aesthetic, textual and interpretive means, departing significantly in the process from the play’s central theme of independence.

A Feminist and Socialist Play

Why should these adaptations merit the attention of a thesis? In the first instance, it is my contention that *Pygmalion* is one of the great English-language comedies of the twentieth century — notable not only for its brilliantly drawn characters, wit, satire, and subversiveness, but also for its underlying concerns of socialism, feminism and gender. And yet *Pygmalion*, far from being the “lucky play” described by Maurice Colborne (173), has been frequently misunderstood by critics, sympathetic biographers, and interpreters alike, while its adapters’ collective approach has been arguably encapsulated in *My Fair Lady* librettist Alan Jay Lerner’s suggestion that his romantic resolution had corrected an error of judgment on Shaw’s part (*Lady* 7). Moreover, in an attempt to counter twenty-five years of interventions by interpreters and film adapters, Shaw ultimately tarnished his own play by replacing the original stage edition with an unsatisfactory (1941) “definitive” version that jarringly merged his screenplay with the stage play. In short, as A.M. Gibbs observes, “[T]he history of Shaw’s *Pygmalion* as a literary text, as a text in performance, and as a work that has been subject to major transformations as a result of its adaptation to the media of film and musical comedy, is [in some ways] the story of a lost masterpiece — or, if not lost, substantially altered and obscured” (*Life* 330).

What these various adaptations obscure is that at its heart, *Pygmalion* is, as L.W. Conolly observes, “an Ibsen-inspired tale of a woman’s escape from class and gender oppression to a position of economic and personal freedom” (*Pygmalion* xxxvi).

These were important concerns to Shaw. An early (1880s) campaigner for the equal political rights of women (Peters 92), Shaw argued in 1913 that, “[U]nless Woman repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to her children, to society, to the law, and to everyone but herself, she cannot emancipate herself” (*Quintessence* 56). Shaw would presumably have agreed with Macey’s definition of feminism as having as “its common core . . . the thesis that the relationship between the sexes is one of equality or oppression” (122), although Shaw’s feminist beliefs encompassed elements of radical feminism as well as a decidedly socialist feminist viewpoint. As Macey observes, “[S]ocialist feminism [seeks] to explain the inequality of the sexes in terms of the social relations and economic structures of capitalism, whilst radical feminism tends to argue that the nuclear family or patriarchy — or even men in general — is/are to blame” (122). For his part, Shaw was not opposed to marriage *per se*, but he despised males who entered into it for the purpose of “ministering to [their sexual] appetite[s]”, arguing that “to treat a person as a means to an end is to deny that person’s right to live” (*Quintessence* 52). As a socialist, he believed that in order “[t]o effect women’s equality, legally and economically, . . . Capitalism had to be transformed into Fabianism” (R. Weintraub, *Fabian* 4), a form of socialism¹² that he defined as “constitutional action” (Shaw, *Socialism* 447). As Rodelle Weintraub observes, it was Shaw’s contention that,

Capitalism . . . forced women of the lower classes into illicit prostitution, in which the wages and working conditions were frequently far superior to those of the factory or laborer’s wife, and upper-class women into legal prostitution, i.e., marriage. (*Fabian* 4)

Indeed, to Shaw, it was an outrage that prostitution offered greater financial and physical security to a woman than “twopence half-penny an hour in a match factory, with a chance of contracting necrosis of the jawbone from phosphorus poisoning . . .” and the prospect of being told that one is “too old at twenty-four” and consequently finding “their places

¹² Shaw defines socialism as “equality of income and nothing else. The other things are only its conditions or its consequences” (*Socialism* 94).

filled by younger girls” (*Socialism* 199–200). Shaw expresses some of these concerns in *Pygmalion* through Higgins’s observation that a working-class woman of Eliza’s age (eighteen) “looks a worn out drudge of fifty a year after shes¹³ married” (P125) and the same character’s graphic prediction of Eliza’s life should she return to “the life of the gutter”: “Work til you are more a brute than a human being; and then cuddle and squabble and drink til you fall asleep” (188). Further echoing Shaw, Higgins warns Eliza that marriage into the upper classes is not the solution to her feelings of insecurity: “If youre going to be a lady, youll have to give up feeling neglected if the men you know dont spend half their time snivelling over you and the other half giving you black eyes” (187).

Weintraub writes that Shaw’s “cure for prostitution” was “Opportunity for economic security, not marriage”, and that if afforded the advantage of education and socialist redistribution of wealth, “women would proclaim, like Lina in [his 1910 play] *Misalliance*,

I am an honest woman: I earn my living. I am a free woman: I live in my own house. . . . I am strong: I am skilful: I am brave: I am independent: I am unbought: I am all that a woman ought to be. (*Fabian* 5)

In *Pygmalion*, Eliza aspires to the same goals and qualities as Lina, telling Higgins towards the end of the play: “I’ll let you see whether I’m dependent on you. If you can preach, I can teach. I’ll go and be a teacher. [I’ll teach] What you taught me. I’ll teach phonetics” (P189). For his part, Higgins initially mocks, then threatens Eliza for seeking economic independence from him, although he reiterates throughout the play that being a

¹³ Shaw only employed apostrophes where confusion might otherwise be caused. Hence, he dispenses with the apostrophe here for the contraction “she’s”, but elsewhere writes “she’ll”, and not “shell”. I have retained Shaw’s punctuation in all extracts from his letters and plays. However, where Shaw uses spacing between letters (instead of italics) to indicate emphasis — e.g., “I told y o u to leave” — I have used italics to avoid any possible confusion. I have also eschewed Shaw’s (intermittent) use of spaces between semicolons, question marks and exclamations, e.g., “What the devil !”, in all quoted passages.

“confirmed old bachelor” (P130) he is uninterested in marrying her (or indeed any woman). Her primary value to him, he suggests, is a secretarial one: “[S]he’s useful. She knows where my things are, and remembers my appointments” (P156).

Is Higgins a misogynist? If we accept Miriam Dixson’s definition of misogyny as “[involving] . . . conscious and unconscious negative feelings about and attitudes towards women . . . [and ranging] from a vague uneasiness and desire not to be with them more than absolutely necessary, through dislike, to contempt, hostility and hate” (300), then Higgins is arguably in the middle of this spectrum. He claims to idealise his mother — “My idea of a lovable woman is something as like you as possible,” he tells Mrs Higgins (P143) — but dismisses all women under the age of forty-five as “idiots” (143), and is consciously irritated by their ability, as he perceives it, to “upset everything” (130). And although towards the end of the play Eliza has become the exception to this generalisation, as indicated by his suggestion that she return to his home “for the sake of good fellowship” (186), he implies that this is because she has achieved honorary *male* status in his eyes — “You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl” (190). Moreover, Higgins’s behaviour at the end of the play — including his smug prediction that Eliza, in spite of her walk-out, will obey his shopping order “right enough”, and his rattling of the coins in his pocket “*in a highly self-satisfied manner*” (191) suggestive of “property ownership” (Gibbs, *Life* 332) — strongly implies that he does not regard Eliza as an equal.

Clearly, then, as a feminist and a socialist, Shaw could not have countenanced a resolution in which Eliza abandons her desire for personal and economic freedom in exchange for a romantic afterlife with an overbearing upper-middle-class misogynist.

The Approach Taken in This Thesis

This thesis examines the metamorphosis of *Pygmalion* from 1912 stage play to 1964 screen musical, analysing how the play’s central themes and concerns changed over time as a consequence of its adapters’ emphasis on the romanticisation of the Higgins–Eliza

relationship. As such, it is the first study that traces the evolution of *Pygmalion* over a half-century period through multiple media (screenplay, film, stage musical and film musical). It also examines Shaw's repeated attempts to regain authorial control over the meaning of his play, firstly via his prose sequel (1916), then through his screenplay (1934; revised 1938), and finally through modifications to his stage text (1939 and 1941), and the implications of these modifications for the original stage text (which was subsequently displaced by the 1941 version).

This thesis principally focuses on formal and aesthetic considerations, addressing *how* Shaw's play was altered for cinema and the musical theatre, rather than analysing *why* this happened. My rationale for doing so is primarily because I feel that the complexity of the formal transformations and creative decisions in themselves deserve the full attention of a thesis. This is not to suggest that the exploration of the influence of wider contextual factors is not a valid area for further study, nor do I wish to imply that the "how" and the "why" are mutually exclusive. Indeed, this thesis briefly considers some of the contextual factors that impacted upon the changes made to *Pygmalion* over the course of its adaptations. This is done so with the goal of providing some historical context for the adaptations, considering, in particular, the extent to which each can be said to be typical of its respective genre conventions at the time.

My decision to focus tightly on formal and aesthetic considerations is also a response to some of the potential limitations of approaching texts from a top-down theoretical perspective. Kristin Thompson, for example, observes, that cinematic analysis has often turned to "Marxist and psychoanalytic film theory [for] large-scale explanations of how people and society work" (*Armor* 9). However, since "Marxism and psychoanalysis work from the top down, arriving at the artwork with a huge body of major assumptions already made . . .", detailed consideration of the formal features of an artwork can be lost (9). While I concur with Thompson's acknowledgement that focusing on the aesthetic realm is a "limited" approach, it is — as she observes — by no means an unimportant one (9).

Scholarly Precedents and Interventions on *Pygmalion* and its Adaptations

Main lines of criticism on Shaw's *Pygmalion*. *Pygmalion*, both at the time of its first London production and in critical opinion until at least the 1950s, was generally regarded as one of Shaw's less substantial works.¹⁴ More recent criticism has identified the thematic richness of *Pygmalion* — in particular, its concerns with class distinctions, independence and transformation — and the ways in which these themes are skillfully interwoven in the play. As Jean Reynolds observes in a 1994 essay, while through the interventions of Higgins, Eliza experiences “a powerful transformation” that frees her “from the prison of her former existence”,

[her] victory is only part of Shaw's purpose. . . . Shaw's artistic intention is to unite Higgins and Eliza, although not in the wedding ceremony that many theatergoers have wished for. Having unwittingly declared war on the 'old speech' at the foundation of British class structure, the two are co-conspirators in an assault upon the British establishment” (212).

The basis of that assault focuses on “the unnaturalness of class distinctions, their impermanence, and the undesirability and possibility of removing them” (Dukore, *Aspects* 286). As Berst observes, the play asserts “the importance of the individual personality which such distinctions obscure” (*Art* 198). Via the respective transformations of Eliza and her dustman father, Alfred Doolittle — effected through clothes and language in the first instance and money in the second — Shaw offers “a radical critique of a class-based society” (Greene 102) that explores “the very foundations of social equality and inequality, and the values and value judgements, the perceptions of worth and status, which come in turn to surround them” (Mugglestone 373–74). As Berst observes, Shaw's point is that, “If a flower girl can to all appearances be made into a

¹⁴ Colbourne, writing in 1949, argues that *Pygmalion* “is neither a perfect nor an extraordinary play” (173–74), while his fellow Shaw biographers A.C. Ward (1951) and St. John Ervine (1956) offer only faint praise, with the latter describing it as coated “with agreeable jam”, but essentially a single-issue play about phonetics (459–60).

duchess in six months, the only things which distinguish a duchess are inherited social prestige and money, neither of which she has earned” (*Art* 198–99).

Much recent scholarly attention has also focused on the play’s mythological allusions. Michael Holroyd sees *Pygmalion* as an integration of “Faustian legend with Cinderella fairy tale” (*Pursuit* 325), while Berst argues that Shaw employs “levels of myth” to “counterbalance and enhance [the play’s] prosaic concerns”, demonstrating that, “The fairy tale of Cinderella does not in fact complement the classical tale of [Ovid’s] *Pygmalion*; rather, one plays against the other most ironically” (*Art* 197). Sabine Coelsch-Foisner sees the play as “a magnificent travesty of its [Ovidian] model in terms of both plot and genre” (234), while Vicki R. Kennell asserts that Shaw “offers two basic revisions of Ovid’s story: the change from supernatural agency to natural explanations, and the replacement of physical creation by linguistic transformation” (73).

My own view is that Shaw incorporates mythological and fairy tale elements in the play to encourage but then *subvert* conventional expectations, for just as the play ends with not Eliza but her *father* going off to be married, it also concludes with its nominal hero (Higgins) being kissed by his *mother*, rather than by the nominal heroine (Eliza). As Lisa S. Starks observes, “Shaw’s *Pygmalion*, a parody of romance, deliberately refuses potential audience desire for a happy romantic ending in which Higgins is reunited with his ‘creation.’ Such an ending contradicts Shaw’s logic in *Pygmalion*, primarily because his Eliza exceeds the role of Galatea in the myth” (46). Moreover, as Bentley notes, in spite of the play’s titular connection with Ovid’s *Pygmalion*, “[Higgins] is not really a life-giver at all” and by the end of the play it is his so-called creation, rather than her creator, who proves “the vital one” (*Shaw* 125).

Indeed, it is the ending, and its implications for the central theme of independence, that has attracted more scholarly attention than any other single element in the play. As Nicholas Grene observes, “The relationship between Higgins and Eliza, and particularly its conclusion, has become *the* critical question of *Pygmalion*” (111). Maurice Valency,

writing in 1973, echoes the view of many earlier critics when he argues that, “A love scene at the end of the play was really obligatory” for Eliza and Higgins, rather than Shaw’s “inept . . . rationalistic conclusion” (314–15). However, since the late 1950s — and particularly during the last three decades — critical opinion has largely departed from this view. Holroyd sees Shaw’s ending as appropriately and “carefully ambiguous”, arguing that while Eliza desires a romantic relationship with Higgins, “What [the latter] wants is less clear” (*Pursuit* 330). Arthur Ganz argues that Eliza and Higgins *are* romantically attracted to each other (183), but sees the ending as fittingly ambiguous given that *Pygmalion* resonates throughout with “unresolvable Shavian conflicts” (178–79). Grene also sees the conclusion as an “unresolved conflict between [Eliza and Higgins]” — two people with “attractions to one another” — and argues that it “is the right ending . . . because it is the ultimate expression of the inalienable individuality of each” (112–13).

My own view of the conclusion is that, whilst Shaw flirts with the possibility of romantic attraction between Eliza and Higgins (and this is part of his subversity), by the end of the play he decisively establishes that there is no compatibility between these two characters, whose “consciousness and values are on different tracks . . .” (Berst, *Pygmalion* 127). Eliza’s decision to leave Higgins signifies her realisation that she has outgrown her emotional and intellectual independence on him, and *that* is the point of the ending. In all other respects, as Bentley observes, “[Eliza’s] fate is as unsettled as yours or mine” (*Shaw* 124). Indeed, Eliza’s *economic* future may even be bleak, as several commentators have suggested,¹⁵ given her lack of money and qualifications, coupled with her linguistic separation from her former (working-class) environment (Jane M. Miller 209). It is difficult, however, to accept that a person such as Eliza, who in the course of the play has metamorphosed from a “vulnerable and poverty-stricken” flower seller in Act I to a “feisty and self-confident woman” by Act V (Conolly, *Pygmalion* xxxvii) will remain economically “worse off than she started”, as Lili Porten suggests (75). And whether Bentley is right that Eliza will ultimately marry *someone* — although, as he observes, that person will not be Higgins — the final scene constitutes “a true naturalistic ending — not

¹⁵ E.g., Bauschatz (109), Havelly (29).

an arbitrary break, but a conclusion which is also a beginning” (123–24).

The textual history of *Pygmalion*. James Melton Creel, Conolly, Diderik Roll-Hansen, Arnold Silver, Berst, Holroyd, and Gibbs have all discussed the textual history of *Pygmalion*. Of these commentators, only Conolly (2008)¹⁶ discusses all three stage editions (1916, 1939, 1941) of the play. Creel’s (1985) study¹⁷ principally analyses the (minor) differences between Shaw’s 1912 shorthand manuscript, the 1913 rough proof typescript, two authorised 1914 magazine versions, and the first (1916) edition in English in book form, while Conolly (2008) provides a more comprehensive overview of the textual history of *Pygmalion* from 1912 shorthand manuscript to the final (1941) edition.¹⁸ Conolly also discusses the 1916 sequel, Shaw’s experiment with a different (unpublished) ending during a 1920 London production, and briefly compares the 1939 ending with the 1916 version. While he provides no analysis of the individual additional scenes unique to the 1941 edition, he argues that this edition “enhance[s] and reinforce[s] the play’s thematic imperatives . . .” and provides “greater credibility to Eliza’s decision to marry [Freddy]” (xlix–l).

Roll-Hansen (1967)¹⁹ also compares the 1916 and 1941 editions, arguing that the former is much superior to the latter, but does not analyse all of the new scenes in the 1941 version.²⁰ Similarly, Arnold Silver in his 1982 psychological study of Shaw,²¹ compares

¹⁶ “Introduction.” *Pygmalion*. Bernard Shaw. London: Methuen, 2008. xiii–li.

¹⁷ “The Phonetic Play: *Pygmalion* from Manuscript to First Printing.” PhD Thesis. U of Texas at Austin, 1985.

¹⁸ Conolly also reproduces in the appendix two sections of dialogue originally intended for Act III that exist only in Shaw’s 1912 shorthand manuscript and typescript transcription of the same manuscript, together with Shaw’s 1934 and 1938 (revised) *Pygmalion* screenplay endings.

¹⁹ “Shaw’s *Pygmalion*: The Two Versions of 1916 and 1941.” *Review of English Literature* 8.4 (1967): 81–90.

²⁰ He also proceeds from the mistaken assumption that Shaw had authorised the romanticised 1938 *Pygmalion* film ending, describing Shaw’s supposed approval of this scene as “a problem in gerontology rather than in literary criticism” (88).

²¹ *Bernard Shaw: The Darker Side*. Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1982. Silver devotes two chapters to *Pygmalion*: “*Pygmalion*: The Two Gifts of Love”, in which he discusses the 1916 edition and “The

the 1916 and 1941 versions, but disregards two of the new scenes from the latter.²² Although Silver provides one of the longer analyses of the 1916 prose sequel to date, he overlooks the issue of whether Shaw's explanation of Eliza's reasons for marrying Freddy — which lie at the core of the sequel — was psychologically valid, merely observing in passing (and without providing textual substantiation) that Shaw “heaps scorn on Freddy Hill and turns him into the chief agent of Eliza's humiliation” (255).

In contrast, Berst in his 1995 study,²³ while acknowledging his qualms about the status of the 1941 version (which he focuses on here) as the “definitive” *Pygmalion* text (46), offers largely positive criticism of this edition. However, he does not discuss all of the differences between the 1916 and 1941 versions,²⁴ nor does he argue a preference for the ending of either stage edition. Holroyd (1989)²⁵ briefly discusses the ending to the 1939 edition, incorrectly describing it as Shaw's “final version of the end”, and suggests that it was an unnecessary modification to the 1916 edition (332), while Gibbs (2005),²⁶ in a thematic overview of *Pygmalion*, argues that the 1916 edition is preferable to the 1941 version, which he describes as structurally and artistically flawed (333).

In this thesis, I provide the most extensive analysis to date of the 1939 ending, comparing it (for the first time) with the 1941 version, and providing the first comprehensive study of the differences between the 1916 and the 1941 versions. This thesis also places a

Playwright's Revenge”, in which he discusses the (1916) sequel and the 1941 edition. Silver's thesis proceeds from the contentious assumption that Shaw's 1916 prose sequel and his 1941 edition constitute an act of misguided revenge against Mrs Patrick (“Stella”) Campbell, the actress who portrayed Eliza at the first London production and with whom Shaw was once romantically involved, and he describes the 1941 edition as “profaning [the 1916 edition]” (276).

²² Of these two (a phonetics lesson and a romantic scene involving Eliza and Freddy), he writes that, “Neither need detain us, . . . since neither scene rises above a pedestrian level” (273).

²³ *Pygmalion: Shaw's Spin on Myth and Cinderella*. New York: Twayne, 1995.

²⁴ For example, he overlooks the changes that Shaw makes in his 1941 edition to the Act V discussion between Eliza and Higgins.

²⁵ *Bernard Shaw. Volume II: 1898–1918: The Pursuit of Power*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1989.

²⁶ *Bernard Shaw: A Life*. Florida: Florida UP, 2005.

greater emphasis on Freddy, examining how Shaw's decision in his sequel to confirm this character's status as Eliza's future husband significantly influenced his 1939 and 1941 textual changes. In addition, this thesis examines the structural and tonal changes arising from Shaw's inclusion of additional scenes in his 1941 edition — an aspect that has hitherto received scant attention — and addresses the implications of Shaw's decision to displace earlier editions of his stage play with an untested “hybrid” version.

Shaw's 1934–38 screenplay. Shaw's *Pygmalion* screenplay has been principally discussed by Dukore, Creel, and Roll-Hansen. Dukore (1980)²⁷ provides by far the most extensive *published* analysis of the screenplay at six and a half pages, in addition to reproducing Shaw's entire *Pygmalion* scenario in his book. Significantly, however, in each instance in which Shaw has modified instructions and/or dialogue from the (revised) 1938 screenplay for his (final) 1941 edition of the play, Dukore has reproduced the latter version rather than the actual screenplay. In my own analysis of Shaw's screenplay, I instead refer to the (unpublished) 1938 scenario.

Dukore provides some historical background to Shaw's early experiences in film adaptation, Shaw's determination to write his own screenplays, and his attempts “to protect his own domain” with respect to screen versions of *Pygmalion* (69). Focusing on Shaw's 1938 revised screenplay, Dukore provides a one-page overview of Shaw's attempts in his scenario to enhance Freddy's romantic eligibility while at the same time deleting “virtually every suggestion of Eliza's possible romantic interest in Higgins” (71). Roll-Hansen (1967)²⁸ restricts his analysis of Shaw's screenplay to the final three scenes of the 1934 scenario, which he discusses in somewhat dismissive terms,²⁹ while Creel

²⁷ “Introduction.” *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw*. London: Prior, 1980. 1–178.

²⁸ “Shaw's *Pygmalion*: The Two Versions of 1916 and 1941.” *Review of English Literature* 8.4 (1967): 81–90.

²⁹ Roll-Hansen also overlooks the fact that Shaw rewrote all three scenes for his revised 1938 screenplay.

(1985)³⁰ confines himself to brief and largely descriptive accounts of new scenes from Shaw's 1938 revised screenplay.

This thesis constitutes the first detailed analysis of Shaw's screenplay, focusing on his 1938 revised version and his renewed attempts (particularly in the wake of the 1935 and 1937 *Pygmalion* films) to discourage the romanticisation of the Higgins–Eliza relationship. It also constitutes the first comparative study of Shaw's 1938 screenplay and Gabriel Pascal's (unpublished) screenplay, the precursor text of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film — and a work hitherto overlooked in scholarly analysis.³¹

The 1938 *Pygmalion* film. The 1938 *Pygmalion* film has received relatively little scholarly attention. Donald P. Costello (1965)³² provides background information on the film (together with accounts of earlier Shavian screen adaptations), including its casting, financing, and reception, and briefly examines the film's fidelity to Shaw's 1941 stage edition — although not to Shaw's actual screenplay — noting the romanticisation of the Higgins–Eliza relationship in the film through performance, textual deletions of Higgins's “antiwoman and antimarriage speeches” (76), and the use of “[t]he framing power of the camera” in terms of making (suggestively romantic) “editorial comments” (71). However, Costello incorrectly assumes that Shaw approved the final (romantic) scene in the film,³³ and also appears not to realise that the American screen version of *Pygmalion*, which he is clearly referring to throughout,³⁴ differs in several significant

³⁰ “The Phonetic Play: *Pygmalion* from Manuscript to First Printing.” PhD Thesis. U of Texas at Austin, 1985.

³¹ The 1938 *Pygmalion* film was based on the Pascal screenplay, rather than on Shaw's scenario. In other words, the film was based on a screenplay (Pascal's) that was, in turn, based on another screenplay (Shaw's).

³² *The Serpent's Eye: Shaw and the Cinema*. Indiana: Notre Dame UP, 1965.

³³ In his brief discussion of the film, Roger Manvell (1979) makes a similar assumption, asserting that Shaw allowed “from the start the romantic interpretation of the *Pygmalion*-*Galatea* / Higgins-Eliza relationship to replace his own deromanticized version . . .” (66).

³⁴ This is indicated by Costello's statement that in the film “all reference [*sic*] to Doolittle's nonmarried state are cut” (76) — an observation that applies only to the truncated American screen version.

respects from the British one. In contrast, Dukore (1980)³⁵ notes some of the differences between the American and British versions, and comments on the impact of censorship on the former. He also examines the film's performances, directing, editing and cinematography, providing a brief overview of differences between Shaw's screenplay and the film — noting, in particular, the thematic downplaying of the former's social resonances and the romanticisation of the Higgins–Eliza relationship. In addition, Dukore briefly addresses how both the German and Dutch *Pygmalion* films depart from and romanticise Shaw's 1934 screenplay.

In her 2001 essay on the (1938) *Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady* films,³⁶ Sara Martin speculates as to why Shaw objected to the musicalisation of *Pygmalion*, and provides anecdotal accounts of the making of both films. Her principal focus is a comparison between the casting and performances of the two films with regard to Higgins, Eliza and (to a lesser extent) Freddy, and she concludes that the chief difference between these adaptations is *Pygmalion*'s greater conclusiveness in terms of its romantic resolution (54). She also provides some analysis of scenes in the *Pygmalion* film that deal with Eliza's metamorphosis (43),³⁷ arguing that these exhibit “a deeper understanding of Eliza's outward transformation than the play” (43). Similarly, Starks (1997)³⁸ compares the 1938 *Pygmalion* film with the screen version of *My Fair Lady*, examining the performance of gender in each film, and concluding that while the latter “is still about fair ladies, . . . in contrast to the earlier *Pygmalion*, it foregrounds the role of fashion in creating or designing them” (49). Starks also discusses how the 1938 film influenced “a string of Pygmalion-themed Hollywood romances” from Billy Wilder's *Sabrina* (1954) to *Pretty Woman* (Garry Marshall, 1990) and Sydney Pollack's 1995 remake of *Sabrina*

³⁵ “Introduction.” *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw*. London: Prior, 1980. 1–178.

³⁶ “Resistance and Persistence: *Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady*, Two Film Versions of G.B. Shaw's *Pygmalion*.” *Enter Text* 1.2 (Spring 2001): 37–60. Web. 1 July 2005. <<http://www.brunel.ac.uk/4042/entertext1.2/martin.pdf>>

³⁷ I.e., the bathroom scene and the Embassy Ball scene.

³⁸ “Educating Eliza: Fashioning the Model Woman in the ‘Pygmalion film’.” *Post Script* 16.2 (1997): 44–55.

(47).

This thesis expands on these previous studies by identifying and examining the specific aesthetic means³⁹ by which the 1938 *Pygmalion* film romanticises the Higgins–Eliza relationship, while also addressing (for the first time) how the American version accentuates this romanticisation through different music, editing, and shot composition. It also provides a historical context for the film, particularly with regard to the prevailing genres of British cinema in the 1930s.

***My Fair Lady* (stage and screen versions).** Bentley (1958),⁴⁰ Myron Matlaw (1958),⁴¹ Stanley S. Solomon (1964),⁴² and Coelsch-Foisner (2006)⁴³ all briefly address how the 1956 stage version of *My Fair Lady* departs thematically from *Pygmalion* (stage play). Bentley sees the entire second (and final) act of *My Fair Lady* as representing the very essence of the conventional romance that Shaw had sought to parody in *Pygmalion* (135–36). Similarly, Matlaw argues that *My Fair Lady* is “a very different play throughout” from *Pygmalion* in that it changes Higgins from a “‘Miltonic mind’ who lives on an entirely different plain, a plain where sex and marriage, indeed, are unknown” into a romantic hero (18–19), while Solomon focuses on the ending of *My Fair Lady*, which he describes as a sentimentalised contradiction of the meaning of *Pygmalion* (63). Coelsch-Foisner, in contrast, while not providing any analysis of specific scenes, sees *My Fair Lady* as a romanticisation of *Pygmalion* from the outset (236).

³⁹ I.e., performances, editing, direction, music, shot composition.

⁴⁰ “My Fair Lady.” *Modern Drama* 1.2 (Sept. 1958): 135–36.

⁴¹ “The Denouement of Pygmalion.” *Modern Drama* 1 (1958): 29–34.

⁴² “The Ending of ‘Pygmalion’: A Structural View.” *Educational Theatre Journal* 16.1 (Mar. 1964): 59–64.

⁴³ “*Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady*: From Social Satire to Musical Romance.” *Interlitteraria* 11 (2006): 233–45.

Paul Bauschatz's 1998 essay⁴⁴ is the lengthiest and most detailed of the few comparative studies between the stage editions of *Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady*. Bauschatz focuses on *My Fair Lady*'s modification what he describes as "the peculiar structural aspects" of *Pygmalion* by depicting what only occurs off-stage in the latter (182) — and how, in turn, these modifications create "logical problems" while also shifting the emphasis of the earlier play from its concerns with money and class to a story about two people who fall in love (189–90). Unlike Bentley, Matlaw, and Solomon, however, Bauschatz argues that the romanticised ending is satisfactory because of the departures from Shaw's text that foreshadow it (190).⁴⁵ Bauschatz also provides a table of the basic structural differences between the 1916 edition of *Pygmalion* and the various adaptations that followed,⁴⁶ ending with the stage version of *My Fair Lady*.

Alan Jay Lerner (1978),⁴⁷ Gene Lees (1990),⁴⁸ Stephen Citron (1995),⁴⁹ and Keith Garebian (1998)⁵⁰ all provide accounts of the difficulties incurred in adapting *Pygmalion* for the musical stage, and of the early production history of *My Fair Lady*.⁵¹ In addition, Lees offers some commentary on the use of sung soliloquy in *My Fair Lady* as a means of conveying Higgins's and Eliza's romantic feelings for each other, while Citron addresses the use of orchestral underscoring with reprise melodies and the use of (musical) key changes as a means of emphasising both sadness and resolution.

⁴⁴ "The Uneasy Evolution of *My Fair Lady* from *Pygmalion*." *Shaw* 18 (1998): 181–96.

⁴⁵ These changes are not generally elaborated on, however.

⁴⁶ I.e., Shaw's 1934–38 screenplay, the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, and also the 1941 stage edition.

⁴⁷ *The Street Where I Live*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

⁴⁸ *Inventing Champagne: The Worlds of Lerner and Loewe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

⁴⁹ *The Wordsmiths: Oscar Hammerstein 2nd and Alan Jay Lerner*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.

⁵⁰ *The Making of 'My Fair Lady'*. Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1998.

⁵¹ Lees, Citron, and Garebian all proceed from the perspective that *My Fair Lady* is the superior work of the two. Lees describes *Pygmalion* as "a drawing-room comedy of interminable talk" (89), while Citron argues that Shaw's explicit rejection in his 1916 sequel of a Higgins–Eliza romance was unconvincing, and that Lerner was right to have disregarded it (279).

In surveys of the American musical theatre, Lehman Engel (1972)⁵² focuses on the extent to which *My Fair Lady* succeeds as an integrated musical, and also (1975)⁵³ examines the types of songs that it incorporates; Ethan Mordden (1998)⁵⁴ addresses *My Fair Lady*'s less conventional elements;⁵⁵ and Scott McMillan (2006)⁵⁶ discusses the musical's downplaying of *Pygmalion*'s concerns with working class poverty and its transformation of Higgins into a romantic character and reformed misogynist. Geoffrey Block (1997)⁵⁷ and Joseph P. Swain (2002)⁵⁸ also provide analyses of *My Fair Lady* in their respective studies of the Broadway musical. Block notes the influence of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film in *My Fair Lady*'s romanticised characterisations of Higgins and Eliza, and examines how music is employed to unite these two characters, in part by having each adopt the other's "musical characteristics" (237); similarly, Swain addresses how lyrics and (in particular) music turn Higgins into a romantic hero.⁵⁹ Conversely, Stacy Wolf (2002),⁶⁰ in her analysis of the stage version of *My Fair Lady* from both a feminist and lesbian perspective, argues that the adaptation fails to "develop, either musically or in dialogue, the coupling of Higgins and Eliza . . .", and that only "in an extratextual reading that presumes normative heterosexuality" can it be considered a romantic story (151).⁶¹

⁵² *Words with Music*. New York: MacMillan, 1972.

⁵³ *The American Musical Theater*. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

⁵⁴ *Coming Up Roses: The Broadway Musical in the 1950s*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998.

⁵⁵ E.g., its lack of an opening musical number and its relatively small amount of dancing.

⁵⁶ *The Musical as Drama*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006.

⁵⁷ *Enchanted Evenings: The Broadway Musical from Show Boat to Sondheim*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

⁵⁸ *The Broadway Musical: A Critical And Musical Survey*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2002.

⁵⁹ In his "Introduction", Swain also discusses the issue of musical adaptation with regard to twentieth-century Broadway musicals, and defines his concept of "a good musical play" (2).

⁶⁰ *A Problem Like Maria: Gender and Sexuality in the American Musical*. Michigan: Michigan UP, 2002.

⁶¹ In her essays "'We'll Always Be Bosom Buddies': Female Duets and the Queering of Broadway Musical Theater" [*GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 12.3 (2006): 351–76]] and "'Defying Gravity': Queer Conventions in the musical *Wicked*" [*Theatre Journal* 60:1 (March 2008): 1–21], Wolf also briefly addresses how *My Fair Lady* conforms in certain respects to the conventions of the mid-twentieth-century Broadway musical. Her comments are noted in Chapter Six.

In contrast with its stage counterpart, the screen version of *My Fair Lady* has received virtually no sustained scholarly attention. Apart from Martin's aforementioned essay, the principal studies consist of brief analyses by Gerald Mast (1987)⁶² and Patrick McGilligan (1991).⁶³ Mast compares the respective musical programmes of the stage and screen versions, and examines some of the film's aesthetics — in particular, its use of colour to emphasise the differences between Higgins's and Eliza's habitats and the artificiality of the British upper classes — while McGilligan provides some historical context to the making of the film, including casting decisions, and briefly analyses its visual and aural qualities. There are also published interviews with the film's director, George Cukor, who discusses, among other things, its stylisation, editing, and shot composition.⁶⁴

This thesis considers both the stage and screen versions of *My Fair Lady*. Beginning with the former, it offers an alternative hypothesis to previous theories concerning the reasons for Shaw's objection to the musicalisation of *Pygmalion*, and then analyses the extent to which the stage version of *My Fair Lady* — both structurally and thematically — is based on the 1938 *Pygmalion* film rather than Shaw's play. Expanding on Block's and Swain's analyses, it also elaborates on the musical means by which *My Fair Lady* romanticises the Higgins–Eliza relationship, while at the same time examining the numerous textual changes that Lerner makes in this regard. In addition, *My Fair Lady*'s treatment of Freddy — both musically and textually — is considered for the first time. This thesis then provides the first detailed discussion of the screen version of *My Fair Lady*, analysing the extent to which it constitutes a faithful adaptation of its stage counterpart. In particular, it addresses the specific aesthetics that the film employs to convey the likelihood of a Higgins–Eliza romance.

⁶² *Can't Help Singin': The American Musical On Stage And Screen*. Woodstock: Overlook, 1987.

⁶³ *George Cukor: A Double Life*. New York: St. Martin's, 1991.

⁶⁴ Lambert, Gavin. *On Cukor*. New York: G.P. Putnam, 1972; and Long, Robert Emmet. *George Cukor: Interviews*. Jackson, USA: UP of Mississippi, 2001.

Film Adaptation Theory

The novel-to-film bias. Through considering the adaptation of *Pygmalion* into film, my thesis forms part of a wider body of work on filmic adaptations of literary texts.

Reviewing the field, Brian McFarlane argues that,

In view of the nearly sixty years of writing about the adaptation of novels into film, writing across a broad critical range, it is depressing to find at what a limited, tentative stage the discourse has remained.⁶⁵ The relationship between a film and its precursor novel is a topic on which everyone feels free to comment while rarely evincing any concomitant need to explore the complex network of connections between the two texts. (*Adaptation* 194)⁶⁶

Significantly, however, McFarlane's comments, and indeed the focus of his study, pertain to the adaptation of *novels*, rather than plays, thus underlining a bias (whether intentional or not) that has pervaded academic writing on cinematic adaptation since the publication of George Bluestone's generally acclaimed *Novels into Film* in 1957.⁶⁷ Indeed, with the exception of a number of Shakespeare-in-film studies during the last forty years,⁶⁸ no comprehensive English-language study of cinematic adaptations of plays has emerged.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ In his introduction to *Film Adaptation* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000), an anthology of essays incorporating critical opinion on adaptation from the 1950s to the late 1990s, James Naremore expresses a similar view: "The very subject of adaptation has constituted one of the most jejune areas of scholarly writing about the cinema" (1).

⁶⁶ *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

⁶⁷ Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1957.

⁶⁸ E.g., Roger Manvell's *Shakespeare and the Film* (Worthing: Littlehampton, 1971), Jack J. Jorgen's *Shakespeare on Film* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1977), Stephen M. Buhler's *Shakespeare in The Cinema: Ocular Proof* (Albany: New York State UP, 2002), Sarah Hatchuel's *Shakespeare: From Stage to Screen* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004).

⁶⁹ However, in a rare instance of a playwright other than Shakespeare being discussed with regard to the issue of adaptation from plays to films, Christine Geraghty devotes one chapter of her *Now a Major Motion*

In his 2003 essay,⁷⁰ Thomas Leitch alludes to this scholarly neglect when he asks, “Why has the novel, rather than the stage play or the short story, come to serve as the paradigm for cinematic adaptations of every kind?” Although Leitch describes this query as one of “several fundamental questions in adaptation theory [that] remain[s] unasked, let alone unanswered” (*Fallacies* 150), it is an issue that he himself never fully addresses.

A partial explanation for this academic neglect, however, may lie in Joy Gould Boyum’s assertion that the “translation” of a play to a film does not necessarily constitute an act of significant artistic endeavour:

To stage a play on film isn’t of necessity to *adapt* it — one can, if one wishes, simply photograph a theatrical performance whole, whether unimaginatively, as early movies did from the vantage point of a seat in the orchestra, or with a bit more filmic sense, as in the movies made of Peter Brook’s *Marat/Sade* and Olivier’s London stage performance of *Othello*. To bring a novel to the screen is something else altogether. For paradoxical as it may seem, though novel and film are closer than play and film in both form and function, to make a movie of a novel involves a great deal more in the way of translation. (39–40)⁷¹

Thus the perception that successful screen versions of novels require greater creativity on the part of their adapters may explain any *intentional* academic neglect of theatrical adaptations. One could equally argue, however, that a genuinely *cinematic* adaptation of a play — that is, one that is not a merely photographic record of a theatrical production — demands as much, if not more, creativity. Indeed, this thesis, through its exploration of the many creative choices made in the 1938 film adaptation of *Pygmalion*, challenges the assumption that screen versions of plays intrinsically involve less artistry — while at the same time seeking to rectify the scholarly neglect of film adaptations of plays.

Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008) to various film versions of Tennessee Williams’s plays.

⁷⁰ “Twelve Fallacies in Contemporary Adaptation Theory.” *Criticism* 45.2 (2003): 149–71.

⁷¹ *Double Exposure: Fiction Into Film*. New York: Universe, 1985.

Fidelity. No other issue related to the study of film adaptation has attracted more critical attention and controversy than fidelity. In 1982 Christopher Orr suggested that, “Given the problematic nature of the discourse of fidelity, one is tempted to call for a moratorium on adaptation studies” (72).⁷² Fourteen years later, McFarlane found the discourse still equally contentious:

Is it really ‘Jamesian’? Is it ‘true to Lawrence’? Does it ‘capture the spirit of Dickens’? At every level from newspaper reviews to longer essays in critical anthologies and journals, the adducing of fidelity to the original novel as a major criterion for judging the film adaptation is pervasive. No critical line is in greater need of re-examination — and devaluation. (*Adaptation* 8)

Indeed, two opposing camps have long existed: one that regards film as an inherently lesser art form than literature, and, accordingly, tends to view the adapter as “botcher”; and, increasingly, one that questions the primacy of literature and regards strict fidelity of a given film to its source material as neither desirable nor feasible.⁷³ Representing the first camp, Virginia Woolf argued in 1926 that,

All the famous novels of the world, with their well-known characters, and their famous scenes, only asked, it seemed, to be put on the films. What could be easier and simpler? The cinema fell upon its prey with immense rapacity, and to this moment largely subsists upon the body of its unfortunate victim. But the

⁷² “The Discourse on Adaptation.” *Wide Angle* 6.2 (1984): 72–76.

⁷³ Proponents of the second camp include Carlo Testa, who in *Masters of Two Arts: Re-creation of European Literatures in Italian Cinema* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 2002) disparagingly refers to fidelity as “the F-word” (4); Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan, whose anthology *Adaptations from Text to Screen, Screen to Text* (London: Routledge, 1999) challenges the assumption that cinema is intrinsically more simplistic than literature and emphasises the intertextual elements at work in adaptations; and Mireia Aragay, whose *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005) is critical of “a binary, hierarchical view of the relationship between literature and film, where the literary work was conceived of as the valued original, while the film adaptation was merely a copy . . .” (12).

results are disastrous to both. The alliance is unnatural. Eye and brain are torn asunder ruthlessly as they try vainly to work in couples. The eye says: ‘Here is Anna Karenina.’ A voluptuous lady in black velvet wearing pearls comes before us. But the brain says: ‘That is no more Anna Karenina than it is Queen Victoria.’ (269–70)

Ten years later Walter Benjamin argued in his influential essay⁷⁴ that the mechanically reproductive nature of film rendered it the “most powerful agent” of dual processes “intimately connected with contemporary mass movements” that both detach “the reproduced object from the domain of tradition” and simultaneously reactivate it by “permitting the reproduction to meet the beholder or listener in his own particular situation . . .” (223). However, as Mireia Aragay observes, it was the perceived obliteration of the “aura” of the original work — namely its “authenticity, authority, originality, [and] uniqueness” — through adaptation that most concerned Benjamin and successive generations of commentators through to the late 1970s (11–12).⁷⁵ Orr — a clear proponent of the second camp — has responded to these concerns by arguing that the obliteration of the viewer’s memory of the precursor text should in fact be the *goal* of the film adapter, adding that, “The claim that an adaptation is faithful to its source means only that the critic’s memory of the literary source has been consumed and effaced by the adaptation” (73). In any event, Orr argues, a more meaningful approach to the study of film adaptation is to approach each adaptation as “a product of the culture that created it and thus an expression of the ideological forces operative in that culture at a specific historical moment” (73). By examining an adaptation from an ideological perspective, he writes,

⁷⁴ “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” This was first published in German in 1934 and translated into English in 1968 (*Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968).

⁷⁵ These included the noted film theorist André Bazin, who in the 1950s argued in his posthumously published *What is Cinema?, Volume II* (Berkeley: California UP, 1971) that a play is “unassailably protected by its text”, and that the directors of filmed plays should attempt to adhere to the same “direction”, as he puts it, of the original play (84–85). Above all, he argued, the cinema should respect “[t]he dramatic primacy of the word”, and not throw the play “off center” by attempting to endow it with the greater reality of the cinema (86).

the issue is not whether the adapted film is faithful to its source, but rather how the choice of a specific source and how the approach to that source serve the film's ideology. Thus lapses of fidelity — the changes that occur in the passage from literary to filmic text — are of interest primarily as a means of reconstructing the film work; i.e., they provide clues to the ideology embedded in the text. (73)

Orr's view echoes that of Dudley Andrew, who in 1980 described the issue of fidelity as "tiresome", and argued that, "It is time for adaptation studies to take a sociological turn" (10, 14).⁷⁶ More recently, Aragay has expressed a similar view, asserting that, "Adaptation . . . is a cultural practice; specific adaptations need to be approached as acts of discourse partaking of a particular era's cultural and aesthetic needs and pressures . . ." (19). Meanwhile, other commentators have called for a *medium-specific* approach to the comparative study of adapted works from different media. Seymour Chatman argues that, "a close study of film and novel versions of the same narrative reveals with great clarity the peculiar powers of the two media. Once we grasp those peculiarities, the reasons for the differences in form, content, and impact of the two versions strikingly emerge" (123).⁷⁷ Similarly, Robert Stam argues that the issue of media specificity is "[c]rucial to any discussion of adaptation" (16).⁷⁸ The questions that need to be addressed, he goes on to write, include: "What can films do that novels cannot? Are some stories 'naturally' better suited to some media alone? . . . Can stories 'migrate' from a less appropriate to a more appropriate medium?" (16).

However, while I acknowledge the inevitability of changes "the moment one abandons the linguistic for the visual medium" (Bluestone 5), it is not my contention that the

⁷⁶ Andrew, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.

⁷⁷ "What Novels Can Do That Films Can't (and Vice Versa)." *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980–81): 121–40.

⁷⁸ "Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation." *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Eds. Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.

various adaptations of *Pygmalion* differ from the original play in significant thematic respects as a consequence of the unique qualities of their specific media. Nor, as previously discussed, is this thesis primarily concerned with the cultural forces that may have influenced these adaptations.

Moreover, my own position with respect to the issue of fidelity as it relates to the various adaptations of *Pygmalion* lies somewhere between the two aforementioned camps. On the one hand, I reject the notion, as identified by Deborah Cartmell, that adaptations of works that have achieved a significant degree of academic “respectability” should “convey an ‘anxiety of influence’, [namely] an awareness that the reproduction is both dependent on and inferior to the original” (29, 31), and I instead respect the value in themselves of (in this case) the *Pygmalion* adaptations. In other words, I do not regard any precursor text, purely by dint of its status as the previous (or original) text, as being ineffably “superior” to its adapted versions. At the same time, I must acknowledge a measure of disappointment that the meanings communicated through Shaw’s play, as I see them, have not been fully articulated through these adaptations. However, *why* they have failed to do so is not attributable to any limitations of their medium, but instead is the consequence of decisions by their creators to “correct”, in particular, Shaw’s so-called perversity in not allowing a Higgins–Eliza romance.

Indeed, as Leitch observes in his 2007 study of film adaptation,⁷⁹ “correction” is a frequent strategy of adapters, who “correct what they take to be the flaws of their originals”. This is especially true of Hollywood adaptations, he goes on to write, which often provide “improbably happy endings” for their source material (*Discontents* 100).⁸⁰ Leitch defines *correction* as one of a number of strategies that fall under the general

⁷⁹ *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 2007.

⁸⁰ Leitch also cites the example of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, which reunited “Eliza Doolittle [with] Henry Higgins instead of pairing her with Freddy Eynsford-Hill”, but incorrectly asserts that this change was made “with the explicit blessing of George Bernard Shaw” (100).

heading of what he terms “*adjustment*” — “[b]y far the most common approach to adaptation” — “whereby a promising earlier text is rendered more suitable for filming . . .” (98).⁸¹ As Leitch observes, adjustment equates approximately to Andrew’s concept of *borrowing*, defined by the latter as the strategy by which the adapter “employs, more or less extensively, the material, idea, or form of an earlier, generally successful, text” (Andrew 98). Adjustment and borrowing also correspond to Geoffrey Wagner’s concept of *commentary*, whereby “an original is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect [and thus] could also be called a re-emphasis or re-structure . . .” (Wagner 223).⁸²

Screenplays as texts in their own right. Leitch questions why “one particular precursor text or set of texts [has] come to be privileged above all others in the analysis of a given intertext”, and asks rhetorically, “What gives some intertexts but not others the aura of texts?” (*Fallacies* 168).

One such intertext that has largely been overlooked in academic circles is the screenplay. And yet to Béla Balázs, the screenplay “is not an unfinished sketch, not a ground-plan,

⁸¹ Other strategies of *adjustment* that he defines include *updating*, whereby “the setting of a canonical classic [is transposed] to the present in order to show its universality while guaranteeing its relevance to the more immediate concerns of the target audience”; *compression*, by which a lengthy work (typically a novel) is subjected to “a great deal of systematic elision and omission”; and *expansion*, “[t]he opposite tendency” to *compression*, by which a short story, song, or other brief work is developed into a “full-blown” narrative (99–100).

⁸² Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated UP, 1975. Wagner, drawing on earlier work by Béla Balázs, also identifies two other types of film adaptation: “*transposition*, in which a novel is directly given on the screen, with the minimum of apparent interference . . . [and] *analogy*, which must represent a fairly considerable departure for the sake of making another work of art” (222–23). While McFarlane welcomes Wagner’s classifications, arguing that that they “categorize adaptation so that fidelity to the original loses some of its privileged position” (10), Aragay sees Wagner’s application of his classifications “to specific adaptations [as having] the perverse effect of foregrounding the severely limited theoretical and practical validity of any model that relies on the centrality of the literary source or ‘original’” (16).

not a mere outline of a work of art, but a complete work of art in itself” (249). The screenplay, he goes on to write,

can present reality, give an independent, intelligible picture of reality like any other form of art. True, the [screenplay] puts on paper scenes and dialogues which later are to be turned into a film; but so does the drama put on paper the stage performance. And yet the latter is regarded as a literary form superior to the former. (249)⁸³

In general, commentators have not shared Balázs’ concerns, however. Wagner argues that, “[F]ew screenplays can be said to have literary value” (29), while several film scholars⁸⁴ have noted (and implicitly endorsed) film director Ingmar Bergman’s opinion of the screenplay as “always a half-finished product, a pale and uncertain reflection” (qtd in Törnqvist 18). Millicent Marcus, although lamenting the lack of public recognition for screenplays and the “anonymity” of their authors, sees the screenplay as “a functional text, like a user’s guide or a recipe, whose nature is therefore provisional and utilitarian, yet also aesthetic in that it aims toward ulterior realization in another art form (as opposed to a washing machine or a soufflé)” (23). In short, she argues, a screenplay “is not an end in itself but looks ahead to its fulfilment in another medium” (23).⁸⁵ However, as Balázs observes, one can argue that screenplays are indeed “finished” works in their own right by employing an analogy between such texts and musical scores:

Written music is only a symbol of the music to be produced by the instruments, but nevertheless no one would call a Beethoven sonata ‘unfinished’ or a ‘sketch’ because of this. We even have film scripts now which are intended for reading and could not be shot — just as there are ‘book’ plays which could never be staged.

⁸³ *Theory of the Film*. [1949] Translated by Edith Bone. New York: Dover, 1970.

⁸⁴ E.g., Morris Beja in his *Film and Literature* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1979), 78.

⁸⁵ Marcus, Millicent. *Filmmaking by the Book: Italian Cinema and Literary Adaptation*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins UP, 1993.

Nevertheless such scripts are not novels or short stories or stage plays — they are film scripts. They belong to a new literary form. (249–50)

Leitch, however, asserts that the screenplay is a performance text — “a text that requires interpretation first by its performers and then by its audience for completion — whereas a literary text requires only interpretation by its readers” (*Fallacies* 154). And yet one could equally argue that a screenplay may be read only, just as Leitch himself acknowledges that an audience may read Oscar Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest* and imagine the playwright’s epigrams “paced and inflected any way they like” (154).

In Chapters Three and Four, I will consequently explore the individual value of Shaw’s and Gabriel Pascal’s respective *Pygmalion* screenplays.

Chapter One: Shaw's *Pygmalion*: Influences and Textual History

Ovid's Pygmalion and Subsequent Variations

The Story of Pygmalion and the Statue is found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Book the Tenth, and was written in approximately *A.D.* 10. Geoffrey Miles writes that, "Ovid is the inevitable starting-point for any discussion of Pygmalion. . . . Ovid's is the oldest version we have,¹ the only substantive ancient version, and the source of all subsequent versions. Indeed, the story as we have it may be essentially his invention — a literary creation rather than a genuine myth" (332).

Miles writes that, "[T]he dominant tone of the story is humorous and erotic" (333). In it, a Cypriot sculptor named Pygmalion, disgusted by the behaviour of the local prostitutes, "the blasphemous Propoetides", creates the sculpture of the ideal woman (often referred to as Galatea in modern retellings of the story). Having fallen in love with his creation, Pygmalion prays to Aphrodite (Venus) to give it life, and the sculpture subsequently awakens. Pygmalion and the woman marry, and later their daughter, Paphos,² is born. Interestingly, Galatea is *not* the name of Pygmalion's creation, who is nameless in Ovid's story; there is, however, a sea-nymph named Galatea who appears in *Metamorphoses*, Book the Thirteenth. Consequently, "the two characters are occasionally confused, just as Pygmalion is sometimes confused with his namesake, the tyrannical king of Tyre in Virgil's *Aeneid*" (Miles 345). Shaw himself appears to have been under the impression that Galatea was the name of the statue in Ovid's tale.³ According to Meyer Reinhold, the French writer-philosopher Thémiseul de Saint-Hyacinthe de Cordonnier (1684–1746)

¹ He notes, however, that two earlier Christian writers, Clement of Alexandria and Arnobius of Sicca, make references to a character named Pygmalion "in the course of polemics against pagan idolatry, both citing as their source the third-century BC scholar Philostephanus. According to them, Pygmalion was not a sculptor, but a young Cypriot — king of Cyprus, according to Arnobius — who blasphemously fell in love with the sacred statue of Aphrodite in her temple, and tried to make love to it" (332).

² Paphos is a male in some later versions of the tale.

³ He refers to "Galatea" as the name of Pygmalion's statue in his capacity as drama critic in two successive reviews in 1896 in the *Saturday Review* (*Drama* II 564, 619).

may have been the first person to use the name Galatea in reference to the Pygmalion story, in a *roman* written in the early 1740s,⁴ although it was not until Jean-Jacques Rousseau's extremely popular *scène lyrique*⁵ *Pygmalion* (written in 1762; first staged in 1770) that Galatea became widely known as the name of the statue (Reinhold 317).

During the same period, a number of eighteenth-century German writers, beginning with Johan Jakob Bodmer (1698–1783), whose poem *Pygmalion und Elise* appeared in 1747, used the name Elise to refer to the statue (317).⁶ It is possible that the name Elise provided Shaw's inspiration for the name Eliza in his own reworking of the myth. Reinhold notes that, "The invention of the name Elise for the statue would appear to have its origins in the frequent confusion of the two mythic Pygmalions. The name Elissa (Elisa) as [a] variant for Dido, sister of Pygmalion of Tyre, made it easier to associate her name with the myth of the sculptor" (317). Elise also features in one of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's (1786) letters from Italy, in which he refers to "Pygmalion's Elise, whom he had shaped to his wishes and given as much truth and existence as an artist can . . ." (Goethe 115).

Miles writes that, "The Romantics, with their lofty conception of the role of the artist, were inevitably attracted to the Pygmalion legend" (338).⁷ Among the works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were Rousseau's aforementioned *Pygmalion* (first performed in English in 1779), Thomas Lovell Beddoes's 1825 poem *Pygmalion, or The*

⁴ Reinhold does not, however, provide the name of this *roman*. I have not been able to locate it through the sources that he cites.

⁵ I.e., a short play with musical interludes. The music in this instance was composed by Horace Coignet.

⁶ Reinhold writes that there was also a *third* name for Pygmalion's statue at the time: Agalméris (317).

⁷ Miles writes that in the centuries before the Romantic period, variations of Pygmalion appeared only intermittently. Although "Pygmalion has only a flickering presence in the Middle Ages," (334), the legend appears more often in literature of the Renaissance. "[However,] on the whole, Renaissance writers take a harshly unsympathetic, satirical view of Pygmalion . . ." (334–35). He goes on to note that, "The most sympathetic Renaissance response to the Ovidian story is one which does not mention Pygmalion at all: the awakening of Hermione's statue in the last scene of Shakespeare's [*The*] *Winter's Tale*" [c.1610] (336–37).

Cyprian Statuary, and William Morris's 1868 poem *Pygmalion and the Image*.⁸ There was also a one-act opera, *Il Pigmalione* (composed in 1816, but not performed until 1960), by the popular Italian composer Gaetano Donizetti. Miles goes on to write that, "Around the beginning of the nineteenth century there emerges a new, far more serious view of Pygmalion as the artist-creator, a solitary, often tormented, sometimes godlike genius, wrestling with the limitations of his material to create and bring to life a vision of ideal beauty" (338). One of these was Mary Shelley's 1818 novel *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus*, which Miles argues "has become a kind of dark shadow of Pygmalion, a myth embodying the horror rather than the joy of lifeless matter becoming alive" (340).

A later nineteenth-century work, though less serious overall in tone and content, is W.S. Gilbert's three-act blank verse play *Pygmalion and Galatea* (1871), a popular success with which Shaw would have been familiar from its London revivals in 1883–84 and 1888.⁹ Jane M. Miller argues that it "must be acknowledged as [Shaw's *Pygmalion*'s] partial forerunner at least" (210), a view shared by Essaka Joshua (97) and Porten (71). In Gilbert's retelling of Ovid's story,¹⁰ Pygmalion is a *married* sculptor who creates a statue of his beautiful wife, Cynisca. Jokingly, Cynisca urges Pygmalion to regard the statue as her surrogate during her absences from home. Cynisca's jealousy is profoundly aroused, however, when the statue (Galatea) becomes human. Martin Meisel writes that this Galatea is "born fully grown and articulate, but with innocent eyes and naïve modes of expression . . .", and "[her] direct responses and naïve simplicity are the measure of her superiority to the world and the standpoint from which it is judged . . ." (419). Miller writes that the play

⁸ Morris (1834–96) and Shaw were friends.

⁹ Shaw was living in London during this period. The play is not mentioned in any of his published diaries, however. Shaw was not yet working as a drama critic at the time of its revivals.

¹⁰ Reinhold notes that Gilbert's play constituted the first major work on the Pygmalion legend in English to use the Galatea character since the English translation of Rousseau's *Pygmalion* in 1779 (319). Miller notes that in Gilbert's version, Pygmalion is *not* a misogynist (210).

serves to emphasise the hypocrisy riddling everyday society. . . . [Galatea] cannot be tolerated in a 'civilised' society. Her qualities also serve as a contrast to the shortcomings of others, particularly Cynisca. In the end she sacrifices her life and happiness for Pygmalion and teaches the beautiful Cynisca the meaning of pity and love. Gilbert reverses the obvious interpretation of the two characters; it is the statue who possesses the qualities of warmth, kindness and pity, while the woman is cold, pitiless and hard. (211)

Ovid and Other Mythological Influences on Shaw's *Pygmalion*

Commentators have disagreed regarding the extent to which Shaw's *Pygmalion* is based on Ovid's tale. Valency states emphatically that, "The myth upon which *Pygmalion* is based has, of course, nothing to do with the legend of Pygmalion and Galatea" (319). To Joshua,

The links between the two are at once both obvious and tenuous: obvious, because they both share the theme of the transformation of a person; tenuous, because Shaw's play does not contain, except metaphorically, any of the key episodes of Ovid's tale. Shaw has no statue, no sculptor, no island, no supernatural vivification, and no marriage between the two protagonists. (97)

Yet to Berst, it is the points of difference between the two works that provide the most illuminating comparison:

Like Pygmalion, Higgins harbors a degree of misogyny and seeks to create an ideal in Eliza. Though he is an artist in his sense of dedication, he is a cerebral one, quite Shavian, and his final proposed union is intellectual, not physical. Parallel to the legend, he creates his ivory statue by Act III, decking it in fashionable clothes and jewels, and the god of Eliza's psyche (urged, in part, by Venus) breathes life into it by Act IV, giving her sudden, clear vision of her Pygmalion. However [in contrast to Ovid's tale], the creator and the created are

out of tune, one existing in a world of intellectual austerity, the other inhaling a vibrant sense of being and seeking emotional fulfillment. The attraction of opposites is held in suspension by the stubborn independence of each, and the play ends in tension, not resolution. (*Art* 200-01)¹¹

Berst, in common with many other commentators, also argues that Shaw invokes many elements of the Cinderella tale, noting that, like the fairy tale, *Pygmalion* includes a “ragged, dirty, mistreated but beautiful waif”, “cruel stepmother, a coach, a midnight hour of reckoning, slippers, and a desperate deserted gentleman” (201). He goes on to argue that, “[A]lthough *Pygmalion* absorbs much of the romantic nimbus [of the Cinderella tale], it converts the legend to its own artistic ends. The incidents are jumbled chronologically, reapportioned, changed in context, and they involve variant emotions and significance” (201).

J. Ellen Gainer also perceives Cinderella elements in Shaw’s play, but argues that *Pygmalion* “more subtly invokes *Snow White*” (227). She points to the chocolate with which Higgins tempts Eliza in Act II, sharing it with her in much the same way as the Evil Queen shares the poisoned apple with Snow White, and the full-length mirror that confronts Eliza in Act II,¹² which becomes as much “a vehicle for self-appraisal and self-recognition” for Eliza as it does for Snow White (228–29).

Other (Non-Mythological) Influences on Shaw’s *Pygmalion*

In common with many commentators, Miles notes the many similarities in Shaw’s plot to Chapter 87 of Scottish author’s Tobias Smollett’s picaresque novel *The Adventures of*

¹¹ Miles argues that *Pygmalion*, as “The classic treatment of the story as a fable of education and class,” can also be traced back to William Caxton’s use of the Ovidian tale in his *Six Books of Metamorphoseos* [*sic*] (c.1480). Miles writes that Caxton “saw the Ovidian story as a metaphor for a lower-class woman transformed by an upper-class educator into a lady and a potential wife” (343).

¹² This scene does not occur in the original play, but is depicted in both the 1938 film adaptation and the 1941 stage edition.

Peregrine Pickle (1751). In this chapter, subtitled “Peregrine sets out for the Garrison, and meets with a Nymph of the Road, whom he takes into Keeping [*sic*], and metamorphoses into a fine Lady” (Smollett 490), Peregrine Pickle, a country gentleman, encounters a beggar-woman and her daughter of approximately sixteen on a country road, and for a small sum of money purchases the girl from her mother. In common with *Pygmalion*’s Eliza, the girl employs bad language (“volubility of tongue”) and is given a bath, against which she protests violently. Pickle is amazed, however, by her transformation after bathing. He subsequently teaches her to speak well, initially using sentences from the works of Shakespeare, Otway, and Pope, and arranges for her to have lessons in French and dancing from his Swiss valet. In time he passes her off in polite society. The girl later elopes with Pickle’s valet. Pickle eventually forgives them and presents them with a gift of five hundred pounds¹³ with which to purchase a coffee house and tavern (490–96).

Several months before the first London production of *Pygmalion* in 1914, with reports now circulating in British newspapers that his play was based on Smollett’s story, Shaw attempted to deflect the suggestion of plagiarism in a humorous but candid letter to *The Observer*:

I have never read *Peregrine Pickle*, and therefore did not know until the Berlin correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* pointed it out, that Smollett had got hold of my plot. He is quite welcome to it.

I may add that if I had read it[,] the result would have been just the same. If I find in a book anything I can make use of, I take it gratefully. My plays are full of pillage of this kind. Shakespeare, Dickens, Conan Doyle, Oscar Wilde, Granville Barker: all is fish that comes to my net. In short, my literary morals are those of Molière and Handel. (*CP* 4 799)

¹³ In his sequel to *Pygmalion*, Shaw writes that Freddy and Eliza receive “a wedding present of £500 from the Colonel to Eliza” (*P196*). As Valerie Grosvenor Myer observes, “It cannot be coincidence that both Eliza and Peregrine’s beggar girl are married off with wedding presents of [the same amount]” (431).

The latter half of this letter is revealing in Shaw's frank acknowledgement of his literary borrowings. In the case of *Pygmalion*, the Dickensian influences are apparent in elements of both the plot and characterisations of the play. Martin Quinn argues that there is a marked similarity between the beginning of Act I of *Pygmalion* and Chapter Two of *The Pickwick Papers* (1836–37), while Harold F. and Jean R. Brooks (96) perceive similarities between the character of Alfred Doolittle in the play and that of Noddy Boffin in *Our Mutual Friend* (1864–65), a view shared by Stanley Weintraub, who regards the latter as “a clear precursor” (*Nondramatic* xxii). Moreover, Michael Grosvenor Myer notes that Doolittle, “like Boffin . . . is transformed by an eccentric will into a ‘Golden Dustman’” (508). Myer also argues that there are “several distinct echoes of [Roger “Rogue”] Riderhood’s first visit to Lightwood and Wrayburn in Book I, Chapter 12 of *Our Mutual Friend*” in Doolittle’s first conversation with Higgins and Pickering in Act II of *Pygmalion* (508). Quinn sees “one precursor for Eliza Doolittle” in the character of Lizzie Hexam in *Our Mutual Friend*, who, in common with Eliza, overcomes “poverty and hard times” (147–48) and regards the Eynsford Hills of *Pygmalion* as “pathetic reminders of the Dedlock cousins in [Dickens’s] *Bleak House* [1852–53] and the Alfred Lammles in *Our Mutual Friend*” (148–49). Michael Goldberg argues that there are strong similarities between Dickens’s *Great Expectations* (1860–61) and *Pygmalion*, including the relationship between Pip and Magwitch, which he argues is similar to that of Eliza and Higgins. He goes on to write that, “Both Liza and Pip are virtually recreated by their social sculptors and both end up resenting their respective benefactors, who in different ways dote on their creations” (115). He also argues that, “The ending of *Pygmalion* is obviously a creative criticism of the ending of *Great Expectations*” [*sic*] given that Shaw, unlike Dickens, denies his readers the “sentimental palliatives”¹⁴ [that the latter] so readily supplied” (117).¹⁵

¹⁴ Goldberg is referring here to Shaw’s prose sequel for *Pygmalion* rather than to the ending of the actual play.

¹⁵ In his 1937 Preface to a Limited Editions Club printing of *Great Expectations*, which he personally edited, Shaw argues that Dickens’s rewritten ending was “psychologically wrong” (*Non-Dramatic* 60).

Other possible literary influences include Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (c. 1611), which, like *Pygmalion*, "deal[s] with fathers and daughters, with manners, and with the mixed blessings of language" (Silver 189); the British author Florence Marryat's novel *Out of His Reckoning* (1879), in which "an eccentric playwright and confirmed bachelor takes under his wing a thirteen-year-old waif . . ." who is subsequently transformed into a lady (Eisenbud 442); and Henry James's 1892 short story *The Real Thing*, in which "a number of strikingly detailed anticipations of *Pygmalion*" occur: "Colonel Pickering . . . recalls Major Monarch; in their impoverished gentility the Eynsford Hills recall the Monarch ménage; the characterization of Higgins as part godlike artist and part unfeeling brute echoes the lesson preached by Jack Hawley — that the ideal cause of art demands the dismissal of the Monarchs" (Briden 17–20). Sara Moore Putzell suggests that Mary Elizabeth Braddon's 1909 novel *Our Adversary* may have "provided at least part of the literary background for Shaw's play" (32). In both works, she notes, a Cockney is turned into a lady. However, "[t]he differences between their [respective] treatments . . . are instructive." Whereas "Braddon aims at realism and achieves romance," she goes on to write, "Shaw uses the romance to achieve realism . . ." (32). R.F. Rattray argues that there are echoes of Eliza in the title characters of Rudyard Kipling's *Badalia Herodsfoot* (1893) and Somerset Maugham's *Liza of Lambeth* (1897) (*Subconscious* 219).

Similarities to Other Shavian Works

Greene argues that, in terms of Shaw's oeuvre, "[I]n many respects *Pygmalion* is a Pleasant Play, . . . written out of its time".¹⁶ He goes on to write that,

In the major trilogy of 1901–05, *Man and Superman*, *John Bull's Other Island* and *Major Barbara*, Shaw had developed his own discursive form of comedy of ideas. In the plays that followed[,] he defied audience expectations of formal structure even more recklessly; *Getting Married* (1908) and *Misalliance* (1909)

¹⁶ In 1898 Shaw published two volumes entitled *Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant*. The former comprised *Arms and the Man*, 1894, *Candida*, 1894, *The Man of Destiny*, 1895 and *You Never Can Tell*, 1897; the latter *Widowers' Houses*, 1892, *The Philanderer*, 1898, and *Mrs Warren's Profession*, 1893.

are almost pure discussion plays and Shaw was proud of their plotlessness.¹⁷ . . . In *Pygmalion*, by contrast, Shaw returned to his earlier technique of giving his audience what appeared to be the popular romance they wanted but with anti-romantic Shawian treatment. (*Critical* 101)

Dukore argues that, “In theme and form, *Pygmalion* resembles [Shaw’s] *Candida* and therefore *A Doll’s House*¹⁸ as well, though in *Pygmalion* the thematic and formal parallels to Ibsen’s seminal work are less pronounced than in Shaw’s earlier play. Like Nora [in *A Doll’s House*] and Morell [in *Candida*], Liza Doolittle is a doll in Henry Higgins’s doll house.” He goes on to note that, “Like Nora, but unlike Morell, she becomes self-reliant. Like Nora, and like [*Candida*’s] Marchbanks too, she leaves the doll house, an independent human being” (*Art* 60). Paul Lauter also perceives similarities in the endings of *Pygmalion* and *Candida*, and in the way in which “Shaw manipulates audience expectations by providing two levels of identification in the play: an apparent hero (heroine in *Candida* and *Pygmalion*) toward whom our sentimental, stereotypic orientation draws us; and the real hero, with whom we are forced to identify if we reflect on the action” (the ‘puny and adolescent’ Marchbanks and the ‘cold and anti-social’ Higgins, respectively)” (16–18).

Several commentators have noted the similarity of the dishevelled rent collector Lickcheese in *Widowers’ Houses* (1892) to that of Doolittle. John A. Mills also notes Shaw’s previous use of Cockney characters in *Man and Superman* (1903), *Major Barbara* (1905), and *Passion, Poison, and Petrification* (1905) and suggests that they “might be regarded as studies, made in preparation for the masterwork on the subject [of dialect]” (48–50).

¹⁷ In his 1945 Foreword to *Cymbeline Refinished* (1937), Shaw writes that, “Plot has always been the curse of serious drama, and indeed of serious literature of any kind” (135).

¹⁸ *A Doll’s House* (1879), by Henrik Ibsen (1828–1906).

The Gestation of *Pygmalion*

Given the number of sources/influences, we can assume that *Pygmalion* had an unusually long gestation. As early as 1897, Shaw was writing that he was consumed with an idea for a play in which actor Forbes Robertson “shall be a west end gentleman and [actress Mrs Patrick Campbell] an east end dona [*sic*] in an apron and three orange and red ostrich feathers” (*CL* I 803). Although fifteen more years passed before Shaw finally wrote *Pygmalion*, his description of this “east end dona” is virtually identical to his stage directions for Eliza Doolittle’s deportment in Act II of the play. As Grene observes, “it is remarkable how clear and how unchanged Shaw could carry the idea of a play for years before execution” (*Critical* 101).

J.L. Wisenthal argues that the germination of *Pygmalion* began even earlier; he points to an 1891 letter to actress Florence Farr¹⁹ in which Shaw provides a foretaste of the transformation theme that dominates the play:

You have reached the stage of the Idiotically Beautiful. There remain the stages of the Intelligently Beautiful & finally of the Powerfully Beautiful; & until you have attained the last you will never be able to compel me to recognize the substance of that soul of which I was shown a brief image by Nature for her own purposes.
(qtd in Wisenthal 123)

Wisenthal argues that, “This letter is indeed remarkable as an anticipation of *Pygmalion* — even its final sentence is echoed in Higgins’ references to Eliza in Act V as a soul and as a part of humanity ‘that has come my way and been built into my house’. . . . And the progression that Shaw sets out in the letter corresponds exactly to Eliza’s development in the last three acts of the play” (123).

¹⁹ Farr (1860–1917) and Shaw were lovers in the early 1890s. She created the roles in two of Shaw’s plays: Blanche in *Widowers’ Houses* and Louka in *Arms and the Man*. At the time of the letter, Wisenthal notes, Shaw was providing Farr with voice and elocution lessons (123).

Shaw's interest in phonetics — an important theme in *Pygmalion* — went back considerably further. Grene writes that having arrived in London in 1876 as a twenty-year-old “tongue-tied young Irishman”, Shaw was “self-consciously aware of the Dublin accent on that tongue if he were to unloose it. His interest in phonetics went back to that time, and that self-conscious awareness of the stigma of the voice” (*Pygmalion* xiii). Silver writes that it was not only Shaw's accent that “marked him as an outsider” (185). Evidently, the impecunious Dubliner's “manners were so gauche that he spent hours poring over books of etiquette”, and, in spite of his attempts to impress so-called polite society,

the young man's aristocratic distinction did not shine through at cultured London houses, [where] he gave himself away quite as thoroughly as Eliza [Doolittle] did at the home of Mrs. Higgins. And like Eliza, too, Shaw as a young man in London studied hard to change his accent and to eliminate his provincialisms of appearance and manner, studied in fact with a voice teacher who improved his way of pronouncing vowels as well as of wearing his hair. (185)²⁰

At some point between the late 1870s and late 1880s, Shaw made the acquaintance of the eminent philologist and phonetician Henry Sweet.²¹ Many years later, in his Preface to *Pygmalion*, Shaw praised Sweet's “great ability as a phonetician” and argued that were it not for the latter's “Satanic contempt for all academic dignitaries and persons in general who thought more of Greek than phonetics”, Sweet would have received “high official recognition” (99–100).

²⁰ Shaw described himself as “a foreigner — an Irishman — the most foreign of all foreigners when he has not gone through the British university mill” (*Autobiography* 173).

²¹ Sweet (1845–1912) was co-founder of the International Phonetic Alphabet, and was renowned among linguistic scholars for his *History of English Sounds* (1874) and *A Handbook of Phonetics* (1877). There is confusion as to when Shaw first met Sweet. Mugglestone states that this occurred in the late 1870s (375); Michael Holroyd writes that it was in the early 1880s (*Pursuit* 442). Archibald Henderson identifies the date as later still — in 1888 (*Century* 152).

Sweet is often regarded as the inspiration for the character of Henry Higgins in *Pygmalion*. Nevertheless, Shaw maintained in his Preface that “Pygmalion Higgins is not a portrait of Sweet, to whom the adventures of Eliza Doolittle would have been impossible . . .”. He acknowledged, however, “that there are touches of Sweet in the play” (102).²² Inspiration for Higgins or not, Sweet’s influence on Shaw appears to have been a significant one. As Lynda Mugglestone observes, Sweet, like Shaw, regarded phonetics as “potentially far more than the mere study of articulation and voice production, and it was precisely its potential for playing a social role which was, in strikingly similar ways, to interest them both”. She goes on to argue that, consequently, Sweet provided the stimulus not only for the character of Higgins, but for the play’s central theme of class:

[Sweet] wrote in his *Handbook* in 1877 [that], ‘When a firm control of pronunciation has thus been acquired, provincialisms and vulgarisms will at last be eliminated and some of the most important barriers between the different

²² There has been considerable debate on the issue of whether the character of Henry Higgins was indeed based on Sweet. Beverley Collins and Inger M. Miles argue that Shaw’s phonetician friend Daniel Jones, a professor at University College, London, was in fact the model for Higgins (97–103). Allan Chappelow, however, argues that in Higgins, “Sweet’s irascibility is as faithfully portrayed as his skill in applied phonetics” (426). Barbara Smoker concurs that, “Sweet [was] the primary model . . .” (*Genius* 213). Irving Wardle, however, argues that, “The Shavian red herring, linking Higgins with the philologist Henry Sweet, has fooled nobody (least of all those acquainted with the laborious Sweet) into missing the uncommonly direct and critical self-portraiture of the role . . .” (161). Holroyd views Sweet as a partial inspiration (*Pursuit* 325), but elsewhere argues that Higgins was initially a recreation of George Vandeleur Lee, a singing teacher from Shaw’s youth, subsequently “[growing] into a self-portrait of the playwright himself” (*Pygmalion and Major Barbara* xv). Others, such as theatre critic Desmond MacCarthy, have noted the similarities between Higgins and the character of composer Owen Jack in Shaw’s 1881 novel *Love Among the Artists*. “Like Jack [Higgins] has a total disregard of people’s feelings, he is outrageously inconsiderate, and yet he is most human,” MacCarthy writes (111). Also sharing this view is Jule Eisenbud, who, noting Henderson’s (1956) assertion that Higgins was modelled on Sweet, argues that this cannot have been the case, since the character of Jack was created before the year that Henderson claims Shaw first met Sweet (442).

classes of society will thus be abolished.’²³ *Pygmalion* can, in effect, be seen as Shaw’s response; as Higgins himself phrases it in the play — thereby closely echoing Sweet in his perceptions — pronunciation, no longer merely an ornament, is instead ‘the deepest gulf that separates class from class and soul from soul’ (375–76).

Sweet himself, however, never lived to witness the completion of *Pygmalion*, dying on 30 April 1912, eight weeks after Shaw had begun work on the play.

Pygmalion was completed in June 1912, and first performed in a German translation by Siegfried Trebitsch at the Hofburg Theatre, Vienna, on 16 October 1913, in front of an audience that included Archduke Francis Ferdinand (Holroyd, *Pursuit* 334). Shaw’s decision to have *Pygmalion* performed abroad first was apparently motivated by the impact that negative English reviews of his plays at the time were having on subsequent foreign productions of his works. “It is the custom of the English Press, when a play of mine is produced, to inform the world that it is not a play — that it is dull, blasphemous, unpopular and financially unsuccessful,” he told *The Observer* in November 1913 (*ST* 170). *Pygmalion* was very well received on its opening night, and was swiftly followed by other Continental productions, first on 1 November 1913, at the Lessing Theatre in Berlin, and then in a Swedish-language production at the Royal Dramatic Theatre in Stockholm. It was subsequently produced in Prague (in Czech), Warsaw (in Polish) and Budapest (in Hungarian), and opened at the Deutsches Theatre in Irving Place Theatre, New York, on 25 March 1914, in Trebitsch’s German translation.

The first English-language production of *Pygmalion* opened at His Majesty’s Theatre, London, on 11 April 1914, and played until July that year (118 performances).²⁴ It then opened in New York at the Park Theatre on 12 October 1914, subsequently transferring to two other theatres (*CL* III n.281) during its seventy-four performances. A sixteen-

²³ Sweet, Henry. *A Handbook of Phonetics* (Oxford, 1877), 196.

²⁴ In 1970 Richard Huggett wrote a two-actor play entitled *The First Night of Pygmalion* (London: Faber and Faber) that is based on the events leading up to the first London production of the play.

month tour of the United States and Canada followed, commencing on 14 December 1914. The first revival of the play in Great Britain was at the Aldwych Theatre, London, on 10 February 1920.

The Textual History of *Pygmalion*

Pygmalion was Shaw's twenty-seventh stage work,²⁵ and was written between 7 March and 10 June 1912.²⁶ It is generally regarded as one of the plays of his middle period, and chronologically falls between two shorter plays, *Androcles and the Lion* and *Great Catherine*, both of which he also wrote in 1912.

As Conolly observes, "The textual history of *Pygmalion* is more complicated than most in the Shavian canon . . ." (*Pygmalion* xxiv). The play was first published in a German translation by Trebitsch as *Pygmalion: Komödie in fünf Akten* (Berlin: S. Fischer) on 16 October 1913. Translations in Hungarian and Swedish followed in early 1914.²⁷ Meanwhile in Great Britain, Constable and Company printed a proof copy²⁸ in 1913 "by a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature". This was the version submitted to the Lord Chamberlain for a performing licence; it was subsequently approved on 26 February 1914.

The *New York Times* published unauthorised extracts from the play on 30 November 1913. According to Shaw, these were "translated into the vilest American" (*ST* 170) from the German-language edition of the play that had been published in Berlin the previous

²⁵ Shaw marks it as opus "xxv", however, in his 1916 edition.

²⁶ The original manuscript in shorthand is held at Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, Texas. SHAW 24.7, together with a typed and revised copy, 24.5.

²⁷ These were, respectively, *Pygmalion: vígjáték 5 felvonásban*. Trans. Sándor Hevesi. Budapest: Rózsavölgyi és társa kiadása, 1914, and *Pygmalion: pjäs i fem akter*. Trans. Hugo Vallentin. Stockholm: Albert Bonniers förlag, 1914.

²⁸ Shaw's name does not appear on this version. British Library Add MS 66056F.

month.²⁹ Complete, authorised versions of the play were published in *Everybody's Magazine*³⁰ (New York) in November 1914 and in *Nash's and Pall Mall Magazine* (London) in November and December 1914.³¹ There were minor punctuation and spelling differences between the two versions, with *Everybody's Magazine* employing American spelling throughout the edition and apostrophes for contractions (in those instances in which Shaw had omitted them), while the *Nash's and Pall Mall Magazine* edition featured Shaw's spelling³² and idiosyncratic punctuation, but essentially the same text was used in both editions.³³ In a comparative analysis between Shaw's rough proof (1913) edition, which he used to direct the play in 1914, and the two authorised magazine editions of 1914, Creel writes that,

Superficially, the [1914 magazine editions] differed very little from Shaw's original proof version: the play's structure remained intact, no new scenes had been added, eliminated or transposed, no speeches of any length or importance had been altered. But the additional stage directions and the small bits of dialogue

²⁹ Samuel A. Weiss writes that, "Shaw considered suing, but in the end demanded only that the *Times* acknowledge its error and pledge not to repeat it. The paper apologized" (*ST* 170n).

³⁰ Putnams of New York also published an unauthorised bound edition of this version that same month (Conolly, *Pygmalion* xxx).

³¹ The play was divided between the two editions of *Nash's and Pall Mall Magazine* as follows: Acts I and II were published in the November edition, and Acts III, IV and V in the December edition.

³² Shaw generally favoured American spellings, e.g., "advertize" instead of "advertise". He also employed archaic spellings on occasion, e.g., "shew" for "show".

³³ There are three textual changes in the *Everybody's Magazine* edition (neither of which is found in any other edition of *Pygmalion*). In the first instance, "damned" in Higgins's Act II line — "I find that the moment I let a woman become friends with me, she becomes jealous, exacting, suspicious, and a damned nuisance" — is "dashed" in the *Everybody's Magazine* edition. A later instance of "damned" in Act III, however, remained, as did the potentially offensive uses of "bloody" in the same act. In Act II, the phrase "a good deal" in Doolittle's line — "Not in a general way I wouldnt; but to oblige a gentleman like you I'd do a good deal, I do assure you" — is changed to "a great deal". In Act V, Higgins's line — "And used perfectly awful language" — has the pronoun "she" inserted before "used" in the *Everybody's Magazine* edition.

he added to crucial scenes [for the 1914 editions], [*sic*] indicate the types of effects he was trying to obtain when he directed the play. (102–03)³⁴

The first English-language version of *Pygmalion* in book form was published on 21 April 1916, by Brentano's of New York and on 25 May 1916 by Constable and Co. of London. *Androcles and the Lion* and *Overruled* were also included in these editions.³⁵ The American and British versions of *Pygmalion* are identical, and both include, for the first time, a Preface and an untitled prose sequel. The text of the play itself in both editions is essentially that of the *Nash's and Pall Mall Magazine* edition.³⁶ The same grouping of *Androcles and the Lion*, *Overruled*, *Pygmalion* was retained for Constable's Standard Edition of Shaw's Works in 1931, and reprinted in 1936.³⁷ There are no textual differences between these editions and the 1916 edition.

Shaw subsequently changed the ending of the play for the 1939 Constable Standard Edition.³⁸ He then changed the entire text of *Pygmalion* for his so-called screen version, which was published in both a separate volume and with *Androcles and the Lion* and *Overruled* by Constable on 14 February 1941. The 1941 edition featured a revised Preface, minor changes to dialogue and stage instructions throughout the play, the 1939 ending, and a number of additional scenes from his 1934–38 screenplay. Penguin

³⁴ In a 1917 letter to *The Times*, Shaw wrote that, "From John Bull's Other Island to *Pygmalion*, the prompt copies and the printed editions should be identical because the plays passed through the furnace of production by the author before they were passed for press; but they are not quite so. I made revisions of no great extent, but of importance (as such things go) in many of them. And further changes are possible. The rehearsals of future revivals may suggest changes to me. . . . The changes need not be improvements: they may be adaptations to inevitable circumstances. The more skilful an author is, the more apt he is to adapt his work to the conditions instead of quarelling with them" (*Agitations* 217).

³⁵ Curiously, the subtitle "A Romance in Five Acts" does not appear on this version, although it appears on all previous and subsequent editions.

³⁶ The only difference is an additional stage instruction in Act IV of the 1916 version.

³⁷ The same grouping was retained in subsequent Standard Edition printings in 1939, 1941, 1949, and 1951.

³⁸ This version was only published in the United Kingdom. The 1939 American edition of *Pygmalion*, published by Dodd, Mead, contained the 1931 text.

published this version of *Pygmalion*, together with more than one hundred illustrations by Felix Topolski, in a paperback edition on 19 September 1941.

The 1941 version was the edition published by The Bodley Head in 1972, and is the official “definitive” *Pygmalion* text, in accordance with Shaw’s wishes that the final version of his works, in each instance, should displace all previous editions. As the starting point for this thesis, however, I have chosen the 1916 version (henceforth referred to as the original play), since this was the first English-language book edition of the play, as well as being the first version to include Shaw’s Preface and sequel. Moreover, with the exception of the two previously mentioned 1914 magazine editions, it is, in practical terms, the closest version we have to that performed at the original London production in 1914, and until the publication of the 1939 edition it constituted the definitive text of the play.

Chapter Two: Analysis of Shaw's *Pygmalion*

Characters

As Daniel Leary observes, Shaw's sense of "fairness, his unwillingness to deal in pure heroes or foul villains" (2) is evident throughout *Pygmalion*. Through his refusal to play favourites, "Shaw [encourages] his audience to identify with just about every character in the play, shifting from viewpoint to viewpoint, from class to class, from sex to sex, sometimes not shifting at all, but holding on to more than one surrogate — to as many as the spectator can contain" (2).

One of the few characters in the play who does not readily invite audience identification is Clara Eynsford Hill, "a complaining, self-pitying creature" (Leary 17). Indeed, the play begins with one of her complaints — "I'm getting chilled to the bone" (P105) — and, in short order, we witness her lack of concern for her brother Freddy's welfare (when she orders him to find a taxi in the pouring rain), her disdain for Eliza's request for compensation after her flowers are ruined by Freddy, and her haughtiness toward Higgins for his breach of etiquette in addressing her without an introduction — "Don't dare speak to me" (112).¹ But at Mrs Higgins's at-home in Act III, we learn that much, if not all, of Clara's bitterness stems from her awareness that she is declassed. "We're so poor! and she gets so few parties, poor child!" her mother tells Mrs Higgins (155), thereby inviting sympathy not only for Clara, but indeed for Mrs Eynsford Hill, who, as Berst observes, "is plagued with manners and social pretensions beyond her means. She is a misfit, a social orphan, and her misfortune breeds misfortune, notably in her children" (*Art* 213).²

¹ Like many commentators, Leary argues that there are elements of the Cinderella tale throughout the play that are intermingled with Ovid's *Pygmalion*. Of Clara, he suggests, "She could be one of the older sisters of the Cinderella tale, but she is about the same age as Liza and psychologically seems closer to the statue-state of Galatea" (7).

² Nevertheless, it is only in Shaw's sequel that Clara fully redeems herself, when, after being shocked to discover that her new role model (Eliza) "had graduated from the gutter in a few months time", she is converted to the social theories of H.G. Wells regarding "real human needs and worthy social structure", and consequently her "snobbery [goes] bang" (P199–200).

Henry Higgins, in contrast, both invites and repels audience identification. As Louis Crompton observes, Higgins's appeal lies in his complexity:

He is at once a tyrannical bully and a charmer, an impish schoolboy, and a flamboyant wooer of souls, a scientist with a wildly extravagant imagination and a man so blind to the nature of his own personality that he thinks of himself as timid, modest, and diffident. Like Caesar in *Caesar and Cleopatra*, he is part god and part brute; but unlike Caesar, he cannot boast that he has “nothing of man” in him. (146–47)

To Matlaw, Higgins is “the Shavian hero, standing alone, a superman embodying a life force divorced from human social and sensual drives, but representative of the vitality and creative evolution in which, in Shaw's philosophy,³ lies the ultimate hope of mankind” (19).⁴ But, as David J. Gordon notes, “heroic need not mean likeable, and indeed usually does not” (148). Higgins is verbally abusive, and, as previously noted,

³ I.e. Shaw's Theory of Creative Evolution. Gibbs summarises this theory as the belief that, “The universe is driven by an intelligent, purposive force, the Life Force, which is working towards higher forms of life and consciousness through the processes of evolution. . . . A recurring feature of Shaw's accounts of the goal of Creative Evolution is the notion of gaining greater self-consciousness and self-understanding” (*Evolution* 81). In *Everybody's Political What's What?*, Shaw wrote that, “I believe myself to be the servant and instrument of creative evolution. . . . That is to say, a person to whom eating, drinking and reproduction are irksome necessities in comparison with the urge to wider and deeper knowledge, better understanding, and greater power over ourselves and our circumstances” (327). This description arguably applies to Shaw's conception of Higgins as well. Higgins sees himself primarily as an artist who lives for his work alone. Although he can say in the broader sense that, “I care for life, for humanity . . .” (P185), *personal* relationships are of little importance to him — “Once for all, understand that I go my way and do my work without caring twopence what happens to either of us” (186).

⁴ Shaw refers to Higgins as a “hero” in his Preface to *Pygmalion* (P99) and (as previously mentioned) in his sequel (P192).

bullying and misogynistic.⁵ Moreover, as Gibbs observes, “Higgins’s class-oriented rudeness and callousness toward ‘the squashed cabbage leaf’ Eliza gives the comedy of the play a distinct edge of cruelty” (*Life* 35). Certainly, Higgins’s sadism and verbal abuse make it difficult to accept Shaw’s observation at the beginning of Act II that, “[Higgins] is so frank and void of malice that he remains likeable even in his least reasonable moments” (*P*118). Nevertheless, on occasions throughout the play, audiences may find themselves identifying with Higgins’s point of view. In Act I, Eliza’s incessant crying is unnecessary and irritating, and we may therefore empathise with Higgins when he orders her to end her “detestable boohooing instantly” (114). Similarly, in Act II, we may concur with Higgins when he upbraids Eliza for snobbery in wanting to display her new clothes to her fellow flower-sellers “just to put the girls in their place a bit” (143). In Act IV, as Berst observes, “the play tilts more toward Eliza’s perspective than [Higgins’s]” (*Pygmalion* 99), but Shaw is careful not to manipulate audience identification too far in favour of the former, arguably dividing the audience’s loyalties near the end of the act when both characters behave with equal petulance, with Eliza goading Higgins to lose his temper while “*drinking in his emotion like nectar, and nagging him to provoke a further supply*” (167).

Rodelle Weintraub suggests that Higgins’s inability to understand Eliza’s anguished concerns⁶ in Act IV is indicative of a person with Asperger’s Syndrome. She further notes Higgins’s “(i)diosyncratic interests” — in particular, his obsession with London dialects — his lack of common sense and empathy, his clumsiness and habit of fidgeting, his inappropriate language and general lack of social skills (including his inability to realise when he is being rude), his lack of awareness “when he comments aloud”, and his

⁵ Several commentators have suggested that he is a self-portrait of Shaw. Silver argues that, “Higgins . . . bears some obvious character traits of the mature Shaw — the egocentricity, the puritanism, the immodesty — and these are quite unsympathetically treated” (185).

⁶ “What am I to do? Whats to become of me?”, a desperate Eliza says. An “*enlightened, but not at all impressed*” Higgins responds, “Oh, that’s whats worrying you, is it?” — but his subsequent comments on marriage reveal that he has *not* grasped that her real predicament here is one of “aimlessness. She is dislocated, fit for neither high nor low society” (Berst, *Pygmalion* 100).

“acute sensory sensitivity”⁷, all of which, she argues, are the characteristics of “a textbook example of an Aspergen” (388–96).

Certainly, many of Shaw’s own comments on Higgins — made, as Weintraub notes, several decades before Hans Asperger identified in 1944 the symptoms of the “high-functioning autism that now bears his name” (388) — indicate a person with a decided lack of awareness of his character and the impact of his behaviour on those around him. In a 1914 letter to Trebitsch, Shaw describes Higgins as “so absolutely unconscious of his own character, that he is in a state of continual complaint and surprise because people have such unreasonable notions about him” (*ST* 174). Yet at crucial moments throughout the play, Higgins *does*, in fact, display a sudden awareness of both his sadism and his egocentricity — often abruptly correcting his behaviour. In an example of the former, with evident relish he instructs Mrs Pearce in Act II to humiliate Eliza:

HIGGINS Take her away and clean her, Mrs Pearce. Monkey Brand, if it wont come off any other way. Is there a good fire in the kitchen?
MRS PEARCE [*protesting*] Yes; but —
HIGGINS [*storming on*] Take all her clothes off and burn them. Ring up Whiteley or somebody for new ones. Wrap her up in brown paper til they come.
(124)

Higgins continues in this vein, urging Mrs Pearce to “wallop” Eliza if necessary, and to “Put her in the dustbin” until her new clothes arrive. But when Mrs Pearce “*resolutely*” protests — “You must be reasonable, Mr Higgins: really you must. You cant walk over everybody like this” — “*Higgins, thus scolded, subsides,*” and, in an example of his manipulative powers, uses his charm and articulation to reassure the hitherto terrified Eliza: “All I propose is that we should be kind to this poor girl. We must help her to prepare and fit herself for her new station in life. If I did not express myself clearly it was because I did not wish to hurt her delicacy, or yours” (124). Higgins’s ability here to

⁷ She notes that, “Whereas Pickering can pronounce twenty-four distinct vowel sounds, Higgins . . . can pronounce 130. Pickering cannot hear the differences between most of them” (393).

switch in an instant from sadist to misunderstood philanthropist suggests a man who often knows exactly what he is doing.

As for his awareness of his egocentricity, an “*arrogant*” Higgins declares to Eliza in Act V that, “I can do without anybody. I have my own soul: my own spark of divine fire,” but then acknowledges, “*with sudden humility*,” that, “I shall miss you, Eliza. [*He sits down near her on the ottoman*]. I have learnt something from your idiotic notions: I confess that humbly and gratefully” (185). These utterances suggest a person who is more self-aware than Shaw’s aforementioned comments to Trebitsch might suggest. Moreover, Higgins’s backhanded compliment regarding Eliza’s “idiotic notions” underline his sense of humour — a quality that arguably mitigates some of his crueller utterances.

Nevertheless, Higgins is unquestionably “*careless about himself and other people, including their feelings*”, as Shaw informs us at the beginning of Act II (118). He is a person who essentially lives for his work. As he tells Pickering: “The science of speech” is “my profession: also my hobby” (114). Little else matters to him.⁸ This is illustrated in Act III, where much of the humour arises from the ironic juxtaposition of Higgins’s own behaviour in front of his mother’s guests with that of Eliza’s performance. Since Higgins’s sole focus is on the experiment at hand — in this instance, the “phonetic job” as he describes Eliza’s impending visit to his mother (145) — his own behaviour is immaterial to him. He therefore treats the Eynsford Hills roughly — informing Clara and her mother that, “We want two or three people. You’ll do as well as anybody else” (148) — and, in his haste to begin assessing Eliza’s performance, “[*throws*] *himself so impatiently on the divan that he almost breaks it*”, thereby causing “*A long and painful pause*” (151).

⁸ Higgins’s other interests appear to be his mother, and “Science and Literature and Classical Music and Philosophy and Art” (188). The poet John Milton (1608–74) is evidently his favourite author, for he implicitly praises him in Act I — “your native language is the language of Shakespear and Milton and The Bible . . .” (114) — alludes in Act II to Milton’s *L’Allegro* when he remarks on Doolittle’s speech, “Observe the rhythm of his native wodnotes wild” (135), and boasts of “the treasures of my Miltonic mind” in Act V (186).

In this same scene, Shaw tells us, Clara “*considers Higgins quite eligible matrimonially*” (149). There is no evidence in the play, however, that Higgins is interested in marrying anybody. He informs Pickering in Act II that he is “a confirmed old bachelor, and likely to remain so” (130), and then reiterates this point to Eliza three times in the final two acts.⁹ As for Higgins’s sexual inclinations, Valency argues that, “They would seem to be nonexistent” (317). While more recent commentators have generally concurred with this view, the issue remains a contentious one. Dukore, for example, argues that it is not “uncontestable” that Higgins is romantically indifferent to Eliza (*Theater* 148). Indeed, Shaw himself, in a 1932 letter to R. and R. Clark, implies that Higgins *does* have sexual interests. His point, however, is that it was Higgins’s and Eliza’s mutual *incompatibility* that precluded their union:

It does not follow in the least that Liza and Higgins were sexually insensible to one another, or that their sensibility took the form of repugnance, or that her combination of hatred and rebellion with doglike fidelity was exactly what it would have been had her instructor been a woman; but the fact stands that their marriage would have been a revolting tragedy; and that the marriage with Freddy is the natural and happy ending to the story. (*CL IV* 311)

One could also argue that Higgins’s misogyny would have precluded a successful romantic relationship with a woman:

⁹ In Act IV, Higgins tells Eliza that, “all men are not confirmed old bachelors like me and the Colonel” (*P165*) — then repeats this comment to her in Act V (“[Pickering’s] as confirmed an old bachelor as I am,” 187) before predicting in the same act (again to Eliza) that, “You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together . . .” (190). Berst argues that, in the first example, Higgins’s uncharacteristic grammatical slip (the inversion of “the Colonel and I”) and the colloquial use of “like” are possible indications “that he may be ever so slightly unhinged” (*Pygmalion* 102–03). He also suggests that Higgins’s use of the adjectives “old” and “confirmed” [bachelor] in this act serve to distance himself “defensively” from Eliza (102).

PICKERING. Excuse the straight question, Higgins. Are you a man of good character where women are concerned?

HIGGINS [*moodily*] Have you ever met a man of good character where women are concerned?

PICKERING. Yes: very frequently.

HIGGINS [*dogmatically, lifting himself on his hands to the level of the piano, and sitting on it with a bounce*] Well, I havent. I find that the moment I let a woman make friends with me, she becomes jealous, exacting, suspicious, and a damned nuisance. I find that the moment I let myself make friends with a woman, I become selfish and tyrannical. Women upset everything. When you let them into your life, you find that the woman is driving at one thing and youre driving at another. (130)¹⁰ (Act II)

Silver argues that Higgins's subsequent suggestion that his misogyny does not apply to older women — “Oh, I cant be bothered with young women” (P146) — and his idealisation of his mother “All but [announces] his kinship to Oedipus” (210). In his 1916 *Pygmalion* sequel, however, Shaw offers a less sensational rationale for such behaviour:

If an imaginative boy has a sufficiently rich mother who has intelligence, personal grace, dignity of character without harshness, and a cultivated sense of the best art of her time to enable her to make her house beautiful, she sets a standard for him against which very few women can struggle, besides effecting for him a disengagement of his affections, his sense of beauty, and his idealism from his specifically sexual impulses. (P193)

¹⁰ Cicely Palser Havelly argues that, “surely there is a faint air of deeply suppressed homo-eroticism about Higgins's clubbish misogynism . . .” in these comments. Intimations that Higgins may be homosexual, she also suggests, imply “all kinds of things about his relationship with Colonel Pickering” (28). Valency writes that, “it would be tempting to direct the play with some intimation of the homosexuality latent in [Higgins's and Pickering's] social arrangements . . .”, although he acknowledges that such an interpretation “would have nothing to do with Shaw's intentions . . .” (317).

Ganz infers that “in a post-Freudian age” Shaw subsequently regarded this rationale for Higgins’s behaviour as “somewhat naïve”, preferring instead the term “mother fixation”¹¹ in acknowledgement, Ganz suggests, “of a sexual element here” (183).¹² Moreover, Ganz argues, Shaw’s stage directions for Higgins provide hints of such a fixation on the latter’s part. “Higgins [is described] as ‘rather like a very impetuous baby’ and ‘he coaxes women as a child coaxes its nurse’, hints that are born out by Higgins’ boyish impetuosity, his self-absorption, and his lack of adult social control” (183). But regardless of these directions, the only *verbal* suggestion of a mother fixation in the play rests on Higgins’s aforementioned utterance — “My idea of a lovable woman is something as like you as possible” (P146) — and it is conceivable in this instance that Higgins is merely seeking to *flatter* his mother, whose assistance he requires for Eliza’s first appearance in polite society.

Higgins may be the most complex character in the play, but he by no means overshadows Eliza. Some critics have overlooked her, however, focusing on her transformation alone. In his review of the London première of *Pygmalion* in 1914, MacCarthy argued that, “[Eliza] is interesting chiefly from her situation — a flower-girl who after six months’ training at the hands of Higgins . . . can be passed off in society as a lady” (109). Yet while Eliza’s transformation is indeed interesting — not only linguistically, but also in terms of the articulateness, confidence and sophistication¹³ that she acquires — it is not

¹¹ Shaw first publicly applied the term “mother fixation” to Higgins in a 1939 interview (BSC 141).

¹² Ganz also argues, however, that the mother fixation theme may be a decoy on Shaw’s part, since “The attraction between Higgins and Eliza is . . . very real, the more so, in fact, for being a dangerous one, and Shaw must try to find some dramatically viable reason for thwarting it” (183). Gordon argues that, “*Pygmalion* is unique among [Shaw’s] plays in encouraging us to make a connection between a character’s early excessive admiration of a mother and his later resistance to a woman he could otherwise love” (147).

¹³ Eliza’s loss of naïveté is one example of the way in which she becomes more sophisticated as the play develops. While always a shrewd judge of character and of motive, her naïveté in the first three acts is ever present. In Act II, for example, she believes Higgins’s warning that, “If the King finds out you’re not a lady, you will be taken by the police to the Tower of London, where your head will be cut off as a warning to other presumptuous flower girls” (129), and in Act III she assumes that it is acceptable to discuss such topics as murder and alcoholism at a middle-class soirée.

“of an inner self or moral nature” (Gibbs, *Life* 35). Throughout the play Eliza remains, in essence, the same person whom we encounter in Act I. As Starks observes, “Despite her dirty face, ragged clothes, and loud, child-like behavior, Eliza does initially have what it takes to pass as a duchess, as both Higgins and the audience know” (46). In short, this feisty eighteen-year-old from the slums of Lisson Grove¹⁴ is clearly no ordinary individual, since from the outset “she has the capacity to resist Higgins” (Greene, *Pygmalion* xvi).

She achieves this in part because of an irrepressible “individual assertiveness” (Berst, *Art* 199). Transcending the severe impediments of her slum upbringing, she is possessed of a strong moral code in which (unlike her father) she has apparently rejected dissipation — “nobody ever saw the sign of liquor on me” (P126) — promiscuity — “I could have been a bad girl if I’d liked” (187) — and idleness,¹⁵ and is determined to better herself. She has a modest goal — “I want to be a lady in a flower shop stead of selling at the corner of Tottenham Court Road” (121) — but, initially, at least, this aim is as realistic as her linguistic and financial situation will allow. Moreover, she is fiercely independent from the beginning (although not averse to slyness, as Higgins observes, on the matter of the amount of loose change that she carries), relatively secure in her sense of self-worth¹⁶ — “I’ve a right to be here if I like, same as you” — and is above seeking charity — “I can buy my own clothes” (125). Having firsthand experience of a father with no sense of familial responsibility, she readily reproves the middle-class Mrs Eynsford Hill for not having discharged her parental duty when Freddy spoils her basket of flowers and leaves without offer of compensation,¹⁷ revealing at the same time that she feels neither intimidated by nor inferior to a person of a so-called higher class. She has also inherited

¹⁴ This is where Eliza was born, as Higgins deduces from her accent. “[Lisson Grove] wasnt fit for a pig to live in . . .”, Eliza says in Act I (111).

¹⁵ In Act II she describes her father as “a disgrace to me, he is, collecting dust, instead of working at his trade” (143).

¹⁶ She does, however, view herself in Act II as a poor marital prospect (“Garn!” she exclaims in response to Mrs Pearce’s suggestion that she may be married. “Whood marry me?”, 125).

¹⁷ I.e., “Ow, eez ye-ooa san, is e? Wal, fewd dan y’ de-ooty bawmz a mother should, eed now bettern to spawl a pre gel’s flahrzn than ran awy athaht pyin” (107).

her father's gift of the ready retort, for when not rattled by one of Higgins's diatribes or confused by his speech, she proves herself adept at providing effective rejoinders to both him and Mrs Pearce:

HIGGINS [*To the girl*] Be off with you: I dont want you.

THE FLOWER GIRL Dont you be so saucy. You aint heard what I come for yet. [*To Mrs Pearce, who is waiting at the door for further instructions*] Did you tell him I come in a taxi?

MRS PEARCE Nonsense, girl! What do you think a gentleman like Mr Higgins cares what you came in?

THE FLOWER GIRL Oh, we are proud! He aint above giving lessons, not him: I heard him say so. Well, I aint come here to ask for any compliment; and if my money's not good enough I can go elsewhere. (120)

These two exchanges underline Eliza's quickwittedness. She may be naïve in her assumption that Higgins would be financially dependent upon her custom and that he would be impressed by her ability to pay for taxis — but her skill in deflecting two very different interlocutors borders on the virtuoso here. As Berst observes, in these exchanges, Eliza succeeds in “turning the social situation topsy-turvey by putting [Mrs Pearce] down on grounds of snobbery, then putting down Higgins on grounds of economics” (*Pygmalion* 53). For his part, Higgins clearly detects something of value in Eliza, for he quickly exercises his charm when In Act II, suddenly realising that a fearful Eliza is about to leave — “Here! Ive had enough of this. I'm going [*making for the door*]. You ought to be ashamed of yourself, you ought” — he resourcefully coaxes her into staying by tempting her with chocolates, “*his eyes suddenly beginning to twinkle with mischief*” (P127).

However, for all Eliza's quick-wittedness, resourcefulness, and obvious intelligence — and the remarkable linguistic transformation that she achieves in a mere six months — she is not a genius. As Matlaw observes, “Eliza is only very gifted. She personifies the potential of a human being — perhaps any human being — given the proper guidance.

But her primary wants are mundane: marriage and the security of an income, or, as she puts it, ‘Freddy loves me: that makes him king enough for me....I’ll go and be a teacher.’” (31).

Eliza has clearly inherited her resourcefulness and intelligence from her father, the layabout dustman Alfred Doolittle. But unlike his daughter, Doolittle has no desire to join the middle classes. Preferring the freedom to cohabit with whomever he chooses, he tells Pickering that marriage “aint the natural way, Colonel: it’s only the middle class way” (182). Above all, Doolittle relishes the freedom of being a dustman, having recognised that this occupation “is too low on the social scale to have any moral standards attached to it . . .” (Crompton 145). Doolittle also shares Higgins’s misogyny, urging the latter to “marry Eliza while shes young and dont know no better. If you dont youll be sorry for it after. If you do, she’ll be sorry for it after; but better you than her, because youre a man, and shes *only a woman* and dont know how to be happy anyhow” [my emphasis] (140). In Act V, he implies to Higgins and Pickering that their treatment of Eliza (as he perceives it) is mitigated by the sins of her sex — “I been the victim of one woman after another all my life; and I dont grudge you two getting the better of Eliza” (183). Has he no morals? “Cant afford them, Governor” (138), he tells Pickering in Act II. He proves this when he admits to Higgins that he would have asked the latter for fifty pounds (rather than five pounds) if he had believed that Higgins’s motives for hosting Eliza were questionable (137–38). Doolittle also despises what he perceives as the double standards of the middle class:

I’m one of the undeserving poor: thats what I am. Think of what that means to a man. It means that hes up agen middle class morality all the time. If theres anything going, and I put in for a bit of it, it’s always the same story: ‘Youre undeserving; so you cant have it.’ But my needs is as great as the most deserving widow’s that ever got money out of six different charities in one week for the death of the same husband. (138)

Being “a thinking man”,¹⁸ Doolittle regards his needs as exceeding those of “a deserving man” — “I dont eat less hearty than him; and I drink a lot more” — and he resents middle-class society for not recognising this fact. “What [then] is middle class morality? Just an excuse for never giving me anything” (138). Grene describes this “anatomy of middle-class morality” as akin to “Falstaff’s catechism on honour, a total subversion of normal values”. Like Falstaff, he goes on to write, “Doolittle [speaks] from a fulness of comic personality which is so purely itself that it leaves no room for ordinary moral judgement” (*Critical* 108). Thus, when he succeeds in coaxing a five-pound note from Higgins in Act II, he inverts conventional expectations by solemnly pledging *not* to “save it and spare it and live idle of it”. Instead he says that,

There wont be a penny of it left by Monday: I’ll have to go to work same as if I’d never had it. It wont pauperize me, you bet. Just one good spree for myself and the missus, giving pleasure to ourselves and employment to others, and satisfaction to you to think it’s not been throwed away. You couldnt spend it better. (139)

Yet in spite of his unorthodox philosophy, Doolittle is Shaw’s everyman,¹⁹ Holroyd argues:

Doolittle is any of us. When asked by Higgins whether he is an honest man or rogue, he answers: ‘A little of both, Henry, like the rest of us.’ But he is more rogue than honest man in the dusty moral climate of pre-war London. Being his name, he does as little as possible — some bribery here or there, a little drinking, an occasional change of mistress: and he provides positively no education at all

¹⁸ In Act II, Doolittle describes himself as “game for politics or religion or social reform same as all the other amusements” (139).

¹⁹ MacCarthy argues that Doolittle is “Shaw’s most amusing achievement, in his Dickens vein of exaggeration”. “He does not exist,” MacCarthy goes on to write, “but he is sufficiently like a type to make one fancy Nature may have been aiming at him” (108).

for his illegitimate daughter ‘except to give her a lick of the strap now and again’.
(*Pursuit* 326)

The sadism inherent in the last of these activities is arguably the physical counterpart to Higgins’s verbal cruelty toward Eliza. Early in Act II, in fact, Eliza appears to recognise this, “*obeying* [Higgins’s order to sit down] *slowly*”, and saying, “Ah-ah-ahow-oo-o! One would think you was my father” (122).²⁰ In Act V, she again alludes to similarities between Higgins and her father when she tells Pickering that, “I was brought up to be just like [Higgins], unable to control myself, and using bad language on the slightest provocation” (179).

For his part, Pickering is in some respects a *third* father to Eliza after Doolittle and Higgins. This “*elderly gentleman of the amiable military type*”, as Shaw describes him in Act I, serves throughout the play as a kindly foil to the cruelty of Higgins. In Act II, it is Pickering who supports housekeeper Mrs Pearce when the latter implores Higgins to consider Eliza’s future before embarking on her phonetic lessons (128), and it is Pickering who persuades the “*half-rebellious, half bewildered*” Eliza to sit down by speaking to her in a “*very courteous*” manner that differs markedly from Mrs Pearce’s brusqueness and Higgins’s “*thundering*” (121). Eliza later credits Pickering with teaching her “really nice manners; and that is what makes one a lady, isn’t it?” (179). Were it not for Pickering, she goes on to say, “I should never have known that ladies and gentlemen didn’t behave [badly like Higgins] . . .” (179).²¹ Moreover, unlike Higgins — who merely claims to treat all people in the same manner — Pickering *does* behave courteously to every character in the play, although, as Berst observes,

²⁰ Higgins responds by accurately predicting that, “If I decide to teach you, I’ll be worse than two fathers to you” (122).

²¹ Although Pickering is undoubtedly important to Eliza as a role model, particularly in terms of his embodying the appropriate etiquette for middle class society — and Eliza is clearly very fond of him — she has an ulterior motive here. In lavishly praising Pickering, she is also pointedly attempting to antagonise Higgins. Her motive becomes obvious when she then asks Pickering to call her “Eliza” instead of “Miss Doolittle”, but adds, “And I should like Professor Higgins to call me Miss Doolittle” (180).

[H]e is more inclined to treat [women] as duchesses,²² since he has a sensitive respect for human dignity and feelings. As Higgins's vitality tends to run at right angles to society, Pickering's vitality runs parallel. One is consequently more startling, but the other is no less real. Pickering's charity and kindness give society a moral meaning which Higgins, with inborn egocentricity, ignores.
(*Art* 218–19)

Yet although Pickering treats Eliza courteously throughout the play,²³ it is he who (in Act II) first uses the dehumanising term “experiment”²⁴ (twice) in reference to her proposed phonetic lessons (123, 128), thus implying that he initially regards Eliza as a type of human palimpsest — a play thing of sorts. This suggestion is further underlined in Act III, when Mrs Higgins reproves him and her son for being “a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live doll” (156). Pickering, like Higgins, is also unable to grasp Mrs Higgins's concerns (which echo those of Mrs Pearce in Act II) regarding “the problem of what is to be done with [Eliza] afterwards” (158), responding to her comments “*indulgently, being rather bored*” with “Oh, that will be all right, Mrs Higgins” (159). By Act V, the solution to Eliza's “problem” is a simple one to the “stiff and conventional” Pickering²⁵: she should remain with him and Higgins at Wimpole Street — and is “*much alarmed*” at the thought that this may not transpire (180). But more importantly (as his reaction to her leaving suggests), he has come to regard Eliza as a *person*, and one who is capable of confronting the boorish Higgins. “Why dont you slang back at him?” he asks Eliza in Act V. “Dont stand it. It would do him a lot of good” (180). By now his obvious

²² Eliza herself points this out to Higgins — “[Colonel Pickering] treats a flower girl as if she was a duchess” — to which the latter responds, “And I treat a duchess as if she was a flower girl” (184).

²³ He does betray understandable irritation with her, however, on their first meeting, when she persistently tries to sell him flowers despite his having told her that he has no change: “Now dont be troublesome: theres a good girl” (108).

²⁴ Higgins later uses the same term in Act III, telling his mother that, “it's the most absorbing experiment I ever tackled” (157). In Act II, he also refers to the “experiment” as “a stiff job” (143).

²⁵ This was Shaw's description of Pickering in a 1914 letter to actor Edmund Gurney (*Portable* 326). Gurney played Doolittle in the first London production of *Pygmalion*.

discomfort with the notion of Eliza as an “experiment”²⁶ — and his apparent inability to recognise that it was he who had first employed this word — underline how differently he regards her. In short, unlike Higgins, Pickering changes. It is Eliza who skillfully brings him to this self-realisation by employing the term herself (and pointedly reminding Higgins²⁷ and his mother, who are also present, of how she was initially viewed by her two male mentors):

LIZA [*to Pickering, taking no notice of Higgins, and working away deftly*] Will you drop me altogether now that the experiment is over, Colonel Pickering?

PICKERING. Oh dont. You mustnt think of it as an experiment. It shocks me, somehow.

LIZA. Oh, I’m only a squashed cabbage leaf—

PICKERING [*impulsively*] No. (178)

Mrs Higgins also initially fails to recognise Eliza’s potential, describing her as “a triumph of [her son’s] art and of her dressmaker’s” who “[gives] herself away in every sentence she utters . . .”, and cannot envisage her improving “as long as she is in Henry’s hands” (155). Nevertheless, Mrs Higgins is perceptive enough to recognise that, “when Eliza walked into Wimpole Street, something walked in with her” (158).²⁸ By drawing a comparison between the plight of her (just-departed) guest Mrs Eynsford Hill — a genteel woman without the income to support her position in society — and Eliza, Mrs Higgins emphasises to the audience²⁹ what it might otherwise have not considered: that even if Eliza *can* acquire the speech mannerisms and etiquette of the middle class, those

²⁶ However, in *As Far as Thought Can Reach*, the final play of Shaw’s five-play cycle *Back to Methuselah* (1921), there is a character named Pygmalion, an insane scientist, who revels in his experiments. This Pygmalion creates synthetic versions of human beings, one of which subsequently bites him to death.

²⁷ This is the second time that she “punishes” Higgins in this way. In Act IV, she bitterly suggests to him that she should return her clothes to Pickering, since “He might want them for the next girl you pick up to experiment on.” A “*shocked and hurt*” Higgins responds, “Is *that* the way you feel toward us?” (166).

²⁸ Berst describes hers as “(t)he only clear head” in Act III (*Art* 212).

²⁹ Since Higgins and Pickering effectively ignore her concerns here, Mrs Higgins’s comments can be regarded as one of the didactic aspects of the play.

same “advantages” will consequently “disqualify [her] from earning her own living without giving her a fine lady’s income!” (158).

Moreover, Mrs Higgins proves an excellent role model for Eliza. She belongs to middle class society, but is neither a snob nor a prude — gracious toward Eliza in Act III and insistent upon attending Doolittle’s wedding to his acknowledged common-law wife in Act V — and, as Valency observes, appears willing to accept Eliza by the end of the play “as a social equal” (318). Uncommonly intelligent, she is also arguably the sanest character in the play.³⁰ Berst describes her as “the ideal of candor, good manners, sophistication, and kindness which are at the heart of true gentility, and, as such, she provides the standard against which Eliza’s growth throughout the play may reasonably be measured” (*Art* 213). In Act V, Mrs Higgins also plays a pivotal role in providing emotional and spiritual support to Eliza after the latter leaves Wimpole Street at the end of Act IV, later striving, as Gordon observes, to convey “the full humanity of Eliza” to Pickering and Higgins (150):

She worked very hard for you, Henry! I dont think you quite realize what anything in the nature of brain work means to a girl like that. Well, it seems that when the great day of trial came,³¹ and she did this wonderful thing for you without making a single mistake, you two sat there and never said a word to her, but talked together of how glad you were that it was all over and how you had been bored with the whole thing. And then you were surprised because she threw her slippers at you! *I should have thrown the fire-irons at you. (P176)*

³⁰ Some commentators regard her as an idealised portrait of Shaw’s mother, Lucinda Elizabeth (“Bessie”) Shaw (1830–1913). In 1916 Shaw described his mother as having been the type of woman “who could act as matron of a cavalry barracks from eighteen to forty and emerge without a stain on her character” (*CL* III 356).

³¹ She is referring here to Eliza’s off-stage appearance at the garden party, dinner party, and opera on the previous evening.

Nevertheless, at the end of the play Mrs Higgins appears slightly critical of Eliza, telling her son that, “I’m afraid you’ve spoiled that girl, Henry,” after Eliza refuses to buy the items that Higgins has requested and “sweeps out”. Mrs Higgins adds, maternally, “But never mind, dear: I’ll buy you the tie and gloves” (191). While Mrs Higgins is unaware of the highly emotional conversation between her son and Eliza that has immediately preceded the latter’s abrupt exit, her protective maternal comments suggest — in addition to underlining her son’s inability to do his own shopping (and thereby reminding us of his acknowledgement in Act II that, “I’ve never been able to feel really grown-up and tremendous, like other chaps,” 133) — that she would be unwilling to embrace the notion of an Eliza–Higgins marriage.

Mrs Higgins *does*, however, appear to approve of Freddy Eynsford Hill’s obvious interest in Eliza. In Act III, she pointedly asks Freddy if he “would like to meet Miss Doolittle again”, and on receiving his enthusiastic response (“Yes, I should, awfully”) encourages him — “Well, you know my days” (154).³² Whether any subsequent encounters at Mrs Higgins’s at-home days between Eliza and Freddy occur is never established, although we learn from Eliza in Act V that, “Freddy Hill writes to me twice and three times a day, sheets and sheets” (187). Freddy, however, does not appear again in the play after Act III, and for this reason, Dukore argues, “[Eliza’s] stated determination to marry what has become an offstage presence may fail to convince some people” (CS 71). Freddy’s profile is further hampered in the play by the fact that his on-stage appearances are limited to fourteen lines in Act I (with these occurring only at the beginning and at the conclusion of the act) and twelve lines of little substance in Act III, although he is present for almost half of the latter act.³³

Scholars have variously described Freddy as a “weak and fawningly devoted” individual (Lauter 14), “a loving nincompoop” (Conolly, *Pygmalion* xliii), “a truly weak figure” (Coelsch-Foisner 239), and as the silliest of a family of “rather silly people” (Berst, *Art*

³² She also informs Mrs Eynsford Hill that her son is “quite nice” and that, “I shall be delighted to see him” (155).

³³ His sister Clara, in contrast, has approximately twenty-three lines in Act I and thirteen in Act III.

123). Unquestionably, Freddy is not a strong character, especially if we compare him with Higgins, to whom he is the opposite in almost every respect. At twenty, Freddy is half Higgins's age (and approximately two years older than Eliza), he is earnest, complaisant, socially adroit, romantic, and openly infatuated with Eliza. In performance, he is often portrayed as a hopelessly ineffectual middle-class twit — thereby precluding any possibility that Eliza might reciprocate his affections — but that is not how Shaw depicts him in the play. He is “weak” in the sense that he obeys his sister's command to search for a taxi in Act I, “fawningly devoted” merely because of his many love letters to Eliza, and “silly” because (like the other members of his family) he gullibly assumes that Eliza's attempts at conversation are an exercise in studied drollery — “The new small talk. You do it awfully well” (152). Clearly, Freddy is not a perceptive individual. But his inability to detect that something is amiss with Eliza's utterances can be partly explained by the fact that the “*infatuated*” youth is immediately distracted by Eliza's beauty, which Shaw informs us “*produces an impression of such remarkable distinction . . . as she enters that they all rise, quite fluttered*” (150).

Freddy is important to the play in the sense that he constitutes a *possible* future spouse for Eliza. Shaw's sequel notwithstanding (with its long narrative on the vicissitudes of Eliza's and Freddy's married life together), it is by no means certain that Eliza *will* marry Freddy after the play is over. Only Eliza's declaration that, “I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as hes able to support me” (189) supports this prediction, and it is not impossible that she is merely seeking to provoke Higgins when she utters it.³⁴ To Shaw, the ultimate point of the play was not that Eliza eventually married, but rather that she achieved emancipation, not only from Higgins but also, one assumes, from the strictures of the English class system. In the event, however, that audiences inferred that she did marry, Shaw wanted them to believe that it was Freddy whom she wed, not Higgins. In short, Freddy was created as a safeguard against romantics who might otherwise have assumed that Higgins was the only possible marital choice for Eliza. Freddy can only fulfill this role, however, if the actor who portrays him is able to register a sufficiently strong

³⁴ Shaw himself only began asserting that Eliza *definitely* married Freddy following the romanticisation of his play in performance with regard to the relationship between Higgins and Eliza.

impression on the audience for this character to be remembered two lengthy acts after his last appearance.

Themes and Interpretive Issues

Phonetics and the British class system. Hugo Baetens Beardsmore writes that, “Nowhere in his creative writing does Shaw’s interest in linguistic phenomena come more explicitly to the fore than in *Pygmalion*” (712). Shaw’s working title was, in fact, “The Phonetic Play”, and, unquestionably, the subject of phonetics is relevant to *Pygmalion*. In the first instance, it triggers the basic premise of the plot, namely, phonetician Henry Higgins teaches Cockney flower seller Eliza Doolittle to speak like a duchess, while at the end of the play it serves as the catalyst for the climactic battle of wills between these two characters when the latter threatens to teach phonetics with the former’s professional rival (Professor Nepean).

In his Preface to *Pygmalion*, Shaw argues that, “The English have no respect for their language, and will not teach their children to speak it.” The fault, he implies, lies with its alphabet: “They spell it so abominably that no man can teach himself what it sounds like.” Consequently, he writes, “The reformer England needs today is an energetic phonetic enthusiast: that is why I have made such a one the hero of a popular play” (99). He goes on to describe *Pygmalion* as a popular didactic work on the subject of phonetics: I wish to boast that *Pygmalion* has been an extremely successful play all over Europe and North America as well as at home. It is so intensely and deliberately didactic, and its subject³⁵ is esteemed so dry, that I delight in throwing it at the heads of the wiseacres who repeat the parrot cry that art should never be didactic. It goes to prove my contention that art should never be anything else. (102)

³⁵ This is by implication phonetics, since the entire Preface is devoted to this subject and its leading practitioners, notably Henry Sweet.

Shaw was being disingenuous, however, for he must have recognised that *Pygmalion* is not *principally* about phonetics, nor is its didacticism primarily related to this subject.³⁶ Its didacticism instead focuses on the British class system, exposing the unjustness and absurdity of class distinctions. As Dukore observes, “Speech lessons represent one way [of removing class distinctions] — important, but confined to a single, superficial aspect. *Pygmalion* also dramatizes other methods” (*Aspects* 286).³⁷ Indeed, Milton Crane argues that the play is not concerned with phonetics at all, since “Virtually nowhere in *Pygmalion* do the characters discuss [this topic],³⁸ despite Shaw’s specific statement that phonetics is the subject of the play” (882).

What Crane overlooks, however, is the way in which Shaw uses phonetics to address the wider issue of the relationship between speech and class, raising in the process the radical notion that, as Grene puts it, “Socially we are what we sound like, and if we can change our voices we change ourselves” (*Critical* 102). Higgins alludes to this notion in Act I when he talks of “upstarts” from Kentish Town³⁹ who “want to drop [their accents]; but [who] give themselves away every time they open their mouths”. The financial consequences of altering one’s pronunciation are significant, Higgins tells Pickering (and the audience), since it is possible for “Men [to] begin in Kentish Town with £80 a year, and end in [upper-class] Park Lane with a hundred thousand [pounds]” (114). In Act III,

³⁶ Shaw identifies only two didactic goals in his Preface, both of them concerning phonetics: “(I)f the play makes the public aware that there are such people as phoneticians, and that they are among the most important people in England at present, it will serve its turn” (102). While few would agree that he achieves the second of these goals, he indisputably succeeds in achieving the first. This occurs in Act I, when he arouses the audience’s curiosity regarding the method that Higgins employs to ascertain the origins of the onlookers, then has Higgins explain that the technique was “Simply phonetics. The science of speech. Thats my profession: also my hobby. . . . You can spot an Irishman or a Yorkshireman by his brogue. *I* can place any man within six miles. *I* can place him within two miles in London. Sometimes within two streets” (114).

³⁷ I.e., clothes, cleanliness, manners, and money. These aspects will be discussed later in this section.

³⁸ This is a considerable understatement. In Acts I and II Pickering and Higgins discuss phonetics, and implicitly in Act III with Mrs Higgins. In Act IV Higgins mentions phonetics, and, in Act V (as discussed on page 70), Eliza laments that her new pronunciation has isolated her from her former existence.

³⁹ Kentish Town, a suburb of North London, was a working-class area at that time.

Higgins demonstrates via Eliza how a former flower seller can approximate the elocution of a Park Lane debutante when she speaks at his mother's at-home day with "*pedantic correctness of pronunciation and great beauty of tone*" (150).

Nevertheless, Eliza's performance on this occasion illustrates what Julian Hilton describes as "the danger of studying words divorced from meaning" (164).⁴⁰ Eliza does indeed *speak* beautifully, but her conversation is peppered with coarse family anecdotes (with obvious working-class references) and numerous grammatical lapses,⁴¹ and she is saved from exposure only by the lack of perceptiveness of her audience (the Eynsford Hills).⁴² Eliza is an extremely fast learner,⁴³ however, and by Act IV she has overcome what Beardsmore identifies as the problem of "cross-level interference", which in her case had constituted the mastering of "the correct phonological rules of upper-class English" without having "acquired the correct sociolinguistic rules of appropriate lexis and grammar" (714).

But as Beardsmore also observes, Eliza's ascent to a new "social milieu" occurs though "a process of acculturation that includes the learning of a complete set of social habits which are primarily mediated through linguistic convention" (712–13). These include acquiring an awareness of the importance of register in discourse. When in Act III Mrs Higgins asks conversationally, "Will it rain, do you think?", Eliza is unable to recognise that an informal (conversational) response is socially appropriate, and instead replies in the overly formal register of a meteorological report — "The shallow depression in the

⁴⁰ Higgins himself anticipates this problem when he acknowledges to his mother (immediately before Eliza and the other guests arrive in Act III) that, Eliza's English "is and it isn't [satisfactory]". "I've got her pronunciation all right," he goes on to say, "but you have to consider not only *how* a girl pronounces, but *what* she pronounces; and that's where—" (147).

⁴¹ E.g., "What become of her new straw hat that should have come to me? Somebody pinched it; and what I say is, them as pinched it done her in" (152).

⁴² As indeed Mrs Higgins implies, when she tells her son that, "[I]f you suppose for a moment that she doesn't give herself away in every sentence she utters, you must be perfectly cracked about her" (156).

⁴³ In Act III, Higgins and Pickering marvel to Mrs Higgins at Eliza's "most extraordinary quickness of ear" (157).

west of these islands is likely to move slowly in an easterly direction” (151). By the time Eliza has mastered her control of polite society discourse, she realises to her sadness that she is no longer able to function linguistically in her previous environment. As she tells Pickering in Act V, “Last night, when I was wandering about [in Covent Garden], a girl spoke to me; and I tried to get back into the old ways with her; but it was no use. . . . I have forgotten my own language, and can speak nothing but yours” (180).

Pygmalion also demonstrates how cleanliness may determine not only the class that a person is perceived to be from, but the way in which that individual is treated. As Mugglestone observes,

(C)leanliness, or rather its converse, initially constitutes a marker of Eliza’s social ostracism, and is likewise to be subject to transition during Eliza’s social transformation. The ease with which it is removed, however, serves to stress the way in which markers of class may have their significance overstated as determinants, as well as determiners, of individual identity; though Eliza was, for example, deemed entirely unworthy of discourse by Clara Eynsford–Hill [*sic*] in Act I,⁴⁴ her acquisition of the right accent, plus the elimination of the dirt, makes her instead an object of emulation by Act III, irrespective of the fact that the substance of her conversation, in terms of true social propriety, still lacks the conventions appropriate for polite conversation. (377-78)

Of course, cleanliness alone will not propel a person into a higher social milieu; clothes are also a crucial component in determining class. In Act V, Doolittle demonstrates that he need not change his working-class accent in order to be treated with respect — merely his clothes.⁴⁵ Ironically, it is Mrs Higgins’s parlor-maid, a woman of only slightly higher

⁴⁴ I.e., when Mrs Eynsford Hill questions Eliza as to how she knew her son’s name was “Freddy” (108).

⁴⁵ And, one assumes, his bathing habits. When Doolittle first meets Higgins in Act II, the former, clad in his usual dustman attire, is clearly malodorous. Shaw writes that, Higgins is “*a little overwhelmed by the proximity of his visitor; for Doolittle has a professional flavor of dust about him*” (137).

“status” than that of Doolittle at the beginning of the play, who infers from his attire⁴⁶ that he is a member of the upper middle class:

THE PARLOR-MAID. A Mr Doolittle, sir.

PICKERING. Doolittle! Do you mean the dustman?

THE PARLOR-MAID. Dustman! Oh no, sir: a gentleman. (171)

In Act II, Doolittle himself acts “*deferentially*” toward an individual on the basis of clothes and a clean appearance when he fails to recognise “*a dainty and exquisitely clean*” Eliza dressed “*in a simple blue cotton kimono*” — “Beg pardon, miss” (140). The respect that Eliza initially receives here contrasts strongly not only with the contempt that she receives in Act I from Clara (as previously mentioned), but also with the indifference shown toward her by Freddy when he collides with her at the beginning of the play. Eliza’s dirty hair and shabby clothes immediately mark her (in the Eynsford Hills’ eyes) as a social inferior. As Berst observes, Freddy’s “scarcely pausing to say a simple ‘Sorry’ shows ever so much less consideration than he would give a lady and contrasts with his lovestruck pursuit of her when she appears as a lady later on” (*Pygmalion* 33). Freddy’s attitude of assumed superiority toward Eliza is further underscored when he returns at the end of Act I and addresses her informally, employing the brusqueness of a direct question (as opposed to the politeness of an *indirect* question) purely on the basis of her perceived class — “Where are the two ladies that were here?” — and cursing in front of her — “Damnation!” (116).

Thus, Shaw demonstrates that good manners are not related to class or so-called breeding, and that, as practised by the middle-class Eynsford Hills in this instance, they are a commodity that can be switched on and off at will depending on the perceived status of the person they encounter. In short, as Silver observes, Shaw asks us to consider “the degree of relatedness of manners to morals and of both to class. To what extent do

⁴⁶ Shaw writes that, “[Doolittle] is brilliantly dressed in a new fashionable frock-coat, with white waistcoat and grey trousers. A flower in his buttonhole, a dazzling silk hat, and patent leather shoes complete the effect” (171).

an individual's manners determine his social class? Do they reveal or mask his intrinsic class?" (182). Certainly, Eliza's manners are superior to those of the Eynsford Hills in Act I, but she cannot be considered middle-class because she lacks the right accent, the right clothes, and money. The Eynsford Hills also lack money, but they *do* possess manners (though only when they *need* to display them — as at Mrs Higgins's at-home day, for example), together with the right clothes and the right accent. Doolittle has the wrong accent, but in his post-transformation period he has money, the appropriate clothes, and the correct etiquette.⁴⁷ He assumes that he will eventually be obliged to learn middle-class English as well — and, blaming Higgins for his predicament, tells him that, "I daresay that's what you done it for" (174). Higgins, in contrast with Doolittle, has no manners for anyone except his mother (and, to a lesser extent, Pickering), but he possesses money, clothes, and the right accent. Thus, Shaw suggests that in order to be accepted into middle-class society, a person must possess at least three of four criteria.

As Ganz observes, "*Pygmalion* does not at first glance seem like a socialist, much less a Fabian play, [*sic*] but it is" (179). Throughout the play, in fact — and in Act I, in particular — Shaw asks his audience to consider the implications of being a member of the working class in 1912 England. "You take us for dirt under your feet, dont you?" asks a Cockney bystander of Higgins, underscoring the contempt with which his working-class characters perceive they are regarded by the middle class. In his instructions at the beginning of Act I, Shaw emphasises how destitute Eliza is in comparison with the middle-class Eynsford Hill women — "[*Eliza*] is no doubt as clean as she can afford to be; but compared to the ladies she is very dirty" (107). The Eynsford Hills, in contrast, are "*in evening dress*" (105). Early in the act, Shaw emphasises the evident disapproval

⁴⁷ In Act V, the formerly *working-class* Doolittle reveals that he has what Shaw describes in a 1914 letter to actor Edmund Gurney (who played Doolittle during the first London production) as "instinctive good manners". Shaw goes on to write that, "I want it to be clear that the dustman has much more social talent than anybody present" (*Portable* 326). In this act, Doolittle remonstrates with Higgins for describing Eliza as a "creature that we picked out of the mud" — exclaiming (with some irony), "Now, now, Henry Higgins! have some consideration for my feelings as a middle class man" (177), and when he inadvertently ignores Mrs Higgins on his arrival, he is "*taken aback as he becomes conscious that he has forgotten his hostess*" (171).

with which the middle class views non-essential contact with the working class, with Mrs Eynsford Hill's obvious discomfort when Eliza addresses Freddy by name. Unable to conceive of familiarity between the two classes without assuming an unsavoury explanation for it, Mrs Eynsford Hill clearly believes that Eliza is a prostitute. How *else* could she know Freddy's name? Moreover, Eliza's explanation — "I called him Freddy or Charlie same as you might yourself if you was talking to a stranger and wished to be pleasant" (108) — underscores the difference between the formality of Mrs Eynsford Hill's class and the *informality* of that of Eliza, with her "lower-class unawareness that a lady would never use familiar nicknames in addressing a stranger" (Berst, *Pygmalion* 34).

In Act I, Shaw also emphasises the intimidation and sense of helplessness felt by Eliza. When a bystander warns her that, "Theres a bloke here behind taking down every blessed word youre saying" (109), and urges her to give Pickering a flower in return for the three halfpence that she has cajoled from him lest the "bloke" is a "copper's nark"⁴⁸ and misconstrues Pickering's motive for giving her the money, Eliza's "*terrified*" reaction — "You dunno what it means to me. Theyll take away my character and drive me on the streets for speaking to gentlemen" (109) — underscores her very real "awareness of the dangers of being arrested for soliciting" (Greene, *Pygmalion* xvi). Working-class *women* are especially downtrodden, Shaw also implies throughout the play. In Act III, Eliza provides a trenchant account of "women [who] has [*sic*] to make their husbands drunk to make them fit to live with" (152).

Central to the class-related concerns of *Pygmalion* is the theme of money. One example is Higgins's habit of jingling his coins, which suggests, as Greene observes, "that some measure of [this character's] bullying self-confidence derives from the unquestioned security of ample means" (104). In Act I Mrs Eynsford Hill, assuming that the working class have no integrity, and gives Eliza a sixpence in an attempt to buy information about her son; and at the end of the act, Higgins, hearing in the striking of the church "*the voice of God, rebuking him for his Pharisaic want of charity to [Eliza]*", throws a generous

⁴⁸ Higgins (the "bloke" in this instance) immediately asks — presumably for the benefit of the audience — "Whats a copper's nark?" "A sort of informer," the Bystander replies (109–10).

amount of money into Eliza's basket, thereby unwittingly providing the flower seller with the means to purchase lessons from him in Act II. Clara's bitterness in Acts I and III is motivated by a lack of money. In Act II, Shaw teaches his audience the typical daily income of a flower seller (half a crown), contrasting it with that of a millionaire (150 pounds sterling), when Eliza offers Higgins "two-fifths of her day's income" (122), as the latter deduces it, in exchange for an English lesson. In doing so, Shaw underscores the financial sacrifice that Eliza is willing to make in order to improve her life. In Act III, Eliza reveals the chilling story of her late aunt, apparently murdered for her new straw hat, since "Them she lived with would have killed her for a hat-pin, let alone a hat" (152), while in Act IV she returns her hired jewels for fear of being accused of stealing.

The notion of Eliza as a tradable property also appears throughout much of the play. "Do you mean to say, you callous rascal, that you would sell your daughter for £50?" a "revolted" Higgins asks Doolittle in Act II (138). Yet in Act V, it is Higgins who invokes his property rights when he claims ownership of Eliza — "[Doolittle] shant provide for her. She doesn't belong to him. I paid him five pounds for her" (175). Higgins subsequently asserts his ownership rights over Eliza, not as purchaser but as *creator* — "I tell you I have created this thing out of the squashed leaves of Covent Garden . . ." (178) and, later, "I'm not going to have *my* masterpiece thrown away on Freddy" [*italics mine*] (189).

Transformation and independence. Two transformations occur in *Pygmalion*: those of Eliza and her father. Both are propelled into the middle class — with markedly different results — and, in both instances, through the actions of Higgins, directly or otherwise. As Ganz observes, "Not only are the actions parallel but they are neither of them motivated by a personal concern for the recipient" (181). Eliza gains an education, a new speech, new manners, eloquence and, finally, after much inner turmoil and verbal clashing, independence from her mentor. Doolittle gains only *financial* independence, and claims that its consequences are not to his liking. Moreover, Doolittle, unlike Eliza, had never wanted to change his circumstances — "Who asked [Higgins] to make a gentleman of me? I was happy. I was free" (173). But Higgins remains unconcerned about the

consequences of his actions. Although he initially reacts with amusement to Doolittle's transformation — “What a lark!” (173) — his mood swiftly changes to one of annoyance when he assumes (incorrectly) that the latter has taken Eliza away from him. His annoyance has a purely selfish motive, however, for, as he complains to his mother at the beginning of Act V, “What am I to do? . . . I cant find anything. I dont know what appointments Ive got” (170).⁴⁹

As many commentators have observed, both transformations contain mythic allusions. Doolittle's fate, while highly comic in the apparent⁵⁰ indignation that it produces in the former dustman, is suggestive of a morality tale.⁵¹ As Bentley observes, “Doolittle commits the cardinal sin on the Shavian scale — he is irresponsible” (*Shaw* 126),⁵² and in Act V we witness an appropriate punishment for his lifetime of cheerful amorality. In a surviving shorthand fragment from 1914, Shaw describes Doolittle's transformation as “a

⁴⁹ Higgins evidently regards Eliza primarily as a useful secretary. In Act III, he makes almost-identical comments to his mother on Eliza's secretarial skills — “Besides, shes useful. She knows where my things are, and remembers my appointments and so forth” (156).

⁵⁰ Grene argues that, “Doolittle may proclaim that he has been ‘ruined’ by his inheritance, . . . but it is hard to believe him” (*Critical* 108). Certainly, Doolittle's fondness for exaggeration and contradictory statements has been established by this stage. For example, in Act II, he claims to be a man who “brought up and fed and clothed [Eliza] by the sweat of his brow . . .” (139), but later in the act also says, “I never brought her up at all, except to give her a lick of a strap now and again” (141).

⁵¹ Berst argues that medieval morality elements pervade the play, e.g., “[in Act I] the presence of an Old Testament God may be implied in the lightning that flashes as [Eliza] bumps into Freddy, as well as in the church bells which remind Higgins of charity. The profound morality test comes in Act II. Here Eliza is The Tempted, most notably in terms of innocent Eve — ‘I'm a good girl, I am' — suffering from the sins of curiosity and ambition, lured on by Satan Higgins” (*Art* 202).

⁵² One of the indicators of Doolittle's irresponsibility, as we have seen, is that he is incorrigibly work-shy. Grene writes that, “A work-ethic was fundamental to Shaw's temperament and he could never accept a system in which a proportion of people were permitted to do nothing” (*Critical* 106). Here, however, Shaw is arguably punishing the man, rather than the (capitalist) system.

frightful retribution”, comparing it with the descent into hell of Don Juan⁵³ in *Il Dissoluto Punito*:

In the old play he is cast into hell by the statue of the man he has murdered. In my play a far more real and terrible fate overtakes him. No: it is not the fate of Oswald in Ibsen’s *Ghosts*, nor of the young man in Brieux’s *Les Avariés*. Nothing like that at all. Something quite simple, quite respectable, quite presentable to the youngest schoolgirl. (*CP* 4 800)⁵⁴

This “retribution”, which constitutes Doolittle’s assumption of respectability in the form of his unlikely entry into the middle class through an annual bequeathment, is effectively foreshadowed in Act II when Higgins offers the dustman ten pounds when the latter has asked him only for five pounds, and the latter declines the additional sum. The explanation that Doolittle provides — “Ten pounds is a lot of money: it makes a man feel prudent like; and then goodbye to happiness” (*P*139–40) — establishes the basis for the feelings of intimidation that he acknowledges experiencing in Act V (174). For if ten pounds could potentially spoil his happiness, then what impact would *three thousand* pounds⁵⁵ have on him? Doolittle provides the answer to this question, and blames Higgins for his predicament:⁵⁶

⁵³ Shaw had previously depicted Don Juan in hell in the dream sequence of Act III of *Man and Superman* (written in 1903; first performed in 1905). In this scene, Don Juan (Jack Tanner) has a long philosophical discussion with the Devil (Mendoza).

⁵⁴ Shaw evidently changed his mind about Doolittle’s fate, for (as previously noted) the sequel suggests a happy afterlife for the former dustman “feeding in the dining room [at ducal dinners] and being consulted by cabinet ministers”. Money, however, proves an enduring problem for him, since he is now obliged to maintain appearances in *upper-* (not middle-) class society, which he finds difficult to do on his fixed income (196).

⁵⁵ In his sequel, Shaw mistakenly writes that the bequeathment was “four thousand a year” (196).

⁵⁶ We subsequently learn from Doolittle that it was because of a letter from Higgins to the now-deceased Ezra D. Wannafeller (praising Doolittle as “the most original moralist at present in England”) that the dustman has received his annual stipend (172).

MRS HIGGINS. But what has my son done to you, Mr Doolittle?

DOOLITTLE. Done to me! Ruined me. Destroyed my happiness. Tied me up and delivered me into the hands of middle class morality. (172)

Doolittle is now forced to be respectable, prudent, and a provider for others; in short, the antithesis of all that he once represented. But as Bentley observes, this is not a “reborn” Doolittle, as “(h)e is too far gone for that” (*Shaw* 126). Doolittle remains the articulate, ebullient iconoclast that he was in Act II, but one hereafter burdened by the impositions of others. He must now marry, since his common-law wife, he implies, feels obliged to conform to middle-class conventions — “respectability has broke all the spirit out of her” (*P*182). Moreover, in what Ganz describes as “a delicious comic reversal of conventional suppositions [his bride-to-be] has, [Doolittle] tells us, ‘been very low, thinking of the happy days that are no more’” (182).

From Shaw’s socialist viewpoint, however, there is a serious aspect to Doolittle’s transformation in its altruistic connotations for society as a whole. As Doolittle ruefully acknowledges — “[Now] I have to live for others and not for myself: thats middle class morality” (173). Doolittle also assumes that he must now provide financially for Eliza, since his newly acquired status precludes her from returning to her former occupation — “I bet shes on my doorstep by this: she that could support herself easy by selling flowers if I wasnt respectable” (173-74).

For the present, however, Eliza appears to have no intention of being supported financially by her father. In quick succession in Act V, she spontaneously declares two feasible (if overly ambitious) income-earning plans to Higgins, both involving phonetics, and both deliberately provocative. One constitutes working for Higgins’s rival, the phonetician Nepean (189), the other involves “[advertising] it in the papers that your duchess is only a flower girl that you taught, and that she’ll teach anybody to be a duchess just the same in six months for a thousand guineas” (190).⁵⁷ But Eliza’s

⁵⁷ In her haste to infuriate Higgins, Eliza appears not to have considered that the inherent notoriety of the latter plan — with its explicit self-exposure as a working-class imposter in middle-class society — might

realisation in Act V that she need not fear for her future, financially speaking, is only one part of her transformation. In the climactic scene of the latter half of Act V, which Bentley aptly describes as “a Strindbergian⁵⁸ battle of wills” between pupil and mentor (*Shaw* 122), Eliza acquires the *emotional and verbal resilience* to withstand Higgins, arguably realising in the process that, spiritually at least, she is his superior:

LIZA. I'll offer myself as an assistant to Professor Nepean.

HIGGINS [*rising in a fury*] What! That imposter! that humbug! that toadying ignoramus! Teach him my methods! my discoveries! You take one step in his direction and I'll wring your neck. [*He lays hands on her*]. Do you hear?

LIZA [*defiantly non-resistant*] Wring away. What do I care? I knew you'd strike me some day. [*He lets her go, stamping with rage at having forgotten himself, and recoils so hastily that he stumbles back into his seat on the ottoman*]. Aha! Now I know how to deal with you. What a fool I was not to think of it before! You can't take away the knowledge you gave me. You said I had a finer ear than you. And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can. Aha! That's done you, Henry Higgins, it has. Now I don't care *that* [*snapping her fingers*] for your bullying and your big talk. . . . Oh, when I think of myself crawling under your feet and being trampled on and called names, when all the time I had only to lift up my finger to be as good as you, I could just kick myself. (189–90)

The Eliza of this confrontation is a considerably more self-possessed and emotionally controlled person than the one we encountered in the previous act:

conceivably deprive her of respectability. In the sequel, however, she decides against teaching phonetics, reasoning “that she had no right, without Higgins's consent, to exploit the knowledge he had given her . . .” (197), and she and Freddy eventually open a joint flower shop/greengrocer's business together.

⁵⁸ After August Strindberg (1849–1912), the Swedish playwright noted for the psychological battles that his characters often wage against each other.

LIZA. Why didnt you leave me where you picked me out of — in the gutter?
You thank God it's all over, and that now you can throw me back again there, do
you? [*She crimps her fingers frantically*].

HIGGINS [*looking at her in cool wonder*] The creature is nervous, after all.

LIZA [*gives a suffocated scream of fury, and instinctively darts her nails at his
face*] !!

HIGGINS [*catching her wrists*] Ah! would you? Claws in, you cat. How dare
you shew [*sic*] your temper to me? Sit down and be quiet. [*He throws her
roughly into the easy chair*].

LIZA [*crushed by superior strength and weight*] Whats to become of me? Whats
to become of me? (163)

Tellingly in both instances, it is the person who *initiates* the violence — Eliza in Act IV, Higgins in Act V — who emerges as the “loser” in each confrontation. In Act IV, Eliza betrays her vulnerability regarding her future (“Whats to become of me?”), goaded by Higgins’s return to the type of dehumanising descriptions — in this instance, “the creature” — with their connotations of Frankenstein’s monster, with which he had mocked her in Acts I and II. Clearly, she is still susceptible to Higgins’s emotional manipulation, while linguistically she does not yet possess the articulation to meet him head-on. Unable to control her emotions, she resorts (unthinkingly) to her only remaining weapon: violence — “[*She*] *instinctively darts her nails at his face*” — before descending into self-pity.⁵⁹ In Act V, however, it is Higgins who loses his emotional self-control. This is painful to the phonetician, as we know from the previous act how important the illusion of composure is to him: “You have caused me to lose my temper: a thing that has hardly ever happened to me before,” (167–68), he tells Eliza. Moreover, here he violates “the treasures of [his] Miltonic mind” by laying hands on her, thus revealing himself to be the very “brute” that Eliza had previously accused him of being — and a charge

⁵⁹ Nevertheless, as Berst observes, Eliza’s “*suffocated scream*” here is a telling indication of her “growing sophistication” given that only months earlier “she would have voiced her emotions in a howl” (*Pygmalion* 100).

subsequently denied by him (185–86).⁶⁰ As Berst observes, “The intellectual snob is the beast now, and she the lady above him” (*Pygmalion* 132).

To many commentators, Act IV represents the turning point in Eliza’s inner development, while Act V reveals its culmination. Between Acts III and IV, Eliza has mastered her elocution and command of etiquette and triumphed at an ambassador’s garden party. But by keeping this success off-stage, Shaw focuses the audience’s attention not on the defining event of her external transformation — for all that we may be curious to learn what transpired at the garden party, the dinner, and at the opera — but rather on its consequences for Eliza as a person. In this and other respects, Bentley argues, *Pygmalion* contains a “singularly elegant structure”. He goes on to write that if we regard the brief first act as the prologue/exposition, then consequently

the play falls into two parts of two Acts apiece. Both parts are Pygmalion myths. In the first a duchess is made out of a flower girl. In the second a woman is made out of a duchess. Since these two parts are the main, inner action[,] the omission of the climax of the outer action — the ambassador’s reception — will seem particularly discreet, economical, and dramatic.⁶¹ (*Shaw* 124)

⁶⁰ Gibbs argues that Higgins’s laying of hands on Eliza here “is Pygmalion/Higgins’s final and decisive creative act in the play, an act which simultaneously brings his work of art to life and secures for both the artist himself and his creation their complete freedom from one another. The Pygmalion legend comes brilliantly to the surface at this point in the play, charged with meanings which give a new direction to the Ovidian tale. Shaw’s *Pygmalion* does indeed create (or recreate) a woman. But the essential sign of her coming to life is that she is no longer a doll-like projection of her creator’s will. She has gained self-ownership and freedom of choice (‘I’m not afraid of you, and can do without you’)” (*Art* 174–75).

⁶¹ Another view on the structure of *Pygmalion* as it relates to the play’s transformation theme is that of Wisenthal, who argues Eliza goes through three stages: “She begins in Acts I and II as a flower *girl*; in Acts III and IV she is a lady; and by the end of the play she has become a woman. We have here an ingenious version of the Pygmalion myth: Pygmalion/Higgins makes the stone/girl into a statue/lady, which Venus/the Life Force causes to come alive as a woman” (123). Bauschatz also disagrees with Bentley’s description, seeing “the play as being much more divided into units connecting Act I to Act II and Act IV to Act V and as pivoting them, as it were, around Act III . . .” (182). In a purely temporal sense, the play conforms with Bauschatz’s theory, since Act I and Act IV are immediately followed by an act that takes

Bentley argues that, “The arousing of Eliza’s resentment in the fourth Act was the birth of a soul” (122). I would argue, however, that it is not so much a *soul* that is born in Act IV as it is the genesis of Eliza’s independence and emancipation from her teacher. As much as Higgins had earlier denied it — “[she has no] feelings that we need bother about” (126), he says in Act II — Eliza always *had* a soul; what she plainly lacked, however, from the moment that she entered Higgins’s Wimpole Street laboratory in Act II were the requisite skills to flourish in her new environment. Berst argues that,

Eliza’s soul grows by degrees, not just at the end. Ostensibly, the lessons and examples of her numerous mentors provide the basis for growth. These Eliza absorbs in terms of her vitality and talent, her own essential qualities without which the lessons would prove futile and the transformation hopeless. She emerges as a synthesis of her education, her environment, and her special abilities, her incipient genius flowering in the broader horizons which are offered her by the relative sophistication and freedom of the upper classes. (*Art* 204)

Although Act IV does not resolve the question⁶² first raised by Mrs Pearce in Act II — and now rephrased in Eliza’s heartfelt “Whats to become of me?” — what it *does* clarify (for the audience, at least) is the shattering of Eliza’s Cinderella dreams. This is a much darker act than the three that have preceded it, and it will become darker still when we learn from Mrs Higgins in Act V that (between acts) Eliza had contemplated suicide (*P*175).

As Berst observes, at the beginning of Act IV, “Shaw evokes a fairy-tale association as the clock on Higgins’s mantelpiece strikes twelve. . . . Just as the ball is over at midnight

place the following morning, whereas the events of Act III occurs several months after those of Act II and some time before those of Act IV.

⁶² I.e., “(W)hat is to become of [Eliza] when youve finished your teaching? You must look ahead a little” (127), Mrs Pearce asks Higgins. In Act III, Mrs Higgins attempts to make Pickering and Higgins (“you two infinitely stupid male creatures”) address “the problem of what is to be done with her afterwards” (158).

for Cinderella, so it is for Eliza” (*Pygmalion* 96). Accordingly, “*She is tired . . . and her expression is almost tragic*” (160). Ignored by Higgins and Pickering — and upset by their insensitivity toward her — “[*her*] *beauty becomes murderous*” (P162). Then, in an ironic parallel to the Cinderella myth, she hurls Higgins’s slippers at him, arguably severing any further connection to the fairy tale. Yet there are intimations throughout the remainder of the act that Eliza harbours vague romantic feelings toward this would-be Prince. When Higgins assumes that she intends to leave Wimpole Street permanently — “I should imagine you wont have much difficulty in settling yourself somewhere or other, though I hadnt quite realized that you were going away” — Eliza looks at him searchingly, presumably seeking an indication of his feelings on the issue, but he merely “*decides that he will eat an apple*” (165). Nonchalantly, he suggests that she might marry, adding (as “*a genial afterthought*”) that, “I daresay my mother could find some chap or other who would do very well” (165). This arguably precludes any suggestion of romantic feelings on Higgins’s part toward her. Eliza’s feelings are more difficult to determine, however. Her actions at the end of Act IV, when she “*goes down on her knees on the hearthrug to look for the ring [that Higgins has thrown into the fireplace]*” (168) contain romantic connotations; yet one could equally argue that it is her sentimental attachment to the ring that drives her to search for it.

Act V, however, does not entirely resolve the issue of Eliza’s feelings toward Higgins, for almost until the end of the play she continues to make ambiguous statements:

LIZA [*much troubled*] I want a little kindness. I know I’m a common ignorant girl, and you a book-learned gentleman; but I’m not dirt under your feet. What I done [*correcting herself*] what I did was not for the dresses and the taxis: I did it because we were pleasant together and I come — came — to care for you; not to want you to make love to me, and not forgetting the difference between us, but more friendly like. (188)

Holroyd argues that Eliza’s insistence here that she harbours no romantic intentions toward Higgins “is clearly a tactical statement added so as not to alarm Higgins at the

start of their new relationship: for love is what she does want. She wants to be valued” (*Pursuit* 330). Higgins’s needs, on the other hand, are “less clear”, Holroyd asserts:

The purpose of Higgins’s experiment has been ‘filling up the deepest gulf that separates class from class and soul from soul’. It is half successful, half a failure. The class gulf is filled at the garden party, dinner party and reception:⁶³ the gulf between Eliza and Higgins remains. Eliza has changed, but Higgins admits ‘I cant change my nature.’ (330–31)

But while it is almost certainly true that Higgins cannot change his “nature” — described by Berst as “celibate and self-centered, slightly perverse in both respects” (*Art* 218) — Higgins does come to the realisation in Act V that he has, as he acknowledges to Eliza, “grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather” (185). Moreover, as his distraught state at the beginning of the act reveals, he is in fact considerably more dependent upon Eliza than he had previously realised. What he wants from her, however, is not romance but companionship (and, as previously noted, her secretarial skills) — “If you come back, come back for the sake of good fellowship; for youll get nothing else” (186). In short, if she returns to him, it will be on *his* terms.

Yet not until virtually the end of the play does Eliza appear to comprehend this crucial point. Before the final confrontation with Higgins, however, she displays a sophistication that we have not seen in the previous acts, gently parodying her mentor’s Act III instructions that she discuss only “the weather and everyone’s health” (146) — “How do you do, Professor Higgins? Are you quite well?” “But of course you are: you are never ill” (178) — and participating in *extended* discourse for the first time in the play. This is a mature, poised and insightful Eliza.⁶⁴ During this final clash with Higgins, however, she

⁶³ Holroyd is mistaken here: the (ambassador’s) garden party *is* the reception. The opera is the third event that Eliza, Higgins, and Pickering attend on the evening of her triumph in high society.

⁶⁴ She does not entirely conceal her former habits, however, reverting to her “A-a-a-ah-ow-oo!” (last heard in Act II) when she sees “her father’s splendor” (181), much to Higgins’s sadistic delight, and betraying traces of her former snobbishness when she refers to Doolittle’s bride-to-be as “that low common

initially struggles to maintain her composure, temporarily losing her articulation as “*she sinks on the chair at the writing-table in tears*” (188). But she swiftly regains her inner strength, and we encounter a fiercely determined Eliza whom we have not encountered before. Shaw’s instructions chart the measure of her resolve as she confronts Higgins, “*rising determinedly*” (189), becomes “*defiantly non-resistant*”, then “*snapping her fingers*” before becoming (on Mrs Higgins’s return to the room) “*cool and elegant*” (190). Almost superfluously (in light of the verbal strength she displays) she declares to Higgins at the end of the confrontation — “I’m not afraid of you, and can do without you” (190).

Mrs Higgins’s return allows Eliza to reflect for a moment on Higgins’s previous statement — “Five minutes ago you were like a millstone round my neck. Now you’re a tower of strength: a consort battleship. You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl” (190). The implications of Higgins’s desexualising term “bachelors” and the adjective “old” are presumably not lost on her. He cannot or will not change his nature. At best, he wants merely a comrade — an intellectual sparring partner — and, at worst, a slave. But as Eliza had acknowledged a little earlier in the act, she desires much more — “Every girl has a right to be loved” (187) — and, recognising herself to be the stronger person in a possible future relationship with Freddy, states that, “Perhaps I could make something of him” (187). Arguably implicit in this statement is her realisation that Higgins, for his part, can no longer “make something” of *her*. On learning that Higgins will not be attending her father’s wedding, Eliza reverts to the mock-formality with which she first greeted Higgins earlier in the act — “Then I shall not see you again, Professor. Goodbye.” “*She goes to the door.*” Higgins calls after her in a casual manner — “Oh, by the way, Eliza . . .”⁶⁵ —

woman” (181). As Berst notes of the latter incident, “Her snobbery toward her stepmother further reveals that she is not yet fully a Mrs. Higgins. She is too close to her squalid roots to easily adopt the kindness, understanding, and integrity which transcend class distinctions” (*Art* 216-17).

⁶⁵ Shaw had very clear ideas as to how this moment should be played. In his “Final Orders” to Stella Campbell, written on the day of the first performance of *Pygmalion* in London in 1914, he reminded her not to sentimentalise the ending: “At the end, when Higgins says ‘Oh, by the way Eliza’, bridle your propensity to run like Georgina to anyone who calls you, and to forget everything in an affectionate tête-à-

and asks her to buy him a ham, a Stilton cheese, reindeer gloves, and a tie. “*His cheerful, careless, vigorous shews that he is incorrigible.*” Eliza’s response — informal this time in comparison with her previous utterance — is coolly emphatic:

LIZA [*disdainfully*] Buy them yourself. [*She sweeps out*].

MRS HIGGINS I’m afraid you’ve spoilt that girl, Henry. But never mind, dear: I’ll buy you the tie and gloves.

HIGGINS [*sunnily*] Oh, don’t bother. She’ll buy em all right enough. Good-bye. *They kiss. Mrs Higgins runs out. Higgins, left alone, rattles his cash in his pocket; chuckles; and disports himself in a highly self-satisfied manner.* (191)

As noted in the Introduction, a number of Shavian scholars have professed themselves disappointed with the ending. A.C. Ward argues that, “Shaw did not face up to the dramatic imperative in *Pygmalion*. Had the play been allowed to take what, in terms of drama, is its predestined course, Liza [*sic*] would have married Higgins — for better, for worse. It would have made trouble — but ‘making life means making trouble . . .’” (132). Ervine concurs: “The end of the fourth act as well as the end of the fifth act . . . assure all sensible people that [Eliza] married Henry Higgins and bore him vigorous and intelligent children” (460). In contrast, Berst argues that, “A close examination of Higgins’s character and comments cannot support a romantic conclusion. . . . His reference to sensual love in terms of thick lips and thick boots reveals a confusion and revulsion which considers marital sensualism gross” (*Art* 218).

Berst also argues that Higgins’s request at the end of the play “involves a contradiction of that independence he has just extolled in her” (217).⁶⁶ He goes on to write that, “Higgins

tête with him. Imagine that he is the author, and be scornful. All that is necessary is to stop on the threshold. If you find it impossible not to come back, at least don’t look obedient and affectionate” (*Shaw and Campbell* 161).

⁶⁶ Berst is referring to a remark that Higgins makes immediately after the final confrontation with Eliza — “By George, Eliza, I said I’d make a woman of you; and I have. I like you like this” (190). Certainly, Higgins’s smug satisfaction that Eliza will dutifully return to him seems at odds with this utterance.

seems to be motivated by a desire for Eliza's companionship, not marriage. He admires her new strength of character as he admires his mother's strength of character, but he values her primarily as she serves his ego and convenience" (218). In his 2005 study, Gibbs perceives Higgins in a similar vein, and argues that, "The final quarrel between Higgins and Eliza suggests that Higgins's confidence of the continuation of his ownership might well be misplaced" (*Life* 332).

Conolly (2008) notes the ambiguity of the ending, arguing that, "audiences are not likely to remain neutral" in their response to it. He also suggests that an unambiguous ending was not Shaw's intention either (xlii). In common with a number of commentators, he notes that there are similarities between Eliza's transformation and that of Nora Helmer in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*: "Eliza's transformation is not as breathtaking as Nora's, and Nora must achieve her transformation and independence in spite of her oppressive husband, but Eliza's departure from Higgins at the end of the play is in its way just as emphatic as Nora's slamming the door" (xxxv-vi).⁶⁷

Certainly, it is difficult not to accept the ending as an emphatic one. Indeed, the notion of Eliza returning to Higgins after she "*sweeps out*" contradicts the meaning of the entire fifth act, with its unmistakable evidence of an increasingly assertive and independent Eliza. Moreover, the strong underlying dramatic pulse of the last quarter of the play points *not* to a mere moment of pique on Eliza's part in her decision to walk out on Higgins, but to something more profound: a decisive turning point in her life. For Eliza to return to Higgins after Act V would, in effect, reinstall her in exactly the same position in

⁶⁷ Valency also argues that Shaw may have been influenced by another Ibsen play, *When We Dead Awaken* (1899), though he acknowledges that, "[T]he relation is not very close. Higgins does not create Eliza. He merely revises her. His relation to her is not artistic, but surgical. In *When We Dead Awaken*, the sculptor Rubek is destroyed because he has preferred his creation to the living woman who informed it, and toward the end of his life he realizes with regret that in his eagerness to work he has forgotten to live. Higgins has no such difficulty" (319). He does, however, see similarities between the two works: "The final scene of *Pygmalion* is in some sense a realization of the scene — which in *When We Dead Awaken* Ibsen forbore to write — in which Rubek lets Irene go after he has finished with her as a model" (319).

which she found herself at the end of Act IV, for Higgins has not changed, nor conceded anything more than surprise that his “creature” can confront him in a verbal confrontation. Were she to return, therefore, it would only be as a more articulate version of the useful secretary that Higgins desires.

The Romanticisation of *Pygmalion* — and Shaw’s Initial Efforts to Constrain It

As Gibbs observes, “Shaw had written a play he thought was about, among other things, a young woman finally emancipating herself from the domination of her male mentor. In his view it was a play not about the growth of love between master and pupil, but about the pupil’s regaining, through struggle, her independent identity . . .” (*Life* 332–33). It was this interpretation that Shaw emphasised to his cast when he directed the first English-language production of *Pygmalion*, which opened at His Majesty’s Theatre, London on 11 April 1914. On the opening night, however, his efforts were undermined by the erratic performance of the theatre’s actor-manager Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree in the role of Higgins.⁶⁸ Shaw found Tree’s acting in the final two acts “like nothing human”, with the latter “[making] every conceivable and practicable mistake,” and reaching his nadir when he wooed Mrs Patrick Campbell’s Eliza “like a bereaved Romeo” in the final scene (*CL* III 227–28).⁶⁹ But Tree — a devotee of “romantic endings” (Pearson, *Tree* 182) — had judged his public well, for the audience roared its approval (Huggett 137). A disgusted Shaw left the theatre before the curtain calls, and vowed the following day that, “(N)o mortal consideration would induce me to sit [*Pygmalion*] out again” (*CL* III 228).

⁶⁸ Hesketh Pearson writes that Tree “scarcely ever knew his lines in the early stages of a run, and this gave him the excitement which frequently issued in flashes of genius; but when he became word-perfect he lost interest and his performance went flat; he began to ‘walk through’ his part, to ‘gag’, and to ‘dry up’ the other actors with unseemly jokes and grimaces” (*Tree* 192). Tree’s ad-libbing during the opening night of *Pygmalion* was noted by several reviewers.

⁶⁹ Ironically, the *Illustrated London News* assumed that Tree’s tampering was a concession on Shaw’s part to romanticism, thus indicating that, “Bernard Shaw is hardly less addicted to [happy endings] than the most confirmed of stage sentimentalists” (qtd in Weintraub, *Heartbreak* 6).

In Shaw's absence, Tree indulged in further interpretive liberties. Stanley Weintraub writes that these included romanticising the ending "without altering a word [of the text]. In the interval between the last lines of the play and the last lowering of the curtain, Tree would provide by demonstrative affection for Eliza a broad hint that matrimony was in store for the professor and his pupil" (*Unexpected* 10).⁷⁰ "Come [back] soon — or you'll not recognize your play," Campbell implored Shaw (*Shaw & Campbell* 162), but by now she too was abetting Tree's romanticisation of the Higgins-Eliza relationship. Campbell had introduced a new final line (possibly created by Tree)⁷¹ that erased any doubt that a servile Eliza willingly returned to her mentor. In this altered ending, Eliza reappears on the stage to ask, in reference to the gloves that Higgins has breezily instructed her to purchase on his behalf, "What size?" — thus contradicting her apparent determination to be free from the latter's control.⁷² In contrast, as Gibbs observes, Shaw's "richly suggestive ending" leaves Higgins alone on the stage at the end of the play, "in a comical state of hubris, with very strong hints that he may be taking one step too far in his serene confidence about Eliza's loyalty" (*Life* 331).

Shaw witnessed Campbell's interpolation when he reluctantly returned to His Majesty's Theatre for the hundredth performance of *Pygmalion* in mid-July. Holroyd writes that on this occasion Shaw found Tree's and Campbell's romanticisation of the Higgins-Eliza relationship "worse than anything he had imagined. His directions had been wonderfully

⁷⁰ Pearson writes that Tree would throw flowers to Eliza (*Tree* 182). Grene describes this as "on a purely theatrical level a nice touch, reversing the image at the end of Act I where Eliza threw her flowers at Higgins . . ." (*Critical* 111).

⁷¹ Dan H. Laurence attributes it to Tree (*CL* III 253). However, in 1942 A. Emil Davies recalled Shaw telling him in May 1914 that the ending of the German-language productions of *Pygmalion* in 1913 had been changed "to make Eliza, . . . *as she goes out* [my emphasis], ask the Professor what size or colour gloves he requires — something which showed her devotion to him" (Gibbs, *Interviews* 154). It is unclear whether or not Shaw approved the change. In any event, he was adamant to Davies that the substituted ending was not a happy one.

⁷² In Act V of the original stage version of *Pygmalion*, Eliza, having already informed Higgins that he will not be seeing her again, responds "*disdainfully*" to his order to purchase gloves and other items on his behalf, saying "Buy them yourself." She then "*sweeps out*". Higgins, however, smugly predicts that, "She'll buy em all right enough." The Campbell interpolation thus confirms Higgins's prediction.

circumvented” (*Pursuit* 340). It was not only the final scene that had been changed: romanticism now permeated much, if not all, of the play. Holroyd goes on to write that at the end of Act IV, “Instead of flinging the ring [that Higgins had given her] down on the dessert stand . . . , Eliza on her knees clutched and gazed on it feelingly — there were no words because the emotion was obviously too deep. . . . And there were other embellishments so shocking that Shaw felt it was hopeless to get the play back on its proper plane” (*Pursuit* 340).

The production closed a week later, but any hope on Shaw’s part that the tampering with his play would be confined to its London run ended when he learned that Campbell’s interpolation had been included in the New York production of *Pygmalion*, which opened at the Park Theatre on Broadway on 14 October 1914.⁷³ In a letter to Shaw, the theatre’s managing director, George Tyler, sought to justify the use of Campbell’s ending on the grounds of its “enormous commercial value with sentimental America”, and admitted that, “Frankly, I was *afraid* to omit the line” (*CL* III 253). Shaw swiftly responded, urging Tyler to “stick to me and to the play . . .” (255), but it was already too late, and thereafter the Campbell interpolation proved an enduring irritation to the playwright in revivals of *Pygmalion* in both North America and the United Kingdom.⁷⁴ A letter from Shaw to theatre critic William Archer in April 1919 reveals his frustration:

⁷³ This was not the first American production. In March 1914 *Pygmalion* had opened at New York’s Irving Place Theatre in Trebitsch’s German translation. Campbell reprised her role as Eliza for the Park Theatre production, staying on for a 16-month North American tour, which ended in March 1916. At Shaw’s request, Tree was replaced in New York by Philip Merivale, who had played Pickering in the London production.

⁷⁴ Conolly writes the Campbell ending was specifically mentioned in the synopsis of the plot in the programme for a 1941 North American touring production (*Pygmalion* xlv). As late as 1948, Shaw received a publicist’s request for permission to use the line in a Minneapolis Civic Theatre production of *Pygmalion*. Shaw replied, “I absolutely forbid the Campbell interpolation or any suggestion that the middleaged bully and the girl of eighteen are lovers” (*CL* IV 815). He subsequently learned that the theatre had ignored his edict.

Ibsen was compelled to acquiesce in a happy ending for *A Doll's House* in Berlin, because he could not help himself, just as I have never been able to stop the silly and vulgar gag with which Eliza in *Pygmalion*, both here and abroad, gets the last word and implies that she is going to marry Pygmalion. (CL III 604)

Nevertheless, Shaw — who had once been passionately in love with Campbell, and with whom he remained friends for the remainder of her life — did not object to her recreating Eliza for a London production of the play at Aldwych Theatre in 1920.⁷⁵ He strove, however, to reinforce his conception of Eliza, and of the play: “[I]f only you had the sense to see your own values . . . ,” Shaw wrote to Campbell, “you would no more be able to throw [your characterisation of Eliza] all away by that silly joke about the gloves than Hamlet could end with a comic song” (*Shaw & Campbell* 207).

Yet the popularity of Campbell's interpolation arguably satisfied the public's desire for a conclusive, romantic ending to *Pygmalion*. Few were willing to accept that the play should conclude on a naturalistic note. Tree had alluded to this in 1914 when he reportedly boasted to Shaw that, “My ending⁷⁶ makes money; you ought to be grateful,” (*Weintraub, Unexpected* 10).⁷⁷ Notwithstanding the confusion caused by his own performance, Tree might also have argued that his ending provided a degree of clarity that many of the opening night critics found lacking in the play. These included the reviewer of the *Westminster Gazette*,⁷⁸ who wrote that, “no one feels certain what the ending is” and that, furthermore, curiosity regarding the play's foundation “remains unsatisfied. There are plenty of ideas, but none is predominant” (*Evans, Critical* 224). H.W. Massingham, writing in the *Nation*, found the play “wanting in firmness of conception and treatment” where the Higgins–Eliza relationship was concerned, and

⁷⁵ He did, however, take the precaution of instructing stage manager Brian Daly to “Be sure to tell me if Mrs Pat[rick Campbell] deviates from the words of the master” (CL III 665).

⁷⁶ Presumably, he was referring to the throwing of flowers to Eliza to signify impending matrimony.

⁷⁷ Shaw apparently responded, “Your ending is damnable: you ought to be shot” (*Weintraub, Unexpected* 10).

⁷⁸ The name of the reviewer was not stated, but the initials “E.F.S.” were provided.

assumed that, at the conclusion of the play, “The audience must guess whether he loves her or she loves him, and what kind of blood flows in the veins of these queer, jangling creatures” (Evans, *Critical* 228). Among the few who professed themselves satisfied with Shaw’s ending included MacCarthy, writing in the *New Statesman*, who acknowledged that while in the theatre he had “wanted to see those [Eliza and Higgins] living together; I wanted to get to the *point* which I conceived was still ahead,” but subsequently “grasped what I now take to be the idea: . . . in Act V something happened, she had got a soul, and therefore the play was really over” (109).⁷⁹

Although MacCarthy detected the play’s underlying seriousness of purpose, it must be said that Shaw himself initially hindered critical appreciation of *Pygmalion*. In a much-quoted interview during the rehearsals for the 1914 London production, he responded flippantly when asked to describe the purpose of the play: “Very simple: to boil the pot” (qtd in Huggett 111).⁸⁰ Reviewers were apt to employ this description as evidence of the play’s absence of profundity. “On the lofty portals of the orthodox Temples of the Drama the golden legend blazons forth: ‘Abandon aim all ye who enter here,’” wrote Alex M. Thompson in the *Clarion*. “(T)he most devout of Shavians will be the most emphatic in accepting Mr Shaw’s claim that he has conformed to the golden rule” (Evans, *Critical* 225).⁸¹

⁷⁹ Like many reviewers, MacCarthy also inferred from Tree’s portrayal that Higgins was in love with Eliza: “Now the last act is, and is not, a love scene; Pygmalion-Higgins, like other Shavian heroes, is running away from passion, and Sir Herbert Tree acted admirably his nervousness, his dread of even touching Eliza lest the floods of irrational emotion should be released in himself” (109).

⁸⁰ Shaw also described *Pygmalion* as his “last potboiler” in a letter to Trebitsch in December 1913. On that occasion, Shaw went on to predict (with some irony, in light of the subsequent misunderstanding of *Pygmalion*) that, “In future I will write plays that will not be understood for 25 years, if ever” (*ST* 170).

⁸¹ Massingham also criticised the play’s supposed lack of profundity, arguing that it was “too flippant, too long, and altogether too cheap”. He went on to write that, “Mr. Shaw may have meant to show that the rich can do nothing for the poor but leave them alone, and await the judgment of God on both. That would have been a powerful piece of criticism. Mr. Shaw hints but does not make it” (229).

Yet the insouciance of Shaw's public comments in 1914 belied his obviously high regard for *Pygmalion*, as evidenced by the extraordinary lengths he subsequently took to regain control of the work.⁸² The first of these was in 1915, when he wrote his aforementioned prose sequel⁸³ to the play for the first authorised English-language edition of *Pygmalion* in book format, which was published the following year.⁸⁴ Described by Berst as "Shaw's first major volley at romantics who palpitated for a Cinderella ending" (*Pygmalion* 136), the sequel's raison d'être was Shaw's insistence that Eliza married Freddy Eynsford Hill,⁸⁵ not Higgins. Philip Weissman, noting the inclusion of the sequel in all subsequent editions of *Pygmalion*, suggests that, "Shaw intended it as a safeguard against any future productions that might dare to interpret a successful livable union between Henry and Eliza." Yet in spite of its existence, he goes on to write, "subsequent productions continued to challenge his interpretation with thoroughgoing success" (167).

The sequel comprises both an essay on human nature and a narrative on the future lives of many of the characters in the play. In it Shaw laments the proliferation of "imagination enfeebled by their lazy dependence on the ready-mades and reach-me-downs of the ragshop in which Romance keeps its stock of 'happy endings' to misfit all stories". The assumption by "people in all directions", he goes on to write, that "for no other reason than that she became the heroine of a romance, [Eliza] must have married the hero of it" is "unbearable" (P191). He then outlines why Eliza could not have married Higgins, arguing that the latter was "a predestinate old bachelor" possessed of a mother-fixation and a passion exclusively for phonetics, and that Eliza "was instinctively aware that she could never obtain a complete grip of him, or come between him and his mother

⁸² In a surviving manuscript fragment written in 1914, Shaw also insisted that, far from being "irresistibly funny", *Pygmalion* was "really a serious play" (CP 4 800).

⁸³ Shaw refers to it as a "sequel" in his Preface to *Pygmalion*, although in the actual text of the play, it simply appears without a title immediately after Act V. It is also often referred to by scholars as either a postscript or an epilogue.

⁸⁴ All page references henceforth are from the single-volume 1916 edition of *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion* (London: Constable and Company).

⁸⁵ Freddy appears in all pre-1941 stage editions of *Pygmalion* at the beginning and end of Act I, and again in Act III. In Act V, Eliza declares to an incredulous Higgins her intention of marrying Freddy.

(the first necessity of the married woman)” (193–94). It is inconceivable, he goes on to write, that a person as strong-willed as Eliza would have genuflected to the equally strong-willed Higgins. On the contrary, strong people desire weaker partners, he argues, and it was principally for this reason that Eliza married the submissive Freddy Eynsford Hill. Unlike Higgins, Eliza was always destined to be married, Shaw writes, and “Freddy is young, practically twenty years younger than Higgins, he is a gentleman (or, as Eliza would qualify him, a toff) and speaks like one; [he] loves [Eliza] unaffectedly, and is not her master, nor ever likely to dominate her in spite of his advantage of social standing”. In short, Shaw argues, when faced with the choice of either “a lifetime of fetching Higgins’s slippers or . . . a lifetime of Freddy fetching hers”, Eliza would have unquestionably chosen the latter option (194–95). Such were the realities of the situation, Shaw stated on another occasion, since “Liza⁸⁶ has to eat, and Freddy will give her a comfortable life. Higgins doesn’t really care a great deal what becomes of her” (qtd in Gibbs, *Interviews* 156).

In December 1915 Shaw predicted in a letter to Campbell that, “The publication of that sequel will be the end of the romance of Sir Herbert Tree; and you will have to play Eliza properly and seriously for ever after . . .” (*Shaw & Campbell* 182). But Shaw’s optimism was shortlived. As Holroyd observes, “He told the story of Eliza and Freddy, Mr and Mrs Eynsford-Hill,⁸⁷ as invitingly as he could: [*sic*] but the public went on preferring its own version” (*Pursuit* 332). One could add that since only *readers* of *Pygmalion* would have encountered the sequel, the public at large was presumably unaware of its existence.

⁸⁶ In *Pygmalion*, Eliza calls herself “Liza”, and her dialogue appears under the latter name. Clearly, it is an abbreviation, however, since all of the other characters address her as “Eliza”, and this is also the name by which Shaw refers to her in his instructions and in the sequel. In his 1934–38 *Pygmalion* screenplay, however, Shaw calls her “Liza”.

⁸⁷ Holroyd hyphenates the surname “Eynsford Hill”; several other commentators refer to this family as “The Hills”. Shaw, uses the non-hyphenated “Eynsford Hill” throughout both the play and in its sequel, but informs us in the sequel and in his 1934–38 screenplay that Freddy was known as “F. Hill” when he subsequently opened his shop. In the sequel, Shaw also states that Freddy’s given names are Frederick Challoner (204). For the sake of consistency, I have used the name “Eynsford Hill” throughout this thesis.

Scholars have been divided on the sequel's worth, with some concurring with Ervine's assessment that it "convinces nobody who reads it" (460),⁸⁸ while others have agreed with Berst's opinion that, irrespective of the sequel's merit, "the play must stand on its own without it" (*Pygmalion* 136). I share the latter view. Although Shaw's rationale for an Eliza–Freddy union is plausible, his sequel (for readers, at least) undermines the play's central theme of independence by describing an afterlife in which Eliza — now having abandoned her idea of becoming a phonetics teacher — is not only dependent on Pickering for regular financial assistance when she and Freddy open a florist/greengrocer's shop together, but remains in regular contact with Higgins, contradicting her Act V vow not to see him again. Higgins even resumes his role as Eliza's teacher when she enlists his assistance with her writing. As Silver observes,

Suddenly all of [Eliza's] independence of spirit is taken away from her. Now she keeps crawling back to beg [Pickering and Higgins] for favors, and she renounces teaching in deference to the wishes of that same Higgins she had gloriously defied in the play. (254)

Silver goes on to argue that the sequel was an unnecessary addition in any event, since "[a] few emphatic sentences in the [play's] preface could have made the essential point that Higgins remained a bachelor" (254). But Shaw was evidently satisfied with his sequel, for he retained it (unchanged) in all subsequent editions of *Pygmalion*. Meanwhile he continued to explore other means of de-romanticising the Higgins-Eliza relationship. A revival of the play at London's Aldwych Theatre in 1920⁸⁹ — again with Campbell as Eliza — provided him with such an opportunity. On this occasion, Shaw changed the

⁸⁸ E.g., Ward, who describes it as "a meandering rigmarole" in which "Shaw's anti-romanticism here carried him into a maze of improbability . . ." (132). Crane suggests that Shaw's decision to write the sequel was motivated by petulance: "If [the early audiences] had believed Liza's statement in Act V that she was going to marry Freddy, Shaw doubtless had another Epilogue in type to prove that Liza was in fact going to marry Higgins" (883).

⁸⁹ Viola Tree, daughter of the now-deceased Sir Herbert, directed the production. Higgins was played by C. Aubrey Smith.

ending to depict Higgins delighting in the independence of his so-called creation, and for the first time he explicitly referenced the Pygmalion myth:

Now comes the most important point of all. When Eliza emancipates herself — when Galatea comes to life — she must not relapse. She must retain her pride and triumph to the end. When Higgins takes your arm on ‘consort battleship’ you must instantly throw him off with implacable pride; and this is the note until the final ‘Buy them yourself.’ He will go out on the balcony to watch your departure; come back triumphantly into the room; exclaim ‘Galatea!’ (meaning that the statue has come to life at last); and — curtain. Thus he gets the last word; and you get it too.... [sic]. (*Theatrics* 155)⁹⁰

During the same month, Shaw gave similar instructions to his Spanish translator, Julio Brouta, again referencing Ovid’s myth: “It is important that the actor who plays Higgins should thoroughly understand that he is not Eliza’s lover,” Shaw informed Brouta. He went on to advise that when Higgins “is left alone on the stage at the end[,] he should just go out on the balcony and look down making it clear that he is watching Eliza’s departure in the carriage. He then comes back into the room, excited and triumphant & exclaims ‘Finished, and come to life! Bravo, Pygmalion!’” (qtd in Holroyd, *Pursuit* 332).⁹¹ Neither the London nor the Spanish ending was published, however, and it is possible that Shaw concluded in each instance that its mythological allusion was too obscure for audiences’ comprehension. It is also possible that Shaw belatedly realised that by referencing the Pygmalion myth at the end of his play, he was also unwittingly drawing attention to the romantic conclusion of the former. As Conolly observes of the 1920 ending, “such an explicit parallel between Eliza and Galatea also implies at least the possibility that the play follows the myth and that just as Pygmalion marries Galatea so Higgins marries

⁹⁰ In the same letter, Shaw also refers to another change to Act V: the inclusion of a new line from Higgins to Eliza: “You are a part of it that has come my way and been built into my house” (154). No record of this line exists in any published version of the play, however.

⁹¹ Unpublished letter, 3 February 1920. Held in Houghton Library, Harvard University. Ref: MS Eng 1046.7 (22).

Eliza”. Conolly goes on to write that there is no evidence of the 1920 ending being employed in any other productions (*Pygmalion* xxvii).

Shaw’s next attempt to counter the romanticisation of his play was in 1934, when he wrote the first version of his *Pygmalion* screenplay for a German film adaptation. In the next chapter, I examine how Shaw responded to the challenge of adapting *Pygmalion* into a screenplay, and analyse his attempts to re-establish his original conception of his work albeit in a different medium.

Chapter Three: Shaw's 1934–38 *Pygmalion* Screenplay

Introduction

“I am what they call in America a ‘movie fan’,” Shaw declared in 1927 (*BSC* 47). His interest in the cinema dated from its inception, and by 1912 he was writing that, “I, who go to an ordinary theatre with effort and reluctance, cannot keep away from the cinema” (*Shaw & Campbell* 39). In 1920 he predicted that, “The kinema [*sic*] will kill the theatres which are doing what the film does better, and bring to life the dying theatre which does what the film cannot do at all” (*BSC* 25).

As early as 1908, Shaw had been approached to write scenarios for short films — a potentially lucrative offer that he declined on the basis that synchronised dialogue in the cinema was not yet possible.¹ Thereafter, he frequently cited this reason for his refusal to allow silent film versions of his plays.² By the mid-1920s, however, major advances in film and sound technology had occurred, and while vacationing in Italy in October 1926 Shaw himself “participated in a short film interview, with synchronized film and phonograph” (Dukore, *BSC* 12). In July 1927 he allowed the British division of American

¹ “Take away our dialogue,” Shaw wrote to actor-dramatist Arthur Wing Pinero in December 1908, “and what better are we than — and — (I dare not fill in the names)” (*BSC* 1). Shaw was opposed to subtitles as a substitute for dialogue “except when the [latter] is so worthless that it is a hindrance instead of a help” (42).

² In 1929 Shaw told the *New York Times* that “the only reason” he had not allowed his plays to be adapted during the cinema’s silent period was “because their greatest strength was in their dialogues, in what I had to say” (*BSC* 59). Privately, however, he often expressed his concern that screen adaptations would ruin the box office earnings of plays that were still being performed. In a 1918 letter to Augustin Hamon, he cited the experience of George Tyler, “(m)y first Pygmalion manager[, who] went bankrupt in America because one of his most expensive productions was met by a film which was advertised ‘Why pay 15f to see So & So when you can see it here for 30c!’” (23). The following year he advised writer William Lestocq “Never [to] let anyone tempt you to have a play of yours filmed until it is stone dead” (24). Nevertheless, Dukore observes that Shaw “frequently flirted” with would-be adapters during the silent period of the cinema. “With one play, *The Devil’s Disciple*, flirtation became serious, but it stopped short of consummation” (*CS* 8).

inventor Lee De Forest's Phonofilm Company to film, as an experiment, the Cathedral Scene (Scene V) from *Saint Joan* in a London studio. Sybil Thorndike, who had created the title role in 1924, again played Joan; Widgey R. Newman directed. Dukore writes that Shaw's arrangement with the company was that, "If he considered [the experiment] successful, he would permit the filming of more scenes from the play" (CS 12). Evidently, Shaw was dissatisfied with the results, for no further scenes were filmed.³ In August 1930, however, he signed an agreement with British International Pictures (B.I.P.) to film his 1905 comedy *How He Lied to Her Husband*. An adaptation of *Arms and the Man* (again with B.I.P.) followed in 1932.⁴

Shaw did not write a formal screenplay for either of these adaptations, although in the case of *Arms and the Man*, he made many changes to screenwriter Cecil Lewis's scenario adaptation.⁵ The fact that both films subsequently failed at the box office did not, however, dissuade a number of Hollywood and European producers from seeking the screen rights to *Pygmalion* and other Shaw plays.⁶ For his part, Shaw considered *Pygmalion* a poor candidate for film adaptation. "(I)t is too long," he told Trebitsch in June 1934, "and the character of Doolittle so important in it and so unsuitable for the

³ It may have been merely the *audio* quality of the filmed scene that concerned Shaw. The recording system employed by De Forest Phonofilms Inc was an early version of the sound-on-film technique — i.e., the soundtrack was recorded directly on to film — and was soon to be superseded by the sonically superior Fox Movietone and RCA Photophone systems. Film historian Donald Crafton describes the De Forest Phonofilm as having "poor quality sound reproduction" (419). However, Shaw alludes to the *Saint Joan* film in a 1929 article as "a successful personal experiment", arguing that it had proved that his dialogue was "as convincing [on the screen] as when it is spoken on the stage" (BSC 60-61).

⁴ These were not, however, the first screen adaptations of a Shaw work. In 1921, an unauthorised film version (in Czech) of *Cashel Byron's Profession* was released in Czechoslovakia as *Román Boxera*. Shaw's novel was not protected by copyright in Czechoslovakia at the time.

⁵ Both films will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

⁶ As early as 1919, would-be adapters had approached Shaw for the licensing rights to film *Pygmalion*. Bemused by the notion of a silent version of the play, Shaw asked rhetorically (in reference to Eliza Doolittle's notorious Act III line), "(H)ow how can you film 'Not _____ likely?'" (BSC 24).

screen” (*ST* 342).⁷ Nevertheless, he was prepared to countenance a *Pygmalion* adaptation provided “that there was to be no sentimental nonsense about Higgins and Eliza being lovers” (342).⁸

There was no shortage of potential adapters. “I now have two American firms and one French and one Italian clamoring for [the film adaptation rights to] *Pygmalion*,” Shaw wrote to Trebitsch in July 1934 (*ST* 343). These proposals were in addition to a request from Eberhard Klagemann⁹ for the rights to a German-language film version of the play. The French offer had come first, when Augustin and Henriette Hamon¹⁰ approached Shaw with a draft *Pygmalion* screenplay (in English) by Albert Riéra.¹¹ It was the Hamons’ contention that Riéra’s screenplay could serve as the basis not only for a French-language film version of *Pygmalion*, but for subsequent adaptations in other languages (*Dukore*, *CS* 41). On perusing Riéra’s screenplay, however, Shaw was unimpressed to discover that the former — in addition to rearranging various scenes — had composed a number of new sequences, including a different ending in which it was

⁷ Shaw does not elaborate as to why he considers the character of Doolittle “unsuitable” for screen adaptation. Moreover, his comments here regarding the supposed inaptness of *Pygmalion* as a film are contradicted by his insistence in an interview three years later that, “I have no objection on earth to have [*sic*] my plays filmed. There is nothing I should like better than to have all my plays added to the repertory of the picture theatre” (*BSC* 123).

⁸ Underscoring Shaw’s resolve to prevent the film version of *Pygmalion* from being romanticised was his recent rejection of a screenplay adaptation of his 1897 play *The Devil’s Disciple* by American novelist Lester Cohen, submitted by the American film studio RKO Radio Pictures Inc. Shaw strongly disliked Cohen’s romanticisation of his play, telling RKO producer Kenneth Macgowan that “[Cohen’s] ways are not my ways; and there is no accounting for tastes” (*BSC* 88).

⁹ Klagemann (1904–90) was the head of Berlin-based production company Klagemann Films.

¹⁰ The Hamons were Shaw’s regular translators of his works into French.

¹¹ Riéra had previously co-written the screenplay for the critically acclaimed French film *L’Atalante* (Jean Vigo, 1934).

implied that Eliza returns to Higgins.¹² Consequently, Shaw rejected the Hamons' proposal, turning instead to the request from Klagemann.

By now Shaw had concluded that his best means of ensuring a faithful film adaptation of *Pygmalion* was to write the screenplay himself (Dukore, CS 43). Therefore, if the Klagemann film were to proceed, he determined, it would need to be on the contractual understanding that no unauthorised deviation from his screenplay was to be permitted. He also reiterated to Trebitsch, who would be responsible for the translation of his screenplay into German, that the film must emphasise that “Eliza married Freddy . . .” (ST 342).

While negotiations with Klagemann were proceeding, Shaw began adapting *Pygmalion* for the screen, completing the task on October 1, 1934. His “Pygmalion: A Scenario”¹³ was a considerably condensed version of the original play. It also included a number of new scenes, together with a new ending in which an Eliza-Freddy wedding was clearly implied. It was Trebitsch's translation of this screenplay that was forwarded to Klagemann when negotiations were successfully concluded in February 1935.¹⁴ Under the terms of this agreement, distribution of the film was to be restricted to German-speaking countries¹⁵ and for a licensing period of five years (Dukore, CS 44). The following year, Shaw successfully negotiated with producer-director Ludwig Berger of

¹² Dukore writes that one of the sequences, which he describes as “seriously wrong”, constituted a new ending in which Eliza, despite having told Higgins to buy his own tie (as she does in the play), “take[s] a tie from a salesman and loosely knot[s] it to judge the effect” (CS 43).

¹³ In contemporary screen jargon, a *scenario* usually refers to the outline of the plot and characters of the filmscript, while a *screenplay* constitutes the actual finished script “containing dialogue and explicit descriptions of significant action” (Blandford *et al* 207). However, in earlier usage, the term *scenario* was sometimes employed to denote a *screenplay* in the modern sense of the word — and this is clearly Shaw's intended meaning in the case of his *Pygmalion* “scenario”.

¹⁴ In addition to accepting the aforementioned Clause #7, Klagemann agreed to pay Shaw “ten per cent of gross receipts paid by exhibitors” (Dukore, CS 44).

¹⁵ Clause #5 also allowed for the film to be shown “[i]n any foreign neighbourhood with a resident [German-] speaking population numerous enough to maintain picture theatres in which it is assumed that the native language of the audience is [German] . . .” (BSC 174).

Filmex Company of Amsterdam for a Dutch-language screen version of *Pygmalion*, again with the stipulation that his screenplay was to be faithfully followed.¹⁶ The German and Dutch film versions were released in September 1935 and February 1937, respectively.

Prior to seeing either of these films, Shaw had signed an agreement in December 1935 with Hungarian producer Gabriel Pascal for an English-language screen adaptation of *Pygmalion*.¹⁷ More than two years were to pass, however, before Pascal, a relatively inexperienced film-maker,¹⁸ was able to raise sufficient funds for the project, which was to be filmed in England. In the meantime, Shaw saw private screenings of the German and the Dutch *Pygmalion* adaptations.¹⁹ According to his secretary, Blanche Patch,²⁰ Shaw liked both movies as films, but “remained annoyed by the tricks they had played with the text” (125).²¹ “They took the most extraordinary pains, and spent huge sums, in altering it out of all recognition,” he said publicly of the German *Pygmalion*, which was directed by Erich Engel²² (*BSC* 125). In his assessment of the German *Pygmalion*,

¹⁶ The Dutch *Pygmalion* film was limited to Dutch-speaking countries; the remaining terms were the same as those of the German *Pygmalion* contract.

¹⁷ The agreement between Pascal and Shaw was that the film be distributed in English-speaking countries only; however, Shaw subsequently allowed the film to be screened in a subtitled version in non-German and Dutch-speaking countries (*GP* 20).

¹⁸ Prior to signing his contract with Shaw, Pascal (1894–1954)’s principal film credits had been on the German-made *Der Hauptmann von Köpenick* (1931) and *Unheimliche Geschichten* (1932) for which he had served as co-producer. He subsequently produced the low-budget British films *Reasonable Doubt* and *Café Mascot* (both 1936) while seeking financial backing for his *Pygmalion*.

¹⁹ He saw these two films in January 1936 and May 1937, respectively.

²⁰ Patch’s 1951 book of Shavian reminiscences was ghostwritten by Robert Williamson, a journalist acquaintance of Shaw (*Gibbs, Life* 509 n.17).

²¹ Neither film is currently available on video or DVD, and, consequently, I have been unable to view either of them. Apart from that of Shaw himself, Dukore’s assessment [in *CS*] of both movies is the only English-language account of which I am aware. In a 2001 interview, film writer Stanley Kauffmann referred to Dukore as “(t)he only person I know, or know of, who has seen [the two films] . . .” (*Pygmalion* 244).

²² Engel was a film and theatre director closely associated with the works of Bertolt Brecht. He had previously directed the stage premieres of two of Brecht’s collaborations with composer Kurt Weill: *Im*

Dukore writes that, as well as ignoring all of Shaw's new screenplay scenes, the film departs in numerous ways from Shaw's conception of his characters and themes:

Instead of a conflict between a middle-aged, mother-fixated bully and a class-intimidated eighteen-year-old girl who becomes an independent woman, the German movie portrays a self-reliant woman of the people and a handsome, virile-looking, wealthy professional man. Throughout, it suggests Cinderella and her prince, or to put the matter in terms of pop movies of the 1930's, the secretary and the boss she will marry. (CS 47)²³

Similarly, the Dutch *Pygmalion* ignores Shaw's screenplay²⁴ and romanticises the relationship between Eliza and Higgins. Freddy is portrayed as ineffectual, and “offers no competition to the pipe-smoking Higgins, who conveys a very attractive and comfortable virility”. Moreover, the film diminishes both Eliza's and Doolittle's “social transformations[, making them] appear to consist of little more than her donning an expensive party dress and him a suit” (64–65).

Shaw's discovery that the makers of both the German and Dutch *Pygmalion* films had defied his wishes by emphasising an Eliza–Higgins romance undoubtedly contributed to his decision to revise the ending of his screenplay in early 1938 for Pascal's forthcoming adaptation. Confident that Pascal would adhere to his screenplay,²⁵ Shaw altered and

Dickicht der Städte (In the Jungle of Cities) (1923) and *Die Dreigroschenoper (The Threepenny Opera)* (1928).

²³ The film's credits name Shaw as the author of the play, but Heinrich Oberländer and Walter Wasserman as the authors of the screenplay (Dukore, CS 45).

²⁴ Dukore notes that the film credits do not state who wrote the screenplay (CS 64). According to the Internet Movie Database, four writers (including Berger but excluding Shaw) contributed to it.

²⁵ In an interview in February 1938, Shaw stated that the forthcoming film of *Pygmalion* “will really be my *Pygmalion* . . .” (BSC 132). Later that month he instructed Pascal to emphasise when promoting the film that *Pygmalion* is “(a)n all British film made by British methods without interference by American script writers, no spurious dialogue but every word by the author, a revolution in the presentation of drama on the [sic] film” (GP 23).

extended the final sequence in order to make a future Eliza–Freddy marriage explicit. Shaw also revised one of the other new (1934) sequences. Notwithstanding some minor dialogue changes, the 1938 version of Shaw’s screenplay is, in all other respects, identical to the 1934 version. The typed manuscript of the former was completed on March 1, 1938, with Shaw subsequently providing one brief additional scene, apparently at Pascal’s behest.²⁶

Using Shaw’s 1938 screenplay as my chief point of reference,²⁷ I address the following questions in this chapter: (1) how does Shaw respond to the challenge of adapting his play for the cinematic medium? (2) In what respects does Shaw’s screenplay differ from the play in terms of its treatment of *Pygmalion*’s principal characters and themes? (3) And in particular, how does Shaw address the romanticisation of his play?

A Preamble: Shaw’s Changing Theory of Adaptation — and Two Early Shavian Films

When asked in 1929 why he had not yet allowed a film adaptation to be made of one of his plays, Shaw retorted that he was still waiting to discover “a [movie] producer who also knows his job” (*BSC* 60). Somewhat perversely, however, it was to Cecil Lewis, a thirty-two-year-old playwright and radio producer who had never previously worked on a film, that he entrusted the task of directing the first complete screen version of one of his plays in 1930. Shaw had known Lewis since 1923, and had closely followed his unorthodox career.²⁸ Seeking to help the young man, whom he appears to have

²⁶ The source of all subsequent scene and page references, except where otherwise stated, is that of Shaw’s 1938 typed manuscript (HRC SHAW 25.7).

²⁷ The differences between the two 1934 scenes and the 1938 revised versions will be discussed, however.

²⁸ Lewis (1898–1997) was a World War I fighter pilot and Military Cross holder, and later one of the founders of the programme section of the B.B.C., becoming that organisation’s Deputy Director of Programmes at the age of 24. In his obituary for Lewis in *The Independent* of 29 January 1997, T.H. Bridgewater describes Lewis’s life as an “adventurous” one. Lewis was an impulsive, romantic character, Bridgewater writes, who abandoned “his promising career” with the B.B.C. after a mere two years, “preferring, he said, to live henceforth by his wits”. In 1936 Shaw described Lewis as “a thinker, a master

recognised as a kindred spirit, Shaw made it known that he would allow a production company to film one of his plays provided that Lewis was hired as its director and that the prospective film was to be a “faithful [reproduction] of the Play as written and designed for ordinary theatrical representation by the Author . . .” (qtd in Costello 32). To Lewis’s surprise, B.I.P.²⁹ came forward and agreed “not to cut or alter the play in any way and to accept an absolutely unknown, untried man as director (me)” (*Never* 106). The play in question was *How He Lied to Her Husband* (1905), a one-act comedy with three characters that takes place in a single room.

It was Shaw’s conviction at the time that his plays could be reproduced “on the screen just as they are produced on the stage” (*BSC* 72).³⁰ Although he had not ruled out writing original screenplays for the cinema, he stated, “I see no reason why *The Apple Cart* [1929], for instance, should not be produced exactly as it stands” (60). At the same time, he deplored the efforts of Hollywood producers, whose films, he asserted, were rife with frequent, unnecessary scene changes “and long intervals of silence during which the film is a movie and not a talkie”.³¹ These same producers had repeatedly told him that faithful screen reproductions of his plays were “impossible”, he went on to write, since “[their directors] could work only on condition of being allowed to adapt the play to their technique instead of adapting their technique to the play” (72). Consequently, if Hollywood were ever permitted to film his plays, he wrote on another occasion, its producers would “cut half my dialogue, in order to insert dozens of changing pictures

of words, and a bit of a poet” (qtd in Holroyd, *Fantasy* 106). Lewis, in turn, greatly admired Shaw, later hailing him as “one of the great influences of my life” (*Never* 87).

²⁹ Film historian Rachael Low describes B.I.P. as “a large studio company run on very commercial lines” (*Persuasion* 177).

³⁰ Moreover, he stated in 1931, he would not be the first playwright whose works had translated successfully to the screen. He cited the then recent talking films of veteran actor/playwright George Arliss (1868-1946) for demonstrating “that a good play could be a good play, and good acting good acting, on the screen exactly as on the stage” (*BSC* 77). Shaw was possibly alluding, among other filmed plays, to the 1931 film version of Arliss’s and Mary Hamlin’s play *Alexander Hamilton*.

³¹ These same producers, he went on to write, ignore “the intelligent section of cinemagoers who want to hear some real dramatic talk from the talkies instead of . . . £100,000 worth of dissolving views” (73).

between the lines of what was left . . .”. This would be unacceptable to him, he went on to write, given that

[m]y plays do not consist of occasional remarks to illustrate pictures, but of verbal fencing matches between protagonists and antagonists, whose thrusts and ripostes, parries and passados, follow one another [*sic*] much more closely than thunder follows lightning. The first rule for their producers is that there must never be a moment of silence from the rise of the curtain to its fall. (76-77).

In short, Shaw was determined to prove with *How He Lied to Her Husband* that a play with continuous dialogue and no scene changes could indeed succeed as a film — and in Lewis he declared that he had found a director who was “free from Hollywood superstitions” and “keen on developing the talkie dramatically . . .” (77). What Shaw was essentially advocating was the primacy of *dialogue* in cinema over the purely visual, a stance that he was never to modify. In 1936, while discussing the problems inherent in filming Shakespeare’s plays, he stated that, “It is extraordinary how much can be spoilt if you let the photographer, as photographer pure and simple, get the upper hand. . . . You have to remember that you are speaking Shakespear [*sic*], not giving an exhibition of photography” (BSC 118). In this respect, as Dukore observes, Shaw’s cinematic theories

differ from those of most film theorists and practitioners. In the conventional view of cinema, the function of dialogue is minimal: the sparser the better. Once dialogue has conveyed the necessary information, it can stop, for it has fulfilled its function. The camera, not language, is primary. (CS 14)

For his part, Shaw freely acknowledged the experimental nature of what he was attempting with *How He Lied to Her Husband*, and he stated shortly after its release in January 1931 that the play in question had been “selected because it pushed the test to the utmost” (BSC 73).³²

³² Another possible reason, as Holroyd suggests, is that the “shadowy simplicity” of the play’s “curtained room” setting appealed to Shaw given “the technical limitations” of British films at the time (*Fantasy* 705).

Few commentators deemed “the test” a successful one, however.³³ While Shaw drew satisfaction from the fact that B.I.P. had honoured its contractual obligation not to cut or change any of his dialogue,³⁴ little if any effort had been made to adapt the play to the cinematic medium. Dukore describes the performances in the film as largely perfunctory and unconvincing, with one of the actors³⁵ (by her own admission) reciting her lines as though she were on a stage, while another³⁶ misses some of his cues and speaks “with a virtually unvarying tempo and rhythm” (CS 24). Given that Shaw had hypothesised only a year before the filming of *How He Lied to Her Husband* that the cinema, unlike the theatre, possessed the potential to create “a perfect production” by joining together all the best “bits” (BSC 62), one assumes that, privately, at least, he must have been disappointed by the on-screen acting that he subsequently witnessed.³⁷ Director Lewis himself asserted that the film as a whole is “as much like a movie as a cow is like a pianola” (Never 106). Responsibility for its failure, Lewis implied on another occasion, lay with Shaw for assigning him a task that “was clearly nothing more than a licence to film a stage play”. The result, he concluded, was at best “a cinematic curiosity” (Eye x). Dukore, however, argues that it was the inexperienced Lewis’s inferior direction that was principally to blame for the artistic failure of the film:

³³ The film reviewer of *The Times* opined that the film demonstrated “the folly of those who suggest that the right use, and the commercial use, of the talkie invention is direct transference from stage to screen” (qtd in Holroyd, *Fantasy* 376). The *New York Times* described it as “an amateurish specimen of animated photography”, but praised Shaw’s “characteristic wit [, which] shines forth like a precious gem in a cast-iron setting” (qtd in Dukore, CS 23). In contrast, *The Nation* employed its review as an opportunity for an attack on the playwright himself: “Shaw’s ideas of direction, which cramp his plays even on the stage, are little short of disastrous when applied to the movies” (qtd in Costello 39).

³⁴ There were “insignificant cuts and variations of a few lines” (Dukore, CS, 24).

³⁵ Vera Lennox, who played Aurora Bompas.

³⁶ Robert Harris, who played Henry Apjohn.

³⁷ Holroyd asserts, in fact, that Shaw’s principal motive for allowing the film to be made was to examine “whether the best use of the medium lay in recording a perfect production of a play for showing around the world” (*Fantasy* 376). Regardless of whether Holroyd is correct, Shaw subsequently conceded that, “A perfect [movie] is not possible” (BSC 63).

A motion picture set in a single room is not intrinsically uncinematic. Once one decides to photograph a stage play intact . . . the transformation from stage to screen is the responsibility of the director, who can accomplish it through actors, camera, and editing. Lewis's failure to employ them satisfactorily is the major reason [*How He Lied to Her Husband*] seems like a photographed stage play. His blocking is stagey, with frequent use of cross-and-turn, and of characters who often just stand and talk to each other. Camera work is trite, and while photography and editing are not as static as the press claimed, they give that impression, for they fail to underscore or comment on the action. (CS 24–25)

However, to the extent that he alone insisted on engaging a person without previous experience in cinema to direct this film, Shaw is arguably responsible for the result. Moreover, one could argue that Shaw's refusal to allow cuts or changes would have stymied many an experienced director.³⁸ As film critic John Simon observes, "Film is a restless medium, suffering from acute dromomania, and can stay put for any length of time only with great difficulty — or great directorial knowhow" (46). Clearly, the inexperienced Lewis was not possessed of such ability. One can only infer, therefore, that, aside from Shaw's genuine interest in helping the young man, he chose Lewis because he feared that an *experienced* director might impose a non-Shavian style on the adaptation. As Manvell observes,

[T]he dramatist-screenwriter finds that his greatest asset, dialogue writing, does not possess the premium it has on the stage and that, consequently, the controller of the action, the director, moves into ascendancy over him. It is he, rather than the writer, who establishes the overall style of the movie. (33)

³⁸ It is worth noting that even the aforementioned films that Dukore offers as examples of plays adapted for the screen do not confine themselves wholly to a single room, as *How He Lied to Her Husband* does. *Rope* (1948), a film generally regarded as one of Hitchcock's less successful adaptations, is set in an apartment, but employs an exterior establishing scene during the opening credits while also making extensive use of the New York skyline throughout the film; *The Homecoming* (1973) employs three exterior scenes; and the action of *The Iceman Cometh* (also 1973) alternates between two rooms.

For his part, Shaw asserted seven years after the release of *How He Lied to Her Husband* that the film had been “perfectly satisfactory”. Although “(i)t was only a little thing”,³⁹ he said at the time, the public “liked it, because the dialogue held them” (*Cinema* 133).⁴⁰ Yet for the next film adaptation of one of his plays — *Arms and the Man* (1932), again directed by Lewis for B.I.P. — Shaw abruptly abandoned his previous insistence that there should be no dialogue cuts or changes. Although he made no public pronouncement that he had changed his cinematic theories, Shaw’s considerably more flexible approach to this film suggests that he had belatedly concluded that the direct transference from stage to screen was undesirable. A perusal of correspondence between Shaw and Lewis at the time reveals the former’s growing awareness of how visual cinematic tools could be effectively employed. On one occasion in April 1932, Shaw advised Lewis that,

(T)he balance between the full sets and close-ups should be carefully watched. I think *How He Lied* suffered from the audience not seeing the whole room often enough. A screenplay all close-ups and groups and corners is rather like a melodrama all asides. Keep the audience well in mind of the whole room, the whole garden, even the whole landscape in which the close-ups take place
(*BSC* 78–79)

In short, these comments underscore Shaw’s determination that *Arms and the Man* was not to be a filmed play. As Holroyd observes,

Working with Lewis’s scenario, Shaw had this time made a real attempt to adapt his play into a film, agreeing to many cuts and exchanges, suggesting others and only vetoing those that seemed to weaken the dramatic effect or confuse the thematic content. His alterations to the script show that he was beginning to

³⁹ The film was only thirty-three minutes long.

⁴⁰ This is unlikely, and appears to contradict what Shaw himself wrote in 1931: “When *How He Lied* was produced in London[,] the young film fans complained that the conversation of my characters was such as had never been heard except in oldfashioned XIX century superliterary books” (*BSC* 77–78).

develop a film technique, and had come to accept that, though the dramatic principles of stage and screen might be the same, the literary methods must differ. (*Fantasy* 378).

In a further departure from his previously rigid stance on adaptation, Shaw agreed to write an entirely new scene depicting the battle of Slivnitza, which is only described in the play. In a 1932 article for the Malvern Festival, Shaw describes the battle scene enthusiastically:

There is no pinning of the characters to one spot: they pass in and out of doors, upstairs and downstairs, into gardens and across mountain country, with a freedom and variety impossible in the room with three walls which, however scene-painters may disguise it, is always the same old stage. (*BSC* 82)

In short, on this occasion Shaw had tentatively *opened up*⁴¹ his play for the cinema, presumably seeking to avoid the stage-bound nature of his previous film. He found the experience an exhilarating one, telling Lewis in April 1932, prior to the commencement of filming, that, “I find this [scenario] game rather fascinating. If I had the time I would half rewrite the play and invent at least fifty more changes of scene” (*CL* IV 286). Dukore notes that in many instances Shaw agreed with Lewis’s cuts and changes, and also “suggested a number of his own” (*CS* 27). Moreover, Dukore argues, Shaw’s notations often indicate that his grasp of film technique is superior to that of his director:

When Raina surreptitiously removes the photograph from her father’s pocket, it is Shaw not Lewis who indicates a close-up ‘full size of the screen with the portrait of Raina and the inscription.’ When Sergius signs a paper with great difficulty, it

⁴¹ Simon describes the “opening up” of a play for the cinema as the filling in of “the scenes merely reported or mentioned in the stage version, or [the inventing of] new ones out of whole cloth for the celluloid version” (46).

is Shaw not Lewis who inserts a close-up of the process: ‘arm on table, cheek on arm, tongue out convulsively following the different strokes.’ (28)

However, the changes were not enough to redeem what Dukore concedes is ultimately an unsatisfying film. Once again he blames Lewis for the adaptation’s deficiencies:

Technically, the film is poor. When Sergius tells Catherine why he resigned his commission, his face is in shadow, his torso in light. As in *How He Lied to Her Husband*, Lewis fails to prevent his actors from performing in too large a manner for the screen; they thereby overact. As in the earlier film, much of his blocking is stagey. Instead of using camera and editor’s shears to provide movement, Lewis uses cross-and-turn movement, or he has actors merely walk from one area of the set to another. (33)

Though Costello writes that, “Shaw was alone in his enthusiasm [for the film]” (40),⁴² Dukore observes that there is no firm evidence to suggest that Shaw was especially pleased with the adaptation (31). In his 1932 Malvern Festival article on the film version of *Arms and the Man*, rather than mentioning any of the performers or director Lewis — as he had done the previous year with *How He Lied to Her Husband* — Shaw “instead . . . discusses the cinema as medium” (Dukore, *CS* 31). The concluding paragraph of the article also suggests that Shaw is more interested in discussing the *future* of film adaptations than *Arms and the Man* — the latter being but a foretaste, he predicts, of cinematic things to come:

But the films, in spite of all their splendors and enchantments, are still in their infancy. When dramatic poets (as they call us authors in Germany) realize the possibilities of the screen, and the performers master its technique, and the great producing corporations, still obsessed with the “movie” tradition, can be persuaded that a good play is not ready to be photographed until the actors have grown into it as completely as they do in the theatre after not only a month’s

⁴² Patch states that, “Shaw was as delighted with it as a boy with a toy train” (122).

rehearsal but a month's performance before the public, then every corner of the country in which a picture house can live will witness performances compared to which this one of *Arms and the Man* [*sic*] will seem a mere sketch, in which the talent of the actors has produced a few happy moments under difficulties not yet, but presently to be, triumphantly overcome. (*BSC* 82)

One may surmise from this paragraph that Shaw was tacitly preparing his audience for a disappointing film. He implies not only that the actors involved in the production were insufficiently prepared for their roles — as well as being inexperienced in the “technique” of film acting — but that he, as screenwriter, had not yet grasped the true potential of cinema. *Arms and the Man* received a poor reception from critics and audiences alike (Costello 40), and Shaw may well have been anticipating the film's failure.

Certainly, B.I.P.'s decision to shorten *Arms and the Man* soon after its release in August 1932 did not help matters. Although accounts differ as to whether Shaw himself authorised the extensive cuts, it seems unlikely that he would have approved what Dukore describes as “mutilations [that] wreaked havoc with important thematic issues and made a mess of dramatic logic” (33). Lewis concurred with Dukore's assessment of the film: “Cut to ribbons, without any continuity whatever, [*Arms and the Man*] was a travesty of the original” (qtd in *CS* 32).

Opinions vary as to whether Shaw should be apportioned the blame for the failure of *Arms and the Man*. In maintaining that Shaw authorised the final editing, the film's scenario editor, Walter Charles Mycroft, argues that the playwright had “capitulated [to changes] when it was too late and the damage was irreparable . . .” (29). Manvell takes a similar view, blaming the failure of both *Arms and the Man* and *How He Lied to Her Husband* on Shaw's “dominant influence”, and arguing that it was the playwright's refusal to adapt his plays appropriately for the screen that rendered them “artistic and economic disasters” (32). Dukore, on the other hand, argues that, “It is not Shaw's

dialogue that makes the film seem stagey, [*sic*] it is the director's insufficient cinematic technique, combined with the studio's damaging, inept cuts" (CS 34).

Regardless of whom one blames for the failure of *Arms and the Man*, it seems reasonable to assume that Shaw must have been privately concerned that two of his plays had achieved, at best, limited success as films. Manvell asserts that Shaw "did not want his plays to be failures with the filmgoing public . . .", but that at the same time he was discovering "that the cinema was in no small measure different from the theater" (63). Shaw's first version of his *Pygmalion* screenplay — written just two years after the release of *Arms and the Man* — reveals the considerable extent to which he had grasped those differences.

The Structure of Shaw's *Pygmalion* Screenplay

"I am cutting *Pygmalion* to bits," Shaw wrote to Trebitsch in September 1934 (ST 344), tacitly acknowledging the extent to which he was now prepared to modify one of his plays for the screen.⁴³ Shaw's description of his activities was indeed an accurate one, for although he left the basic structure of the play intact and made few changes to Acts I and IV, his cuts elsewhere in the play were substantial, amounting to more than a third of the dialogue from Acts II and V, and almost a quarter of Act III.

His cuts are not surprising, however, if one examines the constraints of the British cinema at the time. With a typical performance time of approximately two hours, *Pygmalion* was not a short play⁴⁴ — longer, in fact, than most British feature films of the 1930s.⁴⁵ Given

⁴³ Accordingly, Shaw's standard contract for the Licence for Film Rights no longer stated that the film adaptation must be a "faithful [reproduction] of the *Play* as written and designed for ordinary theatrical representation by the Author . . ." (qtd in Costello 32), but that the film "shall follow the agreed *scenario* without transpositions[,] interpolations[,] omissions [,] or any alterations misrepresenting the Author . . ." [*italics mine*] (BSC 174).

⁴⁴ A 2008 production of the original play was timed at two hours and twenty minutes, including intermission.

that Shaw had already witnessed how the film version of *Arms and the Man* had been severely edited after its release, he would have recognised the likelihood of a long *Pygmalion* film being similarly modified without his permission by exhibitors, both in Great Britain and abroad.⁴⁶ Moreover, Shaw must have known that substantial cuts of the play would be necessary if he were to include all of the new sequences that he had composed for the screenplay.

These sequences constitute substantial additions, and in four instances depict events that either occur off-stage or are alluded to in the original play — Eliza’s departure in a taxi at the end of Act I; Eliza’s bath in Act II; the ambassador’s garden party⁴⁷ that occurs between Acts III and IV; and Eliza’s departure from Wimpole Street between Acts IV and V. Freddy also appears in two of the new sequences, including one scene in which he explicitly declares his love for Eliza, and finds his passion reciprocated. In short, Shaw’s new sequences, most of which include a substantial amount of dialogue, constitute a much more radical reworking of his play than the purely visual battle scene that he had written in 1932 for *Arms and the Man*. Given the extent of these changes, it is not surprising that Shaw advises at the beginning of his screenplay that “the omissions and additions to the text of the original play . . . are so extensive that the printed play should be carefully kept out of the studio, as it can only confuse and mislead the producer and the performers”.

⁴⁵ Many of the celebrated British films of the 1930s — particularly those of the first half of the decade — have running times of considerably less than two hours, e.g., *The Private Life of Henry VIII* (Alexander Korda, 1933) at ninety-seven minutes; *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1934) at seventy-five minutes; *Rembrandt* (Korda, 1936) at eighty-five minutes; *The Drum* (Zoltan Korda, 1938) at 104 minutes; and *The Lady Vanishes* (Hitchcock, 1938) at ninety-six minutes.

⁴⁶ One example of this is William Cameron Menzies’s *Things to Come* (1936), one of the longer British films of the 1930s with an original running time of 117 minutes. The film was reduced to 108 minutes for its London premiere, and later cut to ninety-eight minutes by British exhibitors. American exhibitors subsequently reduced it by a further six minutes. Three years later, Zoltan Korda’s *The Four Feathers* (1939) was trimmed from 130 minutes to 115 minutes for the American market.

⁴⁷ In Shaw’s screenplay this event is now an indoor ambassador’s reception.

Shaw divides his scenario into fifty-one scenes,⁴⁸ of which more than two thirds comprise the new sequences. It should be noted, however, that the number of scenes contained in the new sequences are disproportionate to the amount of screen time that they occupy. Many of what Shaw deems “scenes” are in fact merely different *shots* — a change to a close-up, for example — within the same scene. Conversely, with the exception of Act I, the original acts of the play constitute no more than two designated scenes apiece in Shaw’s screenplay, despite being significantly longer than any of the new sequences.⁴⁹

In the 1934 screenplay the new sequences can be summarised as follows:⁵⁰

1. A brief prologue, beginning in Piccadilly Circus and subsequently cutting to another street scene, in which Eliza has an exchange with an elderly flower seller and Freddy attempts to hail a taxi. [Scenes 1–5]
2. A sequence depicting Eliza’s taxi ride to Angel Court (extended from the end of Act I in the play) and leading into an interior scene at her lodgings (bridging Acts I and II). [Scenes 17–23]
3. A bathroom scene involving Mrs. Pearce and Eliza (inserted into the middle of Act II). [Scenes 25–29]
4. An “entr’acte”. This constitutes a non-verbal woodlands scene intended to depict the passage of time from October to February while Higgins is teaching Eliza (bridging Acts II and III). [No scene number: marked by Shaw for optional use only]

⁴⁸ Although both versions of his screenplay feature fifty-one *numbered* scenes, in the 1938 version there are in fact fifty-two scenes due to the longer Ambassador’s Reception sequence. Shaw inadvertently numbers both the final scene of this sequence and the first scene of Act IV as Scene 35.

⁴⁹ Shaw’s screenplay divides the five acts of the original play into the following scenes: Act I: Scenes 6–16; Act II: Scenes 24 and 30; Act III: Scene 31; Act IV: Scenes 35–37 (1934 version) and Scenes 35–36 (1938 version); and Act V: Scene 48 (1934 version) and Scene 47 (1938 version).

⁵⁰ The scene numbers shown here pertain to both the 1934 and the 1938 screenplays unless otherwise stated.

5. The arrival of Higgins, Eliza, and Pickering at the Ambassador's Reception (bridging Acts III and IV). [Scenes 32–34; *revised* 1938 version: 32–35]

6. A bridging scene between Acts IV and V in the play in which Eliza encounters Freddy in Wimpole Street. The latter declares his love for the former, and the pair then embrace (twice) as they depart together. [Scenes 38–47; *revised* 1938 version: 37-46]

7. A new ending in which a future marriage between Eliza and Freddy is strongly implied (Act V). [Scenes 49–51; *revised* 1938 version: 48–51]

The 1938 screenplay contains the same sequences as above, but with the following revisions to sequences V and VII: (a) the Ambassador's Reception is substantially expanded to include several additional characters — most notably the roguish phonetician Nepomuk⁵¹ — and the depiction of Eliza's successful entry into high society (Scenes 32–35); and (b) the ending is substantially rewritten to depict Higgins's amused acceptance of Eliza's and Freddy's romance (Scenes 48–51).

After Shaw had completed his revised screenplay in early 1938, he subsequently wrote a brief phonetics lesson scene involving Higgins, Eliza, and Pickering.⁵² This takes place one day after the original play's Act II, and was written at the behest of Pascal (*GP* 83). Although he had initially been reluctant to compose the scene, telling Pascal in March 1938 that, "(t)he time elapsing between [Acts II and III] needs no explanation beyond what Higgins & the Colonel say to Mrs Higgins [in Act III]" (25), Shaw evidently came to value the scene, for it was one of a number of screenplay scenes that he included in his 1941 (final) edition of *Pygmalion*.⁵³

⁵¹ Subsequently spelled "Nepommuck" in the 1941 edition of the play (and in all of the Standard Editions thereafter).

⁵² See Appendix Two for details.

⁵³ See Chapter Five for more information.

A Note on the Screenplay Texts

Neither Shaw's 1934 *Pygmalion* screenplay nor his revised 1938 version was published during the author's lifetime.⁵⁴ Both versions appeared for the first time in a somewhat modified form in *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw* (London: George Prior, 1980), edited by Dukore. This edition presents the 1938 version of the *Pygmalion* screenplay in the main body of the text and places the two 1934 scenes that Shaw revised in 1938 in the appendix.⁵⁵ Dukore also relegates the 1934 woodlands entr'acte, which Shaw retained for optional use in his 1938 screenplay, to the appendix, replacing it in the main text with the new phonetics scene — written, as previously noted, after Shaw had completed his final typed version of the screenplay in early 1938.⁵⁶ Since the phonetics scene does not appear in any extant version of Shaw's screenplay, Dukore uses the 1941 edition of the stage play as his source for this scene.⁵⁷

Dukore's source for the appended 1934 scenes is Shaw's holograph manuscript of the screenplay, dated 1 October 1934,⁵⁸ while his *principal* source for the 1938 revised screenplay is the typed manuscript "Pygmalion: A Scenario", held by the Harry Ransom

⁵⁴ As previously noted, Shaw did, however, publish a number of his screenplay scenes in the 1941 edition of the stage play, both in the Standard Edition of his works and in a Penguin paperback edition.

⁵⁵ Dukore's rationale for presenting the 1938 version as the definitive *Pygmalion* screenplay text is that because its changes "constitute major revisions, . . . 1938 rather than 1934 represents the date of completion of the *Pygmalion* screenplay . . ." (CS 44). Shaw would presumably have concurred, since all of the screenplay scenes that he subsequently included in his 1941 stage edition of the play are based on the 1938 version (that is to say, on those instances where differences exist between the 1934 and 1938 screenplays).

⁵⁶ I would argue, however, that since Shaw states in his scenario that one of his purposes in creating the former was to provide "relief to the string of [preceding] interiors" in the film, the entr'acte therefore belongs in the main body of the screenplay. Moreover, the substituted phonetics scene does not necessarily replace the need for the entr'acte, since the latter was intended to bridge the four-month period between Acts II and III (Scenes 30 and 31, respectively, in the screenplay).

⁵⁷ The phonetics scene was one of five screenplay scenes that Shaw subsequently included (in modified form) in the 1941 edition of his play.

⁵⁸ This is held at the British Library (BL 50628).

Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin (HRC SHAW 25.7), and dated 1 March 1938.⁵⁹ It is important to note, however, that in each instance in which Shaw modified instructions and/or dialogue from the 1938 screenplay for his (final) 1941 edition of the play, Dukore has selected the latter version instead of the actual screenplay.⁶⁰

In this chapter I have used *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw* as my point of reference for the two 1934 scenes and the 1938 phonetics scene.⁶¹ Elsewhere, however, I have reverted to Shaw's 1938 typed manuscript given that a) it constitutes the 1938 screenplay submitted to Pascal and Asquith in March 1938 — as opposed to Shaw's subsequent revisions in 1941 for a different medium — and that b) I examine the 1941 version as a separate entity in a later chapter. Accordingly, the source of all subsequent scene numbers, except where otherwise stated, is Shaw's manuscript "Pygmalion: A Scenario" (HRC SHAW 25.7).⁶²

⁵⁹ Written on this copy of the manuscript, in Shaw's handwriting, is "To Floryan Sobienowski for translation into Polish." Sobienowski was Shaw's regular translator of his works into Polish.

⁶⁰ Dukore also removes all of Shaw's individual scene numbering for his edition.

⁶¹ My rationale for doing so is that, in the first instance, Dukore presents the two 1934 scenes in this book in unmodified form, while in the case of the phonetics scene, he presents the *dialogue* without modification, but amends and partly removes Shaw's brief commentary, which is inserted both immediately before and after the scene in the 1941 edition. Since the 1941 commentary is intended for readers of the stage play rather than film technicians, Dukore's decision to excise it is arguably a logical one. In short, he restores the phonetics scene to the likely form in which Shaw would have submitted it to Pascal in 1938.

⁶² The manuscript was typed by a Miss Cowan of Charing Cross. I have preserved the punctuation and spelling of the manuscript in all instances. The format differs from Shaw's usual practice in several respects, e.g., standard brackets (parentheses) are used instead of square brackets for instructions (which are not italicised), and apostrophes are used with all contractions. In a number of instances, Shaw makes minor handwritten changes to the typed text; these modifications are noted subsequently in this chapter. On two pages, an unidentified person has handwritten over the final sequence (Scenes 48–51), "Omit [Scenes] 49 & 50." I have provided only *scene numbers* in each instance for material quoted from the screenplay, as the page numbering is incorrect after page 97. To avoid any possible confusion, I have also italicised Shaw's instructions in all instances.

Analysis of Shaw's *Pygmalion* Screenplay

Shaw's emerging film technique. In his influential treatise *Film Technique and Film Acting*, V.I. Pudovkin⁶³ argues that, "In order to write a scenario suitable for filming, one must know the methods by which the spectator can be influenced from the screen." He goes on to write that, "a knowledge and consideration of the possibilities and peculiarities of directorial work will enable [the screenwriter] to propose material that *can* be used by the director, and will make possible to him the creation of a *filmically expressive* film" [original emphasis] (30).

In his *Pygmalion* screenplay, Shaw — having by the time of its composition identified, one assumes, many of the deficiencies in Lewis's direction of *How He Lied to Her Husband* and *Arms and the Man* — frequently demonstrates an awareness of cinematic technique, particularly in the use of such visual tools as long shots, close-ups, dissolves, fades, and reaction shots. Although, as he acknowledges, his scenario is "technically" incomplete,⁶⁴ he ensures that all of his *new* sequences contain extensive instructions for director and camera operator. He also divides Act I of the original play into 11 separate (but successive) scenes, for each of which he instructs a specific shot.⁶⁵ The following are examples of how Shaw used specific cinematic means to convey information and underscore important thematic points and characters.

⁶³ Vsevolod Illarionovich Pudovkin (1893–1953), Russian actor-scenarist-director noted for his use of montage, particularly in films of the latter part of the silent era.

⁶⁴ On the unnumbered second page of his screenplay, Shaw writes that, "This scenario is not technically complete; but it indicates exactly what the producer has to work on in the studio, with all the omissions from and additions to the text of the original play." Shaw's unwillingness to provide a full shooting script may be explained by Costello's observation that, "[H]e never did think of himself as a cinematician: he always refused to join The Association of Cine-Technicians, stating: 'I am not a cinematician. I am a playwright.'" (37).

⁶⁵ Apart from a single direction in Act II — "*the audience should have a good look at [Doolittle] as he appears in the doorway*" (Scene 30) — Act I is the only act carried over from the play, including its technical instructions.

At the beginning of his screenplay, Shaw makes use of visual dramatisation to establish, in quick succession, the following: an approaching thunderstorm — “*First, a sky over chimney pots and church towers, with masses of thundercloud and a black cloud moving towards the sun*” (Scene 1) — the London setting, which he identifies through the use of the well-known statue of Eros in that city’s Piccadilly Circus, and, finally, Eliza, her occupation, and her importance to the plot.⁶⁶ He achieves the last of these objectives by specifying that Eliza is “*the only young one*” among a group of flower sellers sitting at the base of the Eros monument (Scene 2), and then cuts to a closer shot of her. Shaw employs the latter scene to establish Eliza’s financial predicament and state of mind:

[H]er good looks are not yet discoverable: she is dirty and her ill-combed hair is dirty. Her shawl and skirt are old and ugly. Her boots are deplorable, her hat, an old black straw with a band of violets, indescribable. . . . Eliza is listless, discouraged and miserable. (Scene 3)

When the location shifts to Covent Garden in Scene 6 — the point in the screenplay equivalent to the beginning of Act I — Shaw specifies in a note that, unlike the play, “*the film . . . begins in the late afternoon, as the theatres are closing their matinees. Consequently nobody is in evening dress*”. His motive in bringing forward the time, Dukore infers, is “Partly . . . to show thunderclouds, which are clearer in the daylight, and partly to show Liza’s neighbourhood and lodging more clearly, for they have poor illumination” (*Screenplays* 74). The late afternoon light also allows for greater visibility of the Covent Garden scene, as described by Shaw. In what is clearly intended as a long shot, Shaw writes that we first see a “[g]eneral view of [the portico of the church of St Paul in Covent Garden] from the [perspective of the] market, with the crowd of people sheltering from heavy rain. MRS HILL, her DAUGHTER, HIGGINS and the rest are in position; but they are not distinguishable in this shot” (Scene 6). Shaw then reverses the

⁶⁶ For whatever reason, Shaw was dissatisfied with this scene, however. In a letter to Pascal dated 6 March 1938 (five days after the revised 1938 screenplay had been typed), Shaw states that, “I have not yet had time to look at the first scene and get rid of Piccadilly Circus” (*Shaw and Pascal* 24). To date, however, no replacement scene by Shaw has emerged.

perspective, indicating a shot of the market filmed from the portico end of Covent Garden. He does so in order to imply Higgins's detachment from the other characters, and at the same time to invite curiosity on the screen audience's part regarding the man's behaviour:

Thus all the shelterers have their backs to the audience except HIGGINS, who stands in the middle with his back to them, listening and making notes, cocking his ears right and left alternately as he listens. . . .

The figure of HIGGINS should be on the scale of a close-up. The row of backs behind him should be on that of a longer shot, so as to give him comparative magnitude. (Scene 7)

Elsewhere in the material transferred from Act I, Shaw employs varying character angles to underscore the stark differences between Eliza and Higgins in their respective confidence and social circumstances. When Higgins tells Eliza to stop “crooning like a bilious pigeon” (Scene 13), Shaw emphasises Eliza's wretchedness by cutting to a high angle close-up of her — i.e., with the camera focused on her from Higgins's perspective — for her reaction (“Ah-ah-ah-ow-ow-ow-oo!”), and then cuts to a shot of Higgins from the reverse perspective, but with a lower camera angle.⁶⁷ In each shot, the different camera angles underline the social standing of the speakers: a high angle shot of Eliza looking up at Higgins, thus emphasising her “inferiority” (Scene 14), and a lower angle shot of Higgins standing between the two central pillars of the portico to establish his “superiority” over Eliza (15).

In the second new sequence that immediately follows Act I of the play, Shaw also uses visual means to emphasise Eliza's straitened circumstances. When she arrives at her lodgings in Angel Court (Scene 17), Shaw employs camera angles from opposite perspectives: one of Angel Court from the perspective of an archway towards which

⁶⁷ Shaw does not specifically state that the camera angles are different in each case, but implies this through his instructions, e.g., that, in the first instance, the close-up of Eliza should show her “*looking up at [Higgins] . . .*” (Scene 14).

Eliza is trudging, the other a rear view of Eliza “*wearily dragging along with her basket*” until “[s]he disappears into a doorway” (18), with the latter shot arguably underscoring her loneliness and isolation.⁶⁸ Cutting to a scene inside her lodging, Shaw describes Eliza’s living environment with its “*irreducible minimum of poverty’s needs*” (19), but avoids sentimentality by employing a wordless montage in which Eliza’s naïveté is depicted as she imagines herself, among other things, wearing “*a coronet and diamonds, like Queen Alexandra*”, although “*still ridiculous in her dirty make-up*” (22).⁶⁹

Dukore argues that this sequence, “(f)ar more effectively than the play . . . reveals Liza’s environment, which the play only suggests through expository dialogue”. He goes on to write that, in addition, the sequence provides

a vivid contrast to [Eliza’s] bedroom at Higgins’s house, also unseen by stage audiences, which the screenplay shows to be ‘*light, clean, and cheerful.*’ In taking audiences into both rooms, Shaw does not merely ‘open up’ the play for the screen. Rather, he makes organic use of the film medium to reveal thematically relevant aspects of his characters’ backgrounds. (CS 73)

In the extensive cuts that he makes to the original play, Shaw also demonstrates an awareness of the differing functions of dialogue in the cinema and the theatre. Playwright-screenwriter Alfred Uhry⁷⁰ writes that, when adapting a play for the screen, “I cut any dialogue that I could show rather than tell about,” transferring only what is necessary to the story “while trying to recreate the way that people talk [in the stage version]” (qtd in Seger 45). Similarly, Irwin R. Blacker argues that the screen adapter should expunge any “line [that] does not serve one of the [screenplay’s] basic functions,

⁶⁸ Further intensifying this sense of loneliness, Shaw specifies that there is to be “*No dialogue*” on the soundtrack during this shot (Scene 18).

⁶⁹ Here, in parentheses, Shaw again emphasises that Eliza’s good looks should not yet be discoverable: “[N]o picture must anticipate her change to a blooming young beauty after her first bath”.

⁷⁰ Alfred Uhry (1936–) won an American Academy Award in 1990 for adapting his 1987 play *Driving Miss Daisy* for the screen.

. . . regardless of how clever, memorable, or poetic it is”. He goes on to assert that dialogue serves the following four functions in a screenplay: “To move the storyline forward. To reveal aspects of character not otherwise seen. To present exposition and particulars of past events. To set the tone for the film” (51).

In his screenplay for *Pygmalion*, Shaw attempts much of what Blacker identifies here, using exposition through dialogue to establish Eliza’s financial circumstances and crudeness of language through her new opening line — “I ’avn’t sold a bloody thing since five o’clock, I ’avn’t” (Scene 3)⁷¹ — and deleting dialogue relating to aspects that he is instead able to convey visually, e.g., Eliza’s lengthy description of the bathroom at Wimpole Street in Act II (141), which is now replaced by the new bathroom sequence. Moreover, where discussion hinders the storyline’s advance, Shaw removes multiple exchanges. In Scene 8, he retains Clara’s opening lines from the play — “I’m getting chilled to the bone. What can Freddy be doing all this time?” (105) — but removes the exchanges between Mrs Eynsford Hill and the Bystander, thereby bringing forward the arrival of Freddy. Shaw then removes a further four exchanges between Freddy and the other Hills in order to hasten the former’s collision with Eliza. When Higgins boasts to Pickering that he “could pass that girl off as a duchess at an ambassador’s garden party”, Shaw deletes Higgins’s subsequent comments about “commercial millionaires” and being “a poet on Miltonic lines”, and adds an exchange that underscores for his audience not only the forthcoming plot introduced by Higgins’s boast, but — more clearly than in the play — emphasises Eliza’s already nascent interest in its implications:

⁷¹ Perhaps intentionally, Shaw also reduces the impact of Eliza’s subsequent use of “bloody” — i.e., as “Not bloody likely” — in Scene 31 by introducing this word at the outset. Shaw had been concerned on the eve of the play’s London premiere that Eliza’s use of the word would cause “a collapse of the play after the third act” (*Shaw and Campbell* 161), an event that he almost correctly presaged, and in the intervening two decades, Eliza’s line had not lost the power to shock audiences, although to a somewhat lesser degree than it had in 1914. Moreover, at the time that Shaw was writing and revising his screenplay, the use of “bloody” was unheard of in British cinema. Mycroft asserted in 1959 that B.I.P Head John Maxwell had originally wanted to film *Pygmalion* in 1932 instead of *Arms and the Man*, but had decided against the idea because of his conviction that the British film censor at the time would never allow the inclusion of the play’s most famous line, “Not bloody likely” (15).

ELIZA: What's that you say?

The NOTE TAKER turns crushingly on her.

NOTE TAKER: Yes, you squashed cabbage leaf, you squashed cabbage leaf, you disgrace to the noble architecture of these columns, you incarnate insult to the English language: I could pass you off as the Queen of Sheba. (Scene 15)

Later in his screenplay, when faced with the difficulty of adapting the long Act V — and lacking the opportunity for visual relief that the interpolated bathroom sequence had provided in Act II — Shaw streamlines his dialogue wherever possible, deleting material that is neither thematically essential nor important to the audience's understanding of the characters. Accordingly, he retains the opening conversation between Mrs Higgins and her parlourmaid, but deletes their references to Higgins and Pickering calling the police. This allows him to cut a further half-page of discussion about “that ass of an inspector” (P170), and advance to the arrival of Doolittle. Later in the same scene, he removes over half of the Act V confrontation between Higgins and Eliza,⁷² principally because it contains statements by both parties that may encourage a romantic interpretation,⁷³ but also because he recognises that in terms of screen economy, *dramatic* dialogue⁷⁴ is preferable to discursiveness. As Dukore observes,

What is essential [in this confrontation], he retains; for example, the difference between Higgins and Pickering, Liza's determination not to be passed over, her resolution to marry Freddy, and her independence. What is less dramatically essential or depicted elsewhere, he removes; for instance, the similarity between Higgins and Doolittle, Higgins's dependence on Liza, and his lecture on the difference between life at his flat and life in the gutter. (CS 73–74)

⁷² I.e., most of the dialogue after Eliza's declaration that, “So you are a bus: all bounce and go, and no consideration for anyone” (P184) until “I cant talk to you . . .” (189).

⁷³ This aspect is discussed in the next section.

⁷⁴ I.e., dialogue that advances the plot.

Not all of Shaw's deletions, however, are successful, either dramatically or thematically. In Scene 30, he retains Higgins's question to Doolittle from Act II concerning how the latter had discovered that Eliza was at Wimpole Street — "How . . . could you possibly know that she is here?" (P135) — but deletes Doolittle's explanation, thereby creating a logical problem. Presumably in the interest of screen economy, Shaw also deletes Higgins's Act II discussion with Pickering in which the former emphasises his misogyny (P130). In the original play, this discussion takes place concurrently with Eliza's off-stage bath, which is dramatised in his screenplay. By removing the discussion, Shaw loses an important early opportunity to clarify Higgins's intentions regarding Eliza — "You see, she'll be a pupil; and teaching would be impossible unless pupils were sacred" — together with his insistence that he is "a confirmed old bachelor, and likely to remain so" (P130).⁷⁵ Shaw also deletes the entire Act II discussion between Mrs Pearce and Higgins, in which the former lectures the latter on his personal habits and — in particular — his use of the word "bloody", thus obscuring the comic irony of Eliza's faux pas in the original play when she repeats the word at Mrs Higgins's at-home day, merely emulating her teacher's language. In Shaw's screenplay, however, "bloody" is in Eliza's vocabulary prior to her meeting Higgins.⁷⁶

In an effort to make *Pygmalion* more accessible to an international audience, Shaw also deletes or changes numerous specifically British references, including locations, products, and idioms. The majority of these deletions are from the first two acts. These include, from Act I, Pickering's question about music halls; the Bystander's references to "a copper's nark"; the Sarcastic Bystander's reference to Hanwell Insane Asylum ("You come from Anwell"); Higgins's references to upper class Kentish Town and Park Lane; and the colloquial "Come with me now and lets have a jaw over some supper," which Shaw changes to the more prosaic "Come and dine with me." In Act II, "Lisson Grove prudery" becomes "slum prudery"; Eliza does not irritate Higgins with her suggestion

⁷⁵ He does, however, retain Higgins's subsequent comment in Act III when he hints at a mother-fixation by telling his mother, "My idea of a lovable woman is something as like you as possible. I shall never get into the way of seriously liking young women: some habits lie too deep to be changed" (P143).

⁷⁶ As previously noted, Eliza uses this word in her first utterance in the screenplay (Scene 3).

that he had “had a drop in” the previous evening, nor does she refer to her father’s trade as that of “a navvy”; and Monkey Brand and Tottenham Court Road are not mentioned. Shaw also deletes many of the more esoteric allusions in the play, including Higgins’s reference to Doolittle’s “native woodnotes wild” in Act II and Mrs Higgins’s comments about her son’s “patent shorthand” in Act III. Some potentially offensive references are also removed — for example, Higgins’s comment about the “mendacity” of the Welsh in Act II — though, conversely, there is more swearing in Shaw’s screenplay than in the original play, particularly from Eliza.⁷⁷

Shaw’s deletions do, however, diminish some of the more serious thematic elements of *Pygmalion*, together with several of its characters. As Dukore observes, some of the play’s social concerns, in particular, are less vivid in Shaw’s scenario (*CS 75*). These deletions include Higgins’s Act II observation on the impact of poverty — “a woman of [Eliza’s] class looks like a worn out drudge of fifty a year after shes married” (*P125*) — together with the second of Doolittle’s two monologues in Act V, in which the latter reveals his fear of growing old — “I have to dye my hair already to keep my job as a dustman” — and of consequently being forced from employment into the workhouse (*P174*).⁷⁸ Moreover, since it is Doolittle’s understandable fear of the workhouse that causes him not to repudiate the bequest from Ezra D. Wannafeller’s will, the absence of this explanation⁷⁹ in the screenplay undermines the sincerity of the former dustman’s indignation at being propelled into the middle class. In short, the omission of Doolittle’s

⁷⁷ For example, Eliza’s use of “bloody” in Scene 3 and her outburst at the end of Scene 36: “Yes, damn, damn, damn, damn, damn. I’ll make you damn worse before I’ve done with you. You’ll see how you’ll get on without me.”

⁷⁸ Doolittle himself is somewhat less colourful in Shaw’s screenplay. Possibly because of film censorship concerns, Shaw removes Doolittle’s ribald insinuation in Act II regarding Higgins’s motive for allowing Eliza to live at Wimpole Street — “She said she didnt want no clothes. What was I to think from that, Governor?” — together with his rebuttal of Pickering’s reference to his (Doolittle’s) “immorality”, when he insists that it is his common-law wife, not he, who gains from their cohabitation.

⁷⁹ Accordingly, in Shaw’s screenplay, Mrs Higgins no longer reminds Doolittle that he is at liberty to repudiate Wannafeller’s bequest if he is “really in earnest” regarding the amount of suffering it has caused him (*P174*).

reasoning⁸⁰ — more serious than any of his other utterances in the play — renders him a greater opportunist in Shaw’s screenplay than he appears in the play.

Shaw also deletes Higgins’s Act V denunciation of working class life: “Work til you are more than a brute than a human being; and then cuddle and squabble and drink til you fall asleep” (P188). The absence of this description in the screenplay arguably undermines the pathos inherent in Eliza’s bitter realization (which Shaw retains) that she cannot return to her former existence after becoming accustomed to life with Higgins and Pickering, “and it’s wicked and cruel of you to insult me by pretending I could” (P189). Shaw’s screenplay, in any event, largely obscures the state of limbo in which Eliza finds herself by Act V in the play — ill at ease in both her previous and present environment — by deleting her pitiable recounting to Pickering of her return to Covent Garden, where “I tried to get back into the old way . . . but it was no use” (180),⁸¹ together with her sense of herself as “a slave now, for all my fine clothes” (187).

The related theme of money also features less prominently in Shaw’s screenplay. Doolittle no longer underscores the point that his newly acquired wealth is the only thing that separates him from being a member of the middle class and wearing “the pauper’s uniform” (174). Higgins rattles the coins in his pocket on only two⁸² of the four occasions that he performs this action in the play, thus reducing the implied connection between his financial security and his so-called ownership of Eliza. Shaw also cuts most of the dialogue that occurs in Act II between Eliza’s declared intention to become “a lady in a flower shop” (121) and Pickering’s bet that he will pay “all of the expenses of the experiment” (123), thereby removing Eliza’s rationale for offering a shilling for lessons, together with Higgins’s incredulous response that her proposal equates to “two-fifths of

⁸⁰ “It’s easy to say chuck it; but I havnt the nerve. Which of us has? We’re all intimidated. Intimidated, maam: that’s what we are. What is there for me if I chuck it but the workhouse in my old age?” (P174).

⁸¹ Shaw cuts this reference presumably because in the new sequence (VI) with Freddy that precedes the events of Act V, there is no indication that Eliza plans to visit Covent Garden. The sequence instead ends with Eliza and Freddy hailing a taxi for Wimbledon Common.

⁸² I.e., in Scenes 31 and 35, which correspond to Acts III and IV in the original play.

her day's income for a lesson. . . . By George, it's enormous! it's the biggest offer I ever had". The elimination of these exchanges undermines audience awareness of the extent to which Eliza is prepared to suffer financially in the short term in order to escape the working class.

At the same time, by deleting Mrs Eynsford Hill's moist-eyed revelation in Act III that, "We're so poor! and [Clara] gets so few parties, poor child!" (155), Mrs Higgins's subsequent warning — which Shaw retains in his screenplay — that Eliza may suffer the same fate as "that poor woman" (Mrs Eynsford Hill) whose "manners and habits . . . disqualify a fine lady from earning her own living without giving her a fine lady's income!" loses much of its impact. Indeed, apart from Clara's evident miserliness in Scene 8, when (as in Act I of the play) she criticises her mother for giving Eliza sixpence, there is scant evidence⁸³ conveyed elsewhere in the screenplay to suggest that the Eynsford Hills are living in genteel poverty: in short, that they are as trapped in their own class as Eliza (initially) is in her own. Shaw's failure to adequately convey this point in his screenplay also undermines Higgins's later criticism of Freddy as a "poor devil who couldn't get a job as an errand boy even if he had the guts to try for it!" (Scene 47), since the audience may assume, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that Freddy is sufficiently wealthy not to require employment.

In other respects too, Clara's role is substantially altered by Shaw's cuts, reducing her involvement virtually to that of a spectator in the screenplay's equivalent of Act III (Scene 31). Although Clara still greets Higgins "*with confident familiarity*", her principal motive for doing so — that she "*considers Higgins quite eligible matrimonially*" (P149) — is removed, together with her subsequent attempts to ingratiate herself with him. Thus, she no longer laments that, "If people would only be frank and say what they really

⁸³ In a new sequence (VI), Freddy confesses to Eliza that he has no money when she spontaneously suggests that they ride in a taxi. However, audiences may well infer from this admission that Freddy is merely careless rather than impoverished.

think!” (P149).⁸⁴ In the screenplay, Shaw deletes the discussion on swearing that follows Eliza’s “Not bloody likely” (and, with it, Clara’s unwitting endorsement of such language), cutting instead to Freddy’s “Well, I ask you—”, which in the play is a reaction to his *sister’s* swearing and not that of Eliza.⁸⁵ While these cuts ensure that Eliza’s *faux pas* is given greater emphasis by bringing forward the departure of the Hills the moment immediately after it occurs, Clara’s role in the scene is no longer thematically relevant. As Dukore observes:

Unfortunately, [Shaw’s screenplay] diminishes the importance of Clara, who[,] since Shaw cuts the relevant passages[,] is no longer a foil for Liza (unlike Liza, she attempts to flirt with Higgins; like Liza, she affects a type of speech not her own). Thus, in the screenplay she becomes the only Eynsford Hill not organically related to the transformation of Liza — a dramatic weakness. (CS 75)

The actual *methods* by which Eliza’s transformation is effected, however, are given greater emphasis in Shaw’s screenplay by means of the inclusion of three of his new sequences. Two of these scenes are included, largely, one infers, because of their striking visual images: the bathroom scene, with its vivid depiction of Eliza’s struggle; and the ambassador’s reception sequence, with its pageantry and costumes. In the first of these, cleanliness — as a means of initiating both the external and internal aspects of Eliza’s transformation — is introduced through the new bathroom scene. “I want to change you from a dirty slut to a clean sweet lovable girl,” Mrs Pearce informs Eliza (Scene 29). Taking her upstairs to what Shaw describes as “*A good servant’s bedroom, light, clean, and cheerful*,” Mrs Pearce equates cleanliness with self-esteem — “You’ve got to make yourself as clean as the room: then you won’t be afraid of it” (Scene 27) — and with

⁸⁴ Consequently, Shaw is also obliged to remove Higgins’s retort (“Lord forbid!”) and, with it, his implied criticism of the Eynsford Hills as cultural ignoramuses — “What do you know of poetry? . . . What do you know of science? . . . What does he know of art or science or anything else?” (P149–50).

⁸⁵ Moreover, Freddy’s utterance, spoken in frustration “*to the heavens at large*” — seems an inappropriately irritated response in the screenplay to Eliza’s swearing, given that he is both “*infatuated*” by the latter, and, in the next exchange, “awfully” enthusiastic at the prospect of meeting her again.

virtue — “You know you can’t be a nice girl inside if you’re a dirty girl outside” (29). For her part, Eliza initially expresses disbelief and fear — “You expect me to get into that and wet myself all over! Not me. I should catch my death” – followed by “*heartrending screams*” as the housekeeper “*deftly snatches [her] bathgown away and throws ELIZA down on her back*” in order to begin scrubbing her (29).

Gainor argues that in this scene Mrs Pearce plays the role of “a female surrogate for the male rapist”:

The phallic brush and cleansing ball are applied with the clinical coldness of the bath/laboratory’s rubber gloves. That Eliza should be thrown on her back to be ‘cleaned,’ which in a bathtub would literally lead to drowning, cements the rape imagery, highlighting for the reader the symbolic interpretation over the literal. (236)

Rape scene or not, Shaw attempts to mitigate the disconcerting spectacle of Eliza forcibly disrobed and scrubbed by prefacing it with instructions that Mrs Pearce must speak to her in a “*kindly*” manner while endeavouring to persuade her of the need to bathe (Scene 29).⁸⁶ Shaw also employs humour to convey Eliza’s naïve aversion to bathing — “I knew a woman did it every Saturday night; and she died of it.” However, the sequence also unnecessarily repeats information that Shaw has already conveyed visually in Scene 23 of the Angel Court sequence when, in a series of exchanges, Mrs Pearce discovers that Eliza wears the same undergarments to bed as she does during the daytime.

The other two aspects of Eliza’s transformation for which Shaw provides explicit visual demonstration in his new sequences are linguistic and social; these are represented by the phonetics lesson and the ambassador’s reception scenes, respectively. As previously noted, Shaw wrote the phonetics scene at the request of his producer, Pascal, who

⁸⁶ He further emphasises that Mrs Pearce is motivated by a sense of protectiveness toward Eliza by providing her with new lines in the next scene (30) upon the arrival of Doolittle—[to Higgins] “Don’t give her up to him, sir. I don’t like his looks. I’ll take care of the girl, sir.”

according to his widow, Valerie, believed that “the basis for *Pygmalion* was a miracle of metamorphosis performed by phonetics, [and that he therefore] felt that the most important scenes in the movie should be the ones where Higgins teaches Eliza” (83). It is unlikely that Shaw concurred, however, for he provided only a single brief example of Higgins’s teaching methods. Presumably seeking to demystify for his audience the process by which Eliza’s pronunciation improves dramatically off-stage between Acts II and III in the play, Shaw depicts Higgins as an extremely demanding but effective teacher and Eliza as the possessor of a remarkably quick ear. “By Jupiter, she’s done it at the first shot,” Higgins remarks to Pickering, as Eliza correctly mimics his pronunciation of “cup”. Nevertheless, Higgins continues to harangue his pupil, and on informing her that there will be a further lesson later that day the scene ends with a “sobbing” Eliza rushing from the room (CS 245–46).

The Ambassador’s Reception sequence is considerably longer than the phonetics scene, and constitutes a much more substantial addition than the sequence that Shaw had written in 1934. Lewis writes that Shaw had initially regarded the depiction of Eliza’s success at the reception as a “scene of no importance” (Costello xi), and certainly it can be argued that Shaw’s dramatically flat depiction of the event in his 1934 screenplay does little to advance his narrative. In this earlier version, which contains no distinguishable dialogue amid what Shaw describes as “*the din of conversation*”, Eliza, Higgins and Pickering attend an (unnamed) ambassador’s function in London. Eliza, who is wearing a “*brilliant evening dress, diamonds; fan, flowers, and all accessories*”, is depicted being “*received and greeted*”, getting “*through the ordeal gracefully*” as she “*passes into the crowd*” (CS 481). The scene fades out with a shot of Pickering introducing Higgins to the Ambassador’s wife (481).

In February 1938, Shaw was persuaded to write a longer reception sequence in which new characters are introduced and Eliza’s successful entry into high society is depicted in greater detail.⁸⁷ An element of suspense is also injected through the determination of one

⁸⁷ In a letter to Shaw dated 16 February 1938, Pascal writes that, “I am delighted that you have accepted Anthony [Asquith]’s ballroom sequence . . .”, and asks him to send Asquith “the supplementary dialogues”

of the guests, the Hungarian phonetician and blackmailer Nepomuk, a former pupil of Higgins, to discover Eliza's identity. In what is arguably the comic highlight of his new sequences, Shaw underscores the absurdity of the supposition that genes are responsible for determining one's class. This occurs when Nepomuk, declaring that Eliza is indeed "a fraud", assumes that she cannot be English on the grounds that her pronunciation is *too* perfect — and "Only foreigners who have been taught to speak [English] speak it well." Eliza is, in fact, a *Hungarian* princess, he informs his hostess, since "Only the Magyar races can produce that air of the divine right, those high cheekbones, those resolute eyes" (Scene 35).⁸⁸ Through Nepomuk, Shaw also underlines the hollowness of judgments based purely on superficial markers. Nepomuk assumes that because Eliza possesses the appropriate clothes and accent of a member of high society, she must also be highly educated. Thus, when he recounts that he had attempted to engage Eliza in conversation in Hungarian, only to be informed by the latter that, "I do not understand French," he deems it "impossible" that she does not speak both languages (35).

Comic elements notwithstanding, the sequence contains an underlying element of pathos, as Eliza reveals her fairytale-like hopes for the evening upon arrival at the reception — "I have done this fifty times — hundreds of times — in my little piggery in Angel Court in my day-dreams. I am in a dream now." However, she dispels any notion that she regards Higgins as her fairytale prince, asking Pickering (in Higgins's presence) to "Promise me not to let Professor Higgins wake me; for if he does, I shall forget everything and talk as I used to in Drury Lane" (Scene 33).⁸⁹ Although Eliza goes on to make a considerable

(*GP* 20). In his biography of Asquith, R.J. Minney writes that Shaw had initially listened "very reluctantly and impatiently" to the director's suggestions as to how the sequence might be elaborated, only becoming agreeable to his proposal when Asquith's description of Eliza ascending "the stairs with the frozen calm of the sleepwalker" captured his imagination (94–95).

⁸⁸ Pascal's widow Valerie states that it was her husband who insisted that, "Eliza, at the height of her female charm, had to be suspected of *Hungarian* royal origin." Moreover, she writes, Shaw's reference to "the Magyar races" was his way of obliging Pascal, who was himself of Magyar origin (82).

⁸⁹ Further dispelling any fairytale connotations, Higgins himself does not behave here in the manner of a romantic prince toward Eliza, offering her no compliments on her success and declaring gruffly at the end of the sequence, "Let us get out of this. I have had enough of chattering to these damned fools" (Scene 35).

impression on her hosts and fellow guests at the reception, with the latter group reacting to her “*as though she were a great personage*” (35), the sequence concludes on an anti-climactic note with her dejected assumption that she has “lost [Pickering’s] bet” after an elderly fellow guest tells her that she “[speaks] exactly like Queen Victoria”.⁹⁰

Consequently, Eliza implies, she now feels more isolated than ever — “I have done my best; but nothing can make me the same as these people” (35). Shaw thus foreshadows the despondency that besets Eliza in the screenplay’s equivalent scene to Act IV, as she begins to question the future direction of her life.

How Shaw thwarts notions of a Higgins–Eliza romance. One could argue that Nepomuk’s dominant role in the Ambassador’s Reception scenes, providing both comedy and unexpected suspense, constitutes a means of preventing the sequence from acquiring romantic overtones (given its obvious Cinderella connotations) involving Eliza and Higgins. Shaw further forestalls any potential inference of romance by separating the two characters during most of the sequence and ensuring at its conclusion that she receives no compliments on her performance from her gruff mentor. This approach typifies Shaw’s strategy throughout his screenplay. More broadly, as Dukore observes, “[Shaw] removes virtually every suggestion [from his play] of Higgins’s possible romantic interest in Liza, for such suggestions, because they keep the possibility in the air, may seem to refute subsequent denials” (CS 71).

These deletions include, from Act II, the removal of Higgins’s suggestion that Eliza’s motivation for improving her pronunciation is to obtain a husband — “By George, Eliza, the streets will be strewn with the bodies of men shooting themselves for your sake before I’ve done with you” (125),⁹¹ and, from Act III, Higgins’s acknowledgment to his

⁹⁰ Technically, perhaps, Pickering’s bet has been lost, since it had been wagered in reference to Higgins’s earlier boast that, “I could pass that girl off as a duchess at an ambassador’s garden party” (Scene 15). However, as previously noted, in Shaw’s screenplay additions Higgins goes on to state in the same scene that, “I could pass you off as the Queen of Sheba.” Moreover, at the time that Pickering makes the wager, Higgins boasts that, within months, “I’ll take her anywhere and pass her off as anything” (Scene 24).

⁹¹ Shaw does, however, retain Higgins’s subsequent prediction that Eliza “shall marry an officer in the Guards, with a beautiful moustache: the son of a marquis . . .” (P128).

mother that he never “[stops] thinking about [Eliza] and her confounded vowels and consonants. I’m worn out, thinking about her, and watching her lips and her teeth and her tongue, not to mention her soul, which is the quaintest of the lot” (P156). At the end of Act IV, lest Eliza’s search for the ring that Higgins has thrown into the fireplace be construed as an indication of romantic feelings toward her mentor, Shaw adds instructions that reduce the possibility of Eliza’s actions being afforded a more tender interpretation:

[Eliza] tears the door open,⁹² and is marching out when she hesitates, and looks around at the fireplace. She comes back towards it.

ELIZA on her knees on the hearthrug, searching for the ring.

She finds it; holds it up in triumph; and replaces it on her finger.

She rises, and makes for the door, very determined and self-satisfied. (Scenes 35–36)

From Act V, Shaw deletes Higgins’s “I shall miss you, Eliza. . . . And I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather” (P185), together with Eliza’s insistence that she would never marry Higgins (187), or that infatuation is “not the sort of feeling” she seeks from him (188). To strengthen the audience’s awareness of Eliza’s growing sense of self-determination, Shaw removes her despairing, “Why did you take my independence from me? Why did I give it up? I’m a slave now, for all my fine clothes” (187). He also underlines the non-sexual comradeship that Higgins desires from Eliza by removing the word “consort” — with its implicitly romantic connotation —

⁹² Eliza’s actions are preceded here by a verbal outburst from Eliza — “(Shaking her fist at the door) Yes, damn, damn, damn, damn. I’ll make you damn worse before I’ve done with you. You’ll see how you’ll get on without me” (Scene 35). In all published versions of the play, Eliza does not speak immediately after Higgins’s departure.

from her declaration that, “Five minutes ago you were like a millstone round my neck. Now you’re a tower of strength: a consort battleship” (P190).

Moreover, throughout his screenplay Shaw focuses to a significantly greater degree on Eliza, marginalizing Higgins in the process. This occurs in multiple ways. For instance, as previously noted, it is Eliza, not Higgins (as in the play), on whom Shaw focuses at the beginning of his screenplay. In the transfer of acts from the play, Higgins’s dialogue is more truncated than Eliza’s. At the same time, she is the chief beneficiary of Shaw’s new sequences. Excluding the optional entr’acte, Eliza appears in all seven of these sequences,⁹³ while Higgins appears in only three. Although these sequences do provide Higgins and Eliza with the intimacy of separate scenes in which they each share their thoughts with the audience, the dramatic thrust of the screenplay is clearly centred on Eliza. Thus, at the end of Acts I and IV, respectively, instead of accompanying Higgins and Pickering back to Wimpole Street, or depicting the former’s initial reaction to the news that his pupil has “bolted”, the screenplay depicts what *Eliza* did next, not only because it is more interesting dramatically, but because Shaw wants the audience to identify with *her* daydreams and aspirations, none of which involve Higgins in any romantic sense.

Similarly, in the new sequences added at the respective conclusions of Acts II and III, notwithstanding Higgins’s involvement in both scenes, the focus remains on Eliza and her trials. *Will* she change her pronunciation? *Will* she succeed at the ambassador’s reception? On three occasions in his screenplay — the aforementioned scenes at Angel Court, the search for the ring in the fireplace, and a new sequence in which Eliza first returns to her bedroom before departing from Wimpole Street with Freddy — Shaw encourages a degree of intimacy between the audience and Eliza that he never affords Higgins. Not until the final sequence, in fact, when Eliza and Freddy drive away with Mrs Higgins, “*leaving HIGGINS on the pavement, stranded and amazed*” (Scene 48), does the audience find itself alone with Higgins. And even then, the focus of Shaw’s

⁹³ This total includes the 1938 phonetics scene.

screenplay remains on Eliza albeit through the daydreaming of Higgins, as he imagines her future married life with Freddy.

Moreover, in order to make Freddy more palatable to the audience as Eliza's love interest, Shaw substantially aggrandises his role, employing both verbal and visual means to do so. Firstly, in an example of the latter, he introduces Freddy to the audience *before* Higgins is seen, specifying that the former is "a good-looking young gentleman",⁹⁴ and then subtly links him to Eliza when, caught in a heavy shower, Freddy "rushes off", followed by Eliza, who "disappears in [his] footsteps" (Scene 5). Dukore describes these last two shots as "a clever coupling of the two characters that combines dramatic economy, cinematic freedom, and thematic suggestiveness" (CS 74).

When Higgins first appears two scenes later, Shaw states that, "[He] is not youthful. He is a mature, well built, impressive, authoritative man of 40 or thereabouts, with a frock coat, a broad-brimmed hat, and an Inverness cape" (Scene 7). The emphasis on Higgins's age and aloofness is clearly intended from the outset to establish *visually* his unsuitability as a romantic partner for Eliza while at the same time underscoring, in contrast, Freddy's greater eligibility. Shaw reiterates this point by going on to write that, "It is important that in age and everything else [Higgins] should be in strong contrast to Freddy, who is 20, slim, good-looking, and very youthful." He then adds in parentheses that, "The producer should bear in mind from the beginning that it is Freddy who captivates and finally carries off Eliza, and that all suggestion of a love interest between Eliza and Higgins should be most carefully avoided" (Scene 7).

In order to ensure that the audience both remembers Freddy⁹⁵ and forms a positive impression of him, Shaw depicts him behaving more politely toward Eliza at the end of Act I (now Scene 16) than he does in the play. When Eliza relieves him of his taxi, he no

⁹⁴ In the play Freddy is described somewhat less romantically as merely "a young man of twenty" (P106).

⁹⁵ He returns 15 scenes later. Because of the three — or possibly *four*, if one includes the entr'acte — new sequences that occur between Acts I and III, the film audience must wait even longer for Freddy's reappearance than it does in the theatre.

longer exclaims, “Well, I’m dashed!” at her departure (116), but instead “*dazedly takes off his hat*” as he bids her “Goodbye” — subsequently repeating the word. Shaw also underscores Freddy’s importance to the screenplay by giving Eliza several exchanges with the taxi driver that reveal her interest in Freddy:

TAXIMAN: Where to?

ELIZA: Bucknam Palace.

TAXIMAN: What d’ye mean — Bucknam Palace?

ELIZA: Don’t you know where it is? In the Green Park, where the King lives.

(*To FREDDY*) Goodbye, Freddy. Don’t let me keep you standing there. Goodbye.

FREDDY: Goodbye.

He goes.

TAXIMAN: Here! What’s this about Bucknam Palace? What business have you at Bucknam Palace?

ELIZA: Of course I havnt none. But I wasn’t going to let him know that. (Scene 16)

Freddy subsequently appears in two new scenes, giving him a total of 16 additional exchanges. By reintroducing Freddy immediately after Act IV, and again in the final sequence, Shaw rectifies the visibility problem that undermines the (stage) audience’s acceptance of this character as a credible romantic partner for Eliza (given that in the play, he does not reappear after Act III).

In the first of these new scenes (Sequence VI), Eliza discovers Freddy in the early hours of the morning outside Higgins’s home in Wimpole Street:

ELIZA: Whatever are you doing here?

FREDDY: Nothing. I spend most of my nights here. It’s the only place where I’m happy. Don’t laugh at me, Miss Doolittle.⁹⁶ (Scene 44)

⁹⁶ This information effectively replaces Eliza’s now-deleted revelation from Act V of the play that, “Freddy Hill writes to me twice and three times a day, sheets and sheets” (187).

Grabbing the young man “*by the shoulders*”, Eliza reacts emotionally to his presence — “Freddy: you don’t think I’m a heartless guttersnipe, do you?” — to which Freddy responds ardently, first with declarations of love, and then “[*losing*] *all self-control, [smothering] her with kisses.*” For her part “*ELIZA responds blissfully,*” and “*They stand there in one another’s arms*” until they are interrupted by a “*scandalised*” elderly police officer. Freddy tells him, “Sorry, constable. We’ve only just become engaged,” and the pair then “*run away*” (44).

Given that Eliza’s passionate embrace is the first indication of any romantic feelings on her part for Freddy, and that it can also be interpreted as a mere reaction to the dramatic exchanges with Higgins in the preceding scenes,⁹⁷ Shaw employs further changes of location, punctuated by two additional embraces — one of which is again interrupted by a police officer — to create the sense of an elopement. Moreover, by depicting Eliza outdoors after a succession of long interior scenes, and then cutting rapidly from Wimpole Street to nearby Cavendish Square and then to Hanover Square, as she breathlessly rushes with Freddy, Shaw emphasises her new-found independence in a fast-paced sequence that, as Dukore observes, “employs editor’s shears to cut freely through space and time . . . ” (CS 74). In a letter to Pascal in April 1938, Shaw elaborated on the visual importance of the sequence, rebuffing his producer’s cost-cutting request that a single police officer be depicted by insisting that, “No: I must have two policemen . . . and two scenes, because I must produce the impression of the two lovers having run at least as far as Cavendish Square from the first policeman and to Hanover Square from the second” (GP 28).⁹⁸

Moreover, to strengthen the sense of a fast-developing intimacy between Eliza and Freddy, Shaw has her imply that her suitor has, in effect, saved her from ending her life:

⁹⁷ I.e., Act IV in the original play.

⁹⁸ Wimpole Street and Cavendish Square are approximately 300 metres (328 yards) apart, with Hanover Square a further 200 metres (219 yards) from the latter.

FREDDY: Where were you going?

ELIZA: To the river.

FREDDY: What for?

ELIZA: To make a hole in it.⁹⁹

FREDDY: (*horrified*) Eliza, darling! What do you mean? What's the matter?

ELIZA: Never mind. It doesn't matter now. There's nobody in the world now but you and me, is there?

FREDDY: Not a soul. (Scene 45)

While Freddy's dialogue in this sequence is essentially prosaic, Shaw — presumably mindful of avoiding the possibility of caricature — presents him as earnest and likeable: a complaisant personality who is willing to defer to Eliza's greater life experience. "I had no idea the police were so devilishly prudish," he tells her after a second constable orders them to release themselves from each other's embrace. Eliza, drawing on her firsthand knowledge of the realities of poverty, educates him: "It's their business to hunt girls off the streets" (Scene 46). When the impoverished Freddy reveals that he has no money for a taxi, it is Eliza who again relishes the role of teacher: "I have plenty. The Colonel thinks you should never go out without ten pounds in your pocket" (46).

Her self-esteem thus improved by Freddy's attentions, it is a more confident Eliza who appears in the screenplay equivalent of Act V (Scene 47). Because her evidence of Freddy's love for her no longer consists of mere letters "twice and three times a day", as it does in the play (187), but of *tangible* passion and intimate conversation,¹⁰⁰ her declaration of her intention to marry him is accordingly more decisively worded:

⁹⁹ Shaw's inspiration here for Eliza's allusion to suicide is clearly Mrs Higgins's now-deleted comment to Higgins and Pickering in Act V — "[Eliza] passed the night partly walking about in a rage, partly trying to throw herself into the river and being afraid to, and partly in the Carlton Hotel" (P175).

¹⁰⁰ The previous scene had ended with the pair taking a taxi after Eliza's suggestion that they "drive about all night . . ." (46).

HIGGINS: (*thunderstruck*) Freddy!! That young fool! . . . Woman: do you not understand that I have made you a consort for a king?

ELIZA: Freddy loves me: that makes him king enough for me. (Scene 47)

In the original play Eliza offers a less emphatic rationale for her decision to marry Freddy:

LIZA. Every girl has a right to be loved.

HIGGINS. What! By fools like that?

LIZA. Freddy's not a fool. And if hes weak and poor and wants me, *maybe* hed make me happier than my betters that bully me and dont want me. [*italics mine*] (P187)

Because of the uncertainty of Eliza's response in the play, and the possible ambiguity of her comparison between her relationship with Freddy and that with Higgins, Shaw also dispenses with the following exchange:

HIGGINS. Can he *make* anything of you? Thats the point.

LIZA. Perhaps I could make something of him. But I never thought of us making anything of one another; and you never think of anything else. I only want to be natural. (188)

Presumably recognising the temporal impracticality of Eliza's declaration in the original play that, "I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as hes able to support me" (189)¹⁰¹ — and also seeking to emphasise her greater independence — Shaw changes this line to the considerably more resolute and feminist: "I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as *I'm* able to support *him*" (Scene 47) [*italics mine*].

The ending. In his 1934 screenplay, Shaw adds a brief coda reuniting Eliza with Freddy outside Mrs Higgins's flat on the Chelsea Embankment. Higgins goes out on to the

¹⁰¹ Since Freddy has neither money nor an occupation, Eliza would face a long engagement.

balcony to observe the departure of Eliza and Mrs Higgins for Doolittle's wedding. "Smiling benevolently down to the party beneath", he watches Doolittle "in a courtly manner" holding open the car door for Mrs Higgins (CS 482). Doolittle then "gets in himself, leaving ELIZA on the pavement". However, upon the arrival of Freddy, whom Eliza then kisses, Higgins's expression abruptly turns to one "of fury". Undeterred, "Eliza cocks a snook prettily at Higgins, and gets into the car." Removing his hat "in the Chaplin manner", Freddy follows Eliza, and the car drives away accompanied to the music of the wedding march (482). The 1934 screenplay ends.

When Shaw rewrote this sequence four years later, he had already seen both the German and Dutch *Pygmalion* films, and, almost certainly, the misrepresentation of his screenplay in both these adaptations contributed to his decision to review his ending. It is also possible that Shaw belatedly concluded, as I would argue, that the 1934 ending is problematic in at least two respects. In the first instance, Eliza's gesture of defiance (namely, the "snook") as she departs with Freddy appears to be motivated more by the desire to irritate Higgins (or perhaps to provoke his jealousy) than by the sincerity of her feelings for Freddy. Moreover, the reappearance of Doolittle outside Mrs Higgins's home constitutes a logical problem, since in both the play and in the screenplay he has already departed for his wedding with Pickering.

There are no such logical problems in the 1938 ending, in which Doolittle does not appear. Considerably longer than the 1934 version, the 1938 ending departs from the original play after the point at which Higgins asks Eliza to purchase him a ham, a Stilton cheese, and other items. Instead of brusquely telling him to "Buy them yourself," Eliza blithely chides Higgins for possessing a poor memory for domestic matters, adding, "What you are to do without me I cannot imagine." She then "sweeps out". In the ensuing new exchanges between Higgins and his mother, the latter voices her approval of Eliza's impending marriage, observing that, "After Eliza's six months slavery with you Freddy is just the sort of boy any girl would want to marry." Higgins responds by grumbling that, "Pickering and I will have to keep [Eliza and Freddy] both." At this point Shaw emphasises Higgins's apparent indifference to sexual relations, when he notes that

Freddy can at least “make love to her. I don’t do that sort of thing; and Pickering’s too old.” Moreover, in a subsequent observation that recalls Shaw’s assertion in his *Pygmalion* sequel that, “strong people, masculine or feminine, not only do not marry stronger people, but do not shew [*sic*] any preference for them in selecting their friends” (P195), Mrs Higgins provides a reason for Eliza’s decision by implying that her son and Eliza possess similarly domineering (and therefore incompatible) temperaments — “That’s why Eliza wants the kindly little baby man whom she can bully” (Scene 47).

With the arrival of Mrs Higgins’s limousine, Higgins accompanies his mother outside into Cheyne Walk (Scene 48). Here he is surprised to encounter Freddy sitting in the car with Eliza. Stepping out, Freddy inadvertently thanks him “for promising to set us up in a flower shop”, and Eliza whispers, “Sh-sh-sh, Freddy: I haven’t asked him yet.” Pulling Freddy back into the limousine, “*ELIZA slams the door [and the car] drives off, leaving HIGGINS on the pavement, stranded and amazed.*” “A squashed cabbage leaf! A lady in a flower shop!” he exclaims. The scene then dissolves to “*a vision of the past*” (Scene 49) depicting Eliza at “*her dirtiest and most wretched*”, grumbling to herself about the “unmanly coward” Higgins, while he looks on. As in Act I, music from the church in Covent Garden is heard, causing Higgins to remove his hat. The scene fades out into “*a vision of the future*” depicting:

A florist’s shop in South Kensington, full of fashionable customers. ELIZA behind the counter, serving in great splendor. The name of the shopkeeper, F. HILL, is visible. Half the shop is stocked with vegetables. Freddy, in apron and mild muttonchop whiskers, is serving. Dreamlike silence. (Scene 50)

This scene then fades out, returning to the setting of the earlier scene (48) with Higgins outside his mother’s gate in Cheyne Walk. A “*visibly rapt*” Higgins attracts the attention of a policewoman, who enquires, “Anything wrong, sir?” Emerging from his daydream, Higgins responds “*impressively*”, “No: nothing wrong. A happy ending. A happy beginning.” “*Higgins raises his hat and stalks away majestically. The policewoman stands at attention and salutes,*” and the screenplay ends.

For those who require conclusive endings, Shaw's 1938 ending undoubtedly departs from the aforementioned "delicately poised comic stasis" that Grene describes as the conclusion of the original play (113). I would argue, however, that Shaw miscalculates by ending the scenario with a shot of Higgins walking away. Given that his screenplay begins with Eliza, and the attention of the audience has been chiefly directed to her throughout the scenario, a final shot of this character — possibly in the form of a close-up of a now-carefree Eliza exulting in the presence of Freddy in the back seat of Mrs Higgins's limousine — would have provided both unity and a sense of closure for viewers. Possibly, however, Shaw considered such a conclusion, but disregarded it as a trite and overused Hollywood device.¹⁰² He may also have concluded that ending the screenplay with the unexpected sight of a *female* police officer was both original and thematically relevant to *Pygmalion*. Although Shaw's depiction of a female officer in 1912¹⁰³ overlooks the fact that women were not permitted to enter the police force until after the advent of the First World War in August 1914,¹⁰⁴ it is significant, as Dukore observes, "that Higgins's final encounter is with . . . a woman professionally employed, for she establishes a link to and thereby underscores Liza's independence from him" (*CS* 71).

¹⁰² Shaw was still critical of Hollywood films of the time, arguing in 1936 that, "ninetyfive [*sic*] percent of [them] consist of going up and down stairs and getting and out of motor cars" (*BSC* 124). In 1939 he told an interviewer that, "Hollywood would have murdered *Pygmalion*" (142).

¹⁰³ Shaw never specifically states the period in which either his play or his screenplay is set. However, his Scene 31 instructions regarding Mrs Higgins and other details strongly imply that the time setting is approximately 1911–12. Moreover, all references to sums of money, income, etc. are identical in both the play and the screenplay.

¹⁰⁴ This information comes from the official website of the British Metropolitan Police Force: <<http://www.met.police.uk/history/timeline1910-1929.htm>> (retrieved on 1 July 2009).

The spaciousness of the setting, as Shaw himself describes his envisioned ending in a 1938 letter to Pascal, also underscores the notion of independence.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, as Dukore goes on to write, the 1938 ending is “[m]ore appropriate to the spirit of comedy” given that unlike “the stage play, all the principals clearly get what they want. Freddy gets Liza, Liza gets a flower shop and a man who will not bully her, Higgins gets Liza’s unromantic, egalitarian-based comradeship” (72).

This argument, of course, assumes that Eliza indeed desires Freddy romantically, as she *appears* to do, and that she will be content to serve in a flower shop, as Higgins imagines she will. The audience must also overlook the speed with which Higgins’s attitude toward an Eliza-Freddy marriage somewhat implausibly changes from the “(*thunderstruck*) Freddy!! that young fool!” to amused acceptance — “Pickering and I will have to keep them both” — within the same scene. In any event, Higgins’s vision of Eliza’s and Freddy’s shared future pointedly summarises that of Shaw in his *Pygmalion* sequel, in which he describes the circumstances leading up to the establishment of “Mr F. Hill, florist and greengrocer” (P204), a “shop [that] is in the arcade of a railway station not very far from the Victoria and Albert Museum;¹⁰⁶ and [where] if you live in that neighborhood you may go . . . any day and buy a buttonhole from Eliza” (200). I would argue that this moderately conclusive ending disappoints chiefly in its limited ambition for Eliza, for whom one may feel is destined for a more challenging occupation.¹⁰⁷ The 1934 ending, in contrast, shares some of the ambiguity of the original play, for although it implies that Eliza and Freddy will indeed marry, the nature of Eliza’s future professional life remains tantalisingly unclear.

¹⁰⁵ “(T)he final scene on the embankment of Cheyne Walk must be a really beautiful picture,” Shaw writes. “Its spaciousness must come out when the car is driven off. [The film’s art director Laurence] Irving must eclipse Whistler in this” (*Cinema* 135).

¹⁰⁶ In South Kensington, as stated by Shaw in his screenplay.

¹⁰⁷ E.g., as a phonetics teacher, as indeed Eliza states in both the original play and in Shaw’s screenplay.

Conclusions

In his screenplay, Shaw makes effective (if sporadic) use of the visual tools of cinema, chiefly in his new scenes, which are often highly cinematic.¹⁰⁸ He also judiciously prunes his dialogue to accommodate a less verbal medium. Although, as Dukore observes, Shaw's dialogue cuts lessen "some of the play's social resonances, such as Higgins's [Act II] observation that a woman of Liza's class 'looks like a worn out drudge of fifty a year after shes married'" (CS 75), Shaw uses visual means to convey the squalor of Eliza's pre-transformation environment in Lisson Grove, showing us "*its peeling wallpaper, its broken window mended with paper, and its wretched bed*", and contrasting it with Higgins's private quarters (73). Shaw also employs high camera angles on Eliza in the Covent Garden scene to convey her initial fear of Higgins and her lack of social standing.

Where Shaw's screenplay is arguably most successful, however, is in its depiction of Freddy, whose visibility and likeability are enhanced by his additional dialogue in the scene corresponding to the ending of Act I, and, in particular, through his late reappearance in the new Wimpole Street sequence that precedes Act V. Moreover, thematically, this sequence has notable implications for the screenplay's representation of Act V, in which Eliza now appears from the outset as a more self-assured person than in the play. Shaw implies that the catalyst for this change is the confidence that Eliza has acquired through the knowledge that she is loved by a man for whom she represents "the loveliest, dearest" woman in his acquaintance. Accordingly, Eliza no longer refers to herself as "a slave", nor does she berate Higgins for taking away her independence (P187). Emphasising her composure, Shaw dispenses with dialogue or instructions from the confrontation that imply vulnerability or contradictory feelings on her part regarding Higgins, deleting much of the dramatic pulse of the last act, including Eliza's "*desperate*" denunciations of her mentor,¹⁰⁹ her "[*sinking*] on the chair at the writing-table in tears"

¹⁰⁸ Shaw acknowledged in an interview in 1937 that he would have written his plays differently if he had been writing directly for the screen (BSC 125).

¹⁰⁹ E.g., the now-deleted line "Oh, you *are* a cruel tyrant" (P189).

(188) and her resolute declaration that, “I’ll let you see whether I’m dependent on you” (189).

Moreover, in order to enhance the credibility of her decision to marry Freddy, and, at the same time, make her resolution palatable to his film audience, Shaw recognises that the focus of his screenplay should accordingly shift to Eliza. Consequently, he allows no significant dialogue concerning Higgins’s outlook on life or of his unsuccessful friendships with women prior to meeting Eliza. He also deletes many of Higgins’s philosophical statements,¹¹⁰ together with his Act II revelations to Pickering of his misogyny (130). In short, Shaw does not want his audience to contemplate Higgins’s inner life or to know, in Act V, that he would like Eliza to return to Wimpole Street “[f]or the fun of it” (186) lest such insight into the man might encourage the consideration of *his* needs and motivations. By marginalising Higgins in this way, and, at the same time, providing Eliza with additional scenes that encourage identification with her rather than with her mentor, Shaw attempts to forestall his audience from contemplating any likelihood of a relationship between these two characters. Ironically, however, the title *Pygmalion* undermines Shaw’s strategy, and one could argue that *Galatea* would have represented a more appropriate summation of his screenplay.

In the next chapter I examine Pascal’s 1938 *Pygmalion* film adaptation, addressing how it alternately complies with and circumvents Shaw’s screenplay.

¹¹⁰ E.g., his statement of his supposed egalitarian beliefs in Act V that, “The great secret, Eliza, is not having bad manners or good manners or any particular sort of manners, but having the same manner for all human souls: in short, behaving as if you were in Heaven, where there are no third-class carriages, and one soul is as good as another” (P184).

Chapter Four: The 1938 *Pygmalion* Film

Introduction

Although it is generally regarded as the most faithful of the Shavian play-to-film adaptations,¹ the 1938 screen version of *Pygmalion* occupies a pivotal position in the ultimate metamorphosis of the play from anti-romantic comedy of ideas to Cinderella-like Hollywood musical. Judged on its own merits, however, purely as a motion picture, it is arguably the most cinematic of the Shaw adaptations, and, with the possible exception of *My Fair Lady*, remains the most critically admired of the English-language Shavian films.² Robert Gessner describes it as “[visually] the most fluid film between *Intolerance* [D.W. Griffith, 1916] and *8½* [Federico Fellini, 1963]” (115), while Roy Armes argues that, thematically and historically, “*Pygmalion* is a culminating point of British 1930s cinema because it deals consciously and explicitly with the underlying but often concealed themes of the decade — class, morality, accent” (103).

In this chapter, I seek to provide a historical context for the 1938 *Pygmalion* film by first examining the prevailing themes and concerns of British cinema in the 1930s, together with its leading practitioners. I then turn to the *Pygmalion* film itself, addressing the following questions: (1) to what extent is the 1938 *Pygmalion* film a faithful adaptation of Shaw’s revised (1938) screenplay? (2) Through what specific textual and aesthetic means does it depart from Shaw’s intentions, particularly in regard to the issue of romanticisation? (3) What are the thematic implications of these changes? (4) To what extent does the film conform to the conventions of British screen comedies of the 1930s? I also examine the differences between the British and American release prints of the film.

In my analysis of the aesthetic elements of *Pygmalion*, I have generally avoided ascribing their application to any individual member of the creative personnel involved in the

¹ E.g., by Costello (1965), Dukore (1980), and Holroyd (1991).

² See Appendix Five for a full list of films based on Shaw’s plays.

film's production, with the exception of the film's actors. As Jeffrey Richards observes, "(F)ilm analysis poses a fundamental problem in that, unlike the painting or the novel, film is a collaborative rather than an individual art." Although films represent "the end-product of collaboration between director, writer, cameraman, composer and actors", they often ultimately reflect the "considered decisions" of personnel "not actually involved in translating the script into final images", namely, "producers and production supervisors" (*Best* 6). This view is essentially a rejection of *auteur* criticism,³ which, as Morris Beja observes, maintains "that there *is* someone who can be called the 'author' of many films, and almost invariably . . . that person is the director" (31). Notwithstanding the fact that a number of "individual film-makers [have managed] to put their personal stamp on just about every movie they work on",⁴ in the great majority of films, Beja goes on to acknowledge, "to speak of a single *auteur* in regard to a film is more metaphorical than real. There are simply too many skills and arts involved in the art of film" (31–32).

This is especially true in the case of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, given its unusually complicated production history. In the first instance, as will subsequently be discussed, its screenplay was written by an indeterminate number of adapters; second, the film was officially co-directed by two men, Anthony Asquith and its star Leslie Howard,⁵ but it has been asserted that a third person — the film's editor, David Lean — unofficially co-

³ A theory first postulated by François Truffaut in his 1954 essay "Une certaine tendance du cinéma français." Pascal Kamina writes that, "[T]here was a tendency in the pre-Second World War French *droit d'auteur* to consider the film producer . . . as the sole author of the cinematographic work" (153).

⁴ Richards also acknowledges this point: "There can be no denying that the cinema has produced a high proportion of works of art and that a Hitchcock or a Hawks film, a Ford or a Sternberg, is as recognizable thematically and stylistically as a Dickens novel or a Velasquez painting" (6).

⁵ Gene D. Phillips quotes David Lean as stating that, "Howard was not especially interested in directing at the time" and "limited his role as codirector to occasionally offering a suggestion or two during the rehearsal of a scene — but he was usually on the set only for the scenes in which he appeared" (*Epic* 33). In 1991 Wendy Hiller recalled that, "I wouldn't have known Leslie was co-directing until the day we were shooting the tea-party scene [from Act III in the play]; Leslie suddenly said, 'She can't play it like that, that won't work'" (qtd in McFarlane *Autobiography* 295).

directed the film instead of Howard;⁶ and third, its producer, Gabriel Pascal, a man with decided directorial ambitions himself, played an unusually prominent role in the day-to-day filming.⁷ Moreover, in respect of Pascal's possible responsibility for the romanticisation of the film, it is worth noting Sue Harper's assertion that, "Both male and female roles in film are determined by the prevailing agency within the industry. In the 1930s and 1940s, *the producer* operated as the ultimate determinant of the way actors and actresses functioned in film texts" (137).⁸ Certainly at the time of *Pygmalion*'s release, it was frequently Pascal, rather than his directors, who was credited with the film's artistic success.⁹

British Cinema in the 1930s: Prevailing Concerns and Genres

The 1930s are not generally regarded as a period of sustained achievement in British cinema.¹⁰ As Tom Ryall observes, in contrast to the so-called "golden age" of British filmmaking that occurred in the 1940s,

[the British cinema of the 1930s] was harshly judged by contemporary commentators,¹¹ as it has been subsequently by film historians.¹² It has been

⁶ Gene D. Phillips writes that, "During the shooting period, Lean spent his nights preparing a preliminary edit of each scene and his days, as usual, on the studio floor observing filming. Asquith frequently consulted with him about composing the shots and selecting the camera angles; in effect, Lean was often 'directing the director'" (*Epic* 34).

⁷ According to Wendy Hiller, who portrayed Eliza in the film, "[Pascal] was on the set all the time while we were shooting and kept on interfering" (qtd in Minney 96).

⁸ She goes on to write that, "In the 1950s, it was the distribution company; in the 1960s, the director. In the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, it was an unpredictable *mélange* of different types of agency" (137).

⁹ *Time Magazine*, for example, in its December 5, 1938 edition wrote that "the credit for making *Pygmalion* come to life on the screen" should be accorded to Hiller, Shaw, and Pascal.

¹⁰ In his study of British film-making from 1929 to 1939, Stephen C. Shafer writes that the 1938 screen version of *Pygmalion* is "[o]ften regarded by critics as one of the few feature films from Britain during this decade to be worthy of lasting praise and recognition . . ." (66).

dismissed as trivial and escapist, unduly dependent on the West End theatre for its sources, inattentive to social realities, dominated by cheaply made pictures and, at best, a pale copy of Hollywood. (*British* 35)

Much of the blame for the perceived lack of quality of British filmmaking in the 1930s has been attributed to the Cinematograph Films Act of 1927, and the numerous low-budget so-called “quota quickie” films that emerged in its wake. The Act, in addition to providing substantial funding for the then financially imperilled British film industry,¹³ compelled exhibitors to screen a steadily increasing annual quota of British-made films over a ten-year period, initially set at 5% and reaching 20% by 1937 (Ryall, *British* 35). A year later, the 1938 Cinematograph Films Act attempted to resolve the “[quota-] quickie problem by insisting that quota films cost a certain minimum sum” and reducing the quota requirement for exhibitors to 12.5% (Street 31–33).

The principal reason for the proliferation of quota quickies, as opposed to the increased production of so-called quality films, was that, “The former were cheap to produce and more likely to yield a profit than [the latter]” (Perry 76). By the 1937–38 year, however, when British film production reached its peak, “Over-confidence had led to over-expansion” with the release of “a total of 228 films, far more than could reasonably be

¹¹ E.g., novelist Graham Greene, who was a vociferous critic of British cinema at the time. In a 1936 essay he dismisses British filmmaking as middlebrow, false, and lacking in “the vitality of American film” (qtd in Napper 116).

¹² Exceptions include Roy Armes, who argues that British cinema of the 1930s was a “[period] of modest achievement and safe experimentation, with at best some well-calculated visual excitement and a basically solid professionalism” (97). Ryall himself concludes that, “much work remains to be done, particularly in the analysis of the films of the decade . . .” (*British* 40).

¹³ It had been the British film industry that initially lobbied the government for assistance. Linda Wood writes that the film sector was, in turn, supported by two influential groups: the business community and the imperialist lobby, each of which had its own agenda for supporting the Act: “Business leaders were convinced that if they could show off British wares in British films this would go a long way to fight off US competition. But for the imperialist lobby it was not simply a matter of trade; the need to promote British cultural values was considered of equal importance” (53).

accommodated on British cinema screens . . .”. Consequently, all but the most inexpensively produced films depended upon the American market for profitability (76).

The 1927 Cinematograph Films Act had, however, contributed to a number of positive developments within the British film industry. A chronic shortage of skilled technicians was filled “through the importation of [experienced film] personnel, initially from Hollywood, [and] subsequently in the shape of émigrés from Hitler’s Germany and elsewhere in Europe” (Wood 57), while the proliferation of production companies led to the construction of a number of new studios, including Pinewood¹⁴ in Buckinghamshire, where *Pygmalion* was filmed in 1938. With the number of cinemas in Britain reaching almost 4,500 by the mid-1930s, “A modern film industry had emerged . . .”, together with “the emergence of a ‘studio system’ not dissimilar to that of Hollywood with its interrelated cluster of major, minor and ‘B’ picture companies” (Ryall, *British* 35).¹⁵ Meanwhile, “two quite distinct British cinemas” had become apparent (Armes 82): “careful adaptations of known literary or theatrical successes”¹⁶ that were principally marketed toward “the educated audiences of the new suburban classes” (Napper 116),¹⁷ and “comedies aimed primarily at the [provincial] home market and featuring such Northern music-hall stars as Will Hay, Gracie Fields and George Formby” (Armes 82). Literary adaptations accounted for approximately 50% of the British films produced in the 1930s, “with more films based on plays than on novels and short stories combined” (Bakker 74), while the most popular genre at the time was comedy (Street 46).

¹⁴ Pinewood — deemed “as good as anything to be found in Hollywood” (Betts 112) — was built in 1936 by J. Arthur Rank, a flour magnate whose Rank Film Organisation later became a leading production house.

¹⁵ The Hollywood association was further emphasised in 1938 by the arrival of American film companies, beginning with MGM, which established a British production division at Korda’s Denham Studios in Buckinghamshire, employing its own (Hollywood) directors, but utilising a combination of British and American actors, and usually British screenwriters, on such transatlantic commercial successes as *A Yank at Oxford* (Jack Conway, 1938) and *Goodbye Mr Chips* (Sam Wood, 1939).

¹⁶ E.g., *Journey’s End* (James Whale, 1930), based on R.C. Sherriff’s 1929 play, and *Laburnum Grove* (Carol Reed, 1936), based on J.B. Priestley’s 1935 play.

¹⁷ Lawrence Napper argues that British cinema in the 1930s largely operated within a middlebrow aesthetic, constituting “a cinema in between Europe and Hollywood, art and escapism, highbrow and lowbrow” (110).

Sarah Street writes that the majority of the comedies of the 1930s were “domestically oriented, a factor which gave it a clear sense of Britishness and range of regional representation which did not predominate in other genres”. She goes on to write that, “More than any other genre, comedy put working-class characters on the screen, the majority of them advocating a community of interests which were not necessarily at odds with the existence of other social classes” (60). Where the issue of class consciousness arises, however, in films of this period it is frequently the working class characters who are portrayed in a more positive light. In *The Lambeth Walk* (Albert de Courville, 1939),¹⁸ the story of a Cockney who inherits an earldom, “the underlying logic of the film is that classes can never meet; [working class characters] Bill and Sally can join them only on condition they become like them” (Guy 111). As the film proceeds to its unlikely resolution, however, it is its Cockney hero who “gradually ‘humanises’ the other upper-class characters and resists becoming stuffy and aristocratic himself . . .” (Shafer 69). Thus, “the values and attitudes of the common, working people [are] contrasted, however artificially, with those of the elite and [are] found to be superior” (65). Similarly, the popular quota quickies *If I Were Rich* (Randall Faye, 1936) and *If I Were Boss* (Maclean Rogers, 1938) both “enticed a moviegoer with dreams of what it might be like to be rich and then reassured him that he really would not want to be wealthy . . .” (72). Alexander Korda’s *The Private Life of Henry VIII* (1933), a major commercial and critical success in both Great Britain and in the United States of America,¹⁹ provided similar reassurances to working class audiences, “[encouraging] a class levelling process whereby the monarch is shown to have similar passions and desires as everybody else, particularly his vulnerability to female control of the domestic sphere” (Street 40).

In addition to Korda, important directors of this period include Alfred Hitchcock, whose comedy-thriller *The Lady Vanishes* (1938), due to a distribution arrangement with MGM,

¹⁸ This was based on the popular 1937 London stage production of the musical *Me and My Girl*, by Douglas Furber, L. Arthur Rose and Noel Gay.

¹⁹ It won an American Academy Award for its leading actor, Charles Laughton, in the title role and was nominated for Best Picture of 1933.

was widely screened internationally, thus “ensuring [his] commanding reputation as the best-known British director” (Perry 82); Carol Reed, whose 1939 adaptation of the 1935 A.J. Cronin novel *The Stars Look Down* explicitly promotes its Northumberland coal-miner protagonists as heroic “simple working folk” and “the backbone of the nation” (Sargeant 135),²⁰ and Michael Powell, whose *The Edge of the World* (1937) “revealed [him] as a front runner in the new British realist school which was to emerge properly in the wartime forties” (Perry 81). Another noted director was Anthony Asquith, “that rarity in films, an aesthete” (Betts 126), who had first achieved critical attention with his silent film thriller *A College on Dartmoor* (1929).²¹ Contemporary British film critics in the early 1930s often compared Asquith favourably with Hitchcock. C.A. Lejeune²² argued in 1931 that the two men were “the most imaginative” and “ingenious” of British film directors at the time, and the only representatives of their country “who might, with some justice, be expected to figure in any survey of the screen” (qtd in Armes 96). After a highly promising start in silent cinema in the late 1920s, however, both as a screenwriter²³ and as a director, Asquith’s directorial career had faltered in the 1930s amid what Rachael Low describes as “one unsatisfactory project after another” (*Film Making* 215).²⁴ It was not until the release of *Pygmalion* in 1938, followed by a further theatrical adaptation the following year of Terence Rattigan’s *French Without Tears*, that Asquith’s career regained its earlier lustre (Ryall, *Asquith* 9).²⁵

²⁰ The coal-miners are described as such in the film in what Amy Sargeant describes as “a prologue worthy of documentary” (135).

²¹ The British film critic Raymond Durnat later wrote of Asquith’s direction here that he “out-Hitchcocks Hitchcock before Hitchcock became Hitchcock (191).

²² A British writer and film critic for *The Observer* from 1928 to 1960.

²³ He wrote the original screenplays for his first two films, *Shooting Stars* (1927) and *Underground* (1928), and also wrote the screenplay adaptations for a number of his early sound films. “I have always written my own screenplays,” he stated in the early 1930s, “and it seems to me to be an absolute necessity to do so!” (qtd in Ryall, *Asquith* 8). After writing the screenplay adaptation of *Moscow Nights* (1935), however, he only served as writer on three more of his films during the remaining twenty-nine years of his career.

²⁴ These were chiefly adaptations of novels, e.g., *Tell England* (1931) and *Moscow Nights* (1935), across a wide variety of genres (musical biography, espionage thriller, war story, etc).

²⁵ Notwithstanding these artistic successes, and a number of equally acclaimed theatrical adaptations in the throughout the 1940s and early 1950s (*The Winslow Boy*, 1948; *The Browning Version*, 1951; *The*

British Film Censorship in the 1930s — and the Unusual Case of *Pygmalion*

As Tom Ryall observes, British cinema in the 1930s has been criticised for its “[failure] to reflect social reality”.²⁶ He goes on to attribute this shortcoming to the strict censorship rules of the time, which “effectively inhibited social and political comment in the entertainment film . . .”, thus contradicting what was arguably “a vital objective of the quota legislation”, namely, “to ‘bring to the screen something of the life, tradition and culture of Britain and its Empire’” (*British* 36). Ironically, it had been the British film industry itself that first established a nationwide system for censoring movies in the wake of the 1909 Cinematograph Act, which had provided local councils with the power to censor or ban films:

The prospect of 688 local authorities all taking different views on whether individual films could be shown so terrified the film industry that in 1912 they voluntarily set up the British Board of Film Censors (BBFC). The Board was financed by fees paid by the producers to the censors for viewing the films. Its decisions were to be final and the industry committed itself to abide by those decisions. (Richards, *Censorship* 155)

Under the provisions of the BBFC’s rules, Jeffrey Richards writes, the president of its board and four “anonymous” assistants “classified films as ‘U’ (suitable for universal viewing) and ‘A’ (for adults only, i.e. those over sixteen)” (155). The subsequent popularity of horror films in the 1930s also led to the creation of an ‘H’ classification, “which remained in force [from 1933] until 1951 when it was replaced by the ‘X’

Importance of Being Earnest, 1952), Asquith’s specialisation in theatrical adaptation has been “supposed by many to be inimical to the development of film as an independent art form, a form of cultural dependence and subordination which has been seen as inhibiting the development of a truly ‘cinematic’ British cinema” (Ryall, *Asquith* 9).

²⁶ He goes on to note Michael Balcon’s oft-quoted criticism (as stated in his 1969 autobiography *Michael Balcon Presents...A Lifetime of Films*, p. 99) that, “Hardly a single film of the period reflects the agony of those times” (36).

certificate” (157). In spite of such classifications, the BBFC, “carried no legal status, its function being to either classify or cut or reject the films submitted to it” (Robertson, *Hidden 1*).²⁷

Richards writes that, although “Initially the Board had only two rules — no nudity and no depictions of the figure of Christ,” its second president, the Liberal MP and author T.P. O’Connor, was in favour of banning anything “that [could] teach methods of or extenuate crime, that tend[ed] to bring the institution of marriage in contempt or lower[ed] the sacredness of family ties” (*Censorship* 156). O’Connor also expanded the moral code of the Board to include thirty-three rules concerning “matters that may properly be called moral: banning the depiction of prostitution, premarital and extramarital sex, sexual perversion, incest, seduction, nudity, venereal disease, orgies, swearing, abortion, brothels, white slavery and so on” (156).

For his part, Shaw was vehemently opposed to the BBFC, and enjoyed lambasting it for what he regarded as its inconsistency. “It has licensed some films that have driven me from the theatre by their dull lubricity,” he declared in 1939, “and simultaneously banned a film²⁸ to which it should have given a gold medal for distinguished service to public morals” (Shaw, *Cinema* 143). In the case of *Pygmalion*, he and Pascal submitted a scenario²⁹ for the proposed British film to the BBFC in February 1938 that clearly violated the censors’ ban on such words as “bloody” and “damn”.³⁰ Robertson writes that, “Shaw . . . was determined to have the words included or mount a head-on challenge to [the BBFC]” (*Censors* 70). Accordingly, when the scenario was subsequently

²⁷ The BBFC subsequently banned over 500 films between 1913 and the early 1970s (Robertson, *Hidden 2*).

²⁸ *The Night Patrol: City of Shadows* (Norman Lee, 1929), a British silent film written by, and starring, Elizabeth Baxter. The film deals with issues of homelessness and “White Slave” trafficking. Shaw had criticised the banning of the film in a lengthy letter to *The Times* of 17 February 1930 (Shaw, *Cinema* 67).

²⁹ This was not the final shooting version of the screenplay, which, as will subsequently be discussed, was still being amended in February 1938.

³⁰ By retaining Doolittle’s dual acknowledgements that he and Eliza’s mother had never married and that he was living with his common-law wife, the screenplay also clearly flouted O’Connor’s rule that the institution of marriage must not be mocked.

rejected,³¹ Shaw and Pascal elected “to ignore BBFC objections” and proceeded with the making of the film (70). Upon the completion of *Pygmalion* in July 1938, Pascal submitted a print of the film to the BBFC. On this occasion, the sole censor who viewed it, Colonel JC Hanna — one of the two censors who had rejected the *Pygmalion* scenario — “decided after all to let it through” (70).³² Robertson goes on to write that,

This was the first time that a British producer in the 1930s had openly and successfully defied the BBFC guidelines. A subsequent House of Commons debate on censorship in December 1938 included attacks on the political decision-making role of the BBFC. This in turn led to a more determined assault on BBFC values by the British film industry, for which the *Pygmalion* affair more than any other single event paved the way. (70–71)

The Pascal *Pygmalion* Screenplay: An Introduction

Although Shaw, at Pascal’s and Asquith’s request, was still writing new material for his *Pygmalion* screenplay as late as February 1938,³³ he was aware that both Cecil Lewis and playwright-scenarist W.P. Lipscomb had worked on a shooting version of his scenario the previous year.³⁴ Shaw was not opposed to the notion of an experienced scenarist adapting one of his screenplays for the cinema, but held rigid views regarding the nature of the latter’s role. Ideally, *playwrights* should write their own screenplay adaptations, he told the British film trade magazine *The Cine-Technician* in 1939; in short, “[they] should do everything except the shooting script” (BSC 143). Shaw does not elaborate on his concept of a “shooting script”, but presumably he was employing the term in its conventional sense, that is, to refer to the *technical* version of the screenplay, with “detailed camera instructions, including detailed set-ups for each scene” (Blandford *et al* 212). In Shaw’s

³¹ Two members of the BBFC (Colonel JC Hanna and Mrs N Crouzet) analysed the screenplay; both rejected it (Robertson, *Censors* 70).

³² The film was passed for release with an “A” classification.

³³ E.g., the ballroom sequence, as discussed in the previous chapter.

³⁴ Lewis’s and Lipscomb’s work was presumably based on the 1934 version of Shaw’s *Pygmalion* scenario.

view, therefore, the scenarist, or scenario-writer,³⁵ should be permitted to create the (non-technical) screenplay adaptation of a play only in those instances where the original playwright is unable or unavailable to do so.

Preliminary work on the shooting script for *Pygmalion* was undertaken by Lewis in mid-1937 at Pascal's behest. In a letter to Shaw in June 1937, Pascal states that, "Lewis is working on the *technical* side of the shooting script . . ." [my emphasis] (*GP* 8).³⁶ Notwithstanding Pascal's imprecise command of the English language, this comment implies that his conception of a *Pygmalion* "shooting script" extended to additional, *non-technical* modifications of Shaw's screenplay, including additional scenes for Shaw's consideration and possible new dialogue. A subsequent letter from Pascal in September 1937 confirms that Lewis had indeed composed new material when the former refers to the latter's "dreadful Ascot sequence".³⁷ In the same letter, Pascal, after diplomatically reminding Shaw of their recent discussion in which the playwright had advised him "to engage a scenarist who has had good stage experience to overhaul Cecil [Lewis]'s shooting script . . .", reveals that he has assigned W.P. Lipscomb,³⁸ to undertake "two or three weeks' supplementary work" on *Pygmalion* (11).³⁹ Shaw's response to this letter has not survived, but it is clear that although he accepted Lipscomb's appointment, he

³⁵ "Scenario-writer" is the term used by the interviewer from *The Cine-Technician*. As noted, however, in Chapter 2, n. 13, "scenario" and "screenplay" are sometimes interchangeable. Here, the interviewer is presumably referring to the writer of the (technical) shooting script. However, Shaw calls his own screenplay "a scenario" when he clearly is referring to a (largely) *non-technical* adaptation of his play.

³⁶ Lewis was living in Hollywood at the time.

³⁷ Pascal does not elaborate on this sequence, which presumably Shaw had already scrutinized and rejected. It is possible that Lewis, in an attempt to open up the play, had transplanted Mrs Higgins's at-home day in Act III to Ascot, as librettist-lyricist Alan Jay Lerner was later to do in *My Fair Lady*.

³⁸ Lipscomb had previously written scenarios for a number of British and American films. These included adaptations of novels, e.g., *Les Misérables* (Richard Boleslawski, 1935) and *A Tale of Two Cities* (Jack Conway, 1935). Together with R.J. Minney, he had also written the screenplay for *Clive of India* (Richard Boleslawski, 1935), based on his 1933 play of the same name (also co-written with Minney).

³⁹ Seeking to justify his decision, Pascal emphasises that Lipscomb "is a very clever man who understands that he must respect your style and spirit . . .", and that he "can add several technical improvements to [Lewis's] shooting script", including the removal of the Ascot scene (11).

subsequently monitored the latter's involvement in the scenario closely. According to an article in the February 1940 edition of *The Writer*,⁴⁰ Lipscomb had numerous "sessions" with Shaw, whose standard response to the former's suggestions was, "Young man, this has been a good play for twenty-five years, and it still is!" (qtd in Burack 53). The article went on to assert that Shaw "would permit no word to be changed or eliminated, but . . . had no objection to whole sections of dialogue being shifted from one place to another" (53).⁴¹

Although it is not known whether any of the dialogue changes and additional scenes that appeared in the film were the result of Lewis's and Lipscomb's respective involvement, both men were credited in the film for their work. It is doubtful, however, whether the general public grasped the distinction between Shaw's role in adapting *Pygmalion* for the screen and Lewis's and Lipscomb's contributions given the ambiguously worded and inaccurate credits, which stated: "Screen Play and Dialogue Bernard Shaw. Scenario W.P Lipscomb and Cecil Lewis." As we shall see, it is inconceivable that Shaw wrote all of the dialogue that appears in the film. It is also implausible that he would have agreed to the frequent replacement of material in his screenplay with dialogue that he had deleted from the play in his own adaptation.

It is also highly unlikely that Shaw was aware that as many as four *additional* writers appear to have worked on the shooting version of the *Pygmalion* screenplay at various times.⁴² Of these contributors, only Ian Dalrymple⁴³ was subsequently acknowledged in

⁴⁰ "From Our Rostrum." *The Writer* 53.2. No author is stated. The article consists of a report on a recent talk by Lipscomb and other writers at the California Writers' Guild fall conference in Pasadena.

⁴¹ The writer was possibly alluding to the rearrangement of material in the equivalent scene to Act III of the play, which will subsequently be discussed. However, it is unlikely that Shaw permitted this change given the thematic implications of the rearranging and the necessary deletion of dialogue that arose from it.

⁴² This total is in addition to Asquith's involvement in the Ambassador's Reception sequence, as discussed in the previous chapter. Pascal himself also contributed to the screenplay, according to his widow, Valerie (*Disciple* 82–83).

the film's credits,⁴⁴ although his name appears solely in the truncated *American* release print of the film, which — as will be discussed — differs in several important respects from the British version. The three uncredited contributors were David Lean; Kay Walsh,⁴⁵ who later wrote the romantic closing scene for Lean's *Great Expectations* (1946) (Phillips, *Epic* 119); and Anatole de Grunwald.⁴⁶

The precise nature of each of the various adapters' contributions has not been established, nor is it clear when the final (shooting) version of the screenplay — henceforth referred to as the *Pascal* screenplay — was completed.⁴⁷ But given that this screenplay explicitly rejects Shaw's 1938 ending, in addition to other significant changes, it is inconceivable that Pascal would have forwarded it to Shaw, who, according to Valerie Pascal, only learned that the final scene had been changed when he attended the advance press screening of the film on October 4, 1938 (*Disciple* 84). Moreover, with the exception of the first day of shooting, Shaw was not present while *Pygmalion* was being made.⁴⁸ Yet given how closely Shaw scrutinised — and frequently rejected — Pascal's requested

⁴³ Dalrymple had previously co-directed (with Victor Saville), and written the screenplay for, *Storm in a Teacup* (1937). Perry argues that it was an "important" satirical film that "demonstrated that British film comedy could sometimes work with subtlety" (81).

⁴⁴ These state (more accurately, in light of the number of changes made by Shaw's adapters): "Adaptation by W.P. Lipscomb, Cecil Lewis and Ian Dalrymple." As in the British version, Shaw is credited for "Screenplay and Dialogue".

⁴⁵ According to the anonymous author of Walsh's obituary in *The Daily Telegraph* on 28 April 2005, "When Lean edited Anthony Asquith's version of *Pygmalion* (1939) [*sic*], Kay Walsh wrote additional dialogue for the film so seamlessly that it was said that Bernard Shaw never noticed" (retrieved from <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/obituaries/1488807/Kay-Walsh.html>> on 2 August 2009).

⁴⁶ De Grunwald subsequently wrote the screenplay for Shaw's *The Doctor's Dilemma* (Anthony Asquith, 1958) and worked (uncredited) on the screenplay of *Major Barbara* (Gabriel Pascal, 1941).

⁴⁷ Filming began on 11 March 1938, at Pinewood Studios, but it is unlikely that the shooting script had been completed by that stage. This is suggested by the fact that only five days earlier, Shaw was considering changing the first scene (*Shaw and Pascal* 25). It is not known if he ultimately removed or replaced it.

⁴⁸ "I am too old and too much occupied otherwise to undertake the direction at Pinewood . . .", Shaw told an interviewer in February 1938 (*BSC* 130).

changes⁴⁹ to his screenplay, it seems inconceivable that he would not have applied the same zeal to perusing Lewis's and Lipscomb's shooting script for any unauthorised deviations. The most likely explanation, therefore, is that Shaw somewhat naïvely assumed that the two adapters' work on the screenplay, with the possible exception of minor bridging material, was limited to technical instructions for the camera. Moreover, Shaw had no compelling reason to mistrust Pascal given that the latter had declared his intention of seeking further screen adaptation rights to the former's plays. Having warned Pascal that he would "break with him unless he swore adherence to every comma of [his *Pygmalion*] screenplay" (Dukore, *CS* 82), Shaw presumably concluded that his producer would not be willing to jeopardise his professional relationship with him.

Pascal's Screenplay and Shaw's 1938 Scenario: A Textual Comparison

My analysis of the *Pygmalion* film is divided into two sections. The first of these is a textual comparison between Shaw's 1938 scenario and Pascal's screenplay,⁵⁰ examining the changes to characters and themes that occur in the latter, and focusing, in particular, on how the Pascal screenplay reduces the importance of Freddy while romanticising the relationship between Eliza and Higgins. The second section examines the aesthetic means that the film employs to underline Pascal's textual changes, particularly with regard to romanticisation.

A note on the text. The typewritten Pascal screenplay, signed by Gabriel Pascal, is held at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Austin, Texas (SHAW 25.8). A photocopy of this manuscript is also held in the Dan H. Laurence Collection at the University of Guelph Library, Guelph.

⁴⁹ On 24 February 1938, Pascal asked Shaw to provide dialogue for a new scene involving Doolittle and his bride at St. Paul's Church, Covent Garden that he was eager to film as soon as possible "whatever the ending [of the film] may be ultimately . . .". Shaw replied the same day, stating that he had "no doubt at all as to how to handle the end of it", and criticized Asquith for not "[knowing] the difference between the end of a play and the beginning". Moreover, he wrote, "to go back to the dirty mob in Covent Garden and drag back Doolittle after he has been finished and done with would . . . spoil the whole affair" (*GP* 23).

⁵⁰ Hereafter abbreviated to *PS*.

The Pascal screenplay contains detailed technical instructions for each shot, e.g., medium shots, close shots, pans, tracking shots, and mixes. While it omits specific details of camera angles, particularly for point of view shots, it is technically complete in all other respects. The screenplay contains numerous typographical and punctuation errors, which I have reproduced without modification. For clarification, however, I have italicised all technical instructions.

Overview. Although the Pascal screenplay retains the overall structure of Shaw's screenplay, there are notable differences between the two works in terms of dialogue, characterisations, and thematic concerns. The most significant of these changes constitutes the way in which the Pascal screenplay, from the outset, disregards Shaw's explicit instructions regarding the Eliza–Higgins relationship,⁵¹ culminating in a new final scene in which Eliza returns to Higgins. To presage this dramatic and thematic deviation from Shaw's screenplay, the Pascal screenplay makes significant changes to a number of Shaw's (new) sequences, replacing the opening (I) and closing (VII) sequences with non-Shavian material, shortening Eliza's departure with Freddy from Wimpole Street (VI), and restoring much of the Act V discussion between Higgins and Eliza that Shaw had cut, while, conversely, *deleting* a large amount of the dialogue from this scene that Shaw had retained in his screenplay. Other notable changes include the restoration of the Act II discussion between Mrs Pearce and Higgins; the deletion of Shaw's screenplay entr'acte (IV); the transformation of Shaw's phonetics scene into a montage with non-Shavian dialogue; the rearrangement (and partial deletion) of material from Act III; modifications to the Ambassador's Reception sequence (V); six new bridging scenes, three of which appear between Acts III and IV of the original play and three between Acts IV and V; and the diminution of Doolittle's and Mrs Eynsford Hill's roles.

⁵¹ I.e. Shaw's instructions in his screenplay, as discussed in the previous chapter, that, "The producer should bear in mind from the beginning that it is Freddy who captivates and finally carries off Eliza, and that all suggestion of a love interest between Eliza and Higgins should be most carefully avoided" (Scene 7).

The following chart provides a scene-by-scene comparison between the Pascal screenplay and Shaw's screenplay, juxtaposed with the five acts of the original play.

<i>Pygmalion</i> (play)	<i>Pygmalion</i> (Shaw's screenplay)	<i>Pygmalion</i> (The Pascal screenplay)
Act I: Covent Garden. 11.15 p.m. Summer.	Prologue: Piccadilly Circus (daytime).	Covent Garden (daytime): establishing scene.
	Covent Garden (same day, later in the afternoon).	Covent Garden (evening).
	Eliza's taxi ride home.	Eliza's taxi ride home.
	Inside Eliza's lodgings.	Inside Eliza's lodgings.
Act II: Higgins's laboratory in Wimpole Street, the following morning.	Higgins's laboratory in Wimpole Street, the next morning.	Higgins's laboratory in Wimpole Street, the next morning.
	The bathroom at Higgins's house, Wimpole Street.	The bathroom at Higgins's house, Wimpole Street.
	Higgins's laboratory (Doolittle's visit).	Higgins's laboratory (Doolittle's visit).
	<i>Entr'acte</i> (representing months from October to February) and/or Phonetics lesson (later that day).	Higgins's laboratory. Montage #1: Higgins teaching Eliza.
Act III: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, several months later.	Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, several months later.	Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat.
		Higgins's laboratory: Higgins reassures Eliza.
		Higgins's laboratory. Montage #2: Higgins teaching Eliza, interspersed with Freddy's unsuccessful visits to Wimpole Street.
		Higgins, Eliza, and Pickering preparing to depart from Wimpole Street for the Embassy Ball.

	The Ambassador's Reception Summer (evening)	The Embassy Ball.
Act IV: Higgins's laboratory at Wimpole Street, midnight. Summer.	Higgins's laboratory at Wimpole Street, midnight that same evening.	Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street. That same night.
	Eliza's bedroom.	Montage #3: Eliza in her bedroom, changing her clothes, packing some possessions.
	Outside Higgins's house, then Cavendish Square, and finally Hanover Square (the flight with Freddy).	Outside Higgins's house and then surrounding neighbourhood (the flight with Freddy).
		Eliza returns to Covent Garden (early morning).
		Higgins's discovery that Eliza has left him (Higgins's bedroom, then his laboratory).
		Piccadilly Circus (daytime). Plainclothes detectives ask flower sellers if they have seen Eliza.
Act V: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, the following morning.	Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat.	Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat.
	Outside Mrs Higgins's home. Eliza, Freddy, and Mrs Higgins depart in a car.	Outside Mrs Higgins's home. Eliza and Freddy depart in a car.
	Higgins standing outside his mother's home. Dream sequence: the past and the future.	Higgins striding through the streets of London.
	The present. Higgins outside his mother's home.	Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street.

Romanticisation in the Pascal screenplay

From the outset, the Pascal screenplay arguably seeks to create romantic expectations by emphasising the mythological origins of the film's title. Accordingly, the following caption is inserted immediately after the opening credits:

Pygmalion was a mythological character who dabbled in sculpture. He made a statue of his ideal woman – Galatea⁵²

It was so beautiful that he prayed the Gods to give it life. His wish was granted.

MIX TO

Mr. Shaw⁵³ in his famous play gives a modern interpretation of this theme.

*(PS 2)*⁵⁴

The implications of this caption, especially for an audience that is unfamiliar with Shaw's play, is that the film should be regarded primarily as a romantic tale concerning two individuals: one the benevolent, life-giving creator named Pygmalion, and the other his beautiful "ideal woman", Galatea. To encourage this focus, the Pascal screenplay immediately disregards Shaw's attempts to increase the visibility of Freddy, dispensing with the Piccadilly Circus prologue in which Freddy, as we have seen, is introduced *before* Higgins and is then linked romantically to Eliza when the latter follows in his footsteps during a heavy downpour. The Pascal screenplay instead replaces this sequence with a daytime scene in Covent Garden in which *Higgins* follows Eliza (*PS 3*). Thus, the Pascal screenplay immediately establishes a connection between Pygmalion/Higgins and Galatea/Eliza. It also creates a more romantic atmosphere for Higgins's and Eliza's first meeting by restoring the time setting in the next scene to late evening, as it is in the original play.

⁵² A full stop has been added after this word in the actual film credits.

⁵³ The film credits amend this to "Bernard Shaw".

⁵⁴ In the screenplay, all of the letters in the caption are capitalised.

To make Higgins a more immediately palatable romantic figure, the Pascal screenplay softens the impact of his criticisms of Eliza. Consequently, Higgins no longer tells Eliza that she has “no right to live” when he criticises her “depressing and disgusting sounds” (PS 12); he acknowledges to Pickering in a new phonetics montage that Eliza’s progress is “not bad”; in another new scene (occurring immediately after Mrs Higgins’s at-home day) he confides to Pickering, “I tell you Pick . . . that girl can do anything;” and in an intimate “*close two shot*” during the same scene, he bends down closely to Eliza to provide her with reassurance (51). The Pascal screenplay also adds a comic element to lessen the harshness of Higgins’s departure at the end of Shaw’s Scene 35 (Act IV in the play) — “*He goes out, slamming the door savagely*” — in which the force of his repeated damning is immediately undermined when “*He continues upstairs, stumbles, and then recovers*” (73).

Moreover, where Shaw in his screenplay makes frequent deletions to discourage contemplation of Higgins as a sexual being, and emphasises that his mother is the only woman in his life, Pascal’s screenplay pointedly restores Higgins’s dialogue concerning relationships with women, but deletes the implication that he has a mother-fixation. Accordingly, while Shaw removes the entire Act II conversation between Higgins and Pickering regarding the former’s attitude towards women — “So here I am, a confirmed old bachelor, and likely to remain so” — Pascal’s screenplay selectively restores the discussion, omitting, however, not only Higgins’s rationale for avoiding relationships — “the woman wants to live her own life; and the man wants to live his; and each tries to drag the other on to the wrong track” (30), but also his insistence that where female pupils are concerned, “*I might as well be a block of wood*” (30).⁵⁵ Similarly, in the equivalent scene to Act III in the play, the Pascal screenplay deletes dialogue that Shaw had retained in which Higgins emphasises his idealisation of his mother — “My idea of a lovable woman is somebody as like you as possible” — together with his insistence that

⁵⁵ Moreover, this scene is unnecessary from a dramatic standpoint in the film since its chief purpose in the play is to provide action that occurs simultaneously with Eliza’s off-stage bath. In both the Shaw and Pascal screenplays, however, the bath is depicted.

he is wholly indifferent to young women — “I shall never get into the way of seriously liking young women: some habits lie too deep to be changed” (P146).

Higgins is also a much more involved participant in Eliza’s success in the Ambassador’s Reception sequence,⁵⁶ which in the Pascal version acquires distinct romantic and fairytale elements. Here, Higgins is not “*elephantine and sulky*”, as Shaw describes him in his screenplay, but socially adept in a way that seems incompatible with his behaviour at his mother’s at-home day; in short, more of a prince than a misanthrope. In contrast to Shaw’s instructions, Higgins declares that he is enjoying himself immensely, stating that if Eliza’s identity is discovered by Kharpaty,⁵⁷ “(T)here’ll be the duce of a row . . . I wouldn’t miss it for worlds . . .” (PS 64).

To enhance the fairytale aspects of this Embassy scene, Eliza’s entrance is more majestic than in Shaw’s screenplay, in which she merely “*comes from the cloakroom and joins [Higgins and Pickering]*”. In contrast, in the Pascal screenplay, “*Pickering catches sight of Eliza, who enters shot from [upstage]. He draws Higgins’ attention to her and we focus on Eliza as she walks slowly [downstage] towards them to a CLOSE SHOT*” (57). Moreover, since Eliza’s dialogue in Shaw’s version is downbeat and conversational, thereby breaking the fairytale spell, the Pascal screenplay restricts Eliza’s lines to three utterances in the entire sequence: “Yes”, “How kind of you to let me come,” and “Extraordinary”. Further enhancing the Cinderella-like element of the scene, the Pascal screenplay elevates the status of the guests of honour to that of royalty in the form of the

⁵⁶ In the Pascal screenplay, this is identified as taking place at the Transylvanian Embassy.

⁵⁷ Nepomuk in Shaw’s screenplay. According to Valerie Pascal, it was her husband who was responsible for changing the name of Higgins’s rival “to the more Hungarian-sounding [Aristid] Karpathy” (83). “Karpathy” is spelled “Kharpaty” throughout the Pascal screenplay, and the actor portraying the role in the film pronounces it according to the latter spelling. However, the credits, both in the Pascal screenplay and in the actual film, spell it as “Karpathy”. For his part, Shaw clearly preferred to call this character “Nepomuk”, since he retained this name in his 1941 stage edition of *Pygmalion*. On this particular occasion, however, he changed the spelling to “Nepommuck”.

Queen Mother of Transylvania⁵⁸ and her son, the Prince, who asks for, and receives, “the honour” of dancing with Eliza.

In a further example of the Pascal screenplay’s romanticisation of Shaw’s screenplay, the final discussion between Eliza and Higgins is significantly altered. Here, the Pascal screenplay restores virtually every sentence containing possibly romantic connotations from Act V that Shaw had deleted in his screenplay. Consequently, the much more self-assured Eliza that Shaw creates through his screenplay deletions is replaced by a less emotionally assured character. Eliza now questions (where Shaw’s screenplay does not raise the issue), “What am I to come back for?”; insists that, “I can do without you”; and initiates the prospect of marriage with Higgins — “I wouldn’t marry *you* if you asked me . . .”. Moreover, among the restored passages, the Pascal screenplay subtly modifies the following speech:

What I done [*correcting herself*] what I did was not for the dresses and the taxis: I did it because we were pleasant together and I come — came — to care for you; not to want you to make love to me, and not forgetting the difference between us, but more friendly like. (Original play) (P188)

What I did...It,...it wasn’t for the dresses and the taxis. It was because we were pleasant [*sic*] together and because I come...came, to care for you. Not...not forgetting the difference between us, and not wanting you to make love to me, but...but more...more friendly like. (Pascal screenplay) (PS 91)

Consequently, the repositioning of “make love to me” in Pascal screenplay places greater emphasis on this utterance, while the hesitation that precedes “more friendly like” implies that Eliza is merely attempting to hide the truth about her true feelings for Higgins. In another restored section, when Higgins tells Eliza that, “You’ve never asked, I suppose,

⁵⁸ Valerie Pascal writes that, “Earlier, Shaw had suggested making the Queen the Queen of Rumania, but Gabriel was too much of a Hungarian for that; his Queen and Crown Prince had to be from his own native land, Transylvania” (82).

whether *I* could do without *you*” (P184), the Pascal screenplay deletes Eliza’s immediate response – “Don’t try to get round me” – and retains only “You’ll *have* to do without me” (P185) in order to place greater emphasis on the possible romantic significance of the exchange. In other examples of the Pascal screenplay’s selective use of deleted material from this discussion, Higgins’s acknowledgement that, “I shall miss you, Eliza” is restored, while the first half of the next sentence — “I have learnt something from your idiotic notions . . .” — is omitted, presumably because it undermines the preceding statement. Tellingly, however, the second half of the sentence – “I confess that humbly and gratefully” (P185) – is restored for the converse reason. Similar acknowledgements from Higgins are also restored, including “I’ve become accustomed to your voice and appearance. I even like them rather,”⁵⁹ and his regret that, “I can’t turn your soul on” (P185).

The most significant change in the Pascal screenplay, however, with regard to romanticisation, is the ending. Rather than sweeping out, as she does in Shaw’s screenplay, Eliza, with implied sadness, “*stares out of shot for a moment*” before saying, “Good-bye Professor Higgins” (PS 93). Consecutive close-ups of Higgins and Eliza, respectively, follow. There is no carefree discussion between Higgins and his mother (who does not reappear in the screenplay after Doolittle’s departure). The camera reverts to another close-up of Higgins as Eliza departs, remaining on him as the horn of Freddy’s car is heard. The screenplay then specifies a panning shot of Higgins (presumably to convey his agitation) as he runs to the window to establish the identity of the driver. As in Shaw’s screenplay, the scene changes to an exterior shot outside Mrs Higgins’s house, but here there is no dialogue between the characters. Freddy, in fact, drives away immediately before an uncharacteristically active Higgins materialises, having run from his mother’s house. A succession of tracking shots follow, as an obviously angry Higgins strides from the Embankment, then across the Bridge over Thames, before arriving at his Wimpole Street house, which he “*hurries inside*” (94).

⁵⁹ These lines are slightly modified from those of the play: “And I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather” (P185).

In this scene Higgins returns to his laboratory, angrily smashing one of his phonograph records as he does so. At the same time, he accidentally switches on a record that he had made of Eliza on the first day that she visited Wimpole Street — “Oo..I ain’t dirty...I washed me face and hands before I come I did.”⁶⁰ After listening for a moment, Higgins turns the record off, putting his head in his hands. Throughout this time, the screenplay specifies that the camera remains on a profile shot of Higgins. Suddenly Eliza’s voice is heard off-camera, repeating the previously heard sentence but “*in perfect English*”. “*Higgins swings round in his chair and looks out of shot right of Camera . . .*” as Eliza (who remains unseen) completes the sentence. Higgins then “*swings back in chair with back to Camera*” and repeats an earlier line from Act IV that had enraged Eliza — “Where the devil are my slippers Eliza?” The scene fades out accompanied by music and the screenplay ends (94–95).

From a logical standpoint, Eliza’s return in this scene is problematic given that no motivation is provided for her sudden reappearance. As Dukore observes, “[I]t makes no sense to bring [Freddy] back in the capacity of lover and then to drop the subject without a word of explanation” (CS 83). Moreover, as will be discussed in the next section, this is in fact the second of two occasions in the Pascal screenplay in which Freddy is reintroduced only to disappear for no apparent reason in the following scene. The issue of Freddy notwithstanding, however, Eliza’s return to Higgins is arguably foreshadowed in the Pascal screenplay from the first scene through its careful manipulation of Shaw’s text, and is clearly presaged in its modifications to the final discussion from Act V. Its ending is also consistent with the explanatory caption regarding the Pygmalion myth. As Martin observes, “(T)he final scene . . . shows that Pygmalion has once more succeeded in

⁶⁰ This is foreshadowed at the beginning of the Pascal screenplay equivalent to Act II, when, in a departure from Shaw’s screenplay, Higgins demonstrates to Pickering how he makes recordings with a “[c]oncealed microphone . . . for unsuspecting victims” (PS 17).

turning his work of art into the perfect wife, though in this case she'll be an upper middle-class rather than a royal consort" (45).⁶¹

The marginalisation of Freddy. In its dismissal of Freddy, the ending is also consistent with the Pascal screenplay's marginalisation of this character with regard to the new scenes that Shaw provides him with in his scenario. Whereas Shaw in his new sequence (II) seeks to make Freddy more sympathetic to audiences by having him twice bid "Goodbye" to Eliza in spite of his higher social standing – and, equally importantly, underlines Eliza's concern for what he might think of her when she naïvely asks the taxi driver to take her to "Bucknam Palace" (Scene 16), the Pascal screenplay pointedly returns to the original play for the Freddy– Eliza exchanges only. Consequently, Freddy's contact with Eliza is minimised: he does not bid her farewell, and is instead *irritated* by her presumption in taking his taxi — "Well, I'll be dashed" (*PS* 15) — and Eliza no longer betrays her feelings of pride in not revealing her real address to the taxi driver in front of Freddy.

More significantly, in Shaw's new sequence (VI) outside Higgins's home in Wimpole Street, the Pascal screenplay both truncates the scene and alters some of the dialogue not only to lessen the impact of Freddy's passion — thus undermining his plausibility as her potential lover — but also to imply that Eliza does not reciprocate his feelings and is merely exploiting his availability. Pascal's Freddy merely *kisses* Eliza, rather than losing all control and *smothering* her with kisses, as Shaw specifies. And although, for her part, Eliza initially responds to Freddy's ardour in Shaw's screenplay because she is "*hungry for comfort*", by the time of their second embrace, Shaw implies, her feelings for her suitor are mutual:

ELIZA: There's nobody in the world now but you and me, is there?

FREDDY: Not a soul.

⁶¹ Although Martin's context here is the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, I would argue that her comments apply equally to the Pascal screenplay version, to which the film is identical textually in its depiction of the ending.

They indulge in another embrace, and are again surprised by a much younger constable. (Scene 46)

In the Pascal screenplay, however, Freddy is a much more passive presence who does not object to being depersonalised by Eliza's command:

FREDDY: Eliza...Eliza (*he catches her*)... You let me kiss you.

ELIZA: Well, why not, why shouldn't someone kiss me? Why shouldn't someone kiss me? Why shouldn't someone be in love with me? Kiss me again...Kiss me again.

FREDDY: All right. (*PS 75*)

In short, in Shaw's screenplay, Eliza does not need to command Freddy to kiss her, for words are unnecessary. Pascal's screenplay, in contrast, strips the sequence of its romantic connotations. This is further emphasised by the removal of Freddy's declaration to the first constable who interrupts them that, "We've only just become engaged" (75). Moreover, in the Pascal screenplay, this sequence ends with the second constable ordering them to "Move along then, double quick" rather than concluding with Eliza's and Freddy's dramatic departure in a taxi together for Wimbledon Common.

By appending a new bridging scene immediately after this sequence in which Eliza, a short time later, walks alone through Covent Garden and encounters one of her former fellow flower sellers, the Pascal screenplay further marginalises Freddy, whose sudden disappearance is not explained, thus emphasising his irrelevance.⁶² In short, whereas Shaw's screenplay uses the previous sequence with Freddy to underscore the beginning of Eliza's liberation from Higgins, and strongly implies that Freddy represents a potential romantic partner with whom to share her new life, the Pascal screenplay actively seeks to

⁶² The inspiration for this scene is clearly Eliza's Act V line to Pickering — "Last night, when I was wandering about, a girl spoke to me; and I tried to get back into the old ways with her; but it was no use" (P180). Shaw deletes this line from his screenplay. This new scene is discussed in greater detail in the next section.

negate this impression. Freddy is forgettable and slow-witted in the Pascal screenplay, uncomprehendingly repeating Eliza's words — "To make a hole in it . . ." (*PS* 75) — when he asks her why she is going to the river, and his dialogue is prosaic. In Shaw's screenplay, as we have seen, a "*horrified*" Freddy immediately grasps the implications of her statement. Moreover, *this* Freddy is worldly enough to understand Eliza's allusion to prostitution — "It's [the Police's] business to hunt girls off the street" — a line that the Pascal screenplay deletes, thus removing anything of verbal substance from Eliza's and Freddy's encounter.

Other changes. In order to focus attention on the likelihood of an Eliza-Higgins romance, the Pascal screenplay deletes some of the minor characters' concerns about the consequences of the experiment on Eliza. Consequently, Pickering's and Mrs Pearce's protests in Act II are "strangely muted" (Gessner 115). Although Shaw in his screenplay removes some of Pickering's remonstrances — for example, "If this girl is to put herself in your hands for six months for an experiment in teaching, she must understand thoroughly what shes doing" (*P*128) — he nevertheless retains the essence of Pickering's concern — "Excuse me, Higgins; but I really must interfere. Mrs Pearce is quite right" (128). The Pascal screenplay, however, retains only Pickering's solitary remonstrations, "Doesn't it occur to you, Higgins, that the girl has some feelings?" (128). Similarly, when Higgins concludes, "Can I put it more fairly than that, Mrs Pearce?" after having warned Eliza that her fate, if her origins are discovered by the King, will be decapitation "as a warning to other presumptuous flower girls", the screenplay deletes Mrs Pearce's thoughtful response (retained in Shaw's screenplay) — "I know you don't mean her any harm; but when you get what you call interested in people's accents, you never think or care what may happen to them or you" (*P*130).

All of these deletions undermine one of the central concerns of both the play and Shaw's screenplay, namely, the impact of Higgins's experiment on Eliza. Consequently, Mrs Higgins only remonstrates with her son regarding his lack of manners and insensitivity — "You didn't thank her, pet her, admire her. . . . And she only threw the slippers at you? I'd have thrown the fire-irons at you" (*PS* 79). Significantly, she does not criticise

Higgins and Pickering for being “a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live doll”, nor does she compare Eliza’s future plight with that of Mrs Eynsford Hill — “that poor woman who was here just now [whose] manners and habits . . . disqualify a fine lady from earning her own living without giving her a fine lady’s income!” Moreover, to discourage the possibility of an audience independently making this comparison, Mrs Eynsford Hill’s financial problems are not conveyed in the Pascal screenplay.

In other changes in the Pascal screenplay’s version of the same scene (Mrs Higgins’s at-home day), Clara’s role is further reduced, limiting her to two lines of no consequence. Four additional characters are also introduced in this scene: the Reverend Birchwood and his wife, and Major and Mrs Rawcroft; of these characters, only the Vicar speaks.⁶³ Moreover, in a significant rearrangement of the scene, Pickering’s and Higgins’s (truncated) discussion with Mrs Higgins regarding Eliza takes place in the Pascal screenplay *while* her guests are still arriving, rather than after they have departed, as in the play and Shaw’s screenplay, thus preventing the inclusion of Mrs Higgins’s concluding exclamation, “Oh, men! men!! men!!!”⁶⁴ The at-home scene instead concludes with a close-up of Higgins laughing uproariously at Eliza’s “Not bloody likely” (*PS* 50).

The reduced focus in the Pascal screenplay on the serious issue of Eliza’s future is also consistent with its strategy of emphasising the comic rather than the profound. Accordingly, the Pascal screenplay restores the amusing Act II discussion between Mrs Pearce and Higgins regarding the former’s concerns about the latter’s personal habits, together with Doolittle’s slightly modified explanation as to how he had discovered that Eliza was at Wimpole Street — “She said as how she didn’t want no clothes. Well, what was I to think from that Guvnor?” (*PS* 33). In general, the film restores the more comic

⁶³ His lines are limited to a single “Ah!” and – replacing Mrs Eynsford Hill in the play and screenplay — “Could you tell me . . .?” in reference to Eliza’s use of “done her in”.

⁶⁴ Moreover, the transposition of this discussion is illogical, for as Dukore observes, “[I]n order to hear her son and Pickering, Mrs Higgins must ignore her guests, an uncharacteristic breach of etiquette” (*CS* 81). This action arguably makes her appear as socially awkward as her son.

exchanges that Shaw had deleted, and deletes the more serious material that he retains.⁶⁵ One notable exception occurs in the final discussion between Eliza and Higgins, in which the latter's comparison of the violence of "the life of the gutter" with his cerebral world of "Science and Literature and Classical Music, and Philosophy and Art" (P188) is restored.

The Pascal screenplay also restores Eliza's justification from Act II for offering Higgins one shilling an hour for lessons — "a lady friend of mine gets French lessons for eighteenpence an hour from a real French gentleman. Well, you wouldn't have the face to ask me the same for teaching me my own language" (P122) — as well as the gist of Higgins's calculation that a shilling to Eliza is "equivalent to sixty or seventy guineas⁶⁶ from a millionaire" (122). However, the reference to money also underlines the Pascal screenplay's possible failure to consider the impact of inflation between its late 1930s setting⁶⁷ and that of Shaw's screenplay, which is set in approximately 1912. The inflation rate between 1912 and 1938 was 73.07%.⁶⁸ Moreover, the average weekly cash wages of an ordinary labourer in 1912 for what was then a standard fifty-eight-hour working week amounted to sixteen shillings and ninepence; by 1938 the same worker could expect to receive thirty-four shillings and eightpence for a reduced 50.2-hour standard working

⁶⁵ In certain respects, however, the Pascal screenplay assumes a more literate audience than Shaw's does. Although the Pascal screenplay makes some allowances for international audiences, e.g., substituting "dustman" with the American term "garbage man" in one instance (PS 81), it restores some of Shaw's (deleted) literary references, including Higgins's Act II description of Doolittle's "native woodnotes wild" (P135) and the former's Act V reference to his "Miltonic mind" (P186).

⁶⁶ The film replaces "guineas" with "pounds" presumably because the *guinea* was by 1938 an antiquated term. The British guinea coin had been replaced in 1813 by the one-pound sovereign coin (Maertz, n.2, 102).

⁶⁷ This is established in the instructions provided at the first scene in Higgins's laboratory, where, the screenplay states, there is a wireless device, a separate microphone, and a description of what is clearly a 1930s-type oscilloscope "Waives [*sic*] running across Screen . . ." (16) — items that establish the approximate time period. Similarly, Higgins records on phonograph "records" rather than the 1912-era "cylinders" referred to in the play and Shaw's screenplay.

⁶⁸ This was calculated according to information provided at the financial website <<http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/historic-inflation-calculator>> (retrieved on 1 July 2009).

week (Mitchell 163). Thus, when Doolittle asks Higgins for five pounds in Shaw's screenplay (137), he was requesting the equivalent sum to almost six weeks' earnings. In contrast, the Doolittle of 1938 was requesting the equivalent to less than three weeks' pay.

Moreover, there were significant changes in British social welfare policy between 1912 and 1938 that would have improved the living conditions of both Eliza and her father. The Housing Act of 1933 had sought "to concentrate public effort and money on the clearance and improvement of slum conditions . . .", and by 1935 "it placed an obligation on local authorities to rehouse persons from clearance areas and unfit houses scheduled for demolition" (Smith *et al* LXXVI). In addition, by the late 1930s, unemployed married couples were entitled to a weekly pension each of ten shillings (Macnicol 279), thus providing Doolittle with an incentive to marry his common-law wife. Under the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908, however, Doolittle would have received nothing, since one of the clauses excluded those of "applicants of bad character, and hence make the pension scheme as far as possible one for the 'deserving'" (Macnicol 157). Nevertheless, working conditions for women had not significantly improved by the late 1930s, a period in which "women could not even earn degrees at Cambridge, let alone pursue a 'career'" (Dolly Smith Wilson 245). The majority of single women at the time were employed in "domestic service, clerical work, or light assembly factory posts. Usually regarded as 'unskilled', these jobs had low pay" (245).

Possibly in acknowledgement of the updated time setting, the Pascal screenplay diminishes the social concerns of Shaw's play and screenplay by deleting Doolittle's entire Act V speech in which he explains why "It's the making a gentleman of me that I object to", and thereby dramatically reducing his presence in his final scene. In the Pascal screenplay, Doolittle's sole objection to his newly acquired wealth is reduced to a single utterance — "Yes, I'm expected to provide for everybody now, out of three thousand [pounds] a year." Since he no longer laments the burden of respectability, his observation that his wife-to-be has "been very low, thinking of the happy days that are no more" loses much of its comic irony. The implications of these changes are that Doolittle's objections

to his new status are limited purely to his irritation at having to provide for others, and that, in effect, he is no less content than he was at the beginning of the film. To support this perception, Doolittle is provided with a new exit line as he descends the stairs at Mrs Higgins's home on his way to the church — “Middle class morality claims its victim” accompanied by a wheezy laugh that precludes any perception that he is seriously bemoaning his fate.⁶⁹

In general the Pascal screenplay is also considerably less verbal than Shaw's scenario. To prevent a slowing of momentum when Eliza is led away by Mrs Pearce for her first bath, the Pascal version of the bathroom scene cuts directly to the middle of Shaw's Scene 29 and then deletes approximately half of the remaining dialogue, retaining only its essence: the notion of purification — “You know you can't be a good gal inside if you're a dirty gal⁷⁰ outside” — and Eliza's terror at the thought of bathing. The Pascal screenplay also specifies two fast-paced montages, one for Eliza's phonetics lessons, the other for lessons in etiquette and dancing. Only the first of these is based on Shaw's screenplay. The Pascal screenplay also discards Shaw's suggested entr'acte and turns the phonetics lesson into a fast-moving montage sequence (*PS* 38–40) in which all of Shaw's screenplay dialogue is replaced with vowel exercises (“The rain in Spain stays mainly in the Plains”) and consonant exercises (“In Hampshire, Hereford and Hertford, Hurricanes Hardly ever Happen”).⁷¹ Eliza's inappropriate observation at Mrs Higgins's at-home day in the play and Shaw's screenplay that, “The shallow depression in the west of these islands is likely to move slowly in a easterly direction” is replaced in the same scene with “The rain in

⁶⁹ I would also argue that the inclusion of this line is incongruous from a stylistic perspective given that it momentarily breaks the so-called *fourth wall* in the sense that it is uttered by Doolittle — alone and in close-up — as a virtual aside to the audience. No other character in the film does this.

⁷⁰ This is changed from “slut” in Shaw's screenplay.

⁷¹ Valerie Pascal states that it was her husband Gabriel who created these sentences (83), while Goodman, on the basis of interviews with Asquith and the film's assistant director Edward Baird, writes that the first sentence was created by “a professor of phonetics, who served as advisor on the film . . .” and the second by Asquith himself (313).

Spain . . . ” and “In Hampshire . . . ”,⁷² thus revealing (to the audience) how she obtained these sentences, as well as underlining the point that she is still relying on rote-learning for her most fluent utterances.

The 1938 *Pygmalion* Film: Cast and Crew

In addition to director Asquith and his team of screenwriters, Pascal had assembled an impressive crew and cast for his film of *Pygmalion*. The cinematographer was American Harry Stradling, who had worked in films since 1920, first in Hollywood, and subsequently in France, Poland, Germany and the United Kingdom; the score was by Arthur Honegger, a Swiss composer based in France who, in addition to writing film scores, oratorios, symphonies, chamber music, an opera and an operetta, was a member of the influential Montparnasse-based group of composers *Les Six*; and the editor was the aforementioned David Lean,⁷³ then at the beginning of his career with four years’ experience on British feature films. Higgins was portrayed by Leslie Howard, a popular stage actor (notably on Broadway), who had achieved even greater fame in both British and American films in the 1930s, including *Of Human Bondage* (John Cromwell, 1934), *The Scarlet Pimpernel* (Harold Young, 1934), and *The Petrified Forest* (Archie Mayo, 1936); and Eliza was played by rising British stage actress Wendy Hiller in her second⁷⁴ film, following the “quota quickie” *Lancashire Luck* (Henry Cass, 1937). Hiller was selected by Shaw after the latter had seen her stage performances in the title role of *Saint Joan* and as Eliza in *Pygmalion* at the Malvern Festival in 1936 (McFarlane, *Autobiography* 295). Many of the minor characters in the film were portrayed by well-known stage actors, including Scott Sunderland as Pickering, Jean Cadell as Mrs Pearce, Esme Percy as Kharpaty, and Marie Lohr as Mrs Higgins.⁷⁵ Doolittle was portrayed by

⁷² “The shallow depression in the west of these islands is likely to move slowly in a easterly direction” is transferred in the Pascal screenplay to the phonetics montage (39).

⁷³ Lean later achieved fame as a director, notably for *Brief Encounter* (1945), for which he also co-authored the screenplay, *The Bridge On the River Kwai* (1957) and *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962).

⁷⁴ The credits of the British version of *Pygmalion* incorrectly state “Introducing Wendy Hiller”.

⁷⁵ Prior to engaging Lohr, Pascal considered casting Stella Campbell in the role of Mrs Higgins (Margot Peters 396).

the then lesser-known Wilfrid Lawson, a thirty-eight-year-old actor who had appeared in supporting roles in British films since 1931.

Aesthetics of the 1938 *Pygmalion* Film

Introduction. Textually and thematically, the 1938 *Pygmalion* film is a remarkably faithful adaptation of the Pascal screenplay. With the principal exception of the closing shots of the final scene of the screenplay (*PS* 95), the film follows virtually all of the technical instructions for shot composition, panning, and so forth, deviating from the dialogue in four instances only.⁷⁶ This section focuses on the film's aesthetics, including some aspects not specified in the Pascal screenplay, such as the film's lighting and camera angles,⁷⁷ together with the use of music and the actors' performances, to examine how the film heightens the romanticisation already present in the screenplay. I have viewed two sources of the original (British) ninety-five-minute version of the 1938 *Pygmalion* print. These were a 1996 videotape produced by Alpha Video Distributors, Inc, and a 2004 DVD released by the Criterion Collection and distributed by UniKorea. Both prints proved to be identical in terms of length and content.

⁷⁶ Higgins's "Put her in the dustbin" is Americanised to "Put her in the ashcan" (*PS* 22); Doolittle's "she's a fine handsome young girl" is amended to "she's a fine handsome girl" (34), as in the play and Shaw's screenplay; an exchange is deleted between Eliza and Pickering in which Eliza compares Higgins's behaviour unfavourably with that of Pickering — "You know it was difficult for me with the example of Professor Higgins always before me. . . . I should never have known that ladies and gentlemen didn't behave like that if you hadn't been there" (84–85); and Eliza's exhortation that, "You're not going to let yourself down by marrying that low common woman" (87) is deleted.

⁷⁷ These aspects could also be described as being part of the *mise en scène*. Patrick Phillips employs the term "to describe everything that is in the frame – all the detail that makes up the image. Essentially, it is what we see" (35). However, as Blandford, Grant, *et al* observe, David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson employ this term only for those aspects of "the *profilmic* event — what is arranged on set before shooting — décor, costume, disposition of characters and aspects of performance, colour, lighting — and make a *separate* category of the cinematographic qualities of camera angle distance, and camera movement" while others invoke the term for both "these two areas of decision-making". They go on to suggest that, "Some of these semantic problems can be avoided by not using the term *mise en scène* at all" (149–150).

General observations. As previously noted, the most striking aspect of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film from a cinematic standpoint is arguably its visual fluidity. At the end of the first of its two montages — a 2½-minute sequence in which Higgins’s relentless phonetic coaching is emphasized in almost forty separate shots incorporating dissolves, pans, slanted camera angles and superimposition⁷⁸ — Higgins’s purposeful stride across the screen after declaring that he will “try [Eliza] out on [his mother]” blends seamlessly into his equally vigorous arrival at Mrs Higgins in the next scene, creating the sense of continuous movement and a vibrant Higgins. When Kharpaty emerges from a taxi outside the Transylvanian Embassy at the beginning of the Ambassador’s Reception, the camera identifies his importance by framing him in medium shot and then tracking back with him (while still retaining the medium shot composition) as he walks towards the camera, panning with him as he enters the Embassy in a sweeping turn that reveals the opulence of its entrance. In the same unbroken (forty-two-second) take, the camera continues to track with him as he walks toward the staircase, stopping when *he* stops, and then zooming in on him as he embraces a startled Higgins. Consequently, the film creates interest in the character of Kharpaty before he has uttered any dialogue. Throughout the film, the camera makes similar use of panning and tracking shots to provide visual information during moments without dialogue, while the film employs constant intercutting of close-ups, medium close-ups and medium shots during speeches. When Doolittle makes his Act II speech (“I’m one of the undeserving poor”), the film employs ten separate shots, cutting back and forth between Doolittle and Higgins, not only to provide comic relief in the form of the latter’s response to the former’s wheezing, but also to underscore Higgins’s appreciation of Doolittle’s idiosyncratic eloquence.⁷⁹ The film also cuts from a medium shot of Doolittle’s “Think what that means to a man . . .” to a medium close-up on “It means he’s up against middle-class morality!” to provide visual dynamism as well as emphasis on the core point of the dustman’s speech.

⁷⁸ The superimposition in this instance features Higgins’s finger making stabbing gestures superimposed over a shot of Eliza tossing in her sleep.

⁷⁹ Given the truncation of Doolittle’s part in the film, this information is important in terms of explaining why Higgins subsequently praises the dustman to Ezra D. Wannafeller.

Although it is debatable whether Asquith himself was chiefly responsible for the film's visual variety given that much of the shot composition and editing had been predetermined/anticipated in the Pascal screenplay, the approach used in *Pygmalion* undeniably reflects his stated technique when filming Shaw's plays, in particular. In a 1959 essay, he observes that, "The heart of a Shaw scene is nearly always a verbal one," and goes on to write that, "Generally speaking, with Shaw I try to make the visual flow and emphasis correspond to the rhythm and sense of the dialogue, not make a counterpoint to it, because Shaw is so verbally explicit that everything must be done to concentrate the attention to [*sic*] the audience on what is being said" (13). However, Asquith adds that this approach does not preclude the employment of reaction shots in any given scene of "characters who are not speaking" (13). Indeed, as Dukore observes, the *Pygmalion* film

makes fine use of reaction shots: [those of] Mrs Eynsford Hill and Clara when Liza calls Freddy by his name, bewilderment or shock when Liza relates with precise diction that her father ladled gin down her aunt's throat. More extensively, a great deal of the scene in which Higgins and Pickering ignore Liza after the ball focuses on her reaction to their conversation, which prepares the audience for her rebellion and independence.⁸⁰ (CS 78)

The film also uses camera angles and lighting to convey aspects not prescribed in the Pascal screenplay. In the equivalent scene to Act I in the play, varying camera angles heighten both Eliza's initial fear of Higgins (when she assumes that he is a detective), together with the onlookers' apparent lack of sympathy towards her. Employing a high angle composition (that is, with the camera looking down) on Eliza and thereby underlining her sense of vulnerability, the film uses a low angle perspective (that is, with the camera looking up) for the bystanders, consequently increasing their status and

⁸⁰ Costello makes a similar point (71). I would argue, however, that effective though the film (and the Pascal screenplay) is in foreshadowing Eliza's rebellion that occurs in the next scene in which she leaves Wimpole Street, the remaining sequences in the film, and the final scene, in particular, severely undermine the sense that she has achieved independence from Higgins.

making them seem more indifferent to Eliza's plight than they appear in Shaw's screenplay. The use of a low camera angle here also introduces an element of menace in the onlookers' manner, thus reinforcing the sense of Eliza's isolation. Later, in the first scene at Wimpole Street, when Higgins declares, "It's almost irresistible. She's so deliciously low — so horribly dirty," a low camera angle accompanies these lines, heightening his sense of power over Eliza.⁸¹ Soon after, when Eliza halfheartedly attempts to leave, Higgins stands regally on the staircase in his elegant dressing gown, backlit by an ornate window as he looks down on the much more darkly lit Eliza. A high camera angle on the latter again reinforces her sense of submissiveness. When Eliza is subsequently led away to the bathroom by Mrs Pearce, Higgins stands framed in the doorway, as the camera dramatically zooms up to him from a low angle. The dark lighting on Higgins here, coupled with his evident look of satisfaction, reinforces both his control over Eliza and his apparent sadism. Later, in the Embassy Ball sequence, Kharpaty is also filmed from a low angle, appearing a sinister figure as he watches Eliza from the staircase while endeavouring to discover her identity.⁸² Early in the scene at Wimpole Street that follows the Embassy Ball, it is Eliza who for the first time is filmed from a low angle, thereby suggesting her new-found confidence and assertiveness. After Pickering and Higgins leave the room, however, Eliza, who by now is seated, rises from her chair and walks across the room, with the camera still in low angle on her. Moments later, when she throws Higgins's slippers at him, the camera reverts to a high angle on her and a low angle on Higgins, implying that her loss of self-control has returned her to the role of the latter's social inferior.

The film uses both location shots and studio sets, with the great majority of scenes comprising the latter. There is a jarring quality between the realism of the authentic outdoor sequences, notably the brief scene in Piccadilly Circus, and the artificiality of the Pinewood Studios recreation of Covent Garden. As Dukore observes, "While the set

⁸¹ Compounding this sense of power over Eliza, Howard implies a sadistic sense of relish in the utterance of his lines here.

⁸² Considerable suspense is also provided in this scene through repeated cutaways to the ever-watchful Kharpaty.

decorations and costumes of the [first] Covent Garden scene are realistic, the background is obviously painted” (CS 79). The fact that *Pygmalion* was filmed in black and white,⁸³ however, lessens the distraction of the artificial backdrop while also enhancing the grittiness of the Covent Garden scenes.

How the Film’s Aesthetics Enhances Romanticisation

Music and shot composition. Jerrold Levinson observes that among the narrative functions of film music that have been identified by film theorists are the *indication* of “a character’s psychological condition, including emotional states, personality traits, or specific cognitions, as when the music informs you that the heroine is happy, or that the hero has just realized who the murderer was . . .”; the *suggestion* “to the viewer of how the presenter of the story regards or feels about some aspect of the story . . .”; *guidance* “to the viewer of how he or she is to regard or feel about some aspect of the story . . .”; and the *communication* “of certain formal properties, such as coherence, cogency, continuity, closure, to the film or parts thereof . . .” (257–58).

Pygmalion arguably employs music for all of these functions. Higgins’s personality is represented by the agitated dissonance of the music that accompanies his formidable-looking phonetics machines at the beginning of the film’s equivalent to Act II, and again in the film’s penultimate sequence as he strides furiously from the Embankment to his home. When Eliza gazes expectantly into the mirror at her lodgings, a sentimental melody accompanies this moment on the soundtrack; thereafter, the same melody is associated with her character and, implicitly, with her romantic dreams. Accordingly, the

⁸³ Colour films were rare at the time. The first British film to be filmed in full colour (using the then-new Technicolor process) was *Wings of the Morning* (Harold Schuster, 1937), a racehorse story. In British films of the late 1930s, “colour tended to be used more for adventure spectaculars than marital comedies” (Perry 83). Given the considerable difficulties Pascal encountered in raising money for the film (Dukore, CS 68–69), it is unlikely that he would have contemplated the additional expense of colour film stock. Colour, in any event, would arguably have romanticised the film even further. As Perry observes, “subtler [colour] effects were obtained in the soft English light than in American colour films of the period” (81).

melody returns during the Embassy Ball scene, where it is heard diegetically,⁸⁴ suggesting the possibility of romance for Eliza for the first time. It is subsequently used *non*-diegetically in the next scene to convey the loss of Eliza's romantic expectations with regard to Higgins. On this occasion, the melody is reprised in a sorrowful minor key when Eliza is left alone in the Wimpole Street study after Higgins retires for the first time. However, in a clear indication of its association with Eliza's romantic feelings towards Higgins, it reverts to a more hopeful major key at the end of the scene when Eliza finds the ring that Higgins has thrown into the fireplace. The melody is heard again in the final scene, when for the first time it accompanies Higgins, as he returns alone to Wimpole Street, thus implying that he reciprocates Eliza's feelings for him. On this occasion, the melody begins when he opens the door to his laboratory, but abruptly stops when he smashes a phonograph record, underscoring the suggestion that with this action he is seeking to eradicate his feelings of love. When Eliza returns moments later, however, the melody returns, soaring for the first time to a full orchestral (and symbolic) resolution as the film ends.

Music is also employed in an editorial capacity both to ridicule a character (Freddy) and to invite sympathy (Eliza). In the first instance, Higgins's three-note accompaniment on a xylophone in synchronisation with the phrase "Throw him out" — as specified in the Pascal screenplay (52) — is repeated twice by Honegger's orchestra during the second montage when Freddy attempts to see Eliza, constituting what could be described as a form of musical denunciation. In the second instance, Eliza's despair in the film's equivalent scene to Act IV is underscored by a sudden poignancy of dramatic cellos and violas as "*She falls to knees*" [*sic*] (68). Music is also used at the beginning of the film in the form of a generic romantic accompaniment⁸⁵ to the explanatory note about the

⁸⁴ Diegetic music constitutes music that a film's characters themselves hear, as opposed to non-diegetic (i.e., background) music, which is heard only by the viewer.

⁸⁵ This lush, undemanding melody, with its emphasis on the string section, is highly reminiscent of that used to accompany opening captions of other romantic British and Hollywood films of the period, e.g., *Gone With the Wind* (Victor Fleming, 1939).

Pygmalion myth, thus encouraging the expectation that a conventional love story will unfold.

Visually, the film also acts in an editorial capacity, favouring Higgins over Freddy, not only in the number of close-ups and medium close-ups allotted to the former, in contrast with the virtual absence of similar shots allotted to the latter,⁸⁶ but in its frequent framing of Freddy in either profile or three-quarter profile.⁸⁷ This is especially apparent during the scene in which they kiss, where the focus is on Eliza. Conversely, in her scenes with Higgins, both characters receive equal visual treatment. When Eliza tells Higgins, “I wouldn’t marry you if you asked me, and you’re nearer my age than what he is,” the two characters are framed in medium close-up with the camera favouring Eliza; when Higgins replies — “*Than he is*” — the shot changes to a medium close-up of the two with the camera favouring Higgins. In this same discussion, Howard receives no fewer than eight close-ups, two of them extreme close-ups. Thus the decision to distance Freddy from the viewer, while affording Higgins the familiarity that the intimacy of the close-up allows, ensures that the former remains a marginal presence throughout the film.

The film also employs visual means to provide a greater sense of resolution in the final scene than that of the Pascal screenplay. It achieves this partly through the (unscripted) emotions conveyed by Howard, but, more significantly, through the removal of the possible ambiguity of Eliza’s motive in returning to Wimpole Street. In the Pascal screenplay, Eliza is an unseen (off-camera) presence during this scene:

PLAYBACK:

(HIGGINS) In six months...in three...

He leans over and switches

Playback off, then sits back in chair

⁸⁶ Freddy is generally depicted in medium shot.

⁸⁷ Freddy’s full face is fleetingly filmed in his first scene only when he talks to his mother and sister.

and puts head in hand, still in profile.

ELIZA'S VOICE: *(in perfect English)* I washed my face and hands before I came...

*Higgins swings round in his chair
and looks out of shot right of Camera...*

ELIZA'S VOICE: ...I did.

*He swings back in chair
with back to Camera.*

HIGGINS' VOICE: Where the devil are my slippers Eliza?

FADE OUT (95)

This is a subtler conclusion than that of the film, which departs from the Pascal screenplay's instructions through its inclusion of a shot of Eliza that clearly conveys her satisfaction in being reunited with Higgins. The dramatic nature of that shot, filmed with what appears to be a hand-held camera, also emphasises the significance of her return. In the film, when Higgins swings around on hearing Eliza's voice, a look of delight flickers over his face, followed by an anxiety that suggests discomfort at the emotions that her return have aroused in him. Cutting to a medium shot of Eliza, who is standing at the door, the film then conveys Higgins's emotional state by zooming shakily into a close-up on Eliza, who is half-smiling with a look of expectation. The dramatic nature of the sudden zoom, which is unlike any other camera movement in the film, implies an emotional epiphany on Higgins's part, imbuing the close-up that concludes it with an impression of intense intimacy.

Performances, editing and direction. In different ways, the respective performances of Leslie Howard as Higgins and David Tree as Freddy also underscore the film's implicit endorsement of the inevitability of a love affair between Eliza and Higgins. As portrayed by Howard, Higgins is not the insensitive bully depicted in both the play and Shaw's screenplay — an interpretive decision that the perceptive Shaw recognised at least six months before he saw the completed film. On examining photographs taken halfway through the filming of *Pygmalion*, Shaw recognised in dismay that the choice of Leslie Howard as Higgins was potentially disruptive to his carefully de-romanticised screenplay. “[I]t is amazing how hopelessly wrong Leslie is,” Shaw wrote to Pascal in April 1938.⁸⁸ “He ought to change parts with [Cecil] Truncer.⁸⁹ However, the public will like him and probably want him to marry Eliza, which is just what I dont want” (*GP* 28). Shaw had previously deemed Howard's respectably attired appearance in the opening Covent Garden scenes “fatally wrong”. Higgins, he wrote to Pascal in March 1938, in this scene “should have a topper (cylinder hat) badly in want of brushing, [*sic*] stuck on the back of his head, and a professorial black frock coat and black overcoat, very unvaleted. This is the only way in which he can make a unique figure in the crowd”.⁹⁰ Wendy Hiller as Eliza, in contrast, he deemed “perfect” (*GP* 26). Shaw subsequently concluded that, “The trouble with Leslie Howard is he thinks he's Romeo” (qtd in Dukore, *Screenplays* 84).

Certainly to audiences in 1938, the confirmation (after ninety seconds of screen time) that the man who appears in the first scene of the film, initially shown only in a rear view as he walks behind a woman (Eliza) of obvious future significance both to the story and to

⁸⁸ Shaw's first choice for the role of Higgins had been stage and film actor Charles Laughton, possibly on the basis that Laughton's unromantic screen persona would have precluded any romanticisation of the role. Laurence Olivier, then thirty-one, was also briefly considered. In September 1937 Pascal wrote, “I am not definitely convinced because he is too young and not the real English type” (*GP* 14).

⁸⁹ Truncer plays the First Constable in the film. In an earlier letter to Pascal, Shaw describes Truncer as “[t]he best heavy lead on the English stage” (qtd in Pascal, *Disciple* 83).

⁹⁰ Shaw also felt that “this rigout . . . should be reproduced in the final scene” (26). Ironically, however, Howard wears the same attire of which Shaw had disapproved in the last sequence.

his character,⁹¹ is the popular leading actor Leslie Howard would have established immediate romantic connotations. Howard's screen persona, typified by his role as Sir Percy Blakeney in *The Scarlet Pimpernel* (Harold Young, 1934), was that of "a deeply rooted romanticism" (Richards, *Dream* 238). In the 1930s, Howard's films "epitomized romantic as opposed to sexual love, the pure, decorous yearning sort of love that characterized the ideal of courtly chivalry, a love of what Graham Greene called 'discarnate embraces'" (238). Moreover, the manner in which Howard's identity is revealed in the film — which differs from the Pascal screenplay's instructions⁹² — is romantically depicted with a clap of thunder compelling the hitherto partially obscured Howard to turn from a quarter profile to a well-lit medium frontal shot that reveals his boyish appearance.

In addition to his visual youthfulness, which substantially reduces the apparent age gap between Higgins and Eliza, thereby encouraging the audience to regard the pair as a potential (romantic) couple,⁹³ Howard portrays Higgins with a gentleness that frequently mitigates the brutality of his language. When he declares, "A woman who utters such depressing and disgusting sounds has no right to be anywhere," he does so calmly. Similarly, when Howard orders Eliza to "cease this detestable boo-hooing instantly," he does not deliver the line "*explosively*", as Shaw states in his screenplay, but as a mild reproach. Moreover, he *touches* Eliza on the shoulder as he utters this line — an instruction that is not specified in the Pascal screenplay and that undermines his subsequent description of her as "horribly dirty". He subsequently touches Eliza's hat

⁹¹ This is indicated by the first shot of the film, a medium shot on Hiller/Eliza, followed by the camera panning with Eliza (taking her briefly into medium close-up) as she walks past Howard/Higgins. The camera then tracks after Howard, thereby economically underscoring and linking the two characters.

⁹² In the Pascal screenplay, the "*CAMERA CRANES down and moves in toward Higgins . . .*" as he listens to the Nightwatchman and 1st Bystander, ultimately reaching a close-up of him smoking a cigarette.

⁹³ At forty-five Howard was nineteen years older than Wendy Hiller, but appears considerably younger than his age, while, conversely, Hiller appears somewhat older than her twenty-six years. Consequently, Howard/Higgins does not appear old enough to be Hiller/Eliza's father (Martin 55).

when he boasts that, “I could pass you off as the Queen of Sheba.”⁹⁴ Elsewhere in the film, he acts with similar gentleness. When he tells Eliza to sit down in the first scene at Wimpole Street, the mildness of his delivery does not possess the contrast required with that of Pickering’s “Won’t you sit down, Miss Doolittle?” — a line that is supposed to illustrate the difference between Higgins’s boorishness and Pickering’s gentlemanliness. Howard also creates unscripted moments of intimacy between Higgins and Eliza.⁹⁵ Whereas the Pascal screenplay states that, “*Higgins pops chocolates in [Eliza’s] mouth*” (24) in the equivalent scene to Act II, the film Higgins places a chocolate in his own mouth first, biting it in half and placing the other half in Eliza’s mouth. Later in the film, when he gently asks Eliza “Will you work?”, he leans intimately towards her to say “Good!” in genuine delight when she nods in response. In the Act V discussion with Eliza, Howard further emphasizes this romanticisation, delivering the line “You’ve never asked, I suppose, whether I could do without you” very slowly and tenderly, leaning forward into the camera for extra dynamism. When Eliza says, “Goodbye, Professor Higgins,” he appears stricken.

In contrast to Howard’s understated and naturalistic performance, Tree blatantly overacts, often alternating between frowns and looks of wide-eyed astonishment, in a portrayal that reduces his character to that of a buffoon. Consequently, Freddy emerges “as a fatuous young man too fond of sniggering” (Martin 56). While this interpretation is consistent with the Pascal screenplay’s modifications to his character, Tree’s performance — presumably on the instruction of Asquith⁹⁶ — underlines Freddy’s ineptness to a greater extent than suggested by the Pascal text. In the street scene outside Higgins’s home, Tree

⁹⁴ As Dukore observes, Mrs Pearce also frequently touches the unwashed Eliza in the first Wimpole Street scene (CS 79).

⁹⁵ How much of this was at Howard’s own instigation is difficult to ascertain. David Lean argues that Asquith’s potentially “first-rate” ability as a director was hampered by an habitual “diffidence”: “[Asquith] almost let his actors do too much on their own — an actor could get away with murder on one of [his] pictures because [he] would feel he shouldn’t push his ideas” (qtd in Brownlow 123).

⁹⁶ Tree states that Howard — the film’s credited co-director — was absent from the film during the filming of scenes in which the character of Higgins does not appear (qtd in Dukore, CS 78). Freddy appears only once in the film with Higgins.

portrays Freddy as both an incompetent lover, who almost faints on his first attempt to kiss Eliza, and as a slow-witted individual incapable of comprehending the latter's allusion to suicidal desires. Freddy's impact in this scene is further undermined by the assertiveness of Wendy Hiller's Eliza, whose manner towards him is brusque and domineering. Consequently, Freddy's obvious lack of wit, charisma and passion underline his incompatibility as a potential husband to Eliza, while his deficiencies also serve to invite unfavourable comparisons with Higgins, as romantically portrayed by Howard.

Hiller's performance as Eliza, although more faithful overall to Shaw's conception of her character than Howard's Higgins, also reciprocates some of the latter's romanticism in their scenes together.⁹⁷ Hiller is often assisted in this respect by the direction, editing, and camera work. Neither particularly dirty nor possessed of the requisite atrocious pronunciation in her early scenes, her good looks, contrary to Shaw's instructions (Scene 22), are discernible long before she takes her first bath. Her improved appearance, coupled with Hiller's coquettish performance in her first scene at Wimpole Street, enables the film to exploit at an early stage the intimacy that cinema allows. As Dukore observes, "When [Higgins] and Liza discuss lessons, a tightly framed shot of them, his eyes half closed and her expression flirtatiously perky, clearly suggests romance" (CS 83). Much later in the film, when Eliza speaks to Higgins of "not wanting you to make love to me", Hiller is framed in extreme close-up⁹⁸ for this line. Consequently, when she immediately looks down after saying these words, both her performance and the shot composition strongly suggest that she is attempting to conceal her true feelings towards Higgins.

⁹⁷ This is in spite of Hiller's personal belief that, "Shaw quite simply wrote the most brilliant anti-romantic comedy of the century. To me there was never any question of [Eliza] marrying or being in love with Higgins. Those who want that sort of ending are running absolutely counter to the author. We've all been brainwashed, if you like, into wanting conventional, happy-ever-after endings. So we get them" (qtd in Bourne 47).

⁹⁸ The screenplay specifies only "*close shots*" (PS 91).

One problematic aspect of Hiller's performance, however, in terms of the film's romanticisation of the Eliza-Higgins relationship, is that when juxtaposed with Howard's relatively mild interpretation of Higgins, her assertiveness undermines the credibility of Eliza's genuflection to her mentor. As Dukore observes, "[A]s played by so powerful a persona as Wendy Hiller, Liza emerges as a fiercely independent human being, not as a neurotic who enjoys being bullied and abused by someone like Higgins." Consequently, he concludes, "Her return to fetch slippers for Leslie Howard [at the end of the film] seems incredible" (83). In a private conversation with RJ Minney, Shaw voiced a similar criticism, stating that Howard's Higgins "could *never* have bent Eliza to his will" (Minney 97).⁹⁹ This aspect is evident throughout the film, although it is arguably due more to editing and direction, in some instances, than to Hiller's performance. When the off-camera Higgins warns Eliza that the King may cut off her head if he discovers her deception, the film remains on a shot of a relatively unconcerned-looking Hiller. In the same scene, Higgins order her to "stop snivelling", despite the fact that Hiller is *not* crying. Moreover, as Martin observes, Hiller appears "too intelligent not to see the consequences of her accepting Higgins's foolish experiment, and, clearly, far more mature than him" (41).

The American print of *Pygmalion*

Introduction. In April 1938, Shaw was dismayed to learn that Pascal had sent the *Pygmalion* screenplay¹⁰⁰ for pre-approval to the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA), the self-regulating film censorship body responsible for the Production Code Administration (PCA).¹⁰¹ "I did not know that you intended to

⁹⁹ Noting this criticism, Martin argues that Shaw was "forgetting that Higgins does not exactly tame Eliza in the play" (41). My interpretation of Shaw's comment, however, is that he was referring to the *film's* characterisation of Eliza, and the credibility, in particular, of its ending.

¹⁰⁰ Pascal had forwarded it to the MPPDA on 18 February 1938. It is unclear whether the screenplay concerned was Shaw's version or the Pascal screenplay, neither of which had been completed at that time.

¹⁰¹ The Code forbade, among other things, all profanity and any aspect that undermined the sanctity of marriage. At that time, no film could receive a certificate of approval for release in the United States of America without first being submitted to the PCA for consideration.

send the script to the American amateur censors, who have no legal status whatever,” Shaw wrote to Pascal. “If I had known I should have locked you up until the film was finished.” No “serious dramatist” could possibly acquiesce to the MPPDA’s regulations, Shaw went on to write, and he urged Pascal to proceed with the making of the *Pygmalion* film irrespective of censorship concerns¹⁰² “and let [the MPPDA] attempt to boycott it if they dare. They wont dare” (*GP* 28).

Pascal, however, adopted a more cautious approach towards the American censors. In a letter dated 22 March 1938, Francis S. Harmon of the MPPDA asked Pascal to make a number of changes to his script, including the removal of all instances of profanity (Slide, *Banned* 122–23). Pascal consequently acquiesced to most of these demands, and in certain instances filmed separate takes for American audiences, changing such potentially offensive expressions as “damn it” to “confound it”, or substituting “damn” with “blast”.¹⁰³ However, upon viewing the completed film in September 1938, MPPDA administrator Joseph I. Breen deemed it “unacceptable”. Among Breen’s objections were the revelations of Eliza’s illegitimacy and Doolittle’s cohabitation with an unmarried woman (123). Without Shaw’s knowledge (Dukore, *CS* 76), Pascal reluctantly removed the sections of the film that had been cited by Breen, and upon submitting a truncated print of *Pygmalion*, the film was finally granted a certificate of approval for American release on 26 November 1938 (Slide, *Banned* 123).¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Shooting of the film, in any event, was nearing completion by this stage.

¹⁰³ E.g., on the line “Damn Mrs. Pearce, and Damn the coffee, . . . and Damn you, and Damn my own folly . . .” (*PS* 73), all four “damn”s were replaced with “blast”. The MPPDA did not object, however, to Eliza’s “Not bloody likely” (50), which, as Dukore observes, was “by 1938 . . . a social gaffe, not an obscenity” (*CS* 77).

¹⁰⁴ Anthony Slide writes that, “Once the basic storyline was acceptable to the Production Code Administration [henceforth PCA], filming could go ahead. Producers were generally unconcerned at the use of words such as ‘hell’ or ‘damn’ that could not be heard on American screens. Thanks to the ‘blooping’ process, prints could easily be made to conform to the wishes of the PCA. British film-makers would also record ‘wild lines’, with actors re-recording portions of speeches for the American market; these lines were dubbed in place of extant lines. Audiences were, and generally still are, unaware that actors on screen are not always speaking the same words as those heard on the soundtrack” (*Banned* 25).

Chief differences between the British and American prints of *Pygmalion*. As Slide observes, *Pygmalion* is one of the “relatively few examples of distinct American versions being made of British films” (*Banned* 25). In addition to being eight and a half minutes shorter than the British version,¹⁰⁵ the American print¹⁰⁶ features minor dialogue changes; a number of different takes, the most significant of which occurs in the final scene; and a largely new musical score.¹⁰⁷ The American print also features different opening credits from those of the British version. “Pascal Film Productions presents . . .” is replaced by “Gabriel Pascal presents . . .” and, in possible acknowledgement of the critical acclaim that its female star had already received for the film in the United Kingdom,¹⁰⁸ Wendy Hiller is given equal billing with Leslie Howard. The writing credits are changed, partly to acknowledge the contribution of Ian Dalrymple, but also to make the role of the screenplay adapters explicit. Accordingly, whereas the British version differentiates confusingly between the terms *screen play* and *scenario* — “Screen Play and Dialogue Bernard Shaw. Scenario W.P Lipscomb and Cecil Lewis” — the American version states, “Screenplay and Dialogue Bernard Shaw. Adaptation by W.P. Lipscombe, Cecil Lewis and Ian Dalrymple.” The substitution of much of Arthur Honegger’s score with that of American composer and conductor William Axt is reflected in the latter’s credit for “Additional Composition”.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ The running time of the American version is 86½ minutes, compared with the British version’s ninety-five minutes.

¹⁰⁶ For this section I have viewed a videotape copy of the American version of *Pygmalion*, released by Monterey Classics in 1997 (ISBN 1—56994-257-4). The back cover of this videotape incorrectly states that the running time of the film is ninety minutes.

¹⁰⁷ Slide describes the decision to change the score as “most extraordinary” (*Banned* 25).

¹⁰⁸ The British version premiered at London’s Leicester Square Theatre on 6 October 1939, two months before its American release.

¹⁰⁹ As in the British version, Honegger is still credited for “Original music”.

General changes. Among the minor changes are a number of overdubbed lines, presumably altered for the greater comprehension of American audiences;¹¹⁰ a new exchange involving Perfide of the Globe¹¹¹ and Higgins — “Is it true that all our radio announcers learn their English from you?” — the former asks the latter; the removal of Pickering’s laugh from the soundtrack after the Duchess at the Embassy Ball makes an acerbic observation on their fellow guests — “I feel like Noah standing on the Bridge, watching the loading of the Ark... You know[,] two of everything” (*PS* 59)¹¹² — and the deletion of numerous single lines, including Higgins’s laughing rejoinder to Mrs Eynsford Hill’s discomfort about using the word “bloody” — “Oh don’t, it...it isn’t compulsory you know” (50).¹¹³ Technically, the film is occasionally substandard, with poor editing during the first scene with Doolittle arising from the truncation of his role, a jarring cut during the Embassy Ball scene from a shot of Kharpaty looking at Eliza to a new shot of the latter (in a different position from that of the former’s perspective) and a mouthed but deleted “damned” from Higgins when he tells Eliza, “I’ll see you damned first!” (85).¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ The Nightwatchman and 1st. Bystander, upon whom Higgins eavesdrops at the beginning of the night scene in Covent Garden, are given a new exchange in which their Cockney-like accents have been replaced by more middle-class-*style* accents. In the Embassy Ball scene, the voice of the Footman who interrupts Kharpaty with a request from “Her Excellency” (56) has been dubbed by another actor.

¹¹¹ A new character (portrayed by Viola Tree, daughter of Herbert Beerbohm Tree and mother of David Tree) who together with her companion Ysabel of the Sun constitute some of the additional guests in the Pascal version of the Embassy Ball sequence. Stephen Bourne suggests that Perfide and Ysabel may have been based on Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas, respectively, and asks rhetorically, “Could Shaw or Asquith be acknowledging the existence of the most famous lesbian couple of the 1930s?” (47). (However, this overlooks the fact that Shaw did not create either Perfide or Ysabel.)

¹¹² Pickering’s laugh was presumably cut to avoid making his character seem sympathetic to the outspoken Duchess.

¹¹³ This was cut possibly because “bloody” was a lesser vulgarity to American audiences, and therefore less funny as a *faux pas*.

¹¹⁴ For these reasons, I disagree with Slide’s assertion that, “[T]he American version [of *Pygmalion*] plays more smoothly than the British and is certainly better edited . . .” (*Classic* 34).

More significantly, Doolittle's role is severely truncated in the American version in both of the scenes in which he appears. In his first scene, some of the dialogue that emphasises the more sinister aspect of his character — “You want the girl, I'm not so set on having her back home, but what we mightn't be open to an arrangement” (*PS* 34) — has been deleted, presumably to portray him in a more endearing light,¹¹⁵ while in his second scene, as Dukore observes (*CS* 76), his purpose in visiting Mrs Higgins's house — namely, his impending wedding — has been removed at Breen's request.¹¹⁶ Thus to American audiences, Doolittle appears at Mrs Higgins's house, elegantly dressed, for no other reason than to berate Higgins for having instigated the Ezra D. Wannafeller bequest.

Romanticisation. While many of the modifications to the film were made to appease the MPPDA, the American version — at the apparent behest of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, whose distributor, Loew's, released the film in the United States (Dukore, *Introduction* xviii) — also romanticises *Pygmalion* to a significantly greater extent than the British print.¹¹⁷ It achieves this through a combination of music, textual deletions, and editing. From the outset, Axt's score creates a heightened sense of romantic expectation, with its waltz music underscoring the opening credits and highly sentimental melody (played on violins) during the explanatory caption about the Pygmalion myth. When Eliza returns to her lodgings, a jaunty arrangement of the previously heard waltz accompanies the scene — effectively nullifying the poverty of her living environment — and is later heard on her arrival at the Embassy Ball. In the latter sequence, the arrival of the Queen of Transylvania is accompanied by a regal melody, enhancing the Cinderella-like atmosphere of the scene, in contrast with Honegger's music in the British version, which

¹¹⁵ Similarly, Pickering's objections to Higgins's gift of a five-pound note (on the grounds of Doolittle's dissolute lifestyle) have been deleted.

¹¹⁶ In 1948 Pascal tried unsuccessfully to persuade Breen to allow the restoration of Doolittle's deleted lines from this scene (Slide, *Banned* 123).

¹¹⁷ Pascal's role in this additional romanticisation is unclear. Slide assumes that the re-editing was not carried out by David Lean, who nevertheless remains the only editor credited in the film (*Classic* 34). It is possible that film studio MGM, the American distributors of *Pygmalion*, were responsible for romanticising various elements of the film, with or without Pascal's knowledge.

is ponderous and comical. In the scene that takes place at Higgins's home immediately after the Ball, Honegger's initially forlorn, then dramatic, music that accompanies Eliza's despair when Higgins first retires is replaced with a cheerful reprise of the Embassy Ball waltz, undermining the drama of the moment. The waltz again returns in the final scene, with the music beginning much earlier than in the British version and beginning from Eliza's "I did" in a sweeping full orchestra recapitulation that clearly implies romance.

Given the overtly sentimentalised nature of Axt's music, there is a marked stylistic clash in the film whenever Honegger's impressionistic score is retained. The latter's music is heard at the beginning of the first scene at Wimpole Street, in the first montage, and at the end of the equivalent scene to Act IV, when Eliza discovers the ring in the fireplace. Asquith, who does not appear to have been involved in the editing of the American version of the film, subsequently described Honegger's score as superior to that of Axt (Goodman 316).

The American version also romanticises the film, with regard to the Higgins-Eliza relationship, through its textual deletions and editing. In the final discussion between Eliza and Higgins, six exchanges are deleted, including the former's insistence that she has no romantic interest in the latter — "That's not what I want, and don't you think it" (*PS* 89) — and Eliza's suggestion that Freddy might "make me happier than my betters who bully me and don't want me" (90). Consequently, Freddy is not discussed in this scene — thereby further reducing his impact — and the film cuts directly after Eliza's "I'll speak as I like, you're not my teacher now" (89) to "I can do without you, don't think I can't" (90). Thus, the film reduces this scene to an intimate discussion that focuses only on Higgins's and Eliza's respective needs.

The final scene employs a combination of editing and a different take of one shot. After Higgins returns to his laboratory and listens to the recording of Eliza, in a new take filmed from the same angle as in the British film, Howard reacts differently to the unseen Hiller's "live" delivery of "I washed my face and hands before I came" (95). Instead of swinging around abruptly and looking out of shot, Howard turns slowly in his chair,

displaying a look of trance-like and hitherto unseen serenity, as if imagining Eliza's voice in a dream. Only then does he look out of shot at Eliza. The film then cuts to a close-up of a content-looking Hiller for the end of her sentence — "I did"¹¹⁸ — thereby endowing her words with special meaning, before cutting back to a half-smiling Howard, who abruptly returns to his demeanour¹¹⁹ as he turns his back on Eliza (as in the British film) for his final line, "Where the devil are my slippers Eliza?" (95).

Thus, the American film version of *Pygmalion* creates an even greater romantic ambience than that of the British film. Moreover, given that it was *this* version of the film that remained exclusively in circulation in the United States of America for the next three decades, its heightened romanticisation and narrower thematic focus presumably influenced the American creators of both the stage and screen versions of *My Fair Lady*.

The *Pygmalion* Film's Reception

The 1938 *Pygmalion* film was a major international box office success¹²⁰ upon its release, both in its English-language versions and in (dubbed) French and Italian versions (Dukore, *CS* 87). It was also a notable critical success (Low, *Film Making* 215), earning the Volpi Cup (Coppa Volpi) for Best Actor (Howard) at the 1938 Venice Film Festival,¹²¹ and receiving (American) Academy Award nominations for Best Picture, Best Actor (Howard), and Best Actress (Hiller). Shaw himself won an Academy Award for

¹¹⁸ In contrast, the British film remains on Higgins until the completion of Eliza's line.

¹¹⁹ However, this is done in a manner that suggests self-mockery.

¹²⁰ Shaw's royalties from the film's box office receipts in 1939 alone amounted to more than £20,000, as he noted in 1942 (*Shaw on Cinema* 159).

¹²¹ Pascal maintained to Shaw that, "The Volpi Cup is not as the Press stated for Leslie Howard, but to 'Pygmalion' by George Bernard Shaw, produced by Gabriel Pascal, stars Leslie Howard and Wendy Hiller" (*Shaw and Pascal* 35). However, Pascal's assertion overlooks the fact that the Volpi Cup was only awarded to individual actors at that time (sourced from the official website and retrieved from <<http://www.labiennale.org/en/cinema/history/the30s.html?back=true>> on 2 September 2009).

Best Screenplay, together with fellow recipients Lipscomb, Lewis, and Dalrymple.¹²² On 24 February 1939, Shaw described the award to *The Star* as “an insult”: “It’s perfect nonsense. My position as a playwright is known throughout the world. To offer me an award of this sort is an insult, as if they had never heard of me before — and it’s very likely they never had” (qtd in Osborne 74).

Shaw himself did not see the film until a preview showing on 4 October 1938, and it was then that he learned that his screenplay had been romanticised. Valerie Pascal writes of this occasion that, “a very nervous Gabriel” anxiously held Shaw’s wife Charlotte’s hand during the final scene, convinced that the playwright’s “white beard would soon be ruffled with anger, for Shaw had not been told that Eliza was *not* going to marry Freddy, and there was *not* going to be a flower shop”.¹²³ However, she goes on to write, “When the preview was over, Shaw did not say a word, but there was a faint smile above the white beard” (84–85).

Berst argues that the smile was not an indication “that [Shaw] had sheathed his antiromantic hatchet”, but rather a rueful acknowledgement that the film was a fait accompli: “Never one to cry over spilt milk, he was being a good sport” (*Pygmalion* 21). To Shaw’s chagrin, however, “it was widely reported that [he] had approved the romantic

¹²² There is some confusion as to whether the film was awarded two separate Academy Awards for its screenplay. Both Dukore (*CS* 87) and Holroyd (*Search* 392) state that the film received two Academy Awards, whereas the website of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences (<http://awardsdatabase.oscars.org/ampas_awards/BasicSearchInput.jsp>) states that the film received only one award for its screenplay. However, the confusion has arisen because of the wording of the award, which differentiates the respective roles of Shaw, Lipscomb, Lewis, and Dalrymple by reflecting the information provided in the credits of the American release print. Accordingly, Shaw’s Academy Award was for “Screenplay and Dialogue” and that of Lipscomb, Lewis and Dalrymple for their “Adaptation”.

¹²³ Valerie Pascal also implies that it was her husband who instigated the film’s ending, with its assurance to “the public . . . that Eliza would be running for those slippers to the end of her days. That was not how George Bernard Shaw ever let his women behave — but that was how Gabriel Pascal wanted his women to behave” (85).

reconciliation” depicted in the film (Holroyd, *Pursuit* 333).¹²⁴ Ironically, Shaw had unwittingly contributed to this perception by appearing in a filmed speech for American cinema audiences that played immediately before screenings of *Pygmalion* in which he implied that the film was an exact duplication of his play” (*BSC* 140).¹²⁵ Consequently, he felt obliged to assert otherwise. When asked in January 1939 why he had allowed “a readymade happy ending¹²⁶ to be substituted in the film version of *Pygmalion*”, Shaw responded that, “Nothing of the kind was emphasized in my scenario, where I emphasized the escape of Eliza from the tyranny of Higgins by a quite natural love affair with Freddy.” He went on to blame not his producer, but “about 20 directors [who] seem to have turned up there and spent their time trying to sidetrack me and Mr Gabriel Pascal, who does really know chalk from cheese”. Seeking to downplay the significance of the ending, he added that the [aforementioned directors] devised a scene to give a lovelorn complexion at the end to Mr Leslie Howard: but it is too inconclusive to be worth making a fuss about” (*BSC* 141–42). Privately, however, he implied that Leslie Howard was chiefly responsible for the romanticisation of *Pygmalion*, regretting that his first choice for Higgins, Charles Laughton, had not played the role instead. Recalling a visit to Shaw’s home, Minney writes that Shaw “pooh-poohed my remark that the film [had Laughton portrayed Higgins] would have lost the tenderness Leslie Howard supplied. ‘It was not a tender part,’ he said. ‘It was *not* a love story’” (98).

¹²⁴ This misconception is an enduring one, even among Shavian scholars. Roll-Hansen implies that Shaw allowed the ending (88) and Goodman states explicitly that it received “Shaw’s approval” (315). More recently, Leitch has asserted that the final scene was written with the playwright’s “explicit blessing” (*Discontents* 100).

¹²⁵ Shaw states that, “My friend Mr Gabriel Pascal, who has made this production, has tried the extraordinary experience of putting a play on the screen just as the author wrote it and as he wanted it produced” (140). However, Shaw does not explicitly state that Pascal *succeeded* in doing so. Shaw filmed this speech for the third and final time in November 1938 after two earlier attempts had been hampered by technical difficulties.

¹²⁶ The interviewer, Dennison Thornton, was paraphrasing Shaw’s own words from the sequel to *Pygmalion*, in which the latter deplored the “lazy dependence on the ready-mades and reach-me-downs of the ragshop in which Romance keeps its stock of ‘happy endings’ to misfit all stories” (*P*191).

Nevertheless, the film *was* widely interpreted and admired by the public as a tale of love between mentor and pupil. Low describes it as “certainly one of the best [films] from a British studio during the thirties” and argues that, “the happy ending . . . effectively turned it into a romance and was undoubtedly a major factor in its success” (*Film Making* 215). Not all of the critics approved of its romanticisation, however. Writing in *The New Statesman* in July 1939, Desmond McCarthy compared the film with the play and found their differences “striking”: “[T]he general effect of the film *Pygmalion* (and that accounts for its immense popularity) is merely that of a wish fulfilment love story of a poor girl who became a lady and married the man who made her one” (113). John Mason Brown, writing in the *New York Post* in December 1938, also compared the film with the play, and argued that the former’s final scene “suddenly ceases to have any real connection with [Shaw’s] play. It becomes unashamedly like all our worse movies” (qtd in Dukore, *CS* 86). Conversely, Franz Hoellering, writing in *The Nation* in December 1938, argued that the film “follows the play too closely, repeating its errors . . .”, and that it should have depicted “[Eliza] falling in love with [Higgins]” rather than neglecting “[t]his development . . . to make way for cheaper effects, until it is needed for the end” (363).

For his part, Shaw continued to express confidence in Pascal, telegramming him in January 1939 with the announcement that, “You must be my sole director” on future film adaptations of his plays (*GP* 49),¹²⁷ and later telling him that, “My film career depends on you” (52), while only mildly tempering his (public) praise of the *Pygmalion* film. When asked in August 1939¹²⁸ whether he preferred the Dutch film version of his play or the

¹²⁷ Shaw never wavered from this agreement, and Pascal subsequently directed the film versions of *Major Barbara* (1940) and *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1945). In his autobiography, Kenneth Clark, who knew both Shaw and Pascal, argues that the latter was an inveterate liar (“a sort of Baron Munchausen”) and an “imposter” who “conned” Shaw. He quotes Shaw as telling him, “I cannot do without [Pascal]; there is no one else in the field whom I can trust artistically . . .”, and goes to write, “That [Pascal] should have ‘sold’ all this nonsense to such an intelligent and skeptical man as Mr Shaw was almost an act of genius . . .” (37–38).

¹²⁸ The interview was published in the September–October 1939 edition of the *Cine Technician*.

British version, he replied that, “I prefer my own version, which is substantially that followed by Mr Gabriel Pascal” (*BSC* 142).

Conclusions¹²⁹

Although the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, like its German and Dutch predecessors, romanticises Shaw’s screenplay, it is essentially faithful to the work *schematically* until the final two scenes. Its various additions that precede those sequences — the presence of new (minor) characters in two scenes¹³⁰ and five non-Shavian bridging sequences¹³¹ — do not depart significantly from Shaw’s storyline. Thematically, the film also retains Shaw’s emphasis on the superficiality of class distinctions, demonstrating how admittance to high society can be achieved either through linguistic means and the acquisition of fine clothes (as in Eliza’s case), or through money and clothes (as in the case of Doolittle). Moreover, the interrelated theme of phonetics, and its role in effecting part of Eliza’s transformation, is not only retained, but arguably *clarified* through the film’s use of montage to illuminate both the nature of phonetics to the layperson and Higgins’s practical application of the subject in his teaching.

In many other respects, however, the film is considerably less faithful to Shaw’s thematic concerns. Significantly, it diminishes his emphasis on the social consequences of uprooting an individual from one class to another in the parallel cases of Doolittle and Eliza. Although the *film* Doolittle looks into the camera and confides that, “Middle class morality claims its victim,” he laughs wheezily to reassure the viewer that he regards his new status with amusement. Shaw’s Doolittle, in contrast, bemoans his fate: “Who asked him to make a gentleman of me? I was happy. I was free” (Scene 47). While the film Doolittle still observes that, as a consequence of his elevation to the middle class, he must

¹²⁹ This section relates only to the British film version of *Pygmalion*.

¹³⁰ I.e., Mrs Higgins’s at-home day and the Ambassador’s Reception.

¹³¹ I.e., (1) the first (phonetics) montage; (2) the Wimpole Street scene after Mrs Higgins’s at-home day; (3) the second (lessons in etiquette and dance) montage during which Freddy attempts to visit Eliza; (4) Eliza’s return to Covent Garden; (5) Higgins’s and Pickering’s visit to Piccadilly Circus.

now marry his common-law wife, Shaw's point that the dustman's transformation is effected at the expense of his independence is largely obscured through the removal of his second Act V speech and his lament, in particular, that, "I have to live for others now and not for myself: that's middle class morality" (Scene 47).

In the case of Eliza, the film downplays or removes the concerns of other characters¹³² for her future financial wellbeing. Although it could be argued that the altered time setting from the pre-women's suffrage period of approximately 1912 in the play and Shaw's screenplay to the late 1930s of the film justifies the diminishment of these comments given that "Pre-World War I working-class women like [Eliza] had a far more limited horizon than their 1930s counterparts . . ." (Martin 42), nevertheless, "the film eschews the matter of how to employ the new Eliza by implicitly marrying her off to Higgins, as suggested by the slippers scene" (43). This departure from Shaw's story line betrays the culminating point of his screenplay and play, namely, that Eliza ultimately achieves independence from her mentor. While Costello argues that Eliza's decision to return to Higgins "is the clear and simple situation of a Galatea finally being fully created by her Pygmalion, finally asserting her own individual soul, and, becoming independent, being free to choose" (76), the implication remains that her return is a capitulation, rather than an assertion, of her independence. For in the absence of any meaningful concessions or promises from Higgins, Eliza returns to her mentor *on his own terms*, unaware until she enters his laboratory of the emotional impact that her departure has had on him.

To make this resolution acceptable to audiences, the film "foreshadows it" (Dukore, *CS* 83), employing a combination of textual manipulation (the restoration of deleted dialogue from the play that casts the relationship between Eliza and Higgins in a conceivably romantic light; the deletion of any suggestion that Higgins is possessed of a mother fixation; the truncation and modification of Freddy's new dialogue from Shaw's screenplay) and cinematic aesthetics (shot composition, music, performances), all of

¹³² E.g. Pickering and Mrs Pearce. In Pickering's case, however, the film restores his concern about Higgins's possible sexual interest in Eliza, presumably with the rationale that the raising of the issue will in turn encourage audiences to suspect Higgins of possessing this interest.

which result in consistent departures from Shaw's screenplay with regard to the Eliza-Higgins relationship.¹³³ Consequently, while Shaw aggrandises Freddy's role and provides him with new scenes that enhance his suitability as a future husband to Eliza, the film severely undermines Freddy's impact by divesting his dialogue of any substance, diminishing Eliza's reciprocation of his ardour in their (new) Wimpole Street scene, distancing him from the audience through frequent use of medium and medium-long shots, and portraying him as an ineffectual lover in a performance by David Tree that borders on farce. In contrast, Leslie Howard's Higgins is the antithesis of Freddy — sensual, charismatic; a man of action — and the film underscores his importance through the use of tracking and panning shots, low camera angles, frequent close-ups and, on occasion, extreme close-ups. Moreover, it is not Freddy who is symbolically linked to Eliza in the first scene, as in Shaw's screenplay, but Higgins, a mysterious stranger whom the camera tracks from behind, immediately focusing attention on him as he initially appears to follow Eliza through the crowded Covent Garden market. When Eliza returns to Higgins in the final scene, the film suggests that she, in turn, has followed him, thus ending the film on a note of unity.

In its romanticisation of Shaw's screenplay, the 1938 *Pygmalion* film shares certain similarities with other class-related British film comedies of the 1930s. Like Bill, the Cockney hero of *The Lambeth Walk*, Eliza is a vibrant working class character who humanises a member of a higher social class,¹³⁴ and like the title character of *The Private Life of Henry VIII*, Higgins's (implied) romantic vulnerability reveals that in matters of love he is no different from any other member of society, despite his privileged status. Where it differs, however, from many of the British class-related comedies of the 1930s, with their emphasis on the desirability of "maintaining the *status quo*" (Shafer 133), is in

¹³³ Additional modifications introduced in the Pascal screenplay (and which exploit the 1938 time setting with their use of recent technology) also clearly foreshadow the ending that was ultimately employed, with Higgins, on various occasions, indulging in recordings of Pickering, Eliza, and Doolittle with his concealed microphones. These events serve to explain how the film Higgins is subsequently able to listen to Eliza's recorded voice in the final scene.

¹³⁴ Bill, however, does not fall in love with a member of the upper class.

Eliza's decision — by returning to Higgins — to remain *within* the class to which she has risen. In this sense, Shaw's more egalitarian screenplay ending, with its depiction of Eliza-as-florist working alongside her greengrocer husband Freddy, ensconced in what appears to be a comfortable lower-middle-class existence, is closer to the typical resolution of the British class-related comedy. One could further argue that the ending of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film is in fact closer thematically to classic American romantic comedies of the 1930s such as *It Happened One Night* (Frank Capra, 1934), in which male and female protagonists "from different classes and levels of society" routinely "overcome [these] obstacle[s] through their love" (Lyden 180). Moreover, just as Eliza chooses the assertive Higgins over the ineffectual Freddy, the female protagonists in the American romantic comedies, as John C. Lyden observes, must typically choose between two men, ultimately selecting the "more aggressive and dominating" male (181).

The fact that, from the outset, the 1938 *Pygmalion* film romanticises the Eliza–Higgins relationship, while emphasising the irrelevance of Freddy, belies the likelihood of Shaw's screenplay ending ever having been seriously considered by the film's production team. Although Asquith *did* film Shaw's ending, together with a promptly discarded "compromise" version (Goodman 315),¹³⁵ it is significant that neither of these alternative endings is included in the Pascal screenplay, which in every respect anticipates the film's schematic framework. In short, the filmmakers had defied Shaw's wishes as brazenly as Herbert Tree had done twenty-four years earlier. But in this instance, for all Shaw's public insistence that the film's "lovelorn" ending was "too inconclusive to be worth making a fuss about" (*BSC* 142), privately, at least, he must have been concerned by the relative *permanence* of cinema. Yet there still remained his play, and within months of

¹³⁵ Randolph Goodman, basing his comments on (unreferenced) interviews with Asquith and the film's assistant director Edward (Teddy) Baird, reports that Shaw's ending was filmed "to the letter. Although none of the film-makers approved of such a cold and realistic conclusion, this version was filmed in case Shaw should object to any other. The second version was a compromise between Shaw's ideas and a happy ending[,] which everyone agreed was not good" (315).

the film *Pygmalion*'s release, Shaw would make two final attempts to reassert his anti-romantic conception of the work. Those efforts are examined in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: The 1939 and 1941 Versions of *Pygmalion*

Introduction

In August 1939, ten months after the premiere of the British film version of *Pygmalion*, Shaw completed what Laurence describes as “one of his most significant revisions” (*CL* IV, 532) in the form of a new ending to the stage edition of the play.¹ This marked the first occasion on which Shaw had modified the published version of *Pygmalion* since its initial appearance in book form twenty-three years earlier. In this new edition — henceforth referred to as the 1939 version — the play no longer ends with Higgins confidently declaring that Eliza will do his shopping for him, but instead concludes with the former declaring to his mother that Eliza will marry Freddy.

Shaw’s decision to revise his text suggests that he was anxious to refute the popular misconception that he had either written or authorised the film’s romanticised resolution. In particular, Shaw appears to have been motivated by the concern that the ending of the screen version might influence future stage interpretations of the play. This is indicated by his request to his Edinburgh printers, R. & R. Clark Limited, that they provide him with “a dozen pulls of the corrected page to send to the [British] acting companies” (*CL* IV, 532–33). Outside of the United Kingdom, however, acting companies and, indeed, the general public remained unaware of Shaw’s new ending. Possibly because of the outbreak of the Second World War in September of that same year, the 1939 version of *Pygmalion* was published only in the United Kingdom.² The combination of a limited

¹ Creel asserts that this ending, together with the revised instructions for the ending of Act IV that appeared in the 1941 version two years later, was first published in a separate printing of *Pygmalion* in 1917 (209–11). However, the earliest separate printing of *Pygmalion* after 1916 that I have been able to establish was in 1918, and this version was, in fact, identical to the first edition and subsequent pre-1939 printings in the Standard Edition.

² The 1939 *American* edition of *Pygmalion*, published by Dodd, Mead & Company, retained the 1916 text.

print run³ and the fact that the 1939 version was never reprinted has ensured that this version remains the least remarked of Shaw's published editions of his play.⁴

Moreover, the 1939 version was swiftly displaced by the so-called screen edition of *Pygmalion*, which Shaw completed in November 1939, only three months after its predecessor. As Conolly observes, this latter version — which comprises a revised edition of the play, a modified Preface, and selected scenes from Shaw's (1938) screenplay — “represent[s] Shaw's [final] wishes about how the [1938] film *should* have ended, and how productions of the play should end” [original emphasis] (*Pygmalion* xxxi). Henceforth referred to as the 1941 version, this edition was apparently created at the instigation of Allen Lane,⁵ founder of Penguin Books, and was first published in the United Kingdom in January 1941 in the Standard Edition of Shaw's works by Constable and Company,⁶ and in September of that year as a Penguin paperback.⁷ American and Canadian (Penguin) printings followed in 1942. Due to its status as Shaw's final stage version of *Pygmalion*, the 1941 version is generally regarded as the definitive edition of the play, and as of 2011 it remains the only version of this work that the Shaw Estate has

³ Fifteen hundred copies were published by Constable and Company in the Standard Edition of *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*, together with a separate printing of *Pygmalion* that year (also in Standard Edition) of five thousand copies (Laurence, *Bibliography I* 207).

⁴ Among the few Shavian scholars who have discussed or noted its existence are Holroyd (*Pursuit*, 1989), Laurence (*Shaw: A Bibliography, Volume I*, 1983 and *Collected Letters, Volume IV*, 1988), Berst (1995), and Conolly (2008).

⁵ On 5 November 1939, Shaw wrote to William Maxwell, Managing Director of R. & R. Clark Limited, informing him that, “*Pygmalion* has to be pulled all to pieces for the insertion of the additional scenes written for the [1938] screen version,” and that “Allen Lane wants to Penguinize the play. I have consented, and promised to throw in the screen scenes, on condition that you do the printing” (Shaw, *Publishers* 188).

⁶ As it had done in 1939, Constable and Company issued *Pygmalion* both as a separate volume and together with *Androcles and the Lion* and *Overruled*.

⁷ The Penguin edition also featured over one hundred drawings by Feliks Topolski and was Shaw's second “Penguinized” play (after *Back to Methuselah* in 1939).

permitted to be reprinted in the United Kingdom in the six decades since its author's death.⁸

In this chapter I begin by examining the extent to which the revised ending in Shaw's 1939 version of *Pygmalion* succeeds in discouraging romantic expectations with regard to the relationship between Higgins and Eliza. I then turn to the 1941 version, addressing the following questions: (1) what are the implications for the structural and tonal integrity of the original play through Shaw's inclusion of selected scenes from his screenplay? (2) To what extent do Shaw's modifications of these scenes affect his original stage text and encourage the expectation of an Eliza–Freddy marriage? (3) Do any other thematic changes arise from these revisions?

The 1939 Version

The sole difference between the original play and the 1939 version of *Pygmalion* is the final exchange between Higgins and his mother. The former, as we have seen, ends as follows:

LIZA [*disdainfully*] Buy them yourself. [*She sweeps out*].

MRS HIGGINS I'm afraid you've spoilt that girl, Henry. But never mind, dear: I'll buy you the tie and gloves.

HIGGINS [*sunnily*] Oh, don't bother. She'll buy 'em all right enough. Good-bye.

⁸ For many years the 1941 version was the only commercially available edition of *Pygmalion*. Writing in 1967, Roll-Hansen (81) noted the difficulty in obtaining copies of the original play — a point also made thirty-eight years later by Gibbs (*Life* 331). The 1916 text was last reprinted in the United Kingdom in the 1936 Standard Edition of Shaw's works. More recently, this text has become available in the United States with the passing of the (American) Copyright Act of 1976, under which all books published in that country before 1 January 1923, have entered the public domain. In the United Kingdom, however, The Duration of Copyright and Rights in Performances Regulations 1995 protects published works for a period of seventy years from the date of the author's death. In Shaw's case, this term will end in 2020.

They kiss. Mrs Higgins runs out. Higgins, left alone, rattles his cash in his pocket; chuckles; and disports himself in a highly self-satisfied manner. (P191)

In the 1939 edition this was amended to:

LIZA [*disdainfully*] Buy them yourself. [*She sweeps out*]

MRS HIGGINS I'm afraid you've spoilt that girl, Henry. I should be uneasy about you and her if she were less fond of Colonel Pickering.

HIGGINS Pickering! Nonsense: she's going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy!

Freddy!! Ha ha ha ha ha!!!! [*He roars with laughter as the play ends*]. (P39 279–80)⁹

In the first instance, the emphatic nature of the 1939 conclusion forestalls the possibility of romantic interpolations by the actors portraying Higgins and/or Eliza. Shaw had not forgotten how Stella Campbell had undermined the original ending by returning to the stage after Higgins's final line and inquiring, "What size?" By bringing the curtain down immediately on Higgins's roars of laughter, Shaw removes the opportunity for such unwelcome additions. Commentators, however, have disagreed regarding the implications of the 1939 ending. Conolly argues that it provides an "unambiguous new conclusion" to the play, asking rhetorically of Higgins's final laughter, "What could be clearer?" (*Pygmalion* xxviii). To Holroyd, however, "[T]his laughter sounded as hollow as Higgins's prediction — and even Shaw's printers had begun to query his intentions" (*Pursuit* 332).

Certainly, Higgins's final mirth can be construed in different ways. Those who conclude that Higgins's laughter is feigned, as Holroyd suggests, may infer an attempt on his part to conceal deeper feelings for Eliza, thus undermining his earlier insistence that he "can do without anybody". This interpretation is further supported by the fact that Higgins's

⁹ The pagination of the 1939 Standard Edition of *Androcles and the Lion*, *Overruled* and *Pygmalion* differs from that of the 1916 printing because the 114-page Preface to the first of these plays on the earlier edition employs Roman numerals.

unrestrained mirth seems out of character, for nowhere else in the play does he laugh as uproariously as he does here. A second possible interpretation is that, although Higgins announces Eliza's intention of marrying Freddy, his laughter reveals that he considers the notion too preposterous to be entertained seriously — thus suggesting that he dismisses her abrupt departure as a mere fit of pique.

A third (and more literal) interpretation of the 1939 ending from Higgins's perspective is that he accepts the notion of an Eliza–Freddy marriage, but at the same time regards it as an amusing act of defiance on Eliza's part in view of his negative opinion of Freddy. This is presumably what Shaw wanted audiences to infer, for here he retains the implications of his revised (1938) screenplay scene in which Higgins tells his mother (after Eliza “sweeps out”): “But fancy her wanting to marry that young idiot Freddy. Can you understand it? . . . Pickering and I will have to keep them both. He can clean our boots, I suppose” (Scene 47). In the 1939 version, however, Shaw does not foreshadow any sense of a grudging acceptance toward Freddy on Higgins's part. As in the original play, Higgins still states that, “I'm not going to have my masterpiece thrown away on Freddy,” and predicts to Eliza that, “You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl” (*P39* 278–79). Given that Higgins and Eliza do not discuss Freddy again after the first of these statements — and that Eliza herself appears to vacillate on the subject of marriage, going on to declare that, “If I cant have kindness, I'll have independence” (278) — Higgins's sudden acceptance of an Eliza–Freddy engagement appears extraordinary, if not implausible.

In any event, the issue is ultimately not what *Higgins* believes Eliza will do, but whether the audience concurs with Shaw's insistence in the sequel that “[Eliza] will, *if* she marries either of them, marry Freddy” [*italics mine*]. As Bentley observes, Eliza has already “become not only a person but an independent person” (*Shaw* 123), and that having established her independence — “now I'm not afraid of you, and can do without you” — it is inconsequential “whether Eliza does the shopping or not” (124). One could therefore argue that Higgins's declaration, while providing a more dynamic conclusion to the play than that of the original ending, is as much irrelevant as it is ambiguous. Moreover, the

altered ending lessens the impact of one of the play's recurring themes: money and the power that it provides Higgins over Eliza. As Gibbs observes of the original ending: "[T]he rattling of cash in [Higgins's] pockets recalls the disquieting suggestion of property ownership in his relation with Eliza, which is present as a leitmotif in the dialogue from very early in the play" (*A Life* 332). This sense of ownership is also suggested in the original ending by the smug certainty with which Higgins assumes Eliza will fulfill her servile role ("she'll buy em all right enough").

The fact that the 1939 edition was not reprinted suggests that Shaw may have belatedly concluded that more significant changes were required if the ending, in particular, were to convince audiences that Eliza's future lay not with Higgins, but with Freddy. For these modifications, together with a considerable amount of additional material, he returned to his screenplay in the last of what Gibbs describes as his "numerous attempts to reinforce his idea that the play ultimately shows Eliza's emancipation from Higgins" (332).

The 1941 Version

Writing in 1998, Bauschatz noted that the 1941 version of *Pygmalion* constituted the most frequently performed version of the play, "although portions of its 'additional material' are either played or left out, depending upon directorial whim or the technical capabilities of particular stages" (184). This "additional material" consists of five scenes deriving from Shaw's 1934–38 screenplay, which is also the direct source, in all but one instance,¹⁰ of a number of additions and modifications throughout the main text¹¹ of the 1941 version.

Because of its textual relationship to Shaw's screenplay, this edition is generally referred to as the screen version of the play.¹² This appellation is misleading, however, for the 1941 version does not include any of the material written by Shaw's co-adapters for the

¹⁰ I.e., the ending of Act IV.

¹¹ "Main text" refers here to the play, as opposed to Shaw's screenplay-derived additional scenes.

¹² E.g., by Costello (54), Laurence (*Bibliography I* 239), and, as previously noted, by Shaw himself.

1938 *Pygmalion* film screenplay, nor does it comprise a screenplay in its own right.¹³ Costello argues that the 1941 version is, in fact, “closer to the text of the [original] play than it is to what is presented in the actual [1938] movie” (54). This is essentially correct provided that one considers the 1941 version *without* its “additional material”, as indeed Shaw, in his “Note For Technicians”, instructs directors of conventional stage productions to do. However, it would be more accurate to state that the 1941 version is closest to the 1939 edition, since it retains the 1939 ending.

The 1941 version differs from the 1939 version in that it comprises:

1. A revised Preface.
2. A “Note For Technicians”.
3. Minor revisions to Acts II and III.
4. Additional dialogue and a revised ending for Act I.
5. Revised instructions for the ending of Act IV.
6. Additions and modifications to Act V, including new dialogue inserted immediately before the ending.

It also includes the aforementioned additional material, consisting of five self-contained scenes, all of which are separated from the main text with asterisks and that, with one exception,¹⁴ occur at the end of their respective acts. These scenes are as follows: (a) Eliza’s taxi ride to Angel Court, followed by an interior scene in her lodgings (Act I); (b) the bathroom scene involving Mrs Pearce and Eliza (Act II); (c) the phonetics lesson (Act

¹³ In the scenes that he transfers directly from his screenplay, Shaw dispenses with all of his earlier instructions pertaining to cinematic devices, such as wipes, dissolves, and close-ups.

¹⁴ I.e., the bathroom scene, which (as in his screenplay) Shaw places in the middle of Act II.

II); (d) the Embassy scene¹⁵ (Act III); and (e) Eliza's departure from Wimpole Street with Freddy (Act IV).

Shaw refers to these scenes in the first paragraph¹⁶ of his "Note For Technicians", which immediately precedes the main text of the 1941 version:

A complete representation of the play as printed for the first time in this edition is technically possible only on the cinema screen or on stages furnished with exceptionally elaborate machinery. For ordinary theatrical use the [new] scenes separated by rows of asterisks are to be omitted. (*P41* 194)¹⁷

The 1941 version: staging issues and dilemmas. From both a cinematic and a theatrical perspective, Shaw's note is misleading, and, as Roll-Hansen observes, "raise[s] more problems than it attempt[s] to solve" (81). In the first instance, it is difficult to accept that Shaw was seriously advocating that the 1941 version *in its entirety* constituted a feasible screenplay. The 1941 version, with its five additional scenes, is not only considerably longer than the original play, but almost twice as long as his screenplay. Sheer length alone does not, of course, preclude the possibility that its representation as a motion picture may indeed be "technically possible", as Shaw puts it, but in the absence of any attempt to modify its main text for the cinematic medium, the 1941 version constitutes a hybrid work of approximately six-sevenths stage play and one-seventh screenplay.

¹⁵ This is Shaw's 1938 (British) screenplay version, as opposed to his briefer 1934 scene for the German and Dutch *Pygmalion* films.

¹⁶ The second and final paragraph of the "Note" refers to his use of "an e upside down" throughout the dialogue of the 1941 edition to indicate "the indefinite vowel" (or schwa) "for which," Shaw writes, "though it is one of the commonest sounds in English speech, our wretched alphabet has no letter" (*P41* 194). Shaw had previously used the symbol in his screenplay, and in each instance its use is repeated in the 1941 edition, e.g., "Look at his bə-oots" (206).

¹⁷ This and all subsequent page references for the 1941 edition derive from the 1941 Constable and Company Standard Edition of *Androcles and the Lion-Overruled-Pygmalion*.

At the same time, Shaw overstates the extent to which “exceptionally elaborate machinery” is necessary for presenting the additional material of the 1941 version in a theatrical production. The most technically demanding of these scenes is arguably that of the taxi ride from Covent Garden to Angel Court, but the staging difficulties are feasible with the use of an appropriate backdrop.¹⁸ In any event, the difficulties presented by the additional scenes are not inherently *technical* in nature, but stem instead from their lack of theatricality. Having been written for “the more realistic medium [of film]” (Roll-Hansen 84), the dialogue in these scenes is, accordingly, more conversational and less dramaturgic in nature. Thus, with the exception of the exchanges between Nepommuck and Higgins in the Embassy scene, the screenplay-derived material lacks much of the wit that characterises the dialogue of the original play. Given that Shaw appends his additional material virtually without modification¹⁹ to the 1941 edition, a tonal shift is discernible between his more naturalistic screenplay dialogue and that of the original play, with its “formalized speech . . . and epigrammatic repartees specially designed to reach the furthest seats in the gallery of a theatre” (Roll-Hansen 83).²⁰ The additional scenes also lack “the final fillip of a Shavian curtain” (83), since their purpose in Shaw’s screenplay is chiefly to blur the demarcations between each of the acts of the original play,²¹ thus reducing the influence and effectiveness of its theatrical origins. As Roll-Hansen notes, “For the film producer, operating with sequences, the act is an awkward unit to handle. . . . It has to be broken up, and the climax at the end has to be toned down in order to smooth over the gap between the acts” (83).

¹⁸ A 2004 production of the 1941 version mounted at the Shaw Festival in Canada’s Niagara-on-the-Lake incorporated all of the additional scenes, employing a revolving stage for the ride to Angel Court (*Shaw Magazine*, Spring 2004).

¹⁹ As will subsequently be discussed, Shaw provides Freddy with one additional line in the scene with Eliza outside Higgins’s home and slightly modifies the instructions for this sequence; he also modifies the instructions for the earlier scene inside Eliza’s lodgings at Angel Court and also adds several sentences of commentary for the benefit of the reader.

²⁰ Berst argues that the dialogue of the bathroom scene “has less spark than most of the play . . .” (*Pygmalion* 63).

²¹ The exception here is the bathroom scene, which occurs in the middle of Act II.

In a theatrical presentation, however, this “smoothing over” arguably creates difficulties for the director, who is faced with the prospect of bringing down the curtain at the end of scenes that essentially *fade out* rather than conclude decisively. This is especially noticeable at the end of the Embassy Ball scene, which now concludes Act III on a subdued note (in spite of the opulence of its setting) with Pickering’s statement that, “Eliza is tired; and I am hungry. Let us clear out and have supper somewhere” (263). In the earlier stage versions of the play, as we have seen, the act concludes with Mrs Higgins flinging her pen down and dramatically exclaiming, “Oh, men! men!! men!!!”. The dynamism of this ending provides a distinct contrast to the seriousness of Act IV. More importantly, the concluding exchanges of the act foreshadow Eliza’s concerns about her future — first raised here by Mrs Higgins (“the problem of what is to be done with her afterwards”) and virtually paraphrased by Eliza in the next act (“Whats to become of me?”). Higgins’s attitude toward Eliza in Act IV (“What does it matter what becomes of you?”) can also be seen as justifying his mother’s concerns in the previous act. But by inserting the Embassy Ball scene *between* these acts, the emerging thematic shift toward the more serious issue of Eliza’s future that will dominate both Acts IV and V is abruptly replaced by a return to the more prosaic question of whether her transformation will succeed — an issue that, in a sense, has already been rendered superfluous by Mrs Higgins’s focus on the post-transformation Eliza.

The dramatic bathroom scene is equally superfluous, for in addition to lengthening an already long act,²² its insertion in the middle of Act II “arrests the play’s action . . .” (Berst, *Pygmalion* 63).²³ From a reader’s perspective, the inclusion of the scene also creates an unexpected logical problem when, at its conclusion, the 1941 edition rejoins

²² Shaw also appends the phonetics scene to the end of this act.

²³ Berst also notes the difficulty in staging the scene (63). In the aforementioned 2004 production of the 1941 version at the Shaw Festival, the scene was staged in silhouette above the set. Theatre critic John Simon observed that, “[Director Jackie] Maxwell cleverly has characters speak some of Shaw’s stage directions and perform the . . . scene in amusing shadow play” (*New York Magazine* Theater Review, 16 August 2004).

the original play precisely at the point at which it had departed from it,²⁴ only to be informed that the ensuing conversation had, in fact, taken place concurrently with that of the bathroom scene:

*Meanwhile the Colonel has been having it out with Higgins about Eliza.
Pickering has come from the hearth to the chair and seated himself astride of it
with his arms on the back to cross-examine him.*

PICKERING. Excuse the straight question, Higgins. Are you a man of good character where women are concerned? (*P41 228*)

Mrs Pearce's reappearance only one page later (with Eliza's hat in her hand) makes no logical sense given that the bathroom scene, which has supposedly been occurring simultaneously with that of Pickering's cross-examination, lasts *two* pages. The switch from present time to past time is also disconcerting for the reader, who must wait seven pages for Eliza's return — refreshed and by now dressed in a kimono — for confirmation that the play's narration has indeed returned to the present.²⁵

More problematic from a *theatrical* perspective, however, is the screenplay scene appended to the end of Act I, for here, as Roll-Hansen observes, "Shaw has added an anti-climax of nearly two pages of text, following Eliza further and further away from the centre of action . . ." (84), as the audience accompanies Eliza on her taxi journey to Angel Court and then inside her lodgings. The static nature of the interior scene presents staging difficulties, since it features no dialogue and its "action", as such, consists in the main of

²⁴ I.e., in the original play, "*Mrs Pearce shuts the door; and Eliza's plaints are no longer audible. Pickering comes from the hearth to the chair and sits astride it with his arms on the back.*" Pickering then asks Higgins: "Excuse the straight question. . . . Are you a man of good character where women are concerned?" (*P130*).

²⁵ Roll-Hansen does not address the logical problem that occurs here, but criticises Shaw's amended instructions for telling the reader "quite unnecessarily . . . to take his mind back some five or ten minutes in order to listen to a conversation that began as soon as Eliza had left the room with Mrs Pearce", and concludes that, "This is very poor handling of the narrative" (87).

Eliza's unspoken thoughts, as "chronically weary, but too excited to go to bed, [she] sits, counting her new riches and dreaming and planning what to do with them, until the gas goes out, when she enjoys for the first time the sensation of being able to put in another penny without grudging it" (*P41* 213).²⁶ Roll-Hansen argues that this scene is both superfluous and incongruous, since "our sympathetic understanding of Eliza's social problem is not increased by the added passages, while during the original first act we laugh with her and at all the others" (85). Berst, on the other hand, sees the depiction of "Eliza's squalid living quarters" as reinforcing "a deprivation that contrasts strongly with the relative opulence of later scenes" (*Pygmalion* 46). He goes on to assert that in this scene, Shaw "graphically reminds us of grim realities that ground the dreams of would-be Cinderellas" (49). One could argue, however, that Eliza's daydreams would be more discernible to the *reader* than they would to a stage audience, given the difficulties inherent in visually translating Shaw's largely descriptive prose in this scene.²⁷

Yet for the reader, Shaw's sudden use of the omniscient narrator may seem intrusive here. Not only is its employment a departure from the main text of the play, but its use is restricted to Eliza, indicating that Shaw wishes the reader to sympathise with this character alone. (Moreover, Eliza appears in all five of the additional scenes — in comparison with Higgins's involvement in a mere two — fostering the perception that she is the play's central character.) As Roll-Hansen observes, "At the beginning of the bathroom scene, there is an abrupt change from the stage to the omniscient point of view: 'Eliza is taken upstairs to the third floor greatly to her surprise; for she expected to be taken down to the scullery'" (86). At the conclusion of the subsequent phonetics scene, Shaw again expresses sympathy toward Eliza, commenting, "And that is the sort of

²⁶ This is Shaw's description, which is not italicised. Its novelistic prose was written for the 1941 version and replaces Shaw's technical instructions for repeated close-ups and dissolves depicting Eliza's imagined future in the equivalent scene in his screenplay.

²⁷ E.g., Shaw writes that Eliza's "prodigal mood does not extinguish her gnawing sense of the need for economy sufficiently to prevent her from calculating that she can dream and plan in bed more cheaply and warmly than sitting up without a fire" (*P41* 213).

ordeal *poor Eliza* has to go through for months before we meet her again on her first appearance in London society of the professional class” [my emphasis] (P41 243).

Because of such authorial sympathising, I cannot agree with Silver’s assertion that the 1941 edition reflects Shaw’s supposed “latter-day hostility to the play” — and to Eliza, in particular — “in every touch he added” (276).²⁸ Focusing on the appended bathroom scene, which he describes as “manifestly sadistic,” Silver argues that in his “lust to torture Eliza . . . [Shaw] forgets that later on in the play, and left intact from the original version, Eliza describes her bath as having been a treat for her . . .” (272). Yet this is not necessarily a contradiction on Shaw’s part, for the new scene ends with an understandably terrified Eliza’s immersion in the first bath of her life, and it is not inconceivable that, once the initial shock was over, that she did indeed regard the experience as “a treat”.

²⁸ Silver is alone in regarding the 1941 version as a reflection of what he perceives as Shaw’s lingering disillusionment with Stella Campbell. In 1912, shortly after he had completed *Pygmalion*, the married Shaw had embarked on a (possibly unconsummated) love affair with Campbell. The relationship ended in 1913 when Campbell left him for the much younger George Cornwallis-West. Campbell subsequently married Cornwallis-West in April 1914, five days before *Pygmalion* opened on the London stage. In Silver’s view, the 1941 ending, in particular, represents an attempt by Shaw to punish Campbell by lumbering the character that she had created on the British stage (Eliza) with an unworthy husband (Freddy) who is suggestive of Cornwallis-West. Silver goes on to argue that while, “[The original] ending leaves open the possibility of Eliza’s return[,] . . . if she does not return then the joke would be on the smug Higgins. In the [1941] ending, however, Shaw tries to turn the joke against Eliza, who is now burdened with the incompetent Freddy Hill” (275).

I regard this as a fanciful theory. If Shaw had indeed been determined to “punish” Campbell in this way for marrying Cornwallis-West, then I would argue that rather than wait until she was elderly and infirm to change his ending — Campbell died in 1940 at the age of seventy-five, a year after Shaw had made his final revisions — he would have seized the opportunity to do so when he first published *Pygmalion* (in English) in book form in 1916.

However, *dispensing* with Shaw's additional material creates unexpected difficulties in at least one instance. Ironically, for the stage director who chooses to omit the Angel Court scene on the grounds of its theatrical ineffectiveness, the revised ending of Act I in the 1941 version presents its own staging challenge. This is due to Shaw's decision to add new material from his screenplay in this instance *above* the asterisks that he employs to demarcate ordinary stage productions from more elaborate (or cinematic) representations. In the 1941 version, Act I does not conclude with Freddy's exasperated "Well, I'm dashed!", but instead continues with further exchanges between Freddy and Eliza, and then the latter and the Taximan. These are identical to those of Scene 16 in Shaw's screenplay. As a result, Act I in the 1941 version concludes in the same way as Scene 16:

FREDDY. Goodbye. [*He goes*].

TAXIMAN. Here? Whats this about Bucknam Pellis? What business have you at Bucknam Pellis?

LIZA.²⁹ Of course I havnt none. But I wasnt going to let him³⁰ know that. You drive me home.

TAXIMAN. And wheres home?

LIZA. Angel Court, Drury Lane, next Meiklejohn's oil shop.

TAXIMAN. That sounds more like it, Judy. [*He drives off*]. (*P41* 211–12)

As in his screenplay, Shaw's motive for making this revision was clearly to strengthen the visibility and romantic appeal of Freddy — who in spite of his higher social standing to Eliza, both raises his hat to her in the 1941 version and twice bids her "Goodbye" — while also underscoring Eliza's awareness of this character through her additional interaction with him. However, the loss of the "carefully chiseled climax" (Roll-Hansen

²⁹ As Berst observes, Shaw's sudden identification of Eliza by name here is unusual given that it was his practice in his plays to provide only "a generic identification [e.g., "The Flower Girl"] until the character is named in the course of the action" (*Pygmalion* 45). In the two earlier versions of the play, Eliza is not identified by name until Act II. Berst concludes that because Eliza is identified "at the point [in the act] where [Shaw] entered additions for the film, it was very likely a latter-day slip" (46).

³⁰ I.e. Freddy.

84) that concludes Act I in the earlier versions of the play is unfortunate from a theatrical perspective. In the 1941 version, Freddy has already departed when Eliza is driven away in her taxi, and, consequently, the curtain comes down on an empty stage — a considerably less dynamic and amusing conclusion than the spectacle of a twice-abandoned Freddy expressing his frustration at a flower girl’s presumptuousness. In short, the 1941 ending lacks “the climactic theatrical snap, the surprise, delight, and zestful conclusiveness that trip the curtain in the act’s original ending, leaving the audience to catch its breath” (Berst, *Pygmalion* 47).³¹ But given that as astute a stage director as Shaw would have carefully considered the consequence of altering “the theatrical effects” that he had “so jealously worked out in every detail . . .” for the original London stage production in 1914 (Roll-Hansen 81), the revised ending to Act I strongly suggests that the aggrandisement of Freddy was of greater importance to him than the theatrical impact of the scene.

How the 1941 version discourages the notion of a Higgins–Eliza romance. In his revisions to Acts IV and V, and also to the appended (screenplay) scene outside Wimpole Street that he inserts between these acts, Shaw makes a number of significant changes that discourage the notion of a Higgins–Eliza romance and/or promote the likelihood of a Freddy–Eliza marriage. The first of these revisions is to the instructions for the ending of Act IV immediately after Higgins “*goes out with impressive decorum, and spoils it by slamming the door savagely*”. These 1941 instructions differ from both the 1916 and 1939 versions of the play and Shaw’s screenplay:

1916/1939 versions	Shaw’s screenplay version	1941 version
<i>ELIZA smiles for the first time; expresses her</i>	<i>ELIZA on her knees on the hearthrug, searching for the</i>	<i>Eliza goes down on her knees on the hearthrug to look</i>

³¹ Berst goes on to suggest that “a happy compromise between the [1941 and earlier] versions” could be reached by stage directors who “omit the taximan’s lines and the drive home but include Freddy’s raised hat and ‘Goodbye,’ with the curtain at [Eliza’s instruction to the taximan] ‘Bucknam Pellis’” (47).

<p><i>feelings by a wild pantomime in which an imitation of HIGGINS's exit is confused with her own triumph; and finally goes down on her knees on the hearthrug to look for the ring. (1916 text: 168)</i></p>	<p><i>ring.</i></p> <p><i>She finds it; holds it up in triumph; and replaces it on her finger.</i></p> <p><i>She rises, and makes for the door, very determined and self-satisfied. (Scene 36)</i></p>	<p><i>for the ring. When she finds it she considers for a moment what to do with it. Finally she flings it down on the dessert stand and goes upstairs in a tearing rage. (271)</i></p>
---	--	---

Why did Shaw change the ending of Act IV in his 1941 version? I would argue that, in the first instance, he recognized that his original (stage) ending encouraged romantic interpretations. When the curtain falls, Eliza is still searching for the ring. As Berst observes,

Eliza's search for the ring . . . suggests a sentimental attachment. Here is a touch of Cinderella, fittingly back among cinders, seeking an object that commonly symbolizes love. What will she do when she finds it? Throw it away? So far as romantics are concerned, not bloody likely. (*Pygmalion* 107)

In his screenplay version of the scene, Shaw had unwittingly provided romantics with ammunition to support a sentimental interpretation through the depiction of Eliza replacing the ring on her finger.³² Having witnessed how the 1938 film version had emphasised the romantic implications of Eliza's actions (underlined, as we have seen, by sentimental music on the soundtrack) through the tenderness with which Hiller/Eliza

³² Shaw could instead have discouraged this interpretation through the less personal act of Eliza placing the ring in a drawer.

replaces the ring on her finger, Shaw presumably concluded that a new ending was necessary if he were to de-emphasise the significance of Eliza's recovery of the object. Accordingly, in his 1941 version, he depicts Eliza's flinging of the ring on the dessert stand — a symbolic action that implies the severing of her relationship with Higgins. Yet, while more conclusive and dramatic than the original ending, Eliza's action does not entirely rule out romantic feelings on her part towards Higgins. As Berst goes on to write, "(I)n both versions Higgins has bought Eliza the ring, and it obviously means something to her whether or not she flings it on the dessert stand" (107–08).

Nevertheless, in contrast with Shaw's screenplay instructions, the "*tearing rage*" in which Eliza leaves the laboratory in the 1941 version ensures a more effective theatrically dynamic segue to her encounter with Freddy in the optional scene that follows. Consequently, in the three revisions that he makes to this scene, Eliza does not "[close] *the door softly*", as she does in Shaw's screenplay (Scene 43) when she leaves Higgins's house, but instead "*comes out, giving the door a considerable bang behind her*" (272).³³ Shaw also provides Freddy with a new line that immediately precedes Eliza's dramatic appearance outside the front door — "Goodnight, darling, darling, darling" (272). Thus, when Eliza abruptly emerges from the door, she does so seemingly in response to Freddy's declaration of ardour. Moreover, Shaw exploits Eliza's emotionally charged state both to create a more realistic psychological motivation for her willingness to respond to Freddy's startling loss of self-control when he "*smothers her with kisses*" (after only two exchanges) and to emphasise the passionate nature of their first embrace. Accordingly, Eliza no longer "*responds blissfully*" (Scene 44) to Freddy's kisses, but "*hungry for comfort, responds*" (273). This modification avoids the suggestion that Eliza is a somewhat passive participant in her first embrace with Freddy, while also depicting a more plausible emotional progression from crying — "*She breaks down and grabs [Freddy] by the shoulders*" (272) — to the seeking of comfort (as opposed to bliss) in the space of one exchange.

³³ Through this revision Shaw also avoids conveying the impression that Eliza harbours feelings of tenderness towards Higgins by virtue of her considerate behaviour.

As in the earlier versions of the play, Freddy does not reappear after this scene. However, Shaw makes two substantial revisions to Act V that strengthen the audience's awareness of Freddy and underline Eliza's apparent willingness to marry him. In both instances, the direct source of Shaw's revisions is his own screenplay. The first of these modifications affects the following exchanges:

LIZA. But dont you be too sure that you have me under your feet to be trampled on and talked down. I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as hes able to support me.

HIGGINS [*sitting down beside her*] Rubbish! you shall marry an ambassador. You shall marry the Governor-General of India or the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, or somebody who wants a deputy-queen. I'm not going to have my masterpiece thrown away on Freddy.

LIZA. You think I like you to say that. But I havnt forgot what you said a minute ago; and I wont be coaxed round as if I was a baby or a puppy. If I cant have kindness, I'll have independence.

HIGGINS. Independence? Thats middleclass blasphemy. We are all dependent on one another, every soul of us on earth.

LIZA. [*rising determinedly*] I'll let you see whether I'm dependent on you. If you can preach, I can teach. I'll go and be a teacher. (P189)

In his 1941 version Shaw modifies these exchanges as follows:

LIZA. But dont you be too sure that you have me under your feet to be trampled on and talked down. I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as I'm able to support him.

HIGGINS [*thunderstruck*] Freddy!!! that young fool! That poor devil who couldnt get a job as an errand boy even if he had the guts to try for it! Woman: do you not understand that I have made you a consort for a king?

LIZA. Freddy loves me: that makes him king enough for me. I dont want him to work: he wasnt brought up to it as I was. I'll go and be a teacher. (P41 292-93)

Shaw's decision to revise his text in this instance was presumably motivated by the fact that, while Eliza declares her intention of marrying Freddy in the previous versions of the play, the impact of her statement is undermined in several ways. First, Eliza provides no reason for her decision. Second, she makes no attempt to defend Freddy when Higgins dismisses her announcement and instead proposes his own choices of husband for her. Third, the topic of marriage swiftly evolves into a discussion on independence, and in the process Eliza implies that she does not envisage a shared life with *anyone* — “If I can't have kindness, I'll have independence.” By contrast, the 1941 version clarifies that Eliza's independence does not preclude a life without Freddy, and that, moreover, Eliza intends to demonstrate that quality by financially supporting her husband — “I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as *I'm* able to support *him*” [italics mine]. In this version, Eliza also provides both a reason for her decision to marry Freddy and a retort to Higgins's insistence that she deserves a king for a husband — “Freddy loves me: that makes him king enough for me.” Thus, by emphasising Eliza's marital intentions at this point in Act V, Shaw foreshadows Higgins's final line — “[S]he's going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy! Freddy!! Ha ha ha ha ha!!!!” (*P41* 280) — more effectively than in his 1939 version.

In the second of his Act V revisions, Shaw replaces Eliza's final line — “Buy them yourself” — with four lines of dialogue from his screenplay.³⁴ These are inserted immediately before the final exchange between Higgins and his mother, which, as previously discussed, is taken directly from the 1939 version. In the following comparison between the 1939 version and the 1941 version, the new (screenplay) material is underlined:

1939 version:

LIZA. Then I shall not see you again, Professor. Goodbye. [*She goes to the door*]
 MRS HIGGINS [*coming to Higgins*] Goodbye, dear.

³⁴ As noted in Chapter Three, Shaw also makes the same substitution in his screenplay.

HIGGINS. Goodbye, mother. [*He is about to kiss her, when he recollects something*]. Oh, by the way, Eliza, order a ham and a Stilton cheese, will you? And buy me a pair of reindeer gloves, number eights, and a tie to match that new suit of mine. You can choose the color. [*His cheerful, careless, vigorous voice shews that he is incorrigible*].

LIZA [*disdainfully*] Buy them yourself. [*She sweeps out*].

MRS HIGGINS. I'm afraid you've spoilt that girl, Henry. I should be uneasy about you and her if she were less fond of Colonel Pickering.

HIGGINS. Pickering! Nonsense: she's going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy! Freddy!! Ha ha ha ha ha!!!! [*He roars with laughter as the play ends*]. (P39 279–80)

1941 version:

LIZA. Then I shall not see you again, Professor. Goodbye. [*She goes to the door*]

MRS HIGGINS [*coming to Higgins*] Goodbye, dear.

HIGGINS. Goodbye, mother. [*He is about to kiss her, when he recollects something*]. Oh, by the way, Eliza, order a ham and a Stilton cheese, will you? And buy me a pair of reindeer gloves, number eights, and a tie to match that new suit of mine. You can choose the color. [*His cheerful, careless, vigorous voice shews that he is incorrigible*].

LIZA [*disdainfully*] Number eights are too small for you if you want them lined with lamb's wool. You have three new ties that you have forgotten in the drawer of your washstand. Colonel Pickering prefers double Gloucester to Stilton; and you don't notice the difference. I telephoned Mrs Pearce this morning not to forget the ham. What you are to do without me I cannot imagine. [*She sweeps out*].

MRS HIGGINS. I'm afraid you've spoilt that girl, Henry. I should be uneasy about you and her if she were less fond of Colonel Pickering.

HIGGINS. Pickering! Nonsense: she's going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy! Freddy!! Ha ha ha ha ha!!!! [*He roars with laughter as the play ends*]. (P41 294–95)

Berst argues that in the 1941 version, “Eliza’s detailing and countering [Higgins’s] order, . . . followed by her ‘What you are to do without me, I cannot imagine,’ coupled with Higgins’s emphatic declaration to his mother that ‘she’s going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy! Freddy!’ has Shaw pounding the audience with her decision at the curtain” (*Pygmalion* 134). The audience may not necessarily choose to *believe* that Eliza will marry Freddy, however. At no point in the 1941 version (or in any previous version of the play) does Eliza state that she loves Freddy, only that the latter loves *her*. In the absence of any indication that Eliza reciprocates Freddy’s feelings, audiences may be disinclined to accept that she would be satisfied by the (apparent) one-sided nature of her relationship with the latter. While one could argue that the optional scene (#5) in Wimpole Street suggests, at the very least, that a genuine physical attraction exists between Freddy and Eliza, Shaw’s explicit 1941 instructions regarding the non-use of the additional material (in conventional stage productions) preclude considering this scene as part of the performing edition of the play.

As for the issue of whether *Higgins* believes his own announcement that Eliza will marry Freddy, the 1941 version retains the ambiguity of the 1939 edition, since in both versions his declaration is a contradiction of the prediction that he makes to Eliza in his penultimate exchange with her — “You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl.”

Where the 1941 ending is arguably more successful than both the 1916 and 1939 versions is in the replacement of Eliza’s brusque “Buy them yourself” with her longer response to Higgins’s presumptuous shopping request. Eliza’s haughty but measured five-sentence response strengthens the crucial point that her intention to leave Higgins is a carefully considered decision rather than a flippant remark motivated by a moment of pique.³⁵

³⁵ Mrs Higgins’s observation that, “I’m afraid youve spoilt that girl, Henry” (first uttered in response to Eliza’s “But them yourself” in the original play) seems slightly incongruous here in the light of Eliza’s evident appreciation of Higgins’s extensive domestic needs. One may infer from Eliza’s response that it is, in fact, he, and not she, who has been “spoilt”. Indeed, in the 1938 version of Shaw’s screenplay, Mrs

However, the replacement of Higgins's smug assertion — “She'll buy em all right enough” — with “[S]he's going to marry Freddy” obscures the extent to which Higgins still maintains a strong sense of ownership over Eliza at the end of the play. The culminating point of *Pygmalion* — or at least of the original play — is Higgins's inability (or unwillingness) to recognise that Eliza has outgrown her dependence on him while he, in turn, has become dependent to a certain extent on her. To a large extent, Shaw undermines this point in both his 1939 and 1941 versions through his preoccupation with emphasising an Eliza-Freddy marriage.

Minor changes in the 1941 version. Shaw modifies his Preface in the 1941 version for the first and only time, making three changes. Firstly, he amends his reference to “the Poet Laureate”³⁶ — “to whom perhaps Higgins may owe his Miltonic sympathies . . .” — simply to “Robert Bridges” (*PAI* 198), in acknowledgement of the fact that Bridges was by then deceased.³⁷ Secondly, he updates his reference to the success of *Pygmalion* to include its cinematic adaptation: “I wish to boast that *Pygmalion* has been an extremely successful play, *both on stage and screen*, all over Europe and North America as well as at home” [Italics mine to indicate Shaw's additions] (198). Thirdly, and more significantly, he makes substantial changes to the final paragraph:

Finally, and for the encouragement of people troubled with accents that cut them off from all high employment, I may add that the change wrought by Professor Higgins in the flower-girl is neither impossible nor uncommon. The modern concierge's daughter who fulfils her ambition by playing the Queen of Spain in *Ruy Blas* at the Théâtre Français is only one of many thousands of men and

Higgins implies this when she says in response to Eliza's “What you are to do without me I cannot imagine”: “Really, neither can I” (Scene 47).

³⁶ Robert Bridges (1844–1930), Poet Laureate 1913–1930.

³⁷ Given that Shaw, as Laurence notes, regularly revised the Standard Edition of his works (*CL IV*, 532), it is surprising that he did not update the reference to Bridges in his 1931, 1936, and 1939 editions of *Pygmalion*.

women who have sloughed off their native dialects and acquired a new tongue. *Our West End shop assistants and domestic servants are bi-lingual.* But the thing has to be done scientifically, or the last state of the aspirant may be worse than the first. An honest slum dialect is more tolerable than the *attempts of phonetically untaught persons to imitate the plutocracy. Ambitious flower-girls who read this play must not imagine that they can pass themselves off as fine ladies by untutored imitation. They must learn their alphabet over again, and different [sic], from a phonetic expert. Imitation will only make them ridiculous.* [Italics mine to illustrate both additions and changes] (198–99).

In previous versions of *Pygmalion*, this paragraph had been:

Finally, and for the encouragement of people troubled with accents that cut them off from all high employment, I may add that the change wrought by Professor Higgins in the flower-girl is neither impossible nor uncommon. The modern concierge's daughter who fulfils her ambition by playing the Queen of Spain in *Ruy Blas* at the Théâtre Français is only one of many thousands of men and women who have sloughed off their native dialects and acquired a new tongue. But the thing has to be done scientifically, or the last state of the aspirant may be worse than the first. An honest and natural slum dialect is more tolerable than the attempt of a phonetically untaught person to imitate the vulgar dialect of the golf club; and I am sorry to say that in spite of the efforts of our Academy of Dramatic Art, there is still too much sham golfing English on our stage, and too little of the noble English of Forbes Robertson.³⁸ (P103)

The death of Forbes-Robertson four years earlier may have prompted Shaw to alter the final sentence of the Preface, although one could argue that by 1941 — with the Second World War then entering its third year and a generation of social upheavals having occurred in Britain since the end of World War I — Shaw may have concluded that his

³⁸ Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson (1853–1937), a celebrated actor and theatre manager. In his letters Shaw was inconsistent in his hyphenating of Forbes-Robertson's surname.

references not only to the British stage of Forbes-Robertson's era, but to the "vulgar" pronunciation of "the [upper class] golf club", had lost much of their relevance. Thus "the golf club" became "the plutocracy".³⁹

Shaw's reasons for other changes in his final paragraph are more difficult to determine. His observation that "Our West End shop assistants and domestic servants are bi-lingual" seemingly contradicts his assertion in the previous sentence that men and women who acquire an acceptable "new tongue" for the purposes of employment "have sloughed off their native dialects . . .", since it suggests that, in fact, such people retain their original "tongue".

In Act I Shaw both deletes and adds a small quantity of dialogue.⁴⁰ The first change occurs after Higgins proclaims that, "In three months I could pass that girl off as a duchess at an ambassador's garden party." As in his screenplay, Shaw deletes the lines that follow this boast: "That's the sort of thing I do for commercial millionaires. And on the profits I do genuine scientific work in phonetics, and a little as a poet on Miltonic lines." He then retains the screenplay additions that immediately follow these lines:

THE FLOWER GIRL. Whats that you say?

³⁹ One could also argue that by 1941, Shaw's interest in contemporary British theatre was equalled, if not surpassed, by his enthusiasm for the cinema. When asked by an interviewer in December 1938 if he considered the cinema as important as the theatre, Shaw had replied, "The cinema from the very beginning has been of much greater importance than the theatre. Its possibilities are tremendous . . ." (*BSC* 138). In 1941, he told interviewer Ernest Betts that, "All plays that are any good will have to be adapted to the screen" (*BSC* 158).

⁴⁰ As in his screenplay, he also clarifies the setting in his opening instructions: "[*The scene takes place*] not [*in*] *Wren's Cathedral but Inigo Jones's church in Covent Garden vegetable market . . .*" (201). This was presumably for the benefit of foreign directors of the play. As early as 1914, in an interview with *The Observer*, Shaw noted that, "In Vienna they think that Inigo Jones's church in Covent Garden is St. Paul's Cathedral" (qtd in Huggett 113).

THE NOTE TAKER. Yes, you squashed cabbage leaf,⁴¹ you disgrace to the noble architecture of these columns, you incarnate insult to the English language: I could pass you off as the Queen of Sheba. [*To the Gentleman*] Can you believe that?

THE GENTLEMAN. Of course I can. (210) [1941 text then rejoins 1916/39 text.]

In other minor changes, Eliza now says “he treats me zif I was dirt” (*P41* 217) in Act II, as opposed to “he treats me as if I was dirt”, and the instructions in that act for Pickering and Higgins when they recite their “Eliza, Elizabeth, Betsy and Bess” poem are changed from “*They laugh heartily at their own wit*” to “*They laugh heartily at their own fun*” (218). In Act III, Higgins now says — in response to his mother’s question “But where does this girl live?” — “With us, of course. Where *should* she live?” (255); the italicised word changed from the “*would*” of previous versions of the play. The source of each of these modifications is Shaw’s screenplay.

In Act IV, Shaw modifies Pickering’s “The garden party, a dinner party, and the opera!” to “The garden party, a dinner party, and the reception!” (265)⁴² in order to accommodate the possible inclusion (in a stage production) of the preceding Embassy reception scene. He neglects, however, to change Pickering’s subsequent reference to the “frightfully exciting” garden party,⁴³ at which his “heart began beating like anything” (265). This obvious oversight on Shaw’s part may confuse audiences at productions that include the Embassy reception scene, since Pickering himself tells Eliza at this event — the *third* social outing of the day, according to the 1941 version — that he is “(f)rightfully [nervous]. I feel exactly as I felt before my first battle. It’s the first time that frightens” (261).

⁴¹ Perhaps reasoning that this phrase is sufficiently forceful in itself, Shaw removes the screenplay instruction “*turning crushingly on her*” that immediately precedes this line.

⁴² Shaw retains, however, Higgins’s singing of an aria from Puccini’s *La Fanciulla del West*, the opera that he, Eliza, and Pickering were presumably returning from in the earlier editions.

⁴³ In Shaw’s screenplay, Pickering refers only to the (Embassy) reception.

In Act V, as in Shaw's screenplay (but not earlier versions of the play), Doolittle drops his "H"s on the three occasions that he says "Henry Higgins" (now "Enry Iggins" pp. 276–78),⁴⁴ in keeping with his Cockney pronunciation, while Eliza deliberately reverts to her Cockney origins when she angrily taunts Higgins: "Thats done you, Enry Iggins, it az" (293).⁴⁵ Later in the same act, Shaw replaces Eliza's reference to the unseen "Professor Nepean" of previous versions of the play with "that hairyfaced Hungarian" in a clear allusion to the dishevelled Nepommuck.⁴⁶ In making this revision, however, Shaw overlooks the fact that Eliza's reference to Nepommuck would be comprehensible only to audiences who had seen the optional Embassy scene.

Conclusions

In his 1941 version Shaw attempts to create a definitive edition of *Pygmalion* that represents, above all, his desire to ensure that the main focus of the play emphasises — more clearly than in his 1916 and 1939 versions — the likelihood of an Eliza–Freddy marriage. He attempts "to bring the play into line with [his] Sequel" (Roll-Hansen 90) while at the same time seeking to provide a corrective to the romanticisation of the Higgins–Eliza relationship in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film.

Through his inclusion of selected scenes from his *Pygmalion* screenplay, Shaw also attempts to present the 1941 version as the "official" screen version of the play. Indeed, it is possible that, intent on erasing memories of the non-Shavian material that had been incorporated in the 1938 *Pygmalion* screen adaptation, Shaw had wanted his readers to assume that the 1941 version comprised, in essence, the film's actual screenplay. Regrettably, however, Shaw appears not to have considered the implications of displacing both his 1939 and original stage versions of the play with an edition that, at the

⁴⁴ Doolittle nevertheless retains the "H" one page later: "A little of both, Henry, like the rest of us: a little of both" (279).

⁴⁵ In the original play, this line is less forcefully rendered as, "Thats done you, Henry Higgins, it has" (190).

⁴⁶ "I'll offer myself as an assistant to that hairyfaced Hungarian" (293).

time, was untested in the theatre. This decision was surprisingly at variance with the theatrical practice of a man whom Huggett describes as an “infinitely painstaking perfectionist”: a stage director “for whom no detail was too trivial to be worthy of his serious attention, and who had the talent to convey his ideas with that wit and liveliness which never deserted him” (115). Although the original play is still occasionally revived,⁴⁷ the dominance of the 1941 version — aided by the Shaw Estate’s longstanding embargo on the reprinting of the 1916 text — raises legitimate questions about the validity of its so-called “definitive” status. It is referred to as such in both *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw, Vol IV*, and in recent Penguin reprintings. As Berst observes,

While the [1941] edition may be considered definitive because it is the author’s latest, it presents a twofold problem: most specifically, we have a shift in mediums from the stage to film; more generally, we may question whether the talents of an author at 80⁴⁸ equal the talents of his prime.⁴⁹ (*Pygmalion* 46)

There are several significant aspects that arguably challenge the “definitive status” of the 1941 version. Firstly, the inclusion of the five screenplay scenes creates a tonal

⁴⁷ In July 2007, a revival was staged at the Theatre Royal in Bath, and was transferred to The Old Vic in London in May 2008. However, director Peter Hall departed from the original play in one important respect: according to theatre critic Michael Billington, in this production “[Tim] Pigott-Smith [as Higgins] both rejoices in Eliza’s new-found toughness and is bereft at her departure . . .” (*The Guardian*, 16 July 2007). Similarly, a revival by the Roundabout Theater Company at the American Airlines Theater on Broadway, New York, in October 2007 employed the 1916 text, but changed the implications of its ending, which according to critic Harry Houn “has Higgins staring forlornly at the audience after Eliza’s dry-eyed and emphatic exit” (*Playbill*, 19 October 2007).

⁴⁸ Shaw was, in fact, eighty-one years old when he wrote his revised (1938) *Pygmalion* screenplay and eighty-three when he created the 1941 edition.

⁴⁹ Roll-Hansen, citing the example of Shaw’s 1893 revisions to his 1892 play *Widowers’ Houses*, argues that, “[I]t is clear that only the young Shaw was capable of the sustained intellectual effort needed to improve a play” (85). Gibbs, although less critical overall of the 1941 version than Roll-Hansen, asserts that this version contains “structural and artistic flaws”, and laments the displacement of the original play with the later version (*A Life*, 333).

inconsistency. The dialogue in these scenes is generally less comic⁵⁰ and more conversational than in the original play. In the case of the interior scene at Angel Court, dialogue is omitted altogether, contradicting Shaw's 1931 assertion that in his plays "there must never be a moment of silence from the rise of the curtain to its fall" (*BSC* 77).⁵¹ Secondly, the screenplay scenes lack momentum and conclusiveness given that, with one exception,⁵² they were originally designed as bridging scenes for the purpose of concealing the theatrical origins of the play, with its division into discrete acts.

Moreover, by appending his screenplay scenes for optional use only, Shaw effectively surrenders authorial control over his work. Whereas both the original play and the 1939 revised version were written to be performed *in their entirety*, the 1941 edition lacks a definitive *theatrical* version of *Pygmalion*. In his "Note For Technicians" at the beginning of the 1941 version, Shaw instructs stage directors to omit the additional scenes in small-scale stage productions, but, as we have seen, the technical challenges that he introduced have often been overcome without the need for what he termed "exceptionally elaborate machinery". Consequently, the once "singularly elegant structure" of the original play has been placed at the whim of directorial discretion.

However, in terms of increasing the audience's awareness of Freddy — and correcting the 1938 film's trivialisation of this character — the 1941 version is clearly more successful than Shaw's two earlier stage versions of the play. In his 1939 version, Shaw changed the ending of the play so that the audience left the theatre with Freddy's name freshly imprinted on their collective memory thanks to the outpouring of Higgins's "[S]he's going to marry Freddy", but he quickly recognised that more substantial

⁵⁰ However, Roll-Hansen overstates the case when he argues that the additional scenes are "completely stripped of humour and fun and without the slightest admixture of Shavian paradox" (85). There is humour in Eliza's naïveté regarding bathing — and the dangers she associates with it — in the bathroom scene (#2), and there is both wit and paradox in the Embassy Ball scene (#3), notably when Nepommuck claims that Eliza cannot be English because "Only foreigners who have been taught to speak it speak it well" (*P41* 262).

⁵¹ From Shaw's essay "My First Talkie", written for the *Malvern Festival Book* in August of that year.

⁵² I.e., the bathroom scene.

additions were necessary. In particular, he realised that Freddy's romantic appeal, and its impact on Eliza, needed to be emphasised as early as possible in the play in order to distract attention from Higgins as Eliza's potential love interest. Thus, in the 1941 version, Freddy is no longer the impatient young man who exclaims "Well, I'm dashed!" as Eliza departs in his taxi at the end of Act I, but a gentler, less snobbish character; he twice bids her goodbye and raises his hat to her, underlining the contrast between his manners and those of his mother and sister towards Eliza. For her part, Eliza displays none of the indifference to Freddy that she shows in the earlier versions of the play: she addresses him by name, farewells him, and reveals through her naïve attempt at impressing him with false instructions ("Bucknam Pellis") to the Taximan that she cares about what Freddy may think of her. At the end of Act IV in the 1941 version, Shaw appends his screenplay scene (#4) in which Freddy and Eliza share a passionate encounter, and in Act V he substitutes Eliza's and Higgins's discussion on independence with a brief exchange (again, from his screenplay) that elaborates on the former's reason for wanting to marry Freddy ("Freddy loves me: that makes him king enough for me").

It is debatable, however, whether these modifications are sufficiently effective to convince audiences that Eliza will marry Freddy. Moreover, Shaw's attempt (in his modified ending of Act IV) to downplay the significance of the ring given by Higgins to Eliza, who angrily flings it aside does not necessarily negate the impression that the former still harbours romantic feelings for her mentor. As for promoting Freddy as Eliza's prospective lover, one could argue that Shaw errs by not making the optional screenplay scene (#4) part of the main text of the 1941 version, for rather than "[lessening] Eliza's dignity and [making] Freddy a fool", as Silver asserts (274), it represents evidence of a physical attraction between Freddy and Eliza. The scene is brief⁵³ and more theatrically dynamic than the other scenes that comprise Shaw's additional material. In addition, the spectacle of Eliza's and Freddy's departing in a taxi

⁵³ Excluding the brief (non-verbal) part of the scene that takes place in Eliza's bedroom, as she changes her clothes in preparation for her departure from Wimpole Street, Eliza's encounter with Freddy lasts approximately two minutes.

together at the end of the scene — in contrast with Eliza’s commandeering of Freddy’s vehicle at the end of Act I — conveys a strong sense of romantic resolution.

Both dramatically and thematically, however, the changes that Shaw makes to his main text to convey the notion of Freddy as Eliza’s future husband have unfortunate consequences for the play. By depicting a polite Freddy who obediently leaves the stage when Eliza tells him, “Dont let me keep you standing there” (*P41* 212) — rather than retaining Freddy on the stage to exclaim theatrically as she is driven away in the taxicab, as in the 1916 and 1939 versions — Shaw mars the effectiveness of his staging through his more subdued ending: Eliza’s taxicab simply “*drives off*” (212). The loss of the exhilaration of the original ending of Act I arguably undermines the momentum of the play.

More significantly, the 1941 version undermines the theme of independence. In his “original, more ambiguous ending” (Berst, *Pygmalion* 134), Shaw invites his audience to consider if Higgins is right when he smugly predicts that Eliza will return with his shopping. The evidence of Act V, in particular, strongly suggests that Higgins is mistaken, but in asking his audience to contemplate the issue, Shaw also allows it to consider the question of Eliza’s independence. *Has* she become an independent person — and, if so, would it be a betrayal of that independence for her to return to Higgins on what are clearly his own terms? Shaw obscures the issue of Eliza’s independence in several ways. First, Eliza no longer tells Higgins that, “If I cant have kindness, I’ll have independence.” Shaw presumably makes this change to avoid the possible inference that “independence” might preclude the likelihood of a life *without* Freddy, whom Eliza has earlier stated that she will marry. However, the loss of this line in the 1941 version robs *Pygmalion* of one of the original play’s most profound moments of self-discovery. As Holroyd observes, “The faint poignancy of the ending lies in the half-emergent realization that there is to be no satisfactory marriage for this Cinderella . . .” (*Pursuit* 331). But, having decided that he cannot trust his audience to reach any conclusion but an eventual Eliza-Higgins wedding, Shaw is obliged to remove the line, replacing it with the

(new) notion of Eliza as Freddy's provider: "I don't want him to work: he wasn't brought up to it as I was."⁵⁴

Lastly, Shaw asks his audience to consider whether Eliza will indeed marry Freddy, as Higgins laughingly declares at the end. This is a very different question from the one facing audiences of the original play; the question is no longer one of Eliza's independence, but of whether Freddy constitutes the appropriate husband for her. The irony (in light of Shaw's intentions) is that by obliging audiences to consider the question of marriage, Shaw unwittingly invites comparisons between Higgins and Freddy — and many may conclude that it is the former, not the latter, whom Eliza should marry. In this respect, Shaw's 1941 version of *Pygmalion* fails where his revised (1938) screenplay arguably succeeds.

⁵⁴ Here, Shaw appears to contradict the point that he makes in his sequel: "Will [Eliza] look forward to a lifetime of fetching Higgins's slippers or to a lifetime of Freddy fetching hers? There can be no doubt about the answer."

Chapter Six: *My Fair Lady* (Stage Version)

Introduction: Shaw on Musical Adaptation — and the Genesis of *My Fair Lady*

Although Shaw habitually rebuffed would-be musical adapters of his works, he was not opposed to musical adaptation *per se*. In an essay for the *Anglo-Saxon Review* in March 1901, Shaw asserts that composer Giuseppe Verdi, in his 1887 opera *Otello* — an Italian-language adaptation of Shakespeare's *Othello* — “often rises fully to [the play]” and that in certain passages he “transcends” or “enhances” the original work (*Composers* 224).¹ Similarly, Shaw writes that in the same composer's final opera, *Falstaff* (1893), an adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Verdi's characterisation of “Ford carries Shakespear's a step higher: it exhausts what Shakespear's resources could only suggest” (224).

However, Shaw was not amused when one of his own plays was musicalised, describing Viennese composer Oscar Straus' 1908 operetta *Der tapfere Soldat*² [*The Valiant Soldier*], an unauthorised German-language adaptation of *Arms and the Man*, as an amusing but unfaithful representation of his work.³ After reading the libretto, Shaw stipulated that future productions of the operetta were not to contain his dialogue or the names of his characters, and that “Mr Jacobson, the librettist” was to acknowledge that “the notion of his first act was suggested . . . by Arms & the Man” (Shaw, *Theatrics* 104).

Shaw's attitude towards the adaptation hardened, however, after reading the libretto of its English-language version — retitled *The Chocolate Soldier* — in July 1910, two months

¹ Nevertheless, he argues that this particular adaptation succeeds because of a paradox: “The composition of *Otello* was a much less Shakespearean feat; for the truth is that instead of *Otello* being an Italian opera written in the style of Shakespeare, *Othello* is a play written by Shakespeare in the style of Italian opera” (*Composers* 224).

² First performed in Vienna on 15 November 1908; libretto by Rudolf Bernauer and Leopold Jacobson.

³ Nevertheless, he conceded that the operetta was “much more to the taste of the general public than my comedy” (*Theatrics* 103–04).

before the operetta premiered in London.⁴ “It is a gross violation of the understanding on which I tolerated the German production,” he wrote at the time (105). Shaw was especially upset that, “One of the names [of the characters in *The Chocolate Soldier*] — Louka — is borrowed from my play; and several passages of dialogue are not merely burlesqued but lifted from my book verbatim” (CL II 935). He considered suing Straus and his collaborators, but eventually relented after gaining (fresh) assurances that no names or dialogue from his play would be used and that the theatrical programme would state, “With apologies to Mr. Bernard Shaw for an unauthorized parody” (CL II 935). These changes were made, and the operetta went on to become a major box office success in London — much to Shaw’s chagrin.⁵ In a speech given at the 2002 revival of the work at the Catholic University of America, Musical Director Ellwood Annaheim observed that, “The librettists . . . created some new incidents, glossed over the pacifist message, and . . . completely dismissed Shaw’s socialist significance” (2).⁶

Arms and the Man was in fact the second of Shaw’s plays to be adapted into a musical. In March 1906, *His Majesty*, a two-act adaptation of *Man and Superman* by American composer-librettist Shafter Howard, had premiered at the Majestic Theater in New York City. In its review of the opening night, the *New York Times* reported that the first half of the musical closely followed the original play’s Don Juan in Hell act, although “The characters are brought up to date, and so far up to date that they are projected into the inferno after a railroad collision in which an entire opera company is killed.” The unnamed reviewer went on to state that, “Much of the satire of Shaw is used in the book, and with the slang of the Rialto, . . . it made many laughs,” and its songs “were loudly

⁴ It had opened in New York the previous September. Laurence writes that both the New York and London productions among “the most popular musicals of the decade” (Shaw, *Theatrics*, n. 104).

⁵ As a matter of principle, Shaw had renounced any royalties on the operetta. It was a decision that he later regretted, as he acknowledged in a 1941 letter to copyright lawyer Paul Koretz: “I now, after allowing two or three fortunes to be made out of [*The Chocolate Soldier*] without interference, make its producers pay me a nominal fee of one shilling per performance in acknowledgment of my licence to perform it” (CL IV 605).

⁶ The British theatre critic James Agate publicly described *The Chocolate Soldier* as “Arms and the Man with the brains left out” (qtd in Smoker, *Lady* 7).

encored”.⁷ Notwithstanding its popular opening night, however, *His Majesty* closed after a mere twenty-four performances (Sturgis 193). One can speculate that it was the commercial failure of the work that may have convinced Shaw, if indeed he was aware of the existence of this musical,⁸ to refrain from taking legal action against Howard, whose adaptation (given its lack of fidelity to *Man and Superman*) was almost certainly unauthorised.

However, Shaw did not hesitate to threaten legal action against Franz Lehár⁹ when he learned in July 1921 that the popular composer was planning to adapt *Pygmalion* into an operetta. “Can you warn [Lehár],” he wrote to Trebitsch, “that he cannot touch *Pygmalion* without infringing my copyright, and that I have no intention of allowing the history of *The Chocolate Soldier* to be repeated” (*ST* 224). Twenty-seven years later, Shaw’s opposition to the musical adaptation of *Pygmalion* was as unequivocal as ever: “I absolutely forbid any such outrage,” he wrote in February 1948 to E.A. Prentice, an RAF serviceman who was seeking his permission to musicalise the play. “If *Pygmalion* is not good enough for your friends with its own verbal music,¹⁰ their talent must be altogether extraordinary” (*CL IV* 813). In April 1948, not even the prospect of the celebrated playwright-composer Noël Coward as adapter moved him when he was approached by New York attorney Fanny Holtzmann and actress Gertrude Lawrence. “Noel [*sic*] could

⁷ “‘His Majesty’ Produced.” *The New York Times*, 20 March 1906, p. 9. Bordman takes a much more critical view of the musical, arguing that in addition to possessing a score by Shafter Howard that “offered nothing of merit”, this “most un-Shavian concoction about an opera company killed in a railroad wreck” failed to reflect “the balanced debates that comprised Shaw’s scenes” (256).

⁸ *His Majesty* – not to be confused with the 1928 play of the same name by Shaw’s friend Harley Granville-Barker – is not referred to in any of Shaw’s published letters, nor is it mentioned by any of Shaw’s biographers.

⁹ Hungarian-born Lehár (1870–1948) was a prolific composer of German-language operettas for the Viennese stage, including *Die lustige Witwe* (1905) and *Der Zarewitsch* (1926). Several of his operettas became commercial successes in other languages, including English.

¹⁰ Shaw maintained that he had learned the art of “how to handle English words” not from “English men of letters”, but from the composers Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Wagner, “the masters of a universal language” (qtd in Wilson, 173). On another occasion, he credited Mozart’s opera *Don Giovanni* (1787) with teaching him “how to write seriously without being dull” (qtd in Bentley, *Shaw* 131).

not conceivably interfere in my business,” Shaw wrote to Holtzmann in his last pronouncement on the subject. “My decision as to *Pygmalion* is final: let me hear no more about it” (CL IV 817).

Why was Shaw so opposed to the musical adaptation of *Pygmalion*? Bauschatz suggests that Shaw’s rejection of the idea arose from his belief that the play, as it stood, was unsuited to musicalisation: “Being intensely musical,¹¹ Shaw understood instinctively the difference between a piece of dramatic literature and a libretto, and he knew his play to be an instance of the former” (194–95). Martin takes a similar view, arguing that since, “A play with music is, technically, a melodrama” and, given Shaw’s defence of naturalism in the theatre and his interest in moving “far beyond the restrictive models offered by the popular melodrama and the late 19th century society play . . .”, he may have regarded a musical version of *Pygmalion* as incompatible with his desire for “the construction of a new serious literary theatre” (46).

A more compelling reason, I would argue, is that being a profoundly musical person, Shaw may have anticipated the likelihood that his play, if adapted by a suitably talented composer and librettist, might be eclipsed by a musical adaptation.¹² Indeed, this was the concern of the Hungarian playwright Ferenc Molnár, Shaw’s near contemporary, who rejected an approach from popular Italian composer Giacomo Puccini to adapt his play *Liliom* (1909), reportedly telling the latter that, “I prefer *Liliom* to be remembered as a play by Molnár rather than as the libretto of an opera by Puccini” (qtd in McLamore 146).¹³ Financial considerations almost certainly played a part in Shaw’s resistance to

¹¹ Shaw began writing music criticism in the late 1870s, first for *The Hornet* (ghostwriting for two years for the impresario George John Vandaleur Lee), then for a number of publications including *The Star*, for which he employed the celebrated pseudonym Corno di Bassetto in 1889. He was music critic of *The World* from 1890 to 1894. Crompton writes that, “[M]usic was [Shaw’s] first and longest love” (xi).

¹² Martin makes a similar point in reference to the screen version of *My Fair Lady*, suggesting that Shaw’s chief concern, had he seen this film, might have been its artistic superiority to *Pygmalion* (58).

¹³ However, three decades later, Molnár allowed the popular American theatrical partnership of composer Richard Rodgers and librettist Oscar Hammerstein II to adapt *Liliom* into a stage musical (*Carousel*, 1945). Although Molnár admired the adaptation (Reid 46), his original concern that his play would be

musical adaptation, particularly of his more popular works. Shaw addresses this issue in a letter to Trebitsch in August 1921 in which he refers to his frustration at the financial impact of *The Chocolate Soldier* on productions of *Arms and the Man*: “While its vogue lasted — even whilst the mere memory of its vogue lasted — *Arms & The Man* . . . was banished from the stage: nobody would touch it.” He goes on to emphasise the financial implications of a similar fate befalling *Pygmalion*:

Pygmalion is my most steady source of income: it saved me from ruin during the [First World] war, and still brings in a substantial penny every week. To allow a comic opera to supplant it is out of the question. I might possibly consider an offer of £10,000 English money; but as matters stand now, if they attempt to use a word of my dialogue, or to connect my name or my play in any way with their abominable opera I will let loose all the engines of the Copyright law to destroy them utterly. I have no choice in the matter: the manager who is touring with the play in the provinces could sue me for damages if I ruined his business by letting Lehar loose on him. (*ST* 225)

Holroyd writes that Shaw’s unyielding stance on the musicalisation of *Pygmalion* “was one battle he believed he had won” (*Laugh* 57). Ironically, however, it was Shaw’s trusted producer, Pascal, who, in the summer of 1951, less than a year after the former’s death, approached the Shaw Estate¹⁴ with a proposal for a stage musical adaptation of *Pygmalion* “based partly on new scenes in his [1938] film version” (*GP* 268).¹⁵ The

supplanted by a musical version was arguably justified, for while *Carousel* has achieved enduring critical and commercial success, *Liliom* is today only occasionally revived.

¹⁴ In accordance with Shaw’s will, the executor of his estate was the Public Trustee. The Society of Authors was appointed as literary executor.

¹⁵ Specific details of these scenes have not emerged. I assume that Shaw’s trustees were aware at the time that the 1938 film included non-Shavian material, but agreed to Pascal’s proposal because of Shaw’s significant collaborative role in creating the screenplay. Valerie Pascal writes that four years later, during a legal dispute over the settling of her husband’s will, which included the issue of royalties for the then unstaged *My Fair Lady*, “The [Shaw] Trustee acknowledged the rights of the Pascal Estate in the [musical

following year, after “highly complex and prolonged negotiations” (Ewen 357), Shaw’s trustees accepted Pascal’s proposal,¹⁶ reserving, however, final approval of the musical adapters (Valerie Pascal 239).

Why did the executors of the Shaw Estate so promptly disregard Shaw’s explicit wishes regarding the musical adaptation of his plays? Smoker suggests that financial factors may have influenced their decision. In the early 1950s the Shaw Estate was in debt “due to the Inland Revenue [Department] having demanded a huge sum in death duties, based on an unprecedented formula for valuing Shaw’s copyrights” (*Lady* 4).

On the suggestion of the executors of the Shaw Estate, Pascal initially approached composer Richard Rodgers and librettist-lyricist Oscar Hammerstein II, then at the peak of their popularity after having “established a nearly infallible relationship with the theatre-going public” through four major box-office successes¹⁷ (Sears 133), two of which were adaptations of plays.¹⁸ Adapting *Pygmalion*, however, proved an impossible task for the pair. “It can’t be done,” Hammerstein told Lerner (qtd in Lerner, *Street* 38) after he and Rodgers had worked on the project for more than a year. Although neither Rodgers nor Hammerstein ever publicly commented on their reasons for abandoning the adaptation (Block, *Rodgers* 172), the pair presumably concluded that *Pygmalion*’s seemingly convention-defying qualities constituted insurmountable obstacles. As Gene Lees observes:

[In the early 1950s] it was considered imperative that a [Broadway] musical be built of two story lines. Since musicals were then almost entirely romantic, these consisted of a foreground love story between the two main characters and a

adaptation of *Pygmalion*] on the basis that, because of the changes [Pascal] had made in *Pygmalion* for the film version, he had been co-author with Shaw” (345).

¹⁶ Pascal was obliged to make annual option payments to the Shaw Estate in order to retain these rights (Pascal, *Disciple* 250).

¹⁷ These were the musicals *Oklahoma!* (1943); the aforementioned *Carousel*; *South Pacific* (1949); and *The King and I* (1951).

¹⁸ These were *Oklahoma!*, based on Lynn Riggs’s *Green Grow the Lilacs* (1931), and *Carousel*.

background love affair between secondary characters, the latter as often as not comedic figures who could be played for laughs. This arrangement allowed the main characters to get offstage for a time to rest voices and bodies while the secondary characters advanced the overall tale. *Pygmalion* permitted no such structure, since it had a one-line story, that of the relationship between Higgins and Eliza. (89)

Undeterred by Rodgers's and Hammerstein's withdrawal, Pascal approached a number of other prominent Broadway musical figures, including "Howard Dietz and Arthur Schwartz, Cole Porter, and E.Y. Harburg and Fred Saisy, all of whom . . . turned the project down as fraught with insoluble book problems" (Lees 88).¹⁹ Pascal then turned to Alan Jay Lerner and his composer-collaborator Frederick Loewe.²⁰ On this occasion Pascal believed that he had found his adapters, but in October 1952 Lerner and Loewe abruptly withdrew from the project (V. Pascal 241). In his autobiography Lerner writes that it was *Pygmalion*'s lack of obvious opportunities for musical ensembles and dancing, its absence of a subplot, and the fact that "until the last scene it was most definitely a non-love story . . ." ²¹ (*Street* 36–37) that contributed to their decision to withdraw. Moreover, he writes, the dialogue-driven nature of *Pygmalion* was a significant obstacle to the play's potential musicalisation:

The more we talked the more insoluble the problems seemed to become because, unfortunately, the characters in Shaw's play also kept talking, talking, and talking.

¹⁹ Valerie Pascal writes that her husband also approached composer-conductor Leonard Bernstein. The latter declined the proposal after studying the 1938 *Pygmalion* film (250).

²⁰ Lerner (1918–86) and Loewe (1901–88) were, at that time, moderately successful Broadway partners of ten years' standing whose best-known collaborations were the musicals *Brigadoon* (1947) and *Paint Your Wagon* (1951). The Berlin-born Loewe, son of a popular Vienna-based operetta tenor, was a former child pianist who had immigrated to the United States in 1924; the American Lerner was a graduate of both Harvard and the Juilliard School who had spent some of his adolescence in England. Loewe had been working as a revue songwriter when he met Lerner (then a radio writer) in 1942.

²¹ Presumably Lerner is referring here to the final scene of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film. He goes on to ask rhetorically, "[A]nd how, may I ask, does one write a non-love song?" (37).

Pygmalion is a drawing-room comedy and no matter how hard we tried, we did not seem to be able to tear down the walls of the drawing room and allow the play to unfold in a setting and atmosphere that suggested music. (35–36)

Ironically, it was Pascal's death in July 1954 that provided the impetus for Lerner and Loewe to reconsider the *Pygmalion* project. Upon reading the producer's obituary, Lerner writes, he immediately found himself "thinking about *Pygmalion* again" (43), and after discussions with Loewe, he and his partner surmised that, "[I]t no longer seemed essential that a musical have a subplot,²² nor that there be an ever-present ensemble filling the air with high C's and flying limbs" (43). More significantly,

[W]e gradually began to realize that the way to convert *Pygmalion* to a musical did not require the addition of any new characters to give the score the variety usually demanded. There was enough variety in the moods of the characters Shaw had created and we could do *Pygmalion* simply by doing *Pygmalion* [*sic*] following the [Pascal] screenplay more than the play²³ and adding the action that took place between the acts of the play. (43–44)

After considerable difficulty,²⁴ Lerner and Loewe obtained permission to adapt *Pygmalion* in February 1955, by which time they had already begun work on their then untitled musical adaptation.²⁵ They completed it in December 1955.²⁶ Rehearsals of the

²² However, as I will argue, in *My Fair Lady* Doolittle's story does, in fact, constitute a subplot of sorts.

²³ By "play" (for reasons that I will subsequently explore), I infer that Lerner is referring to the 1941 version of *Pygmalion*.

²⁴ Lerner and Loewe were obliged to negotiate first with the Pascal estate, which was embroiled at the time in a legal dispute between Pascal's widow and his mistress, and then with the Shaw Estate (Lerner, *Street* 46). Smoker writes that [Broadway producer] Moss Hart and [British theatrical company] H.M. Tennent Ltd were the parties that negotiated with the Shaw Estate (*Lady* 5).

²⁵ Among the titles Lerner and Loewe considered were "Liza", "Lady Liza", "Fanfaroon", and "Come to the Ball" (Lerner, *Street* 78). In an interesting coincidence, Gerald Bordman writes that the original title of the 1925 George and Ira Gershwin musical *Tell Me More* was to have been *My Fair Lady*, "but that was dropped as not [being] sufficiently commercial" (449).

adaptation — now entitled *My Fair Lady* — began in January 1956, with Moss Hart directing Rex Harrison as Higgins, Julie Andrews as Eliza, and Stanley Holloway as Doolittle. *My Fair Lady* opened on 15 March 1956 at the Mark Hellinger Theater in New York to excellent reviews. It subsequently won six Tony Awards,²⁷ and was an unprecedented commercial success in its genre.²⁸

In this chapter I address the following questions: (1) through what means does *My Fair Lady* continue the 1938 film's romanticisation of the Higgins-Eliza relationship? (2) To what extent is *My Fair Lady* more closely modelled on the 1938 *Pygmalion* film than on the 1941 version of Shaw's play? (3) In what respects does *My Fair Lady* depart thematically from Shaw's 1941 version, and what are the consequences of those changes? (4) To what extent does *My Fair Lady* conform to the conventions of Broadway musicals of its time?

A Preamble: Musical Adaptation, and the Function of Music in Drama

Theatre critic Martin Gottfried argues that, although “There is nothing immoral about an adaptation,” an original book²⁹ will always be preferred for the obvious reason that it has been designed specifically for a musical. Successful books, he asserts, “are . . . rarely good plays, but then they shouldn't be plays at all. They should be custom-designed for the musical theater's particular needs, conscious of musical usage, conscious of dance staging, conscious of dances and the presence of dancers, *conscious of being musicals*” [italics Gottfried's]. The exceptions among adapted works, he argues, have been those

²⁶ One additional song, “A Hymn to Him”, was written in January 1956, eight days after rehearsals had begun (Lees 124).

²⁷ These included the awards for Best Musical and Best Direction.

²⁸ Its 2717 performances during its initial six-and-a-half year run made it the then-longest running musical on Broadway, overtaking the previous record for a musical set by *Oklahoma!* (with 2248 performances). It was surpassed by *Hello, Dolly!* (Jerry Herman, 1964) in 1971 (Block, *Enchanted* 225 and 378). *My Fair Lady* premiered at the Drury Lane Theatre Royal, London, on 30 April 1958 (with the original Broadway cast of principals), and closed in October 1963 after 2281 performances.

²⁹ Gottfried uses the term in its conventional theatrical sense to denote the narrative or libretto of a musical.

stories and subjects and settings [that] have natural musical references. *The King and I* for example, has them in the exotic sounds and gestures of Siam. The story for *The Music Man* [Meredith Willson, 1957] is also itself musical, dealing as it does with marching bands and the rhythm of the salesman's spiel. Other subjects may not seem musical until that quality is brought out. . . . Lerner and Loewe . . . found rhythm and lilt in British social manners, and used these qualities to transform *Pygmalion* into *My Fair Lady*. (9)

Other commentators have taken a very different view on adaptations. Writing in 1975, Engel argues that, "To date, we have the evidence of [twentieth-century American musical theatre] history that adaptations have provided a sounder basis on which to build a musical show than original ideas" (*Theater* 62). He cites as a supporting argument the advice of Lerner, in his preface to *Brigadoon*: that aspiring librettists should

start off on the right foot and select a story that is all prepared for you. The translation of that story to musical form is quite complex enough. Within that frame you will find more than adequate challenge to your originality and enough on which to experiment (qtd in Engel, *Theater* 56).

Plays, in particular, have long attracted musical adapters. As Swain observes, although "The dramatic conceptions that underlie musical plays or operas may be adapted from most any source that has some potential for dramatic action," plays have provided the most frequent source for Broadway adapters, "simply because their adaptation is so much more straightforward than other sources . . ." (333). The translation of sources other than plays, he goes on to write, has generally proved more problematic to achieve:

The luxurious length and detail which are the very fiber of novels and legends proved too overwhelming for *Show Boat* [Jerome Kern and Oscar Hammerstein II, 1927] and *Camelot* [Lerner and Loewe, 1960]. The thematic consistency of [the short stories of] Sholem Aleichem eluded *Fiddler on the Roof* [1964]. The

dichotomy of religious experience and religious narrative [that] melded so well in St. Matthew's Gospel was the undoing of *Godspell* [Stephen Schwartz and John-Michael Tebelak, 1971]. Is it any wonder that the majority of the most critically acclaimed American musicals — which might include, but not be limited to *Porgy and Bess* [George Gershwin, DuBose Heyward, and Ira Gershwin, 1935], *Carousel*, *My Fair Lady*, *The Most Happy Fella* [Frank Loesser, 1956], and *West Side Story* [Leonard Bernstein and Stephen Sondheim, 1957] — sprang from conceptions already staged? (333–34)

Engel cautions, however, that there are five essential elements — “feeling, subplot, romance, particularization of character and situation, and comedy” — required of the source material, and that any play or other work that “would not permit of their introduction and assimilation . . . is antithetical to the requirements of a workable musical show” (*Words* 222). Successful translations from play to musical also require a significant reduction in the amount of dialogue carried over in order to make room for such non-spoken elements as song, dance, overture, and entr'acte. Engel argues that in order to create a feasible libretto from a play, the latter must be reduced to the point where it is “incomplete without music and lyrics” (*Theater* 62). Elsewhere, he emphasises that,

A libretto, of course, is not a play. It must in the first instance be highly compressed and able to make its important points succinctly. . . . Song is elongated speech and therefore consumes more time in saying the same thing. . . . Also, music can instantly create an atmosphere, set a mood, or convey a spirit that would otherwise require a great many words to do. Sometimes a single musical number can do the work of an entire scene of a play. (*Theater* 38)

Music may therefore assume a role that is equal to, if not greater than, dialogue. As Swain argues, “The music of a good musical play informs the drama that contains it, and the composer is a dramatist in his own right, more important sometimes than the person

who writes the words” (1). At the same time, however, music may also compromise the drama of the original work:

If drama is a product of words alone, then any musical adaptation must weaken the drama, because music is in general abstract, without explicit semantic reference. . . . But if actions are the stuff of drama, as Aristotle would have it, then words are just one way to articulate “the underlying structure of incident and character.” Anything else that can express the thread of the action has just as much right to dramatic representation as words. When the important actions are actions of feeling, or emotion, then music not only suffices, it surpasses the power of words to define the action. (1-2)

Indeed, Shaw also argues that music is more adept at conveying feelings than words alone. In an essay in *The Fortnightly Review* in February 1894, he compares the emotions that a youth might experience while reading a novel such as Alexandre Dumas’ *The Three Musketeers* (1844) with the more visceral experience of playing the vocal score of Giacomo Meyerbeer’s opera *Les Huguenots* (1836):

In the music you will find the body and reality of that feeling which the mere novelist could only describe to you; there will come home to your senses something in which you can actually experience the candor and gallant impulse of the hero, the grace and trouble of the heroine, and the extracted emotional quintessence of their love. (*Composers* 6)

Shaw goes on to write of his dissatisfaction with music that “tried to exist ornamentally for its own sake and had no real content at all . . .”, rather than serving to enhance the poetry or drama of a text (8). Elsewhere in his essays, he frequently refers to the role of music in contributing to characterisation (224) and describes such composers as Mozart, whose operas he greatly admired, as “musical dramatists” (164). His view in this respect is shared by Joseph Kerman, who argues that music can enhance drama through three

specific means: characterisation, action, and atmosphere creation. Kerman describes characterisation as “the most obvious” of these methods, for

[i]f feeling can be presented directly in music, as opera composers seem always to have believed (though philosophers have not always agreed with them), one agency of music in opera is to round out information about a character’s thought and action with insight into his or her inner life of feeling.³⁰ (215)

Kerman identifies action as a second means by which music can contribute to drama, since “music is especially well adapted to mirror, underpin, shape, or qualify individual actions — deeds done, steps taken, events arranged, and ‘psychological actions’ such as deciding, renouncing, and falling in love” (215). He goes on to describe his third category — the creation of atmosphere — as the “more ineffable” of the three, though “also very important”, for

[b]esides presenting individual feelings and defining the quality of local actions, music in opera works in a more general, pervasive way. Music of a particular sort establishes a particular world or a particular field in which certain types of

³⁰ In contrast, Peter Kivy argues that the ability of music to characterise is essentially limited to broad brushstrokes rather than meaningful insight. In a discussion of Mozart’s opera *Don Giovanni* (1787), he writes that, “The strange paradox here is that words *can* impart such significance, but [librettist] Da Ponte’s can’t; whereas music *can*’t, even when, as in the case of Mozart, it is music of genius. The depth is an illusion, brought about by the fact that the music is surpassingly beautiful and makes these otherwise dead characters live, *just as if* [italics Kivy’s] they were products of literary genius and lived — like Dostoyevsky’s characters, for example — because of the depth and complexity that literary language can impart. . . . But it is not in the words, and cannot be in the music; it is, I suggest, in the fantasy of the critic. No doubt, the beauty of the music makes these characters lives [*sic*], I do not pretend to know how — it is a brute aesthetic fact. However, their ‘depth’ and ‘complexity’ are illusion merely: the product of musical beauty, not psychological insight, which can only be expressed in the requisite way, by discursive language” (269).

thought, feeling, and action are possible (or at least plausible). This is what we mean, ultimately, when we say that music imbues atmosphere.³¹ (215)

A Note on the Issue of Textual Authority

One issue that immediately arises when analysing a stage musical is the absence of a complete “authoritative” text. The libretto, for example, contains the dialogue and song lyrics, but it does not contain the musical score. As Stephen Banfield observes,

A musical exists in no definitive form, and a performance is created from no single source. The vocal score and the script are separate, the orchestral parts separate again and, as it were, invisible in the absence of an accessible orchestral score . . . and the choreography and staging may not be fixed in notation at all. (3)

Even the original cast recording of a musical, Banfield goes on to write, may not be considered a reliable representation of the score “in view of the many ways in which it may differ from (let alone foreshorten) what was heard in the theatre . . .” (3). Lerner concurs:

A cast album is not merely a matter of recording what is heard in the theatre. The orchestra may be augmented, a song may be performed slower or faster, the number of verses in a particular song may be reduced, vocal reprises are omitted, and there may even be a change in the running order.³² (*Street* 118)

³¹ One example of the way in which atmosphere can be created in both opera and musical theatre is through the use of the overture. When employed effectively, the overture may “suggest setting, period, . . . or style, so giving the audience a foundation for recognition and appreciation of a show’s initial communicative thrust” (Kislan 222).

³² Lerner also goes on to acknowledge that in the case of *My Fair Lady*, the original cast album — despite being recorded only three days after opening night — departs in several minor respects from the score (119). These changes include the deletion of the final verse of Doolittle’s “Get Me to the Church on Time” and a different orchestral ending to the final track, “I’ve Grown Accustomed to Her Face.”

In any event, a *recorded* representation of a stage musical, whether it be a cast album featuring only the songs and orchestral items from the show or a filmed record of an actual performance in its entirety, remains *at best* only a guide as to how the work in question might be performed under certain circumstances.

For practical purposes, only the *My Fair Lady* libretto³³ will be used as the textual point of reference in this chapter, while the songs will be analysed as they appear in the vocal score, which includes all musical items in the show (including orchestral underscoring³⁴ and music for scene changes).

Pygmalion and My Fair Lady: A Structural Comparison

Although, structurally speaking, Lerner is correct when he writes that *My Fair Lady* is closer to the 1938 film version of *Pygmalion* than the play, it is in its final quarter that *My Fair Lady* most strikingly emulates the film's sequence of events and general plotline.³⁵ In both the 1938 screen version of *Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady*, Eliza returns to Covent Garden after her transformation (*PS* 75–76; *MFL* Act II, Scene 3), Higgins is seen reacting at Wimpole Street to the news that Eliza has departed (*PS* 76–7; *MFL* Act II, Scene 4), Higgins strides furiously along Wimpole Street after Eliza's departure from Mrs Higgins's home (*PS* 94; *MFL* Act II, Scene 6), and Eliza returns to Wimpole Street to find Higgins listening to a phonographic recording of her (*PS* 94–95; *MFL* Act II, Scene 7).

My Fair Lady also emulates the film's employment of montage for Eliza's phonetics lessons³⁶ (*PS* 38–40; *MFL* Act I, Scene 5) using a series of brief scenes — each of which

³³ The text in question is the original 1956 edition, published by Coward-McCann (henceforth abbreviated as *MFL*).

³⁴ I.e., background music.

³⁵ However, as will subsequently be discussed, *My Fair Lady* utilizes very little of the non-Shavian dialogue from the 1938 film.

³⁶ *My Fair Lady* also retains some of the equivalent film scene's (non-Shavian) dialogue, most notably Higgins's phonetic exercises, e.g., "The rain in Spain . . ." (86).

is punctuated with a “*blackout*” to convey the passage of time — and draws from the film’s second montage concerning Freddy’s attempts to visit Eliza (*PS* 51–52; *MFL* Act I, Scene 8). In common with the film, *My Fair Lady* also includes a brief scene at Wimpole Street immediately before the Embassy Ball scene (*PS* 55; *MFL* Act I, Scene 9) in which Higgins insists to Pickering that he is not nervous about the outcome of the evening.³⁷

On the whole, however, *My Fair Lady* follows the structure of the 1941 version of *Pygmalion*. Act I of *My Fair Lady* comprises the first three acts of *Pygmalion*, plus the Embassy Ball Scene (appended to Act III of *Pygmalion* in the 1941 version), while Act II of *My Fair Lady* comprises Acts IV and V of *Pygmalion*, together with the optional (1941) scene involving Eliza’s departure from Wimpole Street with Freddy. The 1941 version also appears to have been Lerner’s principal point of reference for Shavian dialogue in *My Fair Lady*, as indicated by the inclusion of an exchange from Act V³⁸ that exists only in this edition, and not the original play (nor in the Pascal screenplay). The closing line of the 1941 version (“Freddy!! Ha ha ha ha ha!!!!”) is also referenced in Higgins’s final song. Lerner does not utilise any of the material that appears exclusively in Shaw’s screenplay. Accordingly, in this chapter I have used the 1941 Constable edition of *Androcles and the Lion*, *Overruled*, *Pygmalion* for all page references to the stage version of *Pygmalion*. All references in this chapter to Shaw’s text pertain to the 1941 version unless otherwise stated.

Notwithstanding its relationship to both the 1941 stage edition and the 1938 film, *My Fair Lady* also differs in a number of significant respects from both these versions, most

³⁷ However, Lerner provides a considerable amount of new dialogue for this scene. Moreover, in the film, the scene involves only Pickering and Higgins; in *My Fair Lady*, Eliza and Mrs Pearce also appear. This scene will be discussed in the romanticisation section.

³⁸ I.e. the exchange between Higgins and Eliza in which the latter states, “Freddy loves me: that makes him king enough for me. I dont want him to work: he wasnt brought up to it as I was. I’ll go and be a teacher” (*P41* 293). This exchange originated with Shaw’s screenplay, where it included an additional (penultimate) line — “I’ll support him” — that Shaw subsequently deleted in his 1941 version.

notably in its first act, as the following table³⁹ illustrates. Scenes and/or details that are unique to *My Fair Lady* are underlined.

The 1941 text of <i>Pygmalion</i>	The 1938 <i>Pygmalion</i> film	The 1956 text of <i>My Fair Lady</i>	
Act I: Covent Garden. 11:15 p.m. Summer.	Scene 1: Covent Garden (daytime).		
	Scene 2: Covent Garden (evening).	Act I: Scene 1: Covent Garden. A cold March ⁴⁰ night, 1912.	
		<u>Act I: Scene 2: Tottenham Court Road. Immediately following. Eliza encounters her father.</u>	
	Additional Scene #1 (Eliza's taxi journey home and lodgings scene)	Scene 3: Eliza's taxi journey.	
		Scene 4: Eliza's lodgings.	
Act II: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, the next morning.	Scene 5: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, the next morning.	Act I: Scene 3: Higgins's study, Wimpole Street, the next morning.	
	Additional Scene #2 (The bathroom)	Scene 6: The bathroom at Higgins's house, Wimpole Street, the same day.	
		<u>Act I: Scene 4: Tottenham Court Road, three days later. Doolittle discovers Eliza's whereabouts.</u>	

³⁹ For a more detailed table (including the titles of the songs performed in various scenes of *My Fair Lady*), see Appendix 3.

⁴⁰ In contrast with the stage version(s) of *Pygmalion*, *My Fair Lady* begins in late winter (March) instead of summer. Presumably, this change was made so that Eliza's first public appearance after her linguistic transformation could take place outdoors at the (summer) Ascot Races approximately four months later.

<p>Act IV: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, midnight. Summer.</p> <p>Additional scene #5: Eliza's departure from Wimpole Street and encounter with Freddy.</p>	<p>Scene 14: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street. That same night.</p>	<p>Act II: Scene 1: Higgins's study. 3:00 a.m. the following morning.</p>
	<p>Scene 15: Eliza's departure with Freddy outside Higgins's house and in the neighbouring streets.</p>	<p>Act II: Scene 2: Outside Higgins's house, Wimpole Street. Immediately following.</p>
	<p>Scene 16: Eliza's return to Covent Garden.</p>	<p>Act II: Scene 3: Covent Garden, 5:00 a.m. that morning. <u>Eliza encounters her father and learns from him that he is getting married.</u></p>
	<p>Scene 17: Higgins's discovery that Eliza has left him (Higgins's bedroom, then his laboratory).</p>	<p>Act II: Scene 4: Upstairs Hall of Higgins's house. 11:00 a.m. that morning. Higgins discovers that Eliza has left him. <u>Pickering calls the Home Office for assistance, and Higgins compares women unfavourably with men.</u></p>
	<p>Scene 18: Piccadilly Circus.</p>	
<p>Act V: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, the following morning.</p>	<p>Scene 19: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat.</p>	<p>Act II: Scene 5: The conservatory of Mrs Higgins's house. Later that day.</p>
	<p>Scene 20: Eliza's and Freddy's departure by car.</p>	
	<p>Scene 21: Higgins striding through the streets of London.</p>	<p>Act II: Scene 6: Outside Higgins's house, Wimpole Street. Dusk, that afternoon.</p>

	Scene 22: Higgins's study. Immediately following.	Act II: Scene 7: Higgins's study. Immediately following.
--	--	--

As can be seen in this table, *My Fair Lady* departs from both the stage and the 1938 film versions of *Pygmalion* in that it introduces Doolittle to the audience *before* his first encounter with Higgins (*MFL*, Act I, Scenes 2 and 4), while also bringing forward the revelation of his social transformation (and impending marriage) so that it now precedes the events of Act V in *Pygmalion* and its equivalent film scene (*MFL*, Act II, Scene 3). In other significant changes, Mrs Higgins's at-home day (*Pygmalion*, Act III; *Pygmalion film*: Scene 9) is relocated to the Ascot Races (*MFL*, Act I, Scenes 6–7), while Eliza's taxi ride to Angel Court (and the interior scene in her lodgings that follows) and bathroom scenes are omitted.⁴¹

Why does Lerner make these changes? In the first instance, one could argue that Lerner — irrespective of his aforementioned suggestion that *My Fair Lady* lacks a subplot — modifies Doolittle's role to create one. In *My Fair Lady*, Doolittle encounters Higgins and Pickering on one occasion only (Act I, Scene 5), and because he does not appear in *My Fair Lady*'s equivalent scene to Act V of *Pygmalion* (*MFL*, Act II, Scene 5), he and Mrs Higgins never meet. Consequently, Doolittle's transformation and the announcement of his forthcoming marriage are events that occur in *My Fair Lady* without the knowledge of any of the other characters in *Pygmalion* (screen and stage versions), with the exception of Eliza. Moreover, apart from his visit to Wimpole Street, Doolittle's scenes in *My Fair Lady* are essentially confined to his back alley carousing with new characters Harry and Jamie.⁴² Lerner creates this virtual subplot, I would argue, to provide both comic relief and musical diversity.⁴³ In the former respect, he employs the second of

⁴¹ The thematic implications of these changes will be discussed later in this chapter.

⁴² Act I, Scenes 2 and 4; Act II, Scene 3. Harry and Jamie, Doolittle's drinking companions in *My Fair Lady*, are described in the libretto as “two disorderly members of the lowest possible class” (35).

⁴³ Doolittle's two extended back alley scenes (Act I, Scene 2 and Act II, Scene 3) also provide opportunities for the actors portraying Higgins and (to a lesser degree) Eliza to rest — an important consideration for Broadway performers, who are usually required to give eight performances per week.

Doolittle's new Tottenham Court Road scenes (Act I, Scene 4), in which the dustman delightedly learns from a neighbour that, "Moved in with a swell, Eliza has" (62).

Lerner employs this scene to break up *Pygmalion*'s long Act II; he cuts almost cinematically from Wimpole Street to Tottenham Court Road — and back to Wimpole Street again — in consecutive scenes. In the latter respect, he uses Doolittle's three back alley scenes simply to provide lively song and dance ensembles that contrast with the slower songs performed by either Eliza or Higgins in each of the preceding scenes (or, in one instance, earlier in the same scene).⁴⁴ This juxtaposition is in accordance with standard Broadway practice in which, as Engel observes,

Above all there is liberal contrast within the musical sequence. *Especially do ballads not follow ballads.* [sic] Interspersed among the slower and more serious pieces is a generous sprinkling of charm⁴⁵ and comedy material. . . . Ensemble choruses alternate frequently with solos, which are themselves distributed among a variety of different characters. Dancing appears at intervals, according to the opportunities determined by the libretto and the character of the show. [italics Engel's] (*Theater* 119)

Musical concerns also presumably contributed to Lerner's decision to relocate the events of Act III from the relative intimacy of Mrs Higgins's home to the Ascot Races, where

⁴⁴ I.e., Eliza's ballad "Wouldn't It Be Lovely?" (Act I, Scene 1), which she sings accompanied by a chorus of Covent Garden Costermongers, precedes the rousing "With a Little Bit of Luck" (Act I, Scene 2), sung by Doolittle, Harry and Jamie; Higgins's soliloquy "I'm an Ordinary Man" (Act I, Scene 3) precedes a reprise of "With a Little Bit of Luck" (Act I, Scene 4), sung by Doolittle and friends; and the melancholic reprise of "Wouldn't It Be Lovely?" (Act II, Scene 3), sung by Eliza and the Costermongers, precedes the lively ensemble number in the same scene "Get Me to the Church on Time," sung by Doolittle, Harry, Jamie, and the Costermongers.

⁴⁵ Engel defines *charm* songs as "combining music and lyrics in equal importance. The subject matter of the lyrics is light, and there is no attempt to make a comedy point. The musical setting is generally delicate, optimistic, and rhythmic, and may have, more than the music of comedy songs, a life independent of its lyrics" (*Theater* 108).

the assembled spectators provide the opportunity for a large-scale ensemble number (“Ascot Gavotte”). The public setting also enhances the comic element in Eliza’s verbal and social *faux pas*,⁴⁶ given that she now disgraces herself in front of a large section of British upper and upper-middle classes.⁴⁷

With regard to the omitted Angel Court and bathroom scenes, there are several possible reasons for their exclusion. Firstly, given that Eliza is the focus in each scene, Lerner may have been concerned at the prospect of attention being drawn away from Higgins, a character whom he regarded as “far more interesting [and] far more complex” than Eliza (*Street* 49).⁴⁸ Secondly, the essentially visual nature of these scenes would possibly have presented problems for their potential musicalisation. Thirdly, in respect of the Angel Court scene, Eliza’s ballad “Wouldn’t It Be Lovely?” (Act I, Scene 1), which she sings with the Covent Garden Costermongers after her first encounter with Higgins (while remaining in the Covent Garden milieu), constitutes a musical substitution with its allusions to the discomfort of Eliza’s present accommodation — “All I want is a room somewhere/Far away from the cold night air” (33).

In addition to these structural changes, Lerner substantially reduces the amount of dialogue that he carries over from the 1941 edition, utilising slightly less than fifty percent of the combined stage play and optional material from this version.⁴⁹

These cuts are arguably necessary in order to accommodate *My Fair Lady*’s sixteen songs, the lyrics of which constitute 38.5% of Lerner’s libretto. The largest cuts are to Act III of *Pygmalion*, of which Lerner retains less than one third, and to Act V, which he reduces by more than fifty percent. On a proportional basis, however, Shaw’s 1941

⁴⁶ Lerner changes this from “Not bloody likely” to “Move your bloomin’ arse!”

⁴⁷ However, as Bauschatz observes, the transfer of this scene from the relative privacy of Mrs Higgins’s home to a public gathering creates a “serious logical problem” given that Eliza’s humiliation occurs “in front of a large contingent of fashionable London society” (193). This makes it difficult to accept that no one in the Embassy Ball scene, which is set just six weeks after the Ascot Races, has seen Eliza before.

⁴⁸ Lerner also argues that “[Higgins’s] is the central story” of *Pygmalion* (*Street* 92).

⁴⁹ Nevertheless, Lerner asserts that, “sixty per cent of the original play is in [*My Fair Lady*]” (*Lady* 7).

version accounts for approximately sixty-eight percent of the total dialogue in *My Fair Lady*. Of the remaining thirty-two percent, Lerner's contribution amounts to thirty percent, while non-Shavian dialogue from the 1938 *Pygmalion* film accounts for two percent. The bulk of Lerner's original dialogue occurs in Act I, with Scenes 2, 4, and 6 consisting entirely of new material, while the phonetics lessons segment in Scene 5 (much extended from Shaw's optional scene #2 in the 1941 version) constitute the most sustained section of new dialogue.

Despite Lerner's substantial additions and changes for the musical, the oft-repeated assertion that the dialogue in *My Fair Lady* is merely *Pygmalion* "cut down"⁵⁰ remains a persistent myth among non-Shavian scholars. Musical theatre historian Gerald Bordman describes *My Fair Lady* as an "uncommonly faithful" adaptation (651),⁵¹ while Thomas L. Riis and Ann Sears assert in the *Cambridge Companion to the Musical* (2002) that, with the exception of three additional scenes, little of the original play was changed (148–49). Another advocate of *My Fair Lady*'s supposed fidelity to *Pygmalion* was Rex Harrison, who, according to Lerner, assumed "the attitude of Shaw's defender" during the development of the musical, opposing any attempts by its adapters to change Shaw's dialogue (*Street* 93). Lerner consequently felt obliged to deceive Harrison, emphasising the extent to which he had remained faithful to the play. The deception was apparently successful, Lerner went on to write; Harrison subsequently informed *The Times* "that in the entire [musical] there were only six lines not written by Bernard Shaw" (*Street* 96).

Romanticisation

The perception of *My Fair Lady* as a largely faithful adaptation of Shaw's *Pygmalion* was also shared by many of the New York theatre critics when it opened on Broadway on 15 March 1956. Reviewing the opening-night performance for the *Daily News*, John

⁵⁰ This is how Mordden describes it (*Roses* 154).

⁵¹ Bordman also incorrectly states that Shaw had "allowed" the ending of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film in which Eliza returns to Higgins, and asserts that this scene in the musical was the only major departure from the original play (652).

Chapman asserted that the adaptation “remains pure Shaw” (qtd in Bauschatz 181), while in the *New York Times*, Brooks Atkinson wrote that, “Shaw’s crackling mind is still the genius of ‘My Fair Lady’ ” (*Theater* 374–75). Yet many of the scenes that Atkinson goes on to praise (375) — including the Ascot Races, Doolittle’s Covent Garden pre-wedding scene, and the ending — were not written by Shaw and are either unique to *My Fair Lady* or the 1938 *Pygmalion* film. As Bauschatz, writing in 1998, observes:

Now, just about forty years after its original production, it appears that the portions of its text that carry the most weight within *My Fair Lady*’s musical structure are those that are least faithful to Shaw. Indeed, the scenes that provide [the stage version of] *Pygmalion* with some of its greater dramatic punch — Doolittle’s lament in Act V and Eliza’s recounting of her aunt’s death in Act III — are stranded in *My Fair Lady* by its focus on other issues. (195–96)

Chief among these “other issues” is the theme of falling in love, which, as Bauschatz also observes, constitutes to a large extent the principal narrative thread of *My Fair Lady* (189).⁵² Indeed, Lerner and Loewe signal this thematic change through their new title, with its obvious suggestion of romance.⁵³ Perhaps intentionally on Lerner and Loewe’s

⁵² In his initial review Atkinson forms the same conclusion, writing that “Mr. [Rex] Harrison is perfect in the part [of Higgins] — crisp, lean, complacent and condescending until at last a real flare of human emotion burns the egotism away and leaves us a bright young man in love with fair lady [*sic*]” (*Theater* 375). Nine days later, in a further review for the *New York Times* (in which he hailed *My Fair Lady* as one of the best musicals of the twentieth century), Atkinson again emphasized the musical’s romantic emphasis: “‘My Fair Lady’ is so much a romance that most theatregoers will probably be astonished to learn that Shaw never intended Eliza Doolittle and Professor Higgins for each other” (*Best* 117).

⁵³ In addition to being a possible pun on “Mayfair lady”, as a Cockney might pronounce this phrase (Paris 194), one could also argue that the title serves to differentiate the musical from Shaw’s play while also appealing to mainstream audiences (who might otherwise be discouraged from attending because of uncertainty over the title’s mythological reference). Broadway musical adaptations, in any event, usually carry different (and simplified) titles from the book or play on which they are based. Other examples from the 1950s include the musicals *Guys and Dolls* (Frank Loesser and Abe Burrows, 1950), which was based on the short stories *The Idyll of Miss Sarah Brown* and *Blood Pressure*, by Damon Runyon, and *Ernest in*

part, the title is also vaguely ambiguous, for to *whose* “fair lady” does it allude: Higgins’s or Freddy’s? Lerner encourages this ambiguity by prefacing the published edition of *My Fair Lady* with a note in which he avoids stating categorically which of these characters Eliza ultimately marries: “[In his *Pygmalion* sequel] Shaw explains how Eliza ends not with Higgins but with Freddy and — Shaw and Heaven forgive me! — I am not certain he is right” (MFL 7). Lerner’s supposed lack of clarity on this issue, however, is not reflected in his libretto, which only fleetingly presents Freddy as a possible love interest for Eliza before firmly rejecting him in favour of Higgins.⁵⁴ This section explores the methods that *My Fair Lady* employs both to emphasise a Higgins–Eliza romance and (ultimately) to minimise the impact of Freddy.

The romanticisation of the Eliza–Higgins relationship. From the outset in his libretto, Lerner signals his intention to defy Shaw’s intentions with regard to romance, replacing the amended description of Eliza in the 1941 version as “*not at all a romantic figure*” (202) with the original play’s “*not at all an attractive person*” (MFL 20). Significantly, it is the only occasion on which Lerner reverts to Shaw’s original text. As Coelsch-Foisner observes, “Clearly, [Eliza] *is* romantic in Lerner. Shaw’s denying his heroine any romantic status introduces — *ex negativo* — the undercurrent of romance which he carefully builds up and subsequently destroys in the course of the play” [original emphasis] (238). Lerner, however, makes Eliza’s unattractiveness only temporary — and her lack of hygiene barely perceptible. Because Lerner deletes Shaw’s description of her lodgings, “[w]e never see her going to bed in her underwear and the dirty rags she wears in the street” (Coelsch-Foisner 238). Similarly, Higgins’s own questionable hygiene and eccentric personal habits are downplayed in *My Fair Lady* to make him a more palatable romantic figure. As Coelsch-Foisner observes, by deleting many of the eccentric,

Love (Anne Crosswell and Lee Pockriss, 1957), based on Oscar Wilde’s play *The Importance of Being Earnest*.

⁵⁴ In an essay published in *The Shaw Bulletin* in 1956, Lerner argues that Shaw’s (1941) ending is “most unsatisfactory and strange”. He goes on to write that, “Shaw probably figured that the play had come to an end because Eliza had acquired a soul. That would have made the statue [i.e., in the Pygmalion myth] complete, and might be satisfactory on an intellectual level, but it is not satisfactory on a human level” (*Lady* 6).

antisocial and often-unhygienic personal habits ascribed to Higgins in Shaw's text⁵⁵ — “coming down in his dressing gown, half-choking himself with a fishbone, ill-using plates and dishes, or falling over chairs and tables in society” (236) — Lerner makes Higgins a less incorrigible bachelor:

In Lerner's musical, Higgins is a petulant boy who needs to be educated, but he is not beyond education. Shaw's Higgins is a complete social failure, [sic] Lerner's is a prospective husband from the beginning, apt to trigger a romance plot. (236)

My Fair Lady also “normalises” Higgins to a greater extent than in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film by removing any suggestion that he possesses a mother fixation. Whereas the film deletes Higgins's acknowledgement in the stage version(s) of *Pygmalion* (in reference to teaching “the best looking women in the world”) that, “I might as well be a block of wood” (229), *My Fair Lady* removes the entire reference. Similarly, *My Fair Lady* removes Mrs Higgins's comment (retained in the film) that, “You never fall in love with anyone under forty-five,” together with Higgins's response that, “I cant waste my time with young women. . . . Besides, theyre all idiots” (P41 245; PS 41). Moreover, at a much earlier point than in the 1938 film, *My Fair Lady* implies that Eliza is in love with Higgins. In the former, it is not until Scene 14 (the equivalent scene to Act IV in the stage *Pygmalion*) that Eliza's feelings for Higgins arguably become apparent; in *My Fair Lady*, an ecstatic Eliza reveals to the audience through song (in Act I, Scene 5) that her “heart took flight” in the instant that Higgins began dancing with her (94). Consequently, until *My Fair Lady*'s Higgins achieves his own moment of self-revelation twelve scenes later (Act II, Scene 6) in the “*terrifying discovery*” that he has “grown accustomed to [Eliza's] face” (181), the primary issue occupying the audience is whether Eliza's feelings for her mentor will be reciprocated.

⁵⁵ And also, one could add, in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, chiefly through the remonstrances of Mrs Pearce and Mrs Higgins, which are largely absent in *My Fair Lady* — particularly in the case of the former, whose two pages of criticisms in Act II (229–31) have been deleted.

One of the methods through which Lerner and Loewe romanticise the Higgins-Eliza relationship is the use of sung soliloquy.⁵⁶ Lerner writes that, “We tried . . . to illustrate the emotions that were not talked about [in *Pygmalion*],” (*Lady* 6). Having presumably concluded that their unspoken emotions should be similar feelings of attraction, both characters were provided with one soliloquy in which each alluded to the other in implicitly romantic terms (Eliza’s “I could Have Danced All Night” and Higgins’s “I’ve Grown Accustomed to Her Face”).⁵⁷ Moreover, both characters precede their respective songs with a soliloquy of denunciation in which the other person is severely criticised (Eliza’s “Just You Wait” and Higgins’s “A Hymn to Him”), thus ensuring that from rage follows resolution. In addition, Eliza and Higgins both sing a character-establishing soliloquy in the first act (“Wouldn’t It Be Loverly?” and “I’m an Ordinary Man”) in which aspects that are known about them in *Pygmalion* (for example, Eliza’s sentimentality and desire for a husband, and Higgins’s misogyny) are accentuated. Lerner’s motive in juxtaposing these soliloquies, I suggest, is to encourage the audience’s supposition that Higgins’s and Eliza’s incompatibility will follow the miracle of Benedick and Beatrice.

In the first of these soliloquies, Eliza — having remained in her Covent Garden milieu at the end of Act I, Scene 1 after Higgins and Pickering have departed — sifts through the coins that the former has thrown into her basket, and she sings “Wouldn’t It Be Loverly?” accompanied by a chorus of four costermongers:

All I want is a room somewhere,
Far away from the cold night air
With one enormous chair...
Oh, wouldn’t it be loverly?

⁵⁶ Lees argues that, “[S]oliloquy as a means to express a character’s inner state and to clarify the definition of his or her persona . . . is the most significant of the functions that songs serve in musicals” (100).

⁵⁷ As Wolf observes, *My Fair Lady* is one of a number of musicals in the 1940s and 1950s in which “Two principals, one male and one female, are introduced early in the show by solos that convey through music how they are opposites who will eventually unite” (*Buddies* 352).

Lots of choc'late for me to eat;
Lots of coal makin' lots of heat;
Warm face, warm hands, warm feet...!
Oh, wouldn't it be loverly?

As previously noted, these lyrics arguably constitute a musical substitution for the interior scene in Eliza's lodgings in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film; in common with the screen version, "Wouldn't It Be Loverly?" sentimentalises Eliza's poverty by downplaying its severity. Nowhere do *My Fair Lady*'s lyrics convey Shaw's 1941 description of her lodgings, with their "*irreducible minimum of poverty's needs*" (212). The most significant aspect of the song, however, is the way in which it departs from both the 1941 version and the 1938 film by expressing Eliza's romantic yearning:

Someone's head restin' on my knee,
Warm and tender as he can be,
Who takes good care of me...
Oh, wouldn't it be loverly?
Loverly! Loverly!
Loverly! Loverly! (33)

Although the audience may not necessarily associate Higgins at this point with Eliza's imagined lover, these lyrics encourage the expectation of romance, while also implying that Eliza, for all her linguistic and social crudity, is a gentler, more sentimental person than she initially appeared. But the lyrics contradict her stated wish in her next meeting with Higgins — "I want to be a lady in a flower shop stead of selling at the corner of Tottenham Court Road" (45) — by suggesting that, more than achieving independence, what Eliza desires most is a comfortable sanctuary with a loving provider.

Higgins's first soliloquy, "I'm an Ordinary Man"⁵⁸ (Act I, Scene 3), functions as a counterpoint to Eliza's "Wouldn't It Be Lovely?". In it Higgins envisions the consequences of allowing a woman to share his life, and, in contrast with Eliza's optimistic daydream, he "[imagines] the worst that could happen . . ." (Swain 200):

Make a plan and you will find
She has something else in mind;
And so rather than do either
You do something else that neither
Likes at all.⁵⁹ (57)

Musically speaking, "I'm an Ordinary Man" is constructed of three leisurely paced eleven-line sections alternating with three fast (chorus-like) longer sections of varying length. In each of the former, Higgins unwittingly reveals "that he lives with a much idealized and warped image of himself" (Swain 198):

I'm an ordinary man;
Who desires nothing more
Than just the ordinary chance
To live exactly as he likes

⁵⁸ This title has been misinterpreted. In an unfavourable review of *My Fair Lady*, Bentley writes that, "Higgins, who [in *Pygmalion*] had been the very type of an eccentric professor, becomes an average man and is celebrated as such in a song" (*Lady* 135). Yet Bentley overlooks the fact that the title is ironic, for it is Lerner who celebrates Higgins's supposed ordinariness, but Higgins himself in a revealing moment of self-delusion in *Pygmalion* — "Here I am, a shy, diffident sort of man" (231). As Shaw observes, "Higgins is so absolutely unconscious of his own character, [*sic*] that he is in a state of continual complaint and surprise because people have such unreasonable notions about him" (*ST* 174).

⁵⁹ These lyrics are clearly based on Higgins's Act II comments to Pickering in *Pygmalion*: "Women upset everything. When you let them into your life, you find that the woman is driving at one thing and you're driving at another. . . . I suppose the woman wants to live her own life; and the man wants to live his; and each tries to drag the other on to the wrong track. One wants to go north and the other south; and the result is that both have to go east, though they both hate the east wind" (228).

And do precisely what he wants
An average man am I
Of no eccentric whim;
Who likes to live his life
Free of strife,
Doing whatever he thinks is best for him.
Just an ordinary man.

The tempo then abruptly changes from a sedate “*Moderato*” to a very lively “*Allegro molto vivo*” for each of the fast sections. He begins the first of these as follows:

But let a woman in your life
And your serenity is through!
She'll redecorate your home
From the cellar to the dome
Then get on to the enthralling
Fun of overhauling
You. (56–57)

In each of these fast sections Higgins displays his apparent misogyny, with each denunciation becoming progressively more strident and preposterous, as his catalogue of complaints against women intensifies from likening them to a visit to the dentist to comparing them unfavourably to the Spanish Inquisition (57–58). However, by juxtaposing these hyperbolic statements with Higgins's manifestly inadequate self-assessment of himself in the first sections, Lerner implies that the attitudes expressed in the second sections are no more a reflection of his true character than the first — thereby undermining Higgins's misogyny. Loewe's music also questions the sincerity of Higgins's statements in both sections. As Swain observes, “The accompanying music seems ill-matched to [each of the first section's] weighty confessions; its quick dotted rhythms trip along more in the manner of the lightest intermezzo of a soliloquy” (199).

He goes on to write that if the music of the first section can be interpreted as suggesting “that all is not what Higgins claims it is,

should not the music of the . . . second section be similarly considered? For here the increased tempo, pattersong rhythms, absolutely periodic phrasing, and brassy orchestration give over a vaudevillian superficiality. Funny, yes, but is it real? This is the first hint of Loewe’s reinterpretation of the Pygmalion myth: if Higgins’s self-image must be questioned, then so must his misogyny. (199)

A similar juxtaposition is employed in Eliza’s second soliloquy: “Just You Wait” (Act I, Scene 5). On this occasion, the idea is to soften the impact of her implied hatred for Higgins. In this song, which follows a gruelling phonetics lesson, Eliza expresses her desire to exact violent revenge on Higgins: “Just you wait, ’enry ’iggins, just you wait!/You’ll be sorry but your tears’ll be too late!” (76). She wishes, in quick succession, illness, drowning and an execution on her mentor. However, the escalating violence of her imagined actions is mitigated in the middle section of the song by the incongruity of the accompanying music, which is gentle and lyrical.

Feelings of a very different kind are expressed in Eliza’s third soliloquy, “I Could Have Danced All Night,” which is sung later in the same scene and reveals that she is attracted to Higgins. The catalyst for the song is arguably Lerner’s most significant section of original dialogue in *My Fair Lady*:

HIGGINS: Eliza, if I can go on with a blistering headache, you can.

ELIZA: I have a headache, too.

HIGGINS: Here. (*He plops the ice-bag on her head. She takes it off her head and buries her face in her hands, exhausted to the point of tears.*)

(*With sudden gentleness*) Eliza, I know you’re tired. I know your head aches. I know your nerves are as raw as meat in a butcher’s window. But think what you’re trying to accomplish. (*He sits next to her on the sofa*) Think what you’re dealing with. The majesty and grandeur of the English language. It’s the greatest

possession we have. The noblest sentiments that ever flowed in the hearts of men are contained in its extraordinary, imaginative and musical mixtures of sounds. That's what you've set yourself to conquer, Eliza. And conquer it you will. (*He rises, goes to the chair behind his desk and seats himself heavily.*) Now, try it again.

ELIZA (*Slowly*): The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain.

HIGGINS (*Sitting up*): What was that?

ELIZA: The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain.

HIGGINS (*Rising, unbelievably*): Again.

ELIZA: The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain.

HIGGINS (*To PICKERING*): I think she's got it! I think she's got it!

ELIZA [*singing*]: The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain.

HIGGINS (*Triumphantly*):

By George, she's got it!

By George, she's got it! (85–86)

The tenderness of Higgins's actions — “*With sudden gentleness*” and “*He sits next to her on the sofa*” — coupled with the verbal expression of his empathy for Eliza (“I know you're tired”) is quite unlike the self-absorbed professor whom Shaw describes in Act II as “careless about . . . other people, including their feelings” (215), and signals the romantic direction that *My Fair Lady* will ultimately take. Lerner appears to have based this speech, at least in part, on Scene 10 in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, when an uncharacteristically gentle Higgins (as noted in Chapter Four) “*bends down*” to a crying Eliza to offer her encouragement after her disastrous appearance at Mrs Higgins's at-home day (*PS* 51). At the same time, the fact that a single speech is able to effect Eliza's linguistic transformation — Higgins's magic wand, as it were — shifts *My Fair Lady* from the relative realism of *Pygmalion* into a decidedly *fairytale* world. This aspect is accentuated by the unlikely physical encounter between Higgins and Eliza during the joyous orchestral moment that concludes “The Rain in Spain”, as “HIGGINS *turns and grabs ELIZA and they do a few awkward tango steps while PICKERING jumps around like a flamenco dancer shouting 'Viva Higgins, Viva.'*” (88).

Eliza's and Higgins's brief tango subsequently provides the point of reference for "I Could Have Danced All Night", which shortly follows. By this stage, Higgins and Pickering have retired to bed, and Mrs Pearce, who had been "awakened by a dreadful pounding",⁶⁰ tells Eliza, "I don't care what Mr. Higgins says, you must put down your books and go to bed" (91). Eliza, however, is "*lost on an errant cloud [and] only hears her from far below*". Using Mrs Pearce's final word as her cue, she then begins,

Bed! Bed! I couldn't go to bed!
My head's too light to try to set it down!
Sleep! Sleep! I couldn't sleep tonight!
Not for all the jewels in the crown!
I could have danced all night!
I could have danced all night!
And still have begged for more.
I could have spread my wings
And done a thousand things
I've never done before.

I'll never know
What made it so exciting;
Why all at once
My heart took flight.
I only know when he
Began to dance with me,
I could have danced, danced, danced all night! (91)

Lerner acknowledges that he and Loewe wrote the song to provide Eliza with "a great lyrical burst of triumph after she had finally conquered 'The Rain in Spain,' which

⁶⁰ I.e., the noise made during the tango.

would, at the same time, reveal her unconscious feelings for Higgins” (*Street* 87).⁶¹ Certainly, there can be no question that the “he” in this song *is* her mentor, and that audiences are likely to equate “My heart took flight” with the action of falling in love, regardless of whether Eliza has consciously recognised this yet.⁶² As regards Higgins’s own feelings for Eliza, however, the audience must wait until the penultimate scene of *My Fair Lady* (Act II, Scene 6) and his final soliloquy: “I’ve Grown Accustomed to Her Face”, for the implication that he has reached a similar epiphany.⁶³

To make this eventual revelation plausible, Lerner foreshadows it with intimations of a softer, more sensitive professor who behaves, at times, more like a gentleman and not as the social misfit with “no manners” whom Mrs Higgins describes (*MFL* 102). When, in instructions unique to *My Fair Lady*,⁶⁴ Eliza materialises on the landing at Wimpole Street dressed like “*a vision*” for the Embassy Ball (Act I, Scene 9), Pickering praises her beauty, and she “*turns to HIGGINS hopefully*” for similar comments (118). Higgins restricts himself to mild praise — “Not bad. Not bad at all” — but his furtive consumption of a glass of port a moment later when neither Pickering nor Eliza is looking, contradicting his earlier insistence that he does not require alcohol to steady his nerves, suggests that he was also being less than candid in his assessment of Eliza’s beauty.⁶⁵ After drinking the port, Higgins appears to lose his inhibitions, for as he leaves

⁶¹ These feelings were not always unconscious. Julie Andrews writes that during early rehearsals for the first production of *My Fair Lady*, a different song (entitled “Shy”) was featured at this point, and in it Eliza employed the word *love* when singing of “her feelings for Higgins. Alan Lerner realized that in Shaw’s original play, the main characters never once speak of love. Therefore, he and [Loewe] created another song, the famous ‘I Could Have Danced All Night,’ which conveys all the affection and emotion Eliza feels, yet never once mentions the word” (201).

⁶² Her lines “I’ll never know/What made it so exciting” suggest that she is puzzled as to why she feels a physical attraction to Higgins.

⁶³ For this reason I disagree with Lerner’s assertion that, “The *first* act [italics mine] of *My Fair Lady* — words and music — is devoted to the transformation of Higgins” (*Lady* 7).

⁶⁴ In the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, the equivalent scene (#12), which occurs immediately before the Embassy Ball, involves only Pickering and Higgins.

⁶⁵ In other words, Lerner’s text implies, if Higgins is capable of pretending to be complacent about the Embassy Ball, then could he not also be pretending to be indifferent to Eliza’s appearance?

the room, “*he pauses, turns and gazes at ELIZA*”, and then, in an action befitting a courtly prince, “*returns to her and offers his arm. She takes it and they go out the door, PICKERING following after*” (118). Higgins’s hitherto unseen courtliness towards Eliza is further emphasised at the Embassy Ball, where — in contrast to the 1938 film Higgins, who merely watches Eliza dancing with a real prince — he “*takes ELIZA in his arms and dances away with her*” (MFL 125). Thus, he fleetingly behaves as a prince, displaying a grasp of social etiquette that is unimaginable in Shaw’s Higgins.

Later, in the equivalent scene to Act IV in *Pygmalion* (MFL: Act II, Scene 1), Lerner further strengthens the prospect of Higgins as a potential husband by deleting the qualifier — “That is, to people in the marrying line, you understand” (P41 269; PS 71) — that follows his acknowledgement to Eliza that she is “what I should call attractive”. Lerner also deemphasises the serious nature of this scene by deleting Eliza’s bitter declaration that Pickering “might want [her clothes] for the next girl you pick up to experiment on”, together with Higgins’s “*shocked and hurt*” response: “Is that the way you feel towards us?” (P41 270; PS 72). When Higgins angrily departs at the end of the scene, Lerner modifies the implicit violence of the moment in Shaw’s text — that is, the spectacle of “[Higgins] *slamming the door savagely*” (271) — by altering his actions to behaviour that borders on slapstick:

He marches up the stairs with impressive decorum and spoils it by tripping on the top step. He successfully recovers but while looking to see if she noticed his awkwardness, he runs into the table and inadvertently turns on the machine. Guttural vowel sounds come pouring through the speaker. He turns it off violently and with a slam of the door, disappears. (MFL 142)

Through additional textual changes to the actions at the end of this scene and the use of soliloquy, Lerner also obscures Shaw’s point in *Pygmalion* that this moment signals the beginning of Eliza’s independence from Higgins. Immediately following Higgins’s exit — and in a change that emphasises feelings of a passionate nature rather than mere

sentimental attachment — “Eliza runs to the ring⁶⁶ on the floor and picks it up” (142). She then sings a brief reprise of “Just You Wait.” This has been transposed up a tone from the key of E-flat major (in her first rendition) to that of F Major, with Loewe’s instructions changing from “*pesante*” (heavy or ponderous) in the first version to “*agitato*” (agitated) in the second. The key change suggests that her feelings for Higgins have intensified — an aspect that is further emphasised by Lerner’s modifications to his lyrics in the reprise. Whereas previously Eliza had imagined achieving financial superiority over Higgins — “You’ll be broke and I’ll have money/Will I help you? Don’t be funny!” (76) — she now, “*with smouldering fury*”, dreams of hurting him *emotionally*:

Just you wait, Henry Higgins, just you wait!
You’ll be sorry but your tears’ll be too late!
You will be the one it’s done to;
And you’ll have no one to run to;
Just you wait, Henry Higgins, just you....
(*She gives way to uncontrollable sobs.*) (143)

Eliza’s crying undermines the conviction of her words, and, as in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film (when she also sobs at the conclusion of the equivalent scene), her distress emphasises the extent to which she has become emotionally attached to Higgins. The sense that Higgins is, in turn, becoming emotionally dependent on Eliza is implied in his next song, “A Hymn to Him” (Act II, Scene 4), in which he ostensibly returns to the misogynistic theme of his “I’m an Ordinary Man” — on this occasion condemning women as “exasperating, irritating/Vacillating, calculating, agitating/Maddening, and infuriating hags!” — but contradicts his denunciations by repeatedly bemoaning Eliza’s departure:

What in all of Heaven could have prompted her to go?

⁶⁶ In *My Fair Lady*, Higgins throws the ring across the room rather than into the fireplace.

After such a triumph at the ball?⁶⁷
What could have depressed her?
What could have possessed her?
I cannot understand the wretch at all! (162–63)

Lerner conspires to maintain this emphasis on the Higgins–Eliza relationship by removing Doolittle and Pickering from the *My Fair Lady* scene that is equivalent to *Pygmalion*'s Act V scene, and by restricting Mrs Higgins's appearances at the beginning and the end of the scene.⁶⁸ Of the long discussion between Eliza and Higgins that remains, Lerner deletes many of the more serious elements, including the latter's speech about commercial principles⁶⁹ and Higgins's disregard for "the trouble"⁷⁰ that Eliza accuses him of causing her. His motive, I infer, is to retain dialogue from Shaw's text that suggests romance and to delete material that discourages it. Accordingly, he retains Higgins's "You never wondered, I suppose, whether I could get along without you" (*MFL* 174) and the latter's acknowledgement that, "I shall miss you, Eliza. I've learned something from your idiotic notions. I confess that humbly and gratefully" (174). On the other hand, Lerner deletes two lines in which Higgins clearly alludes to his lack of interest in a romantic relationship with Eliza — "Once and for all, understand that I go my way and do my work without caring twopence what happens to either of us" (*P41* 290), and "If you come back, come back for the sake of good fellowship; for you'll get

⁶⁷ In no version of *Pygmalion* (stage or screen) does Higgins explicitly praise Eliza for her performance at the Ball.

⁶⁸ In Lerner's text, Doolittle, as previously noted, has already encountered Eliza, and informed her of his transformation and decision to marry (Act II, Scene 3). Pickering's absence is created by a textual addition in the previous scene in which he departs for the Home Office in order to seek advice about finding Eliza. Mrs Higgins's reduced involvement in the scene is explained by the (off-stage) arrival of the vicar — "MRS. HIGGINS (*horrified*): The Vicar, and the Professor? Good Heavens, no! I'll see him in the library" (*MFL* 172).

⁶⁹ "I am expressing my righteous contempt for Commercialism. I dont and wont trade in affection" (289).

⁷⁰ "Making life means making trouble. Theres only one way of escaping trouble; and thats killing things" (290).

nothing else” (289). Lerner also deletes Higgins’s speech in which he emphasises that if Eliza does return to him, he does *not* want her to be servile to his needs:

You were a fool: I think a woman fetching a man’s slippers is a disgusting sight: did I ever fetch your slippers? I think a good deal more of you for throwing them in my face. No use slaving for me and then saying you want to be cared for: who cares for a slave? . . . [I]f you dare to set up your little dog’s tricks of fetching and carrying slippers against my creation of a Duchess Eliza, I’ll slam the door in your silly face. (289–90)

This is a significant deletion in view of the fact that *My Fair Lady* retains Higgins’s closing line of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film — “Eliza? Where the devil are my slippers?” — with its implied message of expectation (on Higgins’s part) that Eliza is willing to assume the role of dutiful wife. Clearly, Lerner’s intention was to forestall the possibility of the audience inferring that Eliza’s return to Wimpole Street is a capitulation on her part. Lerner does, however, provide Eliza with a fleeting “ode to independence” (Block, *Enchanted* 237) in the form of her final song, “Without You”:

Art and music will thrive without you
Somehow Keats will survive without you.
And there still will be rain
On that plain down in Spain,
Even that will remain
Without you
I can do
Without you. (*MFL* 178)

As Block observes, the first three lines of the above chorus correspond to “a transformation into the major mode of [Eliza’s] ‘Just You Wait.’ Its first four notes also inconspicuously recall Higgins’s second song of act I, ‘I’m an Ordinary Man,’ when he

first leaves speech for song on the words ‘who desires’” (*Enchanted* 237).⁷¹ He goes on to write that,

By this subtle transformation audiences can subliminally hear as well as directly see that the tables have begun to turn as Eliza adopts Higgins’s musical characteristics. At the same time Higgins transforms Eliza into a lady, by the end of the evening Eliza (and her music) will have successfully transformed Higgins into a gentleman. (237–38)

However, the expected note of triumph at the end of Eliza’s song is interrupted by Higgins’s (musically) jarring reprise of “You Did It”⁷²:

I shall not feel alone without you.
I can stand on my own without you.
So go back in your shell,
I can do bloody well,
Without...

HIGGINS (*triumphantly*)

By George, I really did it!
I did it! I did it!
I said I’d make a woman
And indeed I did!

I knew that I could do it!

⁷¹ The lines Block is referring to are, “I’m an ordinary man/Who desires nothing more/Than just the ordinary chance/To live exactly as he likes”.

⁷² “You Did It” is an ensemble number sung by Pickering, Higgins, and the servants. It begins with Pickering and Higgins alternately recounting the events of the Ball. The servants respond by congratulating Higgins on his triumph, but they neglect to praise Eliza.

I knew it! I knew it!
I said I'd make a woman
And succeed I did! (MFL 179)

By denying Eliza her climactic note, Higgins arguably conveys (through musical means) that, irrespective of her new-found assertiveness, he still regards himself as the dominant partner in their relationship. Lerner then replaces Higgins's prediction that, "You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl" (P41 294) with "I like you like this!" (MFL 179),⁷³ thereby avoiding the fraternal connotations of Higgins's vision of comradeship. Lerner also brings forward Eliza's "Then I shall not see you again, Professor. Goodbye" (P41 294)⁷⁴ so that she now utters this line *in response to* Higgins's "I like you like this!" The implication of this rearrangement of material is that Eliza walks out because she has not received the romantic response that she was expecting from Higgins, and Lerner further departs from Shaw's text (and, to a lesser extent, from the 1938 film) by describing Higgins's reaction to Eliza's departure as "*thunderstruck*".⁷⁵ Lerner goes on to convey the impression of a deeply vulnerable Higgins who is unable to comprehend the notion of losing Eliza — "*He walks falteringly across the room and looks after her*" (MFL 180). The instructions and dialogue that follow (and which conclude Act II, Scene 5) are also entirely Lerner's:

HIGGINS (*Calling for help*) Mother! Mother!

(MRS. HIGGINS *enters*)

MRS. HIGGINS What is it, Henry? What has happened?

HIGGINS (*More to himself*) She's gone!

MRS. HIGGINS (*Gently*) Of course, dear. What did you expect?

⁷³ In the play, Higgins says this line in his previous exchange.

⁷⁴ In *My Fair Lady*, Eliza says, "Goodbye, Professor Higgins. I shall not be seeing you again" (180).

⁷⁵ In the 1941 version, Shaw uses the same word to describe Higgins's reaction to Eliza's announcement that she intends to marry Freddy (293). Shaw's purpose, however, is a different one. In his version, Higgins is "*thunderstruck*" because Eliza is prepared to marry "a young fool" rather than comply with his desire for her to be "a consort for a king". In Lerner's version, Higgins is clearly "*thunderstruck*" by the thought that he has lost Eliza.

HIGGINS (*Bewildered*) What am I to do?

MRS. HIGGINS Do without, I suppose.

HIGGINS (*With sudden defiance*) And so I shall! If the Higgins oxygen burns up her little lungs, let her seek some stuffiness that suits her. She's an owl sickened by a few days of my sunshine! Very well, let her go! I can do without her! I can do without anybody! I have my own soul! My own spark of divine fire! (*He marches off*)

MRS. HIGGINS (*Applauding*) Bravo, Eliza! (*She smiles*) (180)

Mrs Higgins's comments effectively replace the dramatic motivation that Eliza's departure with Freddy in the 1938 film provides, namely, to inspire Higgins to stride forcefully out of her house. But whereas the film Higgins marches through the streets of London after Eliza's departure, Lerner, out of theatrical necessity, confines the equivalent scene (Act II, Scene 6) to one street outside Higgins's house. Here Higgins sings "I've Grown Accustomed to Her Face." This is the most complex song in *My Fair Lady*, covering a variety of moods as Higgins alternately expresses anger, tenderness, bitterness, pleasure, benevolence, vindictiveness, and, finally, despair. The orchestral introduction, which is marked "*furioso*", comments ironically on Higgins's conflicted state by beginning with a thunderous recapitulation of the melody associated with the line "Let a woman in your life!"⁷⁶ in "I'm an Ordinary Man", and then gradually dying out as Higgins exclaims,

Damn!! Damn!! Damn!! Damn!! (*A sudden terrifying discovery*) I've grown accustomed to her face!⁷⁷

The orchestra responds to this statement with a brief introduction of the romantic melody that will accompany the main part of the song, which Higgins now begins:

⁷⁶ Swain describes the melody that accompanies this line as Higgins's "leitmotif" (209).

⁷⁷ This sentence is based on a now-deleted admission that Higgins makes to Eliza in Act V: "I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them rather" (289).

She almost makes the day begin.⁷⁸
I've grown accustomed to the tune
She whistles night and noon.
Her smiles. Her frowns.
Her ups, her downs,
Are second nature to me now;
Like breathing out and breathing in.

(Reassuringly)

I was serenely independent and content before we met;
Surely I could always be that way again—

(The reassurance fails)

and yet
I've grown accustomed to her looks;
Accustomed to her voice;
Accustomed to her face. (181)

Lees argues that the opening notes of the song are crucial to the audience's understanding that Higgins has experienced a significant moment of self-revelation:

The phrase, which starts on the tonic, goes, in musicians' terminology, I II III V V V V II; or in the key of C, C D E G G G G D. There are other ways one could set the words, but they would alter the emotional state of the character singing them. What Loewe did with them — what the partners did with them — is remarkable. The fall of a fourth, from G to D, has a tentative and puzzled quality. Higgins is amazed at this discovery that he's grown accustomed to her face. Change that melody by so much as one note and you abolish his amazement, thereby

⁷⁸ This is marked *moderato con tenerezza* (moderate with tenderness).

destroying the revelation that Maxwell Anderson assures us is necessary to a successful play. The whole resolution of Lerner's (as opposed to Shaw's) story is in that fall of a fourth from G to D. A falling fourth, depending on the context, has this sense of puzzlement or resigned acceptance: You would say "Oh hum" or Ah well" as a falling fourth. It is the sound of surrender — Higgins'. (Lees 319)

One difficulty, however, with accepting the fact that Higgins has hitherto been unaware of being "accustomed to [Eliza's] face" is that, as previously noted, Lerner retains Higgins's admission that, "I shall miss you, Eliza. I've learned something from your idiotic notions: I confess that humbly and gratefully" in the preceding scene. But given that Higgins has (presumably) never expressed romantic feelings before, it is possible to interpret the utterance "I've grown accustomed to her face" as the type of understatement that a character as (romantically) repressed as Higgins *might* utter as a substitute for a less ambiguous declaration of love. If one assumes this, then the title words do indeed assume the significance of a major self-revelation.

Throughout the remainder of the song, Higgins alternates between song and speech as he attempts to convince himself that marriage between Eliza and Freddy will end in failure:

(Bitterly) Marry Freddy. What an infantile idea! What a heartless, wicked, brainless thing to do! But she'll regret it! She'll regret it. It's doomed before they even take the vow!

I can see her now:
Mrs. Freddy Eynsford-Hill,
In a wretched little flat above a store.
I can see her now;
Not a penny in the till,
And a bill-collector beating at the door. (*MFL* 182)

Near the end of the song, Higgins exclaims: “Marry Freddy! Ha!”,⁷⁹ before stopping at the front door of his home “*in despair*” and returning to the main part of the song, which he concludes wistfully with:

But I’m so used to hear her say:
Good morning every day.
Her joys, her woes,
Her highs, her lows
Are second nature to me now;
Like breathing out and breathing in.
I’m very grateful she’s a woman
And so easy to forget;
Rather like a habit
One can always break — and yet
I’ve grown accustomed to the trace
Of something in the air
Accustomed to her face. (183)

These final lines, notwithstanding Higgins’s lingering attempts to rationalise his loss (“I’m very grateful she’s a woman/And so easy to forget”), confirm that he has indeed come to the realisation that his life without Eliza will be a bleak one. But do they *confirm* that he desires a physical love affair with Eliza or are they simply an intimate but ultimately platonic relationship with a live-in companion? Bauschatz infers the former, arguing that this song “makes it clear to us, if not fully to [Higgins], that he has arrived at an emotional point equivalent to the one that Eliza had articulated at the end of Act I scene 5” (193).⁸⁰ Intriguingly, Lerner’s instructions in the next and final scene of Act II validate Bauschatz’ inference, but they implicitly question whether Higgins’s repressed

⁷⁹ This is presumably based on Shaw’s 1941 ending of his play, in which Higgins says: “Nonsense: she’s going to marry Freddy. Ha ha! Freddy! Freddy!! Ha ha ha ha ha!!!! (He roars with laughter as the play ends)”.

⁸⁰ Bauschatz is referring to the sequence ending with Eliza’s song “I Could Have Danced All Night.”

nature will ever allow him to articulate, let alone act upon, his feelings — “*If he could but let himself, his face would radiate unmistakable relief and joy. If he could but let himself, he would run to her*” (MFL 186).

The final scene of *My Fair Lady* is virtually identical to that of the 1938 film (Scene 22), but whereas Howard/Higgins enters his study unaccompanied by music, Loewe underscores the scene with a song directly associated with Eliza — as Citron points out, “modulating to B-flat with a slow, soulful ‘I Could Have Danced All Night.’” (279). Thus, the wistful melody emphasises that Higgins’s thoughts are focused on the absent Eliza.⁸¹ The melody then stops as Higgins listens to the recording that he made of Eliza on her visit to Wimpole Street:

HIGGINS’ VOICE: It’s almost irresistible. She’s so deliciously low, so horribly dirty. (ELIZA *turns off the machine.*)

ELIZA (*gently*): I washed my face and hands before I come, I did.

(HIGGINS *straightens up. If he could but let himself, his face would radiate unmistakable relief and joy. If he could but let himself, he would run to her. Instead, he leans back with a contented sigh pushing his hat forward till it almost covers his face.*)

HIGGINS (*softly*): Eliza? Where the devil are my slippers?

(*There are tears in ELIZA’S eyes. She understands.*) (186)

As Higgins utters his final line — immediately before “[t]he curtain falls slowly” — the melody of “I Could have Danced All Night” returns “‘molto maestoso’ [very majestic] in the fresh key of E-flat” (Citron 279), thus implying that resolution has been reached. But what *type* of resolution? Eliza “*understands*”, but what exactly is it that she

⁸¹ Loewe’s use of a reprise melody underlines Swain’s observation that, “The most effective reprises . . . make their point . . . because the dramatic situation which calls for their reprise is different from the original. The reprise juxtaposes for the audience both the original context and the new, and thereby gives rise to a host of possible ironies and dramatic meanings” (414).

comprehends? Wolf argues that this ending is not a romantic one, since “the script does not indicate attraction, desire, or romance [on Eliza’s part] but merely her decision, unspoken but implied by her return, to be there” (*Problem* 154). Similarly, Kurt Gänzl argues that the understanding is “that this is all she will ever get. She can take it or leave it and, for the moment, she is apparently going to take it” (725). Yet Loewe’s majestic music contradicts such an implicitly melancholic realisation on Eliza’s part. I would therefore argue that Eliza’s tears of understanding signify her realisation that Higgins does indeed reciprocate her love, and that, regardless of whether he will ever be able to express his feelings for her in any conventional (verbal or physical) sense, she is nevertheless content to remain with him. Was this Lerner’s intention? In a 1956 essay he equivocated: “The end of the play, I hope, satisfies the desire of seeing them together, but without indicating that anything must or will happen” (*Lady* 7).

The marginalisation of Freddy. If the ending of *My Fair Lady* falls short of confirming that Eliza and Higgins will eventually marry, there is no such equivocation in its treatment of Freddy, who disappears from view at a considerably earlier point than in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film — and likewise without explanation.⁸² Nevertheless, Freddy is presented in a more sympathetic manner than he was in the film. As Coelsch-Foisner observes, “[In *My Fair Lady*] Freddy is just attractive enough to provoke tension but not worthy enough to win the lovely heroine” (241).

Yet, somewhat ironically, in light of Shaw’s opposition to the musicalisation of *Pygmalion*, it is through a “lushly amorous” song (Garebian 102), rather than dialogue, that Freddy briefly emerges as a plausible love interest for Eliza in the third of his five scenes in *My Fair Lady*.⁸³ In Act I, Scene 8, immediately following the equivalent scene of Mrs Higgins’s Act III at-home day in *Pygmalion*,⁸⁴ Freddy stands alone in Wimpole

⁸² Freddy’s final appearance is in the middle of Act II, Scene 3, when he has two lines of dialogue in a new scene concerning Eliza’s encounter with her father in Covent Garden.

⁸³ Freddy appears in the same number of scenes in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film. In *My Fair Lady* he appears in Act I, Scenes 1, 7 and 8, and in Act II, Scenes 2 and 3.

⁸⁴ I.e., the Ascot Races scene in *My Fair Lady* (Act I, Scene 7).

Street and sings “On the Street Where You Live”⁸⁵ — a romantic operetta-like tenor solo reminiscent of Eliza’s “I Could Have Danced All Night” in its soaring lyricism. The heroic quality of Freddy’s music,⁸⁶ coupled with what Lerner describes as “flagrantly romantic lyric[s]” (*Street* 106), emphasises a more ardent and effectual suitor than the buffoon-like character depicted in the 1938 *Pygmalion* film.⁸⁷

And oh! the towering feeling
Just to know somehow you are near!
The overpowering feeling
That any second you may suddenly appear!

People stop and stare. They don’t bother me.
For there’s nowhere else on earth that I would rather be.
Let the time go by,
I won’t care if I
Can be here on the street where you live.⁸⁸ (111–12)

⁸⁵ Several commentators have noted that the preposition “on” in this context is incorrect in British English. Benny Green describes it as “the one American blemish on an otherwise near-perfect simulation of British vocabulary and diction. No Briton, whether from the classes like Freddie, or the masses like Eliza, would ever have talked of being *on* a street. The British live in streets, Americans on them. The slip is all the more astonishing in that none of the three British stars of the pointed out the error, especially as it could have been corrected without spoiling either the rhyme-scheme or the rhythmic stress” (98).

⁸⁶ From a vocal standpoint the music is demanding, with near-octave leaps.

⁸⁷ Garebian expresses a different view, arguing that, “Part of [Freddy’s] lyric is pure romance; part stamps him as the butt of comedy — a poor serenading fool, quite overpowered by feeling,” and that the song’s “supercharged feeling” is more akin to “a fairy tale or courtly myth” (102). In response, I would argue that Freddy’s lyrics in this song are no more fanciful than Eliza’s sentiments in “I Could Have Danced All Night,” — e.g., “I could have spread my wings” and “My heart took flight” — and that they therefore suggest that Eliza and Freddy are emotionally compatible.

⁸⁸ Clearly, the inspiration for Lerner’s lyrics in this instance was Freddy’s revelation to Eliza in the new Wimpole Street scene of the 1941 version — “I spend most of my nights here. It’s the only place where I’m happy” (272). These lines, albeit in slightly modified form, are also featured in Act II, Scene 2 of *My Fair Lady* (146).

The distinctive melody of “On the Street Where You Live”, which also features prominently in the Overture,⁸⁹ has helped to make it possibly the best-known song of the *My Fair Lady* score, aided by the fact that it is one of the few numbers in the musical that can be appreciated out of context.⁹⁰ Had Lerner chosen to end Act I at this point, the positioning of this unabashedly popular song would arguably have prompted the audience to contemplate the notion of Freddy as a plausible romantic alternative to Higgins in Eliza’s affections. Lerner pre-empted this possibility by continuing with a further three scenes (none of which involves Freddy), and concluding Act I with the romance and suspense of the Embassy Ball scene, in which Higgins dances with Eliza and the wily phonetician Karpathy attempts to discover the latter’s identity. Thus, the central questions facing the audience at the intermission are unlikely to involve Freddy, but instead to focus on Karpathy’s possible exposure of Eliza, or to expect a romance between Eliza and Higgins. In respect of the latter possibility, one could argue that, in the orchestral Entr’acte that follows, the replacement of Freddy’s “On the Street Where You Live” theme⁹¹ with the melody of Higgins’s “I’ve Grown Accustomed to Your Face” provides a musical intimation of Higgins’s romantic supplanting of Freddy in Act II.

Moreover, in complete contrast with the music’s function in Act I, Scene 8, Freddy’s next appearance (Act II, Scene 2) undermines his suitability as Eliza’s potential lover. In this scene, which corresponds to Shaw’s additional scene #5 in his 1941 version (*Pygmalion* film: Scene 15), Eliza emerges from Higgins’s house immediately after Freddy has sung a reprise of the lines “The overpowering feeling/That any second you may suddenly appear!” from “On the Street Where You Live.” Seeking comfort, Eliza asks Freddy — as she does in both the 1941 version and the 1938 *Pygmalion* film — “[Y]ou don’t think

⁸⁹ The “On the Street Where You Live” melody occupies more than half of the three-minute Overture.

⁹⁰ In 1958 two renditions of the song entered the British Top Twenty singles chart concurrently. Engel argues that it is precisely the independent popularity of the song that indicates its lack of integration in the *My Fair Lady* score: “Suddenly there was a “pop” song that had strayed into a score [that was] otherwise brilliant, integrated, [and] with a great sense of the play’s own style and a faithful, uncompromising exposition of characters and situations” (*Words* 116).

⁹¹ As previously noted, this melody is the dominant theme of the Overture.

I'm a heartless guttersnipe, do you?" (*MFL* 146). For a moment, romance looks possible, but Freddy's vapid (sung) response, comprising saccharine lyrics set to a pastoral-like melody, emphasises his inadequacy to Eliza's needs where a passionate response is required:

Speak and the world is full of singing,
And I'm winging
Higher than the birds.

Oblivious to Eliza's "*disgust*" at this response, he continues to sing:

Touch and my heart begins to crumble,
The heavens tumble,
Darling, and I'm... (146)

At this point Eliza "[*turns*] on him violently", interrupting his singing with a song that juxtaposes Freddy's poetic ineffectiveness with strident lyrics and fiery music — described by Lerner as "almost a Spanish tempo, and in an agitated 5/4 [time signature]" (*Street* 67):

Words!
Words! Words! I'm so sick of words!
I get words all day through;
First from him, now from you!
Is that all you blighters can do?

(FREDDY *is frightened.*)

Don't talk of stars
Burning above;
If you're in love,

Show me!

Tell me no dreams
filled with desire.
If you're on fire,
Show me! (146–47)

The contrast of Eliza's musical assertiveness here underlines the impression that her character is too bold and individualistic for Freddy's conventional nature. In Shaw's 1941 version, Eliza frightens Freddy with the suggestion that she may commit suicide; in *My Fair Lady*, she frightens him with the violence of her words. Moreover, when Freddy attempts to embrace her, "*she pushes him away*" — denying him the kisses that both the 1938 film and the 1941 version allow him — and at the end of her song she "*answers the longing look in his eyes by crowning him with [her suitcase]*" (148). Freddy is never humiliated in this way in the film version. In an additional textual change, designed, one infers, to ensure that the audience further reduces its respect for Freddy, Lerner concludes the scene with the young man following Eliza with arms outstretched in stock character mode, crying "Darling...Darling...!" (148).

Elsewhere in *My Fair Lady*, Lerner employs various textual changes to minimise Freddy's impact on the audience. One significant difference between the musical and both the 1941 and film versions of *Pygmalion* is the way in which *My Fair Lady* truncates Freddy's involvement in the first scene (Act I: 1941 version; Scene 2: *Pygmalion* film). In *My Fair Lady*, Freddy does not return with a taxi at the end of the scene; instead he departs with his mother⁹² immediately after his collision with Eliza. Consequently, Freddy and Eliza do not meet again until six scenes later (in *My Fair Lady*'s equivalent scene to Act III of *Pygmalion*, Act I, Scene 7). Lerner's motive for dispensing with Freddy's return is arguably threefold. First, it enables Eliza to stay in her Covent Garden setting (as opposed to her commandeering of Freddy's taxi to return to her depressing Angel Court habitat), where she will meet her father in the next scene.

⁹² As will be discussed in the next section, Clara Eynsford Hill does not appear in *My Fair Lady*.

Secondly, by remaining in Covent Garden, Lerner is able to exploit the opportunity for a cheerful song and dance ensemble (“Wouldn’t It be Lovely?”) with Eliza and the Covent Garden costermongers with which to end the scene, as Eliza celebrates her financial windfall from Higgins. Thirdly, Lerner circumvents Shaw’s intention (in his 1941 version) to have the audience infer a possible attraction between Eliza and Freddy. Consequently, with Freddy only a fleeting memory by the end of the scene, there is little likelihood that the audience will associate him with the unnamed “he” when Eliza sings to the Covent Garden costermongers of her wish to have “Someone’s head restin’ on my knee/Warm and tender as he can be” (33).

Moreover, when Freddy returns in Act I, Scene 7 for the Ascot Races scene, Lerner changes the structure of Eliza’s public *faux pas* so that Freddy is no longer the addressee, but merely an observer, of her social gaffe.⁹³ This further reduces his impact on the audience. Indeed, so successful was Lerner in minimising Freddy’s visibility that at the initial out-of-town tryout of *My Fair Lady* in New Haven, the audience (apparently) failed to recognise that the actor portraying Freddy during his performance of “On the Street Where You Live” was the same person who had been present with Eliza in the previous scene. An explanatory verse was therefore hastily added to the beginning of the song (Lerner, *Street* 106).⁹⁴

Thematic Differences between *My Fair Lady* and *Pygmalion* (1941 Version)

As Swain observes, in one respect the Pygmalion myth is followed more explicitly in *My Fair Lady* than in Shaw’s play. In Act I, Scene 5, through “a succession of vignettes,” in which Higgins repeatedly drills Eliza on her pronunciation, we witness “Pygmalion sculpting his statue” (201). Moreover, it is during the initial lines of Pygmalion/Higgins’s

⁹³ Lerner replaces Eliza’s “Not bloody likely” with an incident at the Ascot Races in which the latter, to the dismay of the assembled “Ladies and Gentlemen”, exhorts the horse that she has a bet on to “Move your bloomin’ arse!” (108). Freddy’s only connection to Eliza’s gaffe is that he was the original purchaser of the race ticket.

⁹⁴ I.e., “When she mentioned how her aunt bit off the spoon/She completely done me in” (110).

speech of encouragement in this scene,⁹⁵ Swain argues, that we witness “the first indications that Higgins recognizes the person in Eliza . . .” (201). Whether Swain is right in this respect,⁹⁶ it is clear that *My Fair Lady* — like the 1938 *Pygmalion* film — is more concerned with depicting *how* Eliza’s transformation occurs than with raising questions about its consequences. The big three set pieces of *My Fair Lady* are the aforementioned phonetics scene, the Ascot Races Scene, and the Embassy Ball scene, each of which focuses on progressive stages of Eliza’s linguistic and social metamorphosis.

There are several likely reasons for this. First, all three scenes offer visual dynamism⁹⁷ — an important consideration for Lerner, who writes that, “[S]omehow in a musical you expect everyone to stand up as much as possible” (*Lady* 5). Secondly, the first two of these scenes are highly comic. This element is consistent with Lerner’s approach throughout *My Fair Lady*, in which he generally maintains a lightness of tone, both in his own dialogue and the Shavian material that he retains. Accordingly, he deletes many of the more philosophical or non-comic discussions from *Pygmalion*, particularly those of Acts III and V.⁹⁸ Third, questions or comments from various characters in *Pygmalion*

⁹⁵ I.e., “Eliza, I know you’re tired. I know your head aches,” etc. (86).

⁹⁶ I would argue that notwithstanding Lerner’s retention of Higgins’s cruel observation (deleted in the 1938 film) that Eliza has “no right to live” (*MFL* 26), he makes a subsequent textual change that implies that Higgins does indeed regard Eliza as a sentient being. In Act I, Scene 3, he retains Pickering’s exhortation to Higgins that, “If [Eliza] is to put herself in your hands for six months for an experiment in teaching, she must understand thoroughly what’s she’s doing,” but deletes Higgins’s dismissive response, “How can she? She’s incapable of understanding anything” (224), replacing it with instructions that Higgins “*impressed with PICKERING’S logic, considers for a moment*” (*MFL* 54).

⁹⁷ E.g. in the phonetics scene Eliza almost faints after repeatedly speaking into a gas burner, Higgins feeds the strawberry tart that Eliza has been coveting to his pet bird, and Eliza swallows one of six marbles that Higgins has placed in her mouth (78–84); in the Ascot Races scene is “*The stage is filled with ladies and gentlemen of Ascot all appropriately attired for the occasion*” (99); and the Embassy Ball scene is a “[s]umptuous” and “[d]ecorous” spectacle (125).

⁹⁸ E.g., Higgins’s Act III comments to the Eynsford Hills — “You see, we’re all savages, more or less”, etc. (249); all of Doolittle’s first speech and most of his second in Act V (277-79), together with Higgins’s reference to the brutality of “the life of the gutter”, and his comparison of that life with his own (292).

about the consequences of Eliza's metamorphosis⁹⁹ draw attention away from Higgins, whose own transformation is the underlying theme of *My Fair Lady's* second act. In short, once Lerner establishes that Eliza's external transformation is complete and that she is clearly in love with Higgins, he moves the focus in *My Fair Lady* away from her. In initiating this development, Lerner writes that he was determined to counter what he considered Shaw's "perversity" in making Eliza — not Higgins — the most important character in Acts IV and V of *Pygmalion* (*Lady* 10). Consequently, the principal difference between Shaw's and Lerner's texts is that in the former the only spiritual metamorphosis that occurs is Eliza's, while in the latter, Higgins himself undergoes a transformation that is at least as significant as that of Eliza when he is "humanised", as it were, by the act of falling in love with her.

Lerner also downplays Doolittle's transformation. The removal of his appearance at Mrs Higgins's home after he receives his bequest from Ezra Wallingford¹⁰⁰ ensures that he is never witnessed interacting in genteel society, thus obscuring the point made in *Pygmalion* that money alone enables him to be elevated to the middle classes. Indeed, there is no indication in Lerner's libretto that Doolittle has even left his original environment in the Tottenham Court Road area, for he continues to carouse with the same group of people and drink at the same establishment. As Bauschatz observes, "Every aspect of *My Fair Lady* conspires to keep Doolittle at its conclusion in exactly the same social position he was in at the beginning" (189). For this reason, Doolittle's claim that his middle-class position obliges him to marry his common-law wife — a predicament expressed here in less compelling terms than in *Pygmalion*¹⁰¹ — now makes

⁹⁹ E.g., Mrs Pearce's remonstrance to Higgins that, "[W]hen you get interested in people's accents, you never think or care what may happen to them or you" (225); Mrs Higgins's allusion to "the problem of what is to be done with [Eliza] afterwards" (258); and Eliza's "You never thought of the trouble [the experiment] would make for me" (290). None of these lines exists in *My Fair Lady*.

¹⁰⁰ Previously Ezra D. Wannafeller in *Pygmalion*. In a curious reversal between the two characters' names, Doolittle acquires a middle initial ("P") in Lerner's libretto.

¹⁰¹ In *Pygmalion*, Doolittle states that "respectability has broke all the spirit out of [Eliza's] stepmother" (*P41* 182), and implies that, consequently, she feels forced to submit to its conventions — "She's been very

little sense. In *My Fair Lady* Doolittle tells Eliza that he is “miserable”, but part of the comic irony that underscores his misery in *Pygmalion* is absent here, namely, that the once-chronic sponger is now the sponged upon. If anything, Doolittle appears to enjoy sharing his new-found wealth,¹⁰² and his middle-class responsibilities appear much less onerous than in *Pygmalion*. He is not “*overcome by emotion*” (P41 279) at his predicament, nor does he elaborate that it is his fear of the workhouse that renders him too “intimidated” (MFL 154) to repudiate his bequest. The social resonances of *Pygmalion* are considerably downplayed in *My Fair Lady*. As Bauschatz observes, “Because Doolittle, not Eliza, provides the most cogent social commentary in *Pygmalion*, his marginalization most firmly skewers *My Fair Lady* away from *Pygmalion*’s central concerns with class, power, and money” (189).

Moreover, the fact that we now encounter Doolittle *before* he meets Higgins ensures that his financial motives are established in advance, thus undermining the comic surprise of his machinations at Wimpole Street.¹⁰³ As Bauschatz notes, our advance knowledge of Doolittle’s avarice also creates a logical problem:

The odd moral turn he must take in the dialogue — that is, he must through moral scruple refuse ten pounds because he understands the precariousness of having too much money — rings untrue. *My Fair Lady*’s Doolittle has already been established as a character who is out to get whatever he can, and there is not a reason in the world that he should balk at taking ten pounds. (188–89)

Some of Lerner’s other changes also affect the interrelated themes of money and class. Although his and Loewe’s decision to set their musical in the approximate period of

low, thinking of the happy days that are no more” (286); in *My Fair Lady*, this is changed to the much more prosaic, “Now that I’m respectable — she wants to be respectable” (153).

¹⁰² In Act II, Scene 3, he gives the bartender “*a generous tip*”, telling the man to “take the missus a trip to Brighton” (152).

¹⁰³ In a 1936 letter to Eberhard K. Klagemann, Shaw argues that the German film version of *Pygmalion* spoiled the “dramatic surprise” of Doolittle’s entry “by telling the audience beforehand that it is going to happen . . .” (BSC 97).

Shaw's play (1912) was motivated by the fact that "class distinction is not [in 1956] as crucial an issue as it was in those days", there is less evidence in *My Fair Lady* of the stigmas and deprivation that Eliza and her fellow working-class members face. As in the 1938 film, Higgins does not observe "that a woman of [Eliza's] class looks a worn out drudge of fifty a year after she's married" (221), nor does the Bystander tell him that, "You take us for dirt under your feet, dont you?" (207). Moreover, in the less oppressed working-class world that Eliza inhabits in *My Fair Lady*, Mrs Eynsford-Hill¹⁰⁴ does not imply that she is a prostitute,¹⁰⁵ and Freddy behaves respectfully towards her, apologising profusely when he collides with her and "*Clumsily trying to help her*" to gather up her violets (*MFL* 16). Moreover, a modification suggests that in spite of their class differences, Mrs Higgins already views the former flower-seller as a prospective daughter-in-law. She displays a protective attitude towards Eliza at a much earlier stage than in *Pygmalion*, appearing in the Embassy Ball scene and informing Pickering that, "I've grown terribly fond of that girl" (121).

The diminution of the themes of money and class may also explain why Lerner omits the character of Clara Eynsford Hill in his libretto. In *Pygmalion*, Clara worries about the "sixpence thrown away" on Eliza (203), underscoring the genteel poverty of her family, but in *My Fair Lady* there is no indication that the Eynsford-Hills live in straitened circumstances. Both Mrs Eynsford-Hill and Freddy appear in the new Ascot Races scene, thus suggesting by their presence and attire that they are part of the upper middle class. Moreover, Freddy does not tell Eliza, as he does in Shaw's version of the scene outside Higgins's home in Wimpole Street, that he has no money. One could argue that this is an unfortunate omission, since Higgins subsequently fantasises about Eliza's married life with Freddy "in a wretched little shop above a store" in his final song (182). Higgins's point is that by marrying the impecunious Freddy, Eliza will once again "end up selling flow'rs" (182), but his prediction loses its point if the audience is unaware that the Eynsford-Hills are relatively impoverished.

¹⁰⁴ Lerner hyphenates the surname.

¹⁰⁵ In *My Fair Lady*, Eliza does not address Freddy by name, thereby removing the opportunity for Mrs Eynsford Hill to make this suggestion.

Money also plays a part in one of the most visible differences between *Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady*, namely, the relative opulence of Higgins's home in the latter. Instead of employing a single servant (Mrs Pearce), Higgins now has, in addition to his housekeeper, a staff of five servants, two footmen, and a butler — a surprisingly large total for a professor, and somewhat incongruous, given Higgins's stated preference for living in "an atmosphere as restful/As an undiscovered tomb".¹⁰⁶ Mrs Higgins, in contrast, has only two visible servants. In terms of providing opportunities for musical ensembles, however, the presence of additional staff at Higgins's residence allowed Loewe to compose a miniature Greek chorus to lament the arduousness of Eliza's pronunciation lessons in Act I, Scene 5, and later, (in Act II, Scene 1), a larger scale celebration of Higgins's "triumph" after the Embassy Ball to emphasise Eliza's feelings of isolation.

***My Fair Lady* in Relation to Broadway Musical Genres**

Any discussion of Broadway musicals inevitably involves the use of such generic terms as *musical comedy* and *operetta*. The distinctions between these and other theatrical genres — or *sub-genres*, as some would argue — remain decidedly blurred, with *My Fair Lady* not alone in being variously described as a *musical comedy*, an *operetta*, and a *musical play*.¹⁰⁷ Some musicals, including Frank Loesser's *The Most Happy Fella* (1956),

¹⁰⁶ From his song "I'm an Ordinary Man."

¹⁰⁷ The lack of consensus on the defining characteristics of each of these genres had led some commentators to employ a single all-embracing term for Broadway musicals. Swain argues that, "The cantankerous distinctions . . . made between musicals and musical plays on the one hand and operettas and operas on the other hand, in the words of Professor Higgins, by now should be antique. . . . The matter at hand is *music drama* [italics mine]" (412). Leonard Bernstein, in contrast, while speaking on a 1956 telecast, argued for the term *musical comedy* on the basis that American musicals possess "one great unifying factor: they all belong to an art that arises out of American roots, out of our speech, our tempo, our moral attitudes, our way of moving" (178–79).

have also been labelled *operas*, in spite of the objections of their creators.¹⁰⁸ Conversely, while *Porgy and Bess* (1935) was described by its composer George Gershwin as an “American Folk Opera”, some critics regarded it as a musical (Gottfried 229). Many years later, the composer Leonard Bernstein debated at length whether his musical *West Side Story* (1957) was, in fact, an opera — ultimately concluding that it was not (Stearns 5).¹⁰⁹

Generally speaking, an *opera* is defined as “a dramatic theater piece with continuous music as the dominant artistic feature” (Kislan 13). In contrast, an *operetta*¹¹⁰ is lighter both in subject matter and in the complexity of its scoring, and typically includes a considerable amount of dialogue. Extremely popular in the United States during the first three decades of the twentieth century, operetta had originated in Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire during the late nineteenth century chiefly through the work of composers Jacques Offenbach, Franz von Suppe, Johann Strauss, and Franz Lehár (99). Its most celebrated practitioners on Broadway were Victor Herbert (1859–1924), Sigmund Romberg (1887–1951), and Rudolf Friml (1879–1972), all of whom were European immigrants. This trio’s best-known works were, respectively, *Naughty Marietta* (1910), *The Student Prince* (1924), and *The Vagabond King* (1925). Their model, Kislan writes, was “a wholesome story accompanied by melodic music, romantic settings, sentimental situations, and clean comedy — all wrapped attractively in a sumptuous production” (107). He goes on to observe that although “the more insightful collaborators in operetta . . . valued the book in theory and practice, none was prepared to make music the ultimate servant of the play. Music was and is the greatest factor in

¹⁰⁸ Loesser insisted that *The Most Happy Fella* was, in fact, an “extended musical comedy” (qtd in Bordman 653).

¹⁰⁹ Bernstein’s rationale was that when *West Side Story* reaches its dramatic apex — the murder of Tony — Maria, the story’s heroine, reverts to speech rather than song.

¹¹⁰ Many commentators distinguish between *comic opera* and *operetta*, although there appears to be no consensus on the definition of the former, which, in any event, has changed in meaning during the last 150 years. Kislan argues that “comic opera exploits plausible situations, farce, or verbal wit, [whereas] operetta abandons everything to unfettered imagination” (99). The stage works of the librettist-composer partnership of W.S. Gilbert (1836–1911) and his Arthur Sullivan (1842–1900) are generally referred to as comic operas.

operetta” (107–08). The music in American operettas, Block observes, incorporates “such nineteenth-century European genres as waltzes and polkas or a nonjazz musical vernacular that somehow sounds American” (Block, *Enchanted* 348).

During the 1920s the term *musical comedy* came to be applied to many of the book musicals¹¹¹ that were popular at the time, and which would continue to attract audiences long after the public appetite for operetta began to wane in the early 1930s. Block explains that, “Musical comedies normally utilize contemporary urban settings with matching vernacular dialogue and music, the latter often incorporating jazz” (*Enchanted* 348). Consequently, their scores generally place fewer demands on their vocal performers than those of operettas, which typically required “trained singers” to perform them (Laufe xiv).¹¹² Musical comedy books in the 1920s often focused on “topical subjects such as Cinderella stories in modern urban America (*Sally*) early in the decade, and later bootlegging (*Oh, Kay!*), the Florida land boom and land speculation (*Tip-Toes* and *The Cocoanuts*), the Lindbergh flight (*Rosalie*) and . . . popular sports crazes: football (*Good News!*), boxing (*Hold Everything!*) and golf (*Follow Thru*)” (Block, *Melody* 78).

Show Boat (1927, music by Jerome Kern; book and lyrics by Oscar Hammerstein II) is generally regarded as Broadway’s first significant *musical play*.¹¹³ Based on Edna Ferber’s 1926 novel of the same name, *Show Boat* featured “a relatively serious romantic story . . . set to music neither as clipped as typical musical comedy writing nor as fully arioso as operetta, although leaning toward the latter” (Bordman 485). It also addressed topics that would previously have been considered unthinkable for a musical comedy or

¹¹¹ I.e., any musical containing a narrative. A *revue*, in contrast, usually refers to a series of unconnected sketches or dances.

¹¹² Lehman Engel describes the vocal demands of the operettas on Broadway at that time as “nearly synonymous with those of opera” (qtd in Grant, 14).

¹¹³ One of the few dissenting voices is that of Mark Grant, who in *The Rise and Fall of the Broadway Musical* argues that the seldom-performed musical *Deep River* (music by W. Frank Harling, book and lyrics by Laurence Stallings, 1926) contained “the first dramatically mature book” of a Broadway musical. *Deep River* was acclaimed by a number of respected drama critics, but played for only one month. Grant goes on to write that, “unlike *Show Boat*, [*Deep River*] had a tragic ending and no showbiz hoofing” (60).

an operetta, including miscegenation, racism, spousal abandonment, and alcoholism. As musical theatre historian Miles Kreuger observes,

This seminal work revealed that a Broadway musical was free to embrace any kind of theme, however controversial, could deal with serious issues in a suitably mature fashion, could counterpoint light and cheerful scenes with those of human anguish, and yet never need to sacrifice popularity and a memorable, tuneful score. (18)

Show Boat was also “unprecedented” at the time, Block argues, because of its “concern for character development, with songs that grew meaningfully out of plot, and with spectacle and dance used only when those elements were essential to the story” (Block, *Enchanted* 16). Although “Kern never developed the musical play beyond this point” (Gottfried 171), his librettist Hammerstein remained closely associated with its development, subsequently collaborating with composer Richard Rodgers on nine musical plays between 1943 and 1959. Swain argues that the Rodgers and Hammerstein musical plays integrate song and dialogue to the extent that, “it seems as if the dialogue interrupts the song as much as the song interrupts the dialogue, [thereby creating] the dramatic action that the character songs alone would lack. The dramatic continuity takes place across the numbers, rather than within them.” Moreover, he writes, the songs themselves are often reprises, albeit with telling alterations to the lyrics, as a means of both advancing the action and revealing feelings (105).

Swain’s analysis is also applicable to *My Fair Lady*, which at times cuts back and forth between song and dialogue,¹¹⁴ and also employs reprises with altered lyrics to reveal plot

¹¹⁴ E.g., in “A Hymn to Him”, during which Pickering and Mrs Pearce alternately interact with Higgins (through dialogue) between verses, and in “Without You”, in which Higgins interrupts Eliza’s singing with dialogue between the verse and the chorus.

development or changing moods.¹¹⁵ *My Fair Lady* is, in the main, an integrated musical play, as opposed to being a play *with* music,¹¹⁶ notwithstanding the fact that it contains two lengthy scenes¹¹⁷ — of eleven pages and eight pages, respectively — of continuous dialogue. Indeed, the sheer quantity of dialogue in *My Fair Lady* is arguably its most unusual feature.¹¹⁸ Lerner and Loewe recognised this from the outset: “[We] were determined to retain as much of Shaw’s dialogue as possible, which would automatically mean there would be more dialogue than in any other musical to date” (Lerner, *Street* 67). Including its lyrics, the libretto to *My Fair Lady*, as published in the 1980 Signet edition, comprises eighty-seven pages — the same length, in fact, as the 1941 version of *Pygmalion* (excluding Shaw’s preface and sequel), which appears in the same edition. In comparison, the librettos of Rodgers and Hammerstein’s *Oklahoma!* and *Carousel* are eighty-three and forty-four pages shorter, respectively, than the plays upon which they are based (Engel, *Theater* 38).

By subverting Shaw’s antiromanticism in favour of a more conventional narrative in which the younger, naïve female falls in love with a middleaged man to whose world she is unaccustomed (and for which she must subsequently be educated), Eliza has much in common with the unworldly navy nurse Nellie Forbush and postulant Maria Rainer of Rodgers and Hammerstein’s *South Pacific* and *The Sound of Music* (1959), respectively. Moreover, as Wolf observes, like Sarah Brown and Sky Masterson in *Guys and Dolls*

¹¹⁵ Doolittle reprises his “With a Little Bit of Luck” — first sung in Act I, Scene 2 — with new lyrics that reflect his discovery in Act I, Scene 4 that Eliza is living at Wimpole Street, and, as previously discussed, Eliza reprises her “Just You Wait” with altered lyrics that reflect her desire to punish Higgins emotionally.

¹¹⁶ Kislán writes that a *play with music* “avoids making fundamental, illuminating use of the peculiar components of a musical theater”. He goes on to cite *1776* [Sherman Edwards and Peter Stone, 1969] as an example, arguing that this work “offers lyrics, song, and movement. To remove them would do little damage to the text” (175). In *My Fair Lady*, however, many of the most significant moments — e.g., Eliza’s and Higgins’s moments of self-revelation in “I Could Have Danced All Night” and “I’ve Grown Accustomed to Her Face”, respectively — occur in song, and cannot therefore be removed without affecting the text. For this reason, it cannot be considered a play with music.

¹¹⁷ I.e., Act I, Scene 3 and Act I, Scene 5. Both of these scenes consist of material from Act II of *Pygmalion*.

¹¹⁸ Mordden argues that, in addition, its dialogue is clever in a way that even first-rate musical-comedy books never are . . .” (*Roses* 153–54).

(Frank Loesser and Abe Burrows, 1950), Nellie and Emile in *South Pacific*, and Maria and the Captain in *The Sound of Music*, Eliza's and Higgins's "differences of background or temperament signal that they will eventually form a couple" (*Gravity* 9).¹¹⁹ *My Fair Lady* is rare among musicals of the 1950s, however, in that it contains no love scenes between its main characters,¹²⁰ and no duets.¹²¹ In the latter respect, the starkly different vocal capabilities of the original Higgins and Eliza, Rex Harrison and Julie Andrews, ultimately determined this. While the latter possessed what Lerner describes as "a charming soprano voice, so flexible she could sing light opera and popular [material] with equal ease . . ." (*Street* 52), the former had never sung on stage before. Consequently, Eliza's music requires a legitimate soprano voice¹²² capable of negotiating a range of nearly two octaves, while Higgins's songs are virtually spoken,¹²³ with most of his notes staccato-like quavers or semiquavers, coupled with a range of approximately an octave, and a tessitura that hovers around the middle register for a baritone.¹²⁴ It was relatively uncommon at the time for a musical to feature a leading character who

¹¹⁹ Wolf goes on to argue that, "Indeed, the ideological project of musical theatre in the United States in the mid-twentieth century was to use the heterosexual couple's journey from enemies to lovers to stand in for the unification of problematic differences in American culture — between the city and the country, between work and leisure, between us and them, between whites and racialized Others" (9).

¹²⁰ It is not unique in this respect, however. The possible romantic attraction between the King and Anna in Rodgers and Hammerstein's *The King and I* (1951) is only vaguely implied. Unlike *My Fair Lady*, however, *The King and I* contains a romantic subplot.

¹²¹ The only occasion on which Eliza and Higgins sing together is during the Act I ensemble number "The Rain in Spain", in which Pickering also participates. In *South Pacific* Nellie Forbush and her middleaged French planter suitor Emile de Becque sing "Twin Soliloquys" together (although never in unison), while in *The Sound of Music* Maria Rainer and Captain Von Trapp sing "An Ordinary Couple".

¹²² Mark Grant defines a legitimate singer in a Broadway context as one who can "manage the natural breaks in the voice so as to ensure continuity of sound between the head voice and the chest voice [as opposed to 'belting', which is] a completely different timbre produced from the chest . . ." (Grant 14).

¹²³ Mordden writes that in the first half of the 1950s — prior to the composition of *My Fair Lady* — "careful, indulgent compositions" were written for several non-singing stars, although he acknowledges that "there were very few serious or romantic leads before 1950 who basically could not sing" (*Roses* 153). The part of the King in *The King and I*, although requiring less singing than the role of Higgins, was also written for a non-singer.

¹²⁴ The lowest note Higgins sings is the D-flat below middle C; the highest an E-flat above middle C.

essentially did not sing. Loewe subsequently claimed that because of Harrison's vocal limitations,

an entire new way of presenting numbers had to be invented. It's what is called in German *sprechgesang*. In this case it was really interwoven with all sorts of things, because the patter songs in *My Fair Lady* are not just rhythmical patter songs, they have a character and a melody of their own. And that is what made it different. It is the combination of the lyrics and *sprechgesang* that made a new form. Up to then, patter songs had no melody to be distinguished. Also they made no attempt in characterization of the character. (qtd in Lees 108)

Presumably because of Loewe's Austrian musical background, *My Fair Lady* is also rare among 1950s musicals in that its score is closer to the Viennese operetta model that had dominated Broadway in the 1920s than the dynamic jazz-infused dance musicals that were attracting audiences (*The Pajama Game*, 1954; *Damn Yankees*, 1955; *West Side Story*, 1957) at the time of its premiere.¹²⁵ Indeed, as Bordman notes, to many observers at the time of its first production, *My Fair Lady* was regarded as "a modern-day operetta",¹²⁶ a description that he argues underlines "how the modern musical play was really a continuation of an older tradition" (653).

Conclusions

¹²⁵ Compared with the great majority of musicals of its time, there is relatively little dancing in *My Fair Lady*, with most of it confined to Doolittle and the Covent Garden chorus. Higgins and Eliza dance together for a mere thirty seconds (approximately) in "The Rain in Spain" and again (briefly) in the Embassy Ball scene. *My Fair Lady* is also unusual in that it lacks a true opening dance number, with its curtain rising to what Mordden describes as "the extremely strange . . . 'Street Entertainers'" — a two-minute "food fight of a tune, as an opera audience standing outside Covent Garden seeks taxis while buskers dance for alms" (*Roses* 158).

¹²⁶ Ironically, Lerner and Loewe initially rejected the title *My Fair Lady* "because it sounded like an operetta" (Lerner, *Street* 78).

In his 1956 essay Lerner argues that, “what should have happened to Higgins and did not [in *Pygmalion*] was due to Shaw’s strange touch of never allowing a man and woman ever to complete a relationship” (*Lady* 5). Yet this assertion overlooks not only Shaw’s efforts (particularly in his 1941 version) to convince audiences that Eliza ultimately married Freddy, but also the romantic resolution of *Arms and the Man*, among Shaw’s other plays. Nevertheless, *My Fair Lady* represents an attempt to rectify this apparent Shavian perversity, and, notwithstanding the questions that remain at its conclusion regarding the precise nature of Higgins’s and Eliza’s future relationship, I would argue that Lerner essentially achieves his objective, assisted by Loewe’s persuasively romantic music. Eliza’s return to Higgins in the final scene of *My Fair Lady* is conceivable *because* it is foreshadowed so effectively, not only through the lyrics of the former’s soliloquy (“I Could Have Danced All Night”), but also through Lerner’s numerous textual changes to Higgins’s character, humanising him in the process “from a frog to a prince” (Block, *Enchanted* 235). Unlike the 1938 *Pygmalion* film’s Eliza, who to a certain extent must still infer that Higgins harbours romantic feelings towards her, *My Fair Lady*’s Eliza clearly knows that a sensitive man lurks beneath her mentor’s curmudgeonly exterior, for this is a Higgins who patiently empathises with Eliza when she despairs of improving her pronunciation, gallantly offers her his arm when she departs for the Embassy Ball, and dances with her on two auspicious occasions. As Block observes, while “[Eliza’s] marrying Higgins would be unthinkable” to readers of Shaw’s *Pygmalion*, “[i]t is the ultimate achievement of Lerner and Loewe’s *My Fair Lady* that the unthinkable has become the probable” (*Enchanted* 242).

Inevitably, however, the thematic consequences of depicting Higgins’s metamorphosis from misogynist to late-blooming romantic ensure that *My Fair Lady* is a considerably less subversive work than *Pygmalion*. As Coelsch-Foisner observes, “Lerner’s *My Fair Lady* . . . fulfils what Shaw denied his audiences, re-fashioning the latter’s anti-social romance into a perfect musical romance and, thereby, bringing it closer again to the Ovidian model” (234).

At the heart of *My Fair Lady*'s reclamation of Ovid's myth is Lerner's contention that, as the title character, Higgins is the character around whom the play should revolve — although not, he implies, in the exclusive role of the propeller of its action (*Lady* 5). Consequently, in *My Fair Lady*, something happens *to* Pygmalion/Higgins: namely, the epiphany he experiences on realising that he has become enamoured of his own creation. Shaw's Higgins, in contrast, undergoes no such meaningful change; rather, he is the *instrument* of change: first, as the indirect agent of Doolittle's social and financial transformation; second, as the mastermind of Eliza's phonetic transformation; and, third, as the (unwitting) catalyst for Eliza's repudiation of her inferiority complex:

LIZA. You said I had a finer ear than you. And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can. . . . Oh, when I think of myself crawling under your feet and being trampled on and called names, when all the time I had only to lift up my finger to be as good as you, I could just kick myself. (*P41* 293)

Tellingly, in *My Fair Lady*, Eliza never makes this self-discovery; the most she can say about herself is that she “can do bloody well without [Higgins]” — a declaration that is promptly contradicted by her return to Wimpole Street on the same day that she ostensibly abandons her mentor. By returning to Higgins, she also betrays the hopes of his mother, whose “Bravo, Eliza!” in response to her walkout, reveals Mrs Higgins's wish for an independent Eliza (in what is arguably Lerner's only acknowledgement of the feminist undercurrent of Shaw's text). Thus, in Lerner's version, Eliza acquires the skills with which to function in middle-class society, but not the self-esteem that might convince her to lead an independent life. As Coelsch-Foisner observes, “[In *My Fair Lady*] Eliza becomes a fit wife for a distinguished professor. When she returns to his studio in the last scene, . . . she has acquired her due place in society and complies with the traditional gender pattern” (236).

In short, *My Fair Lady*'s emphasis on the romantic aspects of the Higgins-Eliza relationship, and on Higgins's transformation (while understating the consequences of Eliza's and Doolittle's respective transformations) inevitably minimalised many of the

more serious thematic concerns of *Pygmalion* — particularly, money, class, and independence. *My Fair Lady* is subversive in one respect, however: just as Shaw in his play confounds conventional expectations by subtitling it “a romance”, but concluding with a wedding that is neither desired by its groom nor anticipated by its audience, so too does *My Fair Lady* create confusion for Broadway musical audiences by allocating its only overtly romantic song¹²⁷ for a male singing voice to an unsuccessful suitor (Freddy Eynsford-Hill), while allotting to its hero (Higgins) undemanding patter songs written for a non-singer. Shaw might well have enjoyed the irony.

¹²⁷ I.e. “On the Street Where You Live.”

Chapter Seven: *My Fair Lady* (Film)

Introduction

The chief instigator in bringing *My Fair Lady* to the screen in 1964 was Hollywood producer Jack L. Warner, Head of Warner Brothers Studios. Warner had been present at the Broadway premiere of the musical in 1956, and had immediately become interested in purchasing the screen rights from CBS (McGilligan 280).¹ It was not until February 1962, however, with both the original Broadway and London productions of *My Fair Lady* nearing the ends of their respective runs,² that CBS accepted Warner's offer, selling his studio the cinematic rights to the musical for the then unprecedented sum of US\$5.5 million.³

After considerable procrastination, Warner chose Hollywood veteran George Cukor⁴ to direct the film. Cukor was not primarily regarded as a director of film musicals,⁵ and candidly acknowledged at the time to *The New York Times* that he disliked the genre.⁶ He

¹ CBS had purchased the musical from Loewe, Lerner, and Hart (Thomas 259).

² The Broadway production finished its 6½-year run in September 1962; the following month the London production concluded its 4½-year run. It was standard practice at the time for successful Broadway musicals not to be converted into films until after the respective stage version had finished its initial run. Other examples from this period include Rodgers and Hammerstein's *South Pacific* (Broadway 1949–54; film, 1958); Meredith Willson's *The Music Man* (Broadway, 1957–61; film, 1962) and Stephen Sondheim's *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum* (Broadway 1962–64; film, 1966).

³ As Thomas notes, CBS's terms were "stringent": "fifty percent of the distributor's gross (not net) above \$20 million, plus ownership of the negative at the end of the contract" (259). According to details outlined on the 1994 CBS documentary *More Lovely Than Ever: My Fair Lady Then And Now*, the screen rights to *My Fair Lady* reverted to CBS seven years after the release of the film.

⁴ Cukor (1899–1982) had four (American) Academy Award nominations for Best Director to his credit at the time for, respectively, *Little Women* (1933), *The Philadelphia Story* (1940), *A Double Life* (1947), and *Born Yesterday* (1950).

⁵ He had, however, directed three of them: *A Star is Born* (1954), *Les Girls* (1957), and *Let's Make Love* (1960).

⁶ "Most musicals are silly damned things," he was reported as saying (qtd in McGilligan 279).

maintained, however, that *My Fair Lady* was not a musical *per se* but rather “a play with music” (qtd in McGilligan 279).⁷

Pre-production on *My Fair Lady* began in January 1963, with Lerner providing the screenplay adaptation⁸ of his stage musical libretto and Loewe composing additional music.⁹ Cecil Beaton, who was the only member of the Broadway *My Fair Lady* production team to be employed on the film, was again responsible for the costume design, while Rex Harrison and Stanley Holloway reprised their stage roles as Higgins and Doolittle, respectively.¹⁰ A link to an earlier screen adaptation of *Pygmalion* was also provided by the appointment of Harry Stradling Sr, who had worked as cinematographer on the 1938 *Pygmalion* movie, as the film’s director of photography.¹¹ However, Warner’s decision to cast Audrey Hepburn — most of whose singing in the film was subsequently dubbed — in the role of Eliza was controversial, as Cukor subsequently acknowledged (Lambert 245). The decision to employ Hepburn instead of Julie Andrews, the original Eliza in both the Broadway and London productions of *My Fair Lady*, contradicted the wishes of Lerner, who consequently “was alienated from the production from that point on” (McGilligan 281).¹²

⁷ Cukor presumably felt qualified to make this distinction, having begun his career as a Broadway theatre director and subsequently achieved critical and commercial success with a number of film adaptations of plays, e.g., *Dinner at Eight* (1933), *Holiday* (1938), *The Women* (1939), *Born Yesterday* (1950).

⁸ Lerner’s screenplay has not been published. All of the *My Fair Lady* screen dialogue attributed to Lerner in this chapter has been transcribed directly from the film.

⁹ This was mainly incidental music for the purpose of underscoring various scenes. Loewe did not write any new songs for the film.

¹⁰ Neither man was the first choice of Warner, who considered, among others, Cary Grant and Rock Hudson for the role of Higgins and James Cagney as Doolittle. McGilligan writes that Peter O’Toole was initially favoured by both Lerner and Cukor for Higgins (281).

¹¹ Stradling also worked as cinematographer on the Gabriel Pascal production of *Androcles and the Lion* (Chester Erskine, 1952).

¹² Lees, however, quotes Lerner as opining that the *My Fair Lady* film “had an ideal cast”, and that it was, in fact, the subsequent decision to film it on a Warner Brothers soundstage in Hollywood, California rather than on location in England “that deprived it of its ultimate glory” (149).

The premiere of the film version of *My Fair Lady* was held in New York on 21 October 1964, and the film subsequently won eight American Academy Awards, including those of Best Picture, Best Director, Best Actor (Harrison), and Best Cinematography; a British Academy of Film and Television Award (BAFTA) for Best Film from any Source; three Golden Globe Awards, including that of Best Motion Picture: Musical/Comedy; and the New York Film Critics Circle Award for Best Film and Best Actor (Harrison). In 1998 *My Fair Lady* was ranked #91 on the American Film Institute (AFI)'s list of 100 Greatest American Films,¹³ and in 2006 at #8 on the AFI's list of the 25 Greatest Musicals.¹⁴

In this chapter I begin by providing a brief overview of the Hollywood film musical and its sub-genres before addressing the following questions: (1) to what extent is the film version of *My Fair Lady* a faithful adaptation of its stage musical counterpart? (2) In what specific ways do the film's aesthetics convey the likelihood of a Higgins-Eliza romance? (3) In what respects is the *My Fair Lady* film more faithful to the stage version(s) of Shaw's play than the 1938 film version of *Pygmalion*? (4) To what extent is *My Fair Lady* typical of other Hollywood Broadway musical adaptations of the 1950s and 1960s?

Hollywood Film Musicals in the 20th Century: History and Sub-Genres

Introduction. Andy Medhurst argues that although many countries have produced film musicals, the genre “has come to be seen as synonymous with Hollywood, indeed, as embodying what we may think of as the virtues or vices of classical Hollywood cinema” (106). In his 2007 study of British film musicals, K.J. Donnelly also acknowledges the dominance of Hollywood, writing that, “In terms of box-office success, production values, stars and innovations, [it] has always led the way” (11). The first feature-length

¹³ The AFI's evaluation criteria in each instance comprised critical recognition, popularity over time, historical significance and cultural impact.

¹⁴ However, the film did not appear on the AFI's top 100 list in 2007.

film to incorporate synchronized dialogue had, in fact, been a Hollywood musical.¹⁵ As Rick Altman observes, the production of Hollywood musicals was at its peak between 1927 and 1948, with, on average, forty-eight such films released annually.¹⁶ This figure compared with an average of 23 musicals released annually between 1949 and 1958, subsequently falling to approximately seven per year between 1959 and 1980 (198).¹⁷

Mast writes that the period from approximately 1930 to 1955 comprises the years in which *original* film musicals — that is, those written specifically for the screen, as opposed to film adaptations of stage musicals — dominated the Hollywood musical genre (*Singin' 3*).¹⁸ A contributing factor in the decline of original film musicals from the mid-1950s was “the existence of an ever-widening gap between the music in the musicals the studios were making and the music an increasing percentage of the nation was actually listening to — rock’n’roll” (Barry Keith Grant 199). However, it was to successful Broadway works that the makers of Hollywood musicals generally turned for their source material during this period. By the early 1960s, Clive Hirschhorn argues, “[T]he Hollywood musical had . . . become something it had never been before (except, possibly, for a brief moment in its infancy): a Broadway parasite” (17). Thomas Schatz concurs, arguing that many of the late Golden Age original musicals are “At once more cinematic and narratively complex” in terms of their “consistent balance of story and performance, style and substance, word and music, [and] dance and song” than the

¹⁵ *The Jazz Singer* (Alan Crossland, 1927). Mordden writes that, apart from “a synchronized score and a few ‘talking’ sequences”, it was essentially a silent film (*Medium 5*). The first *all*-talking film musical was *The Broadway Melody* (Harry Beaumont, 1929).

¹⁶ As Mordden notes, however, the production rate of musicals varied significantly in the early years of sound in accordance with the fluctuating popularity of the genre, ranging from more than seventy in 1930 to fewer than fifteen in 1932. He attributes the sudden revival of the genre in 1933 to the “rich and influential form” of Lloyd Bacon’s backstage musical *42nd Street* (*Hollywood* 43–45).

¹⁷ Donnelly notes that the drop-off in British film musicals occurred even earlier, with few being produced in the 1950s” (11).

¹⁸ Many commentators refer to this period as the Golden Age of (Hollywood) Film Musical.

Broadway adaptations of the same period (203).¹⁹ Although largely overlooked by film scholars, many of the adaptations of the 1950s and the 1960s were notable box office successes,²⁰ while four of them were awarded the American Academy Award for Best Picture — a feat that previously only original screen musicals had achieved.²¹ Altman nevertheless expresses the predominant view of film scholars when he argues that most of the adaptations of this period — in contrast, as we have seen, with standard Hollywood practice in the 1930s and 1940s — “stick painfully close to the Broadway version” and frequently suffer from “servile and uninventive” direction (Schatz 197).²²

Yet there were compelling economic reasons for the Hollywood studios’ new-found preference for making faithful adaptations of commercially successful Broadway musicals. As Altman observes, the gradual breakdown during that decade of “Hollywood’s assembly-line genre film production system” — a *modus operandi* by which the studios had employed permanent artistic and technical personnel for specific purposes — had resulted in a “lack of investment in permanent personnel [, which] made it all the harder to undertake projects as mammoth as the creation of an all-new large-scale musical film . . .”. This, in turn, he goes on to write, contributed to a “dependence

¹⁹ Schatz singles out musicals made by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (or MGM), which is generally regarded as the most important film studio of the Golden Age of Film Musicals.

²⁰ E.g., *Oklahoma!* (Fred Zinnemann, 1955); *South Pacific* (Joshua Logan, 1958); *My Fair Lady*; *The Sound of Music* (1965). Robert B. Ray writes the Hollywood film musical was at its most “dominant” in terms of commercial success between 1946 and 1965, with one or more musicals appearing annually in the American Top Twenty Box Office list during this period, with the exception of the years 1959 and 1961 (165).

²¹ The four adaptations were *West Side Story* (Robert Wise and Jerome Robbins, 1961); *My Fair Lady* (1964); *The Sound of Music* (1965); and *Oliver!* (Carol Reed, 1968). The *original* film musicals to receive the Best Picture Academy Award were *The Broadway Melody* (Harry Beaumont, 1929); *The Great Ziegfeld* (Robert Z. Leonard, 1936); *Going My Way* (Leo McCarey, 1944) and the aforementioned *An American in Paris* (1951) and *Gigi* (1958). In 2003, *Chicago* (Rob Marshall, 2002), an adaptation of a Broadway production, became the first film musical since *Oliver!* to win this award.

²² Babington and Evans are rare exceptions in this respect, arguing that much of the criticism of the “enormously and deservedly popular” film adaptations of Rodgers and Hammerstein’s musicals in the 1950s has been “extremely impressionistic” (188).

on Broadway's prepackaged spectacles, which [had] the added benefit of also providing prepackaged personnel — personnel who could be, as it were, 'leased' rather than bought or put on long-term contract" (199).

In some instances, fidelity to the original Broadway musical was further assured by the involvement of one or more of its creators in the adaptation. Babington and Evans note that the team of Rodgers and Hammerstein reportedly exercised "considerable conservative interference" in the 1955 film version of their *Oklahoma!* (188).²³ In the adaptations of Lerner and Loewe's musicals *Brigadoon*, *My Fair Lady*, and *Camelot*, Lerner himself was responsible for writing the screenplay in each instance.²⁴

Hollywood musical sub-genres. Many original film musicals have been so-called *backstage musicals*,²⁵ a generic term for a musical containing a plot centred on the making of a show, and that concludes with a lengthy production number involving either dancing or singing, or a combination of both.²⁶ The backstage musical was not a cinematic invention. It had long existed in the musical theatre, and includes such stage works as *Show Boat* (1927), which contains a number of diegetic songs (McMillin 105).²⁷

²³ Rodgers' influence on film adaptations of his and Hammerstein's musicals also extended to making decisions about the singing voices that were to be used (Hirschhorn 362).

²⁴ Lerner remains the only person to have been solely responsible for writing both the libretto of a Broadway show and the screenplay of its film adaptation for a Hollywood musical.

²⁵ Schatz singles out MGM's *The Broadway Melody* (Harry Beaumont, 1929), which won the American Academy Award for Best Picture of 1928–1929, as the forerunner of this musical sub-genre (188).

²⁶ Altman argues that the backstage musical — despite being "the best known and . . . most often commented upon" type of film musical — is, in fact, part of a broader musical sub-genre that he classifies as the *show musical*, a categorisation which he defines as incorporating films that, "[i]n general, . . . construct their plot around the creation of a show (Broadway play, fashion magazine, high school revue, Hollywood film), with the making of a romantic couple both symbolically and causally related to the success of a show" (200).

²⁷ McMillin uses the term *diegetic* to describe "[musical] numbers that are called for by the book. It is meant to cover the backstage musicals plus any other occasions on which characters deliberately perform numbers for other characters. . . . The diegetic number is not a case of someone 'bursting into song.' Rather, someone has a song to sing, according to the book, and goes ahead and sings it" (103–04).

In a backstage musical, McMillin writes, “the plot is about the means of its own production. Since the characters are show people whose job is song and dance, much of the singing and dancing is called for by the book. *Show Boat* is about entertainers, so they sing and dance.²⁸ . . . *Babes in Arms* is about kids putting on a show in a barn, and *Pal Joey* is about Chicago nightclub performers” (102). Thomas Schatz writes that the “preparation for the climactic show [served] as a pretext both for rehearsal-production numbers and also for romantic entanglements” (188). This was particularly true of the backstage musicals of the 1930s, in which, “none . . . proposed song as a vehicle of narrative motion. In some cases, the narrative was just an excuse to get the entertainers on stage in the first place” (Mordden, *Hollywood* 18).²⁹ By the end of the decade, however, backstage musicals had begun to move toward what Schatz describes as an “integrated, life-is-music strategy” (193). Schatz goes on to write that,

In *Broadway Melody of 1940*, for instance, the backstage milieu is not reserved for the romantic subplot, nor are the musical numbers assigned to a rehearsal or traditional stagebound context. [Fred] Astaire’s “I’ve Got My Eyes on You” is performed onstage in an empty theater as his love interest and future partner (Eleanor Powell) eavesdrops. The music man’s dual role (lover and performer) is thus linked with the film’s dual narrative strategies (courtship romance and musical show). (193)

From the mid- to late 1930s dance was also increasingly used as a narrative agent in musicals (Dunne 69). Many of these films featured Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers, who appeared together in nine musicals for RKO Studios between 1933 and 1939. Michael Dunne writes that in *Shall We Dance* (Mark Sandrich, 1937), the characters portrayed by

²⁸ It would be incorrect, however, to describe *Show Boat* as exclusively a backstage musical, since it also includes songs that are not performed in the context of a show, but instead can be classified as spontaneous expressions of feelings, e.g. “Make Believe”, which is sung by principal characters Magnolia Hawks and Gaylord Ravenal at their first meeting.

²⁹ Schatz describes the backstage settings of the 1930s Warner Bros. musicals as providing “enforced realism” (194).

Astaire and Rogers perform an impromptu routine together, thus revealing “their [romantic] compatibility by following each other’s leads despite their different dancing styles (69). Dunne goes on to observe that in another of the Astaire-Rogers films, *Carefree* (Sandrich, 1938), dance is also used to disclose “subconscious elements of a character’s personality” — in this instance a moment of self-revelation that occurs during a slow-motion “dream ballet” sequence (79–81).

Schatz argues that, “As the musical genre evolved[,] it sacrificed *plausibility* for *internal narrative logic*, steadily strengthening its basis in fantasy and artifice and steadily expanding its range of narrative, visual, and musical expression” [original emphasis] (194). In short, Schatz asserts, it was no longer necessary to provide characters in film musicals with “reasonable motives for breaking into song (rehearsals, shows, etc) [since] the music itself seems to determine the attitudes, values, and demeanor of the principal characters in these later films” (194). Consequently, “Lovers of the classic [musical] form were prepared to believe that it was natural — more of a thirsty emotional need than a luxury — for a character to break into song . . .” (Lane 2). Schatz writes that the later backstage musicals produced by MGM in the late 1940s and early 1950s, such as Charles Walters’s *Easter Parade* (1948) and Vincente Minnelli’s *The Band Wagon* (1953), “are considerably more integrated musically and more complex narratively than those produced before and during [World War II]” (205). Both of these films were produced by Arthur Freed,³⁰ whose team of writers, directors, choreographers, and other artistic personnel, Schatz argues — through their “interweaving [of] story and performance, character and performer, reality and fantasy” — was instrumental in blurring the distinction that the early backstage musicals had “reinforced . . . between music as a stage-bound professional activity and music as a spontaneous ‘natural’ mode of expression” (220).

³⁰ Arthur Freed (1894–1973), lyricist and producer. The Freed Unit, as his production team was commonly known, was responsible for the majority of MGM’s most critically and commercially successful original musicals of the 1940s and 1950s, including *An American in Paris* (Vincente Minnelli, 1951) and *Singin’ in the Rain* (Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly, 1952). Alan Jay Lerner wrote the American Academy Award-winning screenplay for the former of these two films.

In *non*-backstage musicals, however, song and narrative had been integrated since the movie version of *The Desert Song* (Roy Del Ruth, 1929), which was the first screen adaptation of a Broadway operetta or musical comedy,³¹ and in such early original film musicals as Rouben Mamoulian's *Love Me Tonight* (1932).³² Mordden writes that in spite of Hollywood producers' initial concerns regarding the likely reaction of audiences to the "touchy naturalism" of film musicals containing "plot and character songs that burst out anywhere", audiences were "curious" to see *The Desert Song* (*Hollywood* 17–20). The commercial success of this film subsequently led to a succession of screen adaptations of operettas,³³ with many of the early films "relatively untouched" versions of the stage productions (Altman 196).³⁴ As Altman notes, however, the comparative fidelity of these films to their Broadway origins was in distinct contrast to Hollywood's later practice from the mid-1930s to the late 1940s of purchasing "the rights to musical plays, only to discard the scanty plot and half the music for the movie version (which thus resembles the original only in title)" (196).³⁵

Altman classifies both *The Desert Song* and *Love Me Tonight* as examples of what he terms the *fairy tale musical*, a sub-genre that he argues was the first "to reach maturity in [musical] film . . . thanks to massive borrowing from a long tradition of European and American operettas" (131). He categorises the plots of the fairy tale musical as "commonly [opposing] a happy-go-lucky commoner to a proper aristocrat, a woman with duties to her country, to her family, and to her own pride" (341). In these films, he goes on to write,

³¹ Mordden writes that, "the adaptation was faithful" (*Hollywood* 19).

³² In this film, Mordden writes, conversations develop into songs and, in one number, "the various characters [jump] fluently from song to speech[,] though every line is in fact a lyric" (*Hollywood* 41).

³³ E.g., *The Vagabond King* (Ludwig Berger, 1930) and *New Moon* (Jack Conway, 1930).

³⁴ As Mordden notes, however, the running time of films during this period was considerably shorter than that of the typical Broadway musical, thus requiring the adaptation to be somewhat condensed (*Hollywood* 19).

³⁵ A typical example is the film musical *Maytime* (Robert Z. Leonard, 1937), which retains only one song from Sigmund Romberg's 1917 operetta of the same name.

[A]n opposition is established between the joy and talent of the lower classes, as represented by the commoner (nearly always the man), and the stuffy, limiting tradition identified with the woman and her entourage. In a sense, then, there is little to identify the fairy tale musical as specifically American, for the thematic concerns which it tenders are clearly borrowed from the Old World. (341)

However, Altman draws a distinction between *fairy tale musicals* and what he terms *folk musicals*, arguing that whereas “the fairy tale musical creates a utopian world like that of the spectator’s dreams[,] the folk musical projects the audience into a mythicized version of the cultural past” (272). He goes on to assert that, “Of all the characteristic concerns of the folk musical, none so clearly separates it from the show and fairy tale traditions as its emphasis on family groupings and the home”, together with its vital “sense of community” and frequent “small town or agricultural setting” (273–75).³⁶

***My Fair Lady* the Film in Comparison with *My Fair Lady* the Stage Musical**

Introduction. Altman argues that *My Fair Lady* is one of a number of film adaptations of Broadway musicals of the 1950s and 1960s that displays a “lack of independence from the stage production” (197).³⁷ It is possibly because of this widely held perception that

³⁶ Screen adaptations of musical plays that he categorises as *folk* musicals include two film versions of *Show Boat* (James Whale, 1936 and George Sidney, 1951); *Oklahoma!* (1955); and *West Side Story* (Robert Wise and Jerome Robbins, 1961). Films that he classifies as *fairy tale* musicals include *The King and I* (Walter Lang, 1956); *My Fair Lady*; and *The Sound of Music* (373–77).

³⁷ The other examples that he provides are *Call Me Madam* (Walter Lang, 1953); *The King and I*; *The Sound of Music*; *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum* (Richard Lester, 1966); and *Camelot* (Joshua Logan, 1967). Among other scholars, however, not all of these films have been described as being dependent upon their stage counterparts. Hirschhorn, for example, writes that in the case of *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*, “a completely new rhythm and pace” including “jump cuts and . . . flashy editing” is imposed on the film (385).

the screen version of *My Fair Lady* has received scant attention from film scholars.³⁸ As Mast observes, *My Fair Lady* is often regarded “as too reverential for a ‘real movie musical’ — giving up the clever game between stylized song and credible movie storytelling” (310). Mast overstates the extent of the film’s fidelity to the stage version, however, when he argues that the film “duplicates the [original] show — scene by scene, line by line, number by number, note for note”, for Lerner’s screenplay — though in certain respects a “rigidly adherent adaptation” (McGilligan 292) — incorporates a significant number of changes to his stage libretto, including the addition of the bathroom scene from Shaw’s 1941 version, new dialogue by Lerner, and the restoration of material from all five acts of *Pygmalion*. Mast goes on to state more accurately that, “Rather than cutting numbers, the usual practice of film adaptations, *My Fair Lady* transcribes all twenty-one slots³⁹ of the show” (309). Although this assertion overlooks the film’s omission of Doolittle’s reprise of “With a Little Bit of Luck”, *My Fair Lady* is nevertheless virtually unique among film adaptations of musicals for retaining all of the songs from its Broadway version, with only the film versions of *South Pacific* and *West Side Story* observing a similar degree of fidelity to their respective source material.⁴⁰

Mast argues that such fidelity was possible in the case of *My Fair Lady* because “Lerner and Loewe held all the cards [regarding the adaptation], guaranteeing the reverential transcription of their stage work” (309). Yet aside from the fact that Lerner wrote the screenplay, neither he nor Loewe was involved in the actual production of the film, nor

³⁸ The screen versions of *The King and I* and *The Sound of Music*, among other ex-Broadway adaptations of the 1950s and 1960s, have arguably been overlooked for the same reason.

³⁹ Mast is mistaken here: there are, in fact, twenty “slots”, or musical numbers, in the Broadway version, excluding the non-sung Overture, Entr’acte, etc.

⁴⁰ The screen adaptation of *West Side Story* deviates from its Broadway counterpart, however, in that it transfers three of its songs (“Gee, Officer Krupke”, “Cool”, and “Somewhere”) to different characters, as well as extending one of its songs (“America”) to involve additional characters and altering the lyrics of three of its songs (“Gee, Officer Krupke”, “Tonight” ensemble, and “I Feel Pretty”). In contrast, the 1958 film version of *South Pacific* retains its Broadway score, but, as Hirschhorn notes, it includes one additional song (“My Girl Back Home”) — a number that had been written for the stage version but subsequently discarded (362).

did either man have control over the casting.⁴¹ A more likely reason for the film's relative fidelity to its (musical) stage source was the reluctance on the part of Cukor to tamper with audiences' expectations of the film.⁴² As the film's art director, Gene Allen, recalled of its production period, "Always hanging there was the success of *My Fair Lady* on the stage and a worldwide audience waiting to pounce on you if you didn't do it right" (qtd in McGilligan 291).

Screenplay changes to *My Fair Lady*. Notwithstanding the cautiousness with which the makers of the film version of *My Fair Lady* approached the adaptation, Lerner makes nine principal changes in his screenplay:

1. The acrobatic "Street Entertainers" performance by three buskers that begins the stage version is deleted.
2. Eliza returns to Covent Garden the morning after her first encounter with Higgins.
3. The order of the songs "With a Little Bit of Luck" and "I'm an Ordinary Man" is reversed, so that the latter now precedes the former.
4. Eliza's bathroom scene is added.
5. Doolittle's reprise of "With a Little Bit of Luck" (Act I, Scene 4 in the stage version) is deleted.
6. Most of Act I, Scene 6 ("Near the race meeting, Ascot") is deleted, together with a portion of Act I, Scene 10 ("The promenade of the Embassy"); these deletions amount to approximately two pages of dialogue.⁴³
7. A brief scene involving Higgins and his mother is added after Eliza's faux pas at the Ascot Races (see Shavian additions below).

⁴¹ Although both Lerner and Cukor were permitted to make suggestions, it was producer Jack Warner who retained the right to approve casting (McGilligan 281).

⁴² Cukor himself acknowledges that, "[T]here were certain limitations from the start": "People were very possessive about this one. 'If you don't do it as well as it was done on the stage,' they said, 'we'll shoot you'" (qtd in Lambert 240–41).

⁴³ Lerner was the author of this dialogue.

8. The Intermission/Entr'acte is brought forward so that it now precedes the Embassy Ball rather than follows it.
9. Higgins sings a new twelve-line verse in the ensemble number "You Did It".

Lerner's screenplay also features *additional* dialogue drawn from three sources: (1) *Pygmalion* (the play; 1941 version); the 1938 *Pygmalion* film (non-Shavian dialogue); and (3) new dialogue by Lerner himself.

Cukor asserts that *My Fair Lady* employed "even more of Shaw's screenplay than the stage version [of the musical] did" (qtd in Lambert 244). It would be more accurate to state that the film is closer to the 1941 version of *Pygmalion* than Shaw's screenplay, since in two instances (both of which are asterisked on the next two pages) Lerner features dialogue in his screenplay that appears only in the stage editions of *Pygmalion* (all versions), and not in Shaw's screenplay, together with material that is found only in the 1941 version. While it is true that all of the (new) 1941 dialogue is also featured in Shaw's screenplay, in the instance of a minor difference — such as when Shaw has excised a line from his screenplay in his 1941 edition⁴⁴ — it is the latter version that Lerner observes in his screenplay.⁴⁵

The additional Shavian material in the *My Fair Lady* film is as follows:

1. Mrs Eynsford Hill's interaction with Pickering from Act I is restored — "Oh, sir, is there any sign of [the rain] stopping?"⁴⁶

⁴⁴ E.g., in Shaw's screenplay, Eliza (when defending her decision not to make Freddy work) says, "I'll support him. I'll go and be a teacher" (Scene 47). Shaw deletes the first sentence in his 1941 version (293), and Lerner follows suit.

⁴⁵ Cukor may have incorrectly assumed that the 1941 edition constituted Shaw's actual screenplay.

⁴⁶ Mrs Eynsford Hill also interacts with Higgins (as she does in the stage and screen versions of *Pygmalion*), but the new exchange is based on Clara's response to Higgins in Shaw's text(s). Clara's rebuke in *Pygmalion* — "Will you please keep your impertinent remarks to yourself" — is transferred to her mother in *My Fair Lady*: HIGGINS: "I don't know whether you've noticed it, madam, but it's stopped raining. You can get a motor bus to, er, Hampton Court. Well, that's where you live, isn't it?" MRS EYNSFORD HILL:

2. Mrs Pearce's Act II remonstrance ("It's no use talking to her like that, Mr. Higgins. She doesn't understand you") and her attempt to retrieve Higgins's handkerchief from Eliza — "Here, give that handkerchief to me! He give it to me, not to you!"*
3. The Bathroom Scene (Optional Scene #2 from the 1941 version).
4. Higgins's brusque treatment of Mrs Eynsford Hill in Act III ("I've seen you before somewhere. Oh it doesn't matter. You'd better sit down").
5. Mrs Higgins's Act III objections to Higgins's experiment on Eliza from Act III.⁴⁷
6. Higgins's insistence to Pickering from Act IV that he had not been nervous during the Ambassador's reception ("Weren't you a little bit nervous once or twice?" / "No, not when I saw we were going to win hands down. I felt like a bear in a cave, hanging about with nothing to do").
7. Eliza's exchanges with Freddy in Wimpole Street after her row with Higgins: "Eliza, where are you going?" / "To the river." / "What for?" / "To make a hole in it." / "Eliza, darling, what do you mean?", (etc.). (from Optional Scene #5 in the 1941 version)
8. Part of Doolittle's first speech in Act V — "Who asked him to make a gentleman out of me? I was happy. I was free. . . . Now I'm tied neck and heels and everybody touches me. . . . Oh, I have to live for others now, not for meself. That's middle-class morality", (etc.).
9. Mrs Higgins's scolding of Higgins and Pickering for not praising Eliza sufficiently for her performance at the Ambassador's reception (Act V)^{48*}

"What impertinence!" Mrs Eynsford Hill also addresses one line (written by Lerner) to Eliza – "Go about your business, my girl."

⁴⁷ In a curious change, however, Mrs Higgins says of Eliza in the same (film) scene: "She's ready for a canal barge." In Shaw's play, by contrast, it is *Higgins's* language that his mother deems appropriate only "on a canal barge" — thus underscoring her point that "as long as [Eliza's] in Henry's hands" the experiment will fail. This point is obscured in Lerner's adaptation, with Mrs Higgins merely stating that "[Eliza's] ready for a canal barge", to which Higgins replies, "Well, her language may need a little refining."

The non-Shavian material from the 1938 *Pygmalion* film comprises just three brief instances: Pickering's insistence that Higgins give up the experiment with Eliza after the fiasco of her appearance at Mrs Higgins's at-home day; the Ambassador's wife's exchange with Higgins regarding her curiosity about Eliza — “Such a faraway look, as if she's always lived in — in a garden” / “So she has; a *sort* of a garden” — and the Queen of Transylvania's request of Eliza that she dance with her son.

Lerner's new (original) dialogue comprises approximately fifty exchanges of minor significance. One third of these involve Doolittle in his Covent Garden milieu in scenes corresponding to Act I, Scene 2 and Act I, Scene 4, respectively, of the stage musical. The majority of Doolittle's new exchanges are with his cronies, as the former extols his carefree ways and rationalises his parental neglect of Eliza — “I give her the greatest gift any human being can give to another: life. . . . Then I disappears and leaves her on her own to enjoy it.” Lerner provides Eliza with a number of new lines in the interpolated bathroom scene as she struggles with Mrs Pearce and two maids⁴⁹ — and adds several exchanges to the Embassy ball, increasing the element of suspense as the Ambassador's wife dispatches Karpathy to discover Eliza's identity — for example, PICKERING [to MRS HIGGINS]: “Henry must take Eliza home at once. There's a language expert here — a sort of, er, you know, sort of an ‘imposterologist’.” In the scene between Freddy and Eliza in Wimpole Street, Lerner also makes explicit the latter's reason for returning to Covent Garden, with Eliza declaring in response to Freddy's “Where are you going?": “Where I belong!”

Structural changes. In his screenplay, Lerner deletes material that is either non-cinematic — such as the wordless “Street Entertainers” acrobatic troupe number — or

⁴⁸ Mrs Higgins's lines are transferred, however, to Eliza, who now recounts the two men's behaviour to the former: “They just sat there congratulating each other on how marvellous they had been, and the next moment on how glad they were that it was all over and what a bore it had been.”

⁴⁹ Only Mrs Pearce is with Eliza in Shaw's version and the 1938 *Pygmalion* film. *My Fair Lady*'s maids have no dialogue.

that had been written principally to accommodate theatrical requirements. Examples of the latter include Doolittle's reprise of "With a Little Bit of Luck", which arguably exists in the stage version mainly as an opportunity for the actor playing Higgins to rest after the long Act I, Scene 3, and most of Act I, Scene 6 — the chief purpose of which in the stage musical is to allow time for the performer portraying Eliza to change costumes off-stage for her appearance at Ascot.

Lerner reserves his main structural changes for the scenes that correspond to Act I, Scenes 2, 3, and 4 in the stage musical, from which he not only deletes Doolittle's reprise of "With a Little Bit of Luck",⁵⁰ but rearranges the order of Higgins's and Doolittle's songs, inserting the bathroom scene from Shaw's screenplay before the first of them.

These changes are described in the table on pages 316 and 317:

⁵⁰ He does, however, separate Doolittle's on-screen version of the song into two sections of four and two verses apiece, inserting dialogue between them so that the second half of the song effectively serves as a reprise.

<i>My Fair Lady</i> (stage version)	<i>My Fair Lady</i> (film version)
<p>Act I: Scene 2: Tenement section, Tottenham Court Road. Late evening.</p> <p>Brief dialogue establishing Doolittle's character. Doolittle meets Eliza and persuades her to give him a half crown with which to purchase some "liquid protection".</p> <p><i>Song</i>: With a Little Bit of Luck (Doolittle)</p>	<p>Covent Garden, 5:00 a.m.</p> <p>New dialogue (by Lerner) establishing Doolittle's character (no song); Doolittle meets Eliza and persuades her to give him a half crown with which to purchase some "liquid protection".</p> <p>Eliza wanders through Covent Garden, watching the flower sellers, and at the same time reflects on Higgins's boast of the previous evening.</p>
<p>Act I: Scene 3: Higgins's study, Wimpole Street, the next morning.</p> <p>Eliza visits Higgins and asks for lessons on how to "speak more genteel". Pickering bets him that he will not be able to pass Eliza off as a duchess. Higgins accepts the challenge. Eliza is bundled off to the bathroom with Mrs Pearce.</p> <p><i>Song</i>: I'm an Ordinary Man (Higgins)</p>	<p>Higgins's house, Wimpole Street, later that morning.</p> <p>Eliza visits Higgins and asks for lessons on how to "speak more genteel". Pickering bets him that he will not be able to pass Eliza off as a duchess. Higgins accepts the challenge. Eliza is bundled off to the bathroom with Mrs Pearce.</p>
	A terrified Eliza has her first bath.
	<i>Song</i> : I'm an Ordinary Man (Higgins)

Act I: Scene 4: Tenement section – Tottenham Court Road	Tenement section – Tottenham Court Road
Doolittle discovers to his delight that Eliza is staying at Wimpole Street, and sings in celebration a reprise of “With A Little Bit of Luck”.	New dialogue (by Lerner) in which Doolittle and his friends ponder how to avoid working. <i>Song:</i> With a Little Bit of Luck (Doolittle) (first four verses of the song)
	Doolittle discovers to his delight that Eliza is staying at Wimpole Street, and then sings the remaining two verses of “With A Little Bit of Luck”.

Why does Lerner make these changes? In the first instance, I would argue that he delays Doolittle’s rendition of “With a Little Bit of Luck” because it would otherwise occur too soon after Eliza’s “Wouldn’t It Be Lovely?” in his screenplay. As a general rule, songs in *story* film musicals do not closely follow one another — particularly at the beginning of a film — and given that only one page of dialogue separates the two songs in Lerner’s libretto, clearly some distancing was desirable.⁵¹ To compensate for the postponement of the song, Lerner provides Doolittle with the aforementioned character-establishing dialogue in which we learn, among other things, that the latter is an eloquent layabout with a penchant for philosophising. A further motive for delaying Doolittle’s song is that it allows Lerner to focus on the more important aspect of what Eliza does next, namely, her actions between meeting her father and arriving at Higgins’s home. One could argue that the more naturalistic medium of cinema requires this elaboration, for while a

⁵¹ Lerner would also have been aware of the need to pace the songs at appropriate intervals given the unusually large amount of dialogue featured in *My Fair Lady*.

theatrical audience may be content to deduce the events that happen between the scenes — leaving it to fill in the (off-stage) gaps, as it were — a cinema audience has different expectations. Accordingly, Lerner uses cinematic means to convey Eliza’s inner thoughts as she pauses reflectively in the Covent Garden flower market, overlaying Harrison’s voice on the soundtrack — “[I]n six months I could pass her off as a duchess at an Embassy Ball” — to indicate that she is considering the implications of Higgins’s boast.

The insertion of the bathroom scene immediately before Higgins’s “I’m an Ordinary Man” serves a similar purpose to that of the 1938 film in that it provides both visual and dramatic relief from the static world of Higgins’s laboratory after a substantial amount of dialogue. Unlike the 1938 film, however, Lerner retains much of Shaw’s screenplay dialogue, emphasising Eliza’s naïveté — “Oh, what’s this? Is there where you wash clothes?”... “This is where we wash ourselves, Eliza” — as well as showing us the immaculate bedroom in which she will sleep — “Oh, I couldn’t sleep here, Missus. It’s too good for the likes of me” — while at the same time portraying her reaction to being washed as more indignant than terrified.

The rearrangement of Higgins’s and Doolittle’s songs serves to create a useful counterpoint between Eliza’s wistful declaration of her romantic daydreams in “Wouldn’t It Be Lovely?” and Higgins’s emphatic rejection of romance in “I’m an Ordinary Man”. As Altman observes of film musicals: “Each scene involving only one of the lovers is invariably matched by a parallel scene (song, shot, event) featuring the other lover” (22). *My Fair Lady* differs from Altman’s generalisation only in that its “lovers” do not sing their songs in identical settings,⁵² but instead perform their (stylistically very different) numbers in their respective milieux: Covent Garden for Eliza’s “Wouldn’t It Be Lovely?” and Wimpole Street for Higgins’s “I’m an Ordinary Man”.⁵³

⁵² Unlike, for example, a film musical such as *Gigi* (1958) — also with a screenplay and score by Lerner and Loewe, respectively — in which, as Altman notes, stars Leslie Caron and Louis Jourdan sing successive numbers on the same Parisian park bench (22).

⁵³ It could, of course, be argued that Higgins’s first song, “Why Can’t the English?”, which he sings in the same setting as the next song — Eliza’s “Wouldn’t It Be Lovely?” — provides a better illustration of

One other significant rearrangement that Lerner makes is the bringing forward of the Intermission/Entr'acte, so that the first half ends immediately before the Embassy Ball rather than after it. This is a logical decision given that the first act of *My Fair Lady* is a very long one.⁵⁴ The earlier break also ensures that the second half of the film begins on a note of anticipation, as opposed to the more serious Act II, Scene 1 of its stage counterpart.

Thematic consequences of Lerner's changes. Lerner's Shavian additions in his screenplay principally bolster the transformation theme as regards both Eliza and Doolittle by following the structure of Act III more closely in the first instance and restoring dialogue from the latter's Act V appearance in the second instance. In respect of the former, whereas the Ascot Races scene in the stage musical concludes with Higgins's roars of laughter at Eliza's "Move your bloomin' arse!", the film version includes an additional scene at Ascot utilising material adapted from the end of Act III in which Mrs Higgins (Gladys Cooper) remonstrates with Higgins⁵⁵ over his experiment on Eliza — "You're a pretty pair of babies playing with your live doll." Although Lerner does not include Mrs Higgins's concerns regarding the potential social consequences of transformation on Eliza,⁵⁶ the addition is significant nonetheless in that it underscores Higgins's inability to consider Eliza as a fully developed person — a point that is further emphasised by the restoration of his line, "It fills our whole lives: teaching Eliza, talking to Eliza, listening to Eliza, dressing Eliza." The terseness with which Mrs Higgins

Altman's point. However, I regard "Why Can't the English?" as a prologue song that serves principally to establish the wit and one of the prevailing themes of the musical play, whereas I would argue that both "Wouldn't It Be Lovely?" and "I'm an Ordinary Man" constitute revealing character songs.

⁵⁴ Bauschatz argues that it is "structurally flawed" in this respect. He goes on to write that, "I have never seen a production of [the stage version of *My Fair Lady*] where the audience did not groan audibly when the first act did not conclude after Eliza's triumphant 'I Could Have Danced All Night' at the end [of] scene 5 but kept trundling on toward scene 6 at Ascot" (195).

⁵⁵ Although Pickering is also the target of Mrs Higgins's criticism, he is absent from this scene.

⁵⁶ Nor does Mrs Higgins draw any comparison between Eliza and Mrs Eynsford Hill, whose genteel poverty (as in the stage musical) is not apparent here.

addresses her son in this scene also underlines Shaw's point that, of all the characters in *Pygmalion*, she and Mrs Pearce possess the most common sense.

As regards Doolittle's transformation, the restoration of eight sentences from the first of his Act V speeches emphasises the comic irony of his plight to a much greater extent than the stage musical. While the stage version fails to clarify why Doolittle objects to his new status, the film *Doolittle* identifies the essence of his distaste for "middle-class morality" — "Oh, I have to live for others now, not for meself." To a greater degree than the stage version of *My Fair Lady*, the film also emphasises Doolittle's loss of freedom — "Who asked him to make a gentleman out of me? I was happy. I was free" — while also conveying his realisation that his predicament constitutes a form of retributive justice:

I touched pretty nigh everyone for money when I wanted it, same as I touched [Higgins]. Now I'm tied neck and heels and everybody touches me. A year ago I hadn't a relation in the world, except one or two who wouldn't speak to me. Now I've 50, and not a decent week's wages amongst the lot of them.

Significantly, however, Lerner does not restore any dialogue from Doolittle's more serious second (Act V) speech, in which he reveals his fear of the workhouse. This omission is consistent with the overall tone of Lerner's screenplay, which in many respects is a more comic work than his stage libretto.⁵⁷ Accordingly, many of Lerner's additions (both Shavian and non-Shavian) emphasise the comedic elements of *My Fair Lady*, while at the same time increasing the visibility of several of its minor characters. In a new exchange by Lerner, Mrs Pearce (Mona Washbourne) replies drily to Freddy's description of Eliza's behaviour at the Ascot Races as "unbelievable" — "So I've been told, Sir." Later in the film, in another of Lerner's additions, Mrs Higgins asks her maid not to bring the Bishop⁵⁸ into the same room as her son on the grounds that, "I shall be excommunicated." Mrs Eynsford Hill (Isobel Elsom)'s aforementioned opening-scene

⁵⁷ Broadway historian Miles Kreuger argues that the original stage production of *My Fair Lady* was "crisp and cool" and "not a warm and loving show" in comparison with the film version (qtd in Lees 148).

⁵⁸ Aggrandised from Vicar in the stage version of *My Fair Lady*.

response to Higgins — “What impertinence!” — This comment, in turn, allows the restoration of Higgins’s socially inappropriate remarks to Mrs Eynsford Hill when he meets her again at Ascot: “I’ve seen you before somewhere. Oh it doesn’t matter. You’d better sit down.”⁵⁹ Lerner also provides Pickering (Wilfrid Hyde-White) with several new lines that cast him in a comic light.⁶⁰ During the lesson sequence, he accidentally adopts Eliza’s Cockney pronunciation (“Did you try the pline cake?”) — much to Higgins’s chagrin — and at the Embassy Ball, he responds ineptly when asked who Eliza is (“Oh, er, a cousin of mine – and Higgi- . Excuse me”).

Aesthetic Elements of the Film: General Observations

Shot composition and editing. Not surprisingly, given that *My Fair Lady* and the 1938 *Pygmalion* film share the same cinematographer in Harry Stradling, there are striking visual similarities at times between the two films. In the opening Covent Garden scenes of both films, high camera angles are employed on Hiller and Hepburn, respectively, to stress Eliza’s fear and vulnerability when she discovers that Higgins is transcribing her conversation. Moreover, the similarity in the appearance, clothing and grouping of the onlookers in both scenes is remarkable.⁶¹ In the Embassy Ball scene, the arrival of Eliza occurs in an-almost identical manner,⁶² as she emerges from a door and walks toward the camera, while earlier in both films Cukor emulates Asquith’s use of low angles to emphasise Higgins’s dominance over Eliza as he stands on a staircase. In both films, the use of shadow and contrast on Eliza is also very similar in the scene corresponding to that of Act IV in the play. The films differ significantly, however, in the degree of fluidity of their respective directors’ approach, with Cukor employing none of the long panning and tracking shots that Asquith uses in *Pygmalion*, nor any of his montage work. Moreover,

⁵⁹ Taken from Act III of *Pygmalion*.

⁶⁰ Lerner’s motive for doing so may have arisen from a need to compensate Pickering for the partial deletion of Act I, Scene 6 and Act I, Scene 10, both of which had involved him.

⁶¹ The black and white photography of *Pygmalion*, however, in contrast with the vibrant colour of *My Fair Lady* does, however, help to create a dirtier, more realistic Covent Garden.

⁶² The only difference is that Higgins and Pickering are positioned on reverse sides of the screen.

unlike *Pygmalion*, much of *My Fair Lady* is filmed in either medium or medium-long shot, with few medium-close-ups, and virtually no close-ups.

Cukor's camera is mostly static, particularly during the film's equivalent to Acts II, IV, and V in the play, with only the occasional panning shot.⁶³ Reaction shots are minimal, and consequently assume greater significance than usual when they do occur, such as a cutaway to Eliza (to reveal her interest) when Higgins boasts to Pickering that he "could pass her off as a duchess at an embassy ball". During Doolittle's first long speech at Higgins's home, the camera remains entirely static. This composition style, coupled with the widescreen Super Panavision 70 format,⁶⁴ reinforces the theatricality of the film, with the viewing perspective often akin to that of being seated in an ideal position in the circle of an auditorium. At times, however, as *Time* magazine notes in its 1964 review, "the camera seems welded to the wrong orchestra seat . . ." (2). This is evident during some of the musical numbers involving characters other than Higgins, Eliza, or Doolittle. In "You Did It", for example, there are no close-ups — or even medium close-ups — on Pickering/Hyde-White while he is singing; instead, he is filmed mainly in profile with cutaways to Higgins for spoken comments and to Eliza for reaction shots. When Doolittle makes his first appearance in Higgins's study, and the latter identifies the former's origins as "Brought up in Hounslow, mother Welsh", Cukor keeps the camera on Higgins after this line rather than cutting to a (presumably surprised) Doolittle for his reaction. Moreover, "The chorus and small parts, among the delights of the musical, are barely glimpsed except as background" (McGilligan 291). This is especially evident during both "Wouldn't It Be Lovely?" and "You Did It", in which the respective ensembles of Cockneys and Higgins's servants are not visible even when they are singing.

In an interview Cukor argues that,

⁶³ E.g., when the camera follows Eliza at the beginning of the film, thus alerting the audience to the fact that she is a character of some significance.

⁶⁴ This process uses 65mm width film, as opposed to the standard 35mm.

The audience should not be aware of camera tricks. . . . As a rule of thumb, unless you have to move the camera, unless it does something for you, be quiet, be quiet. When you cut, you have to do it very delicately, not too adventurously. (Long 116–17).

Nevertheless, there are moments in *My Fair Lady* in which a cutaway is poorly executed, such as a reverse angle shot of Karpathy in the Embassy Ball scene that merely repeats a previously used cutaway of this character.⁶⁵ At other times, the editing is highly effective. Examples of this include the rapid cutting of shots taken from different angles⁶⁶ in the opening scene to convey the scurrying of people in Covent Garden during the sudden downpour, and the wittiness with which Cukor conveys the clipped speech of the British upper classes by cutting to a different shot of its members after each word during the Ascot Gavotte.⁶⁷

Visual motifs and colour. Cukor begins *My Fair Lady* with rapid dissolves of still photographs of flowers in bloom, and these constitute virtually the only close-ups in the entire film. The flowers remain throughout the ensuing credits and eventually dissolve into flowers on the banisters of the entrance to the Royal Opera House, as its elegantly dressed patrons descend the stairs. They subsequently reappear throughout the film: at the Covent Garden market the morning after Eliza's first encounter with Higgins — again in close-up — presumably symbolising not only a new day, but also the beginning of Eliza's transformation, and in the blurred foreground on both the left and right sides of the screen during Freddy's "On the Street Where You Live" and its reprise. Thus, flowers are associated with Eliza as both a metaphor for the blooming of her character — or its transformation — and as a symbol for the transformation she effects in others. Freddy accordingly "blooms" in her presence. But as Mast observes, when Eliza abruptly leaves

⁶⁵ This occurs when Higgins invites Karpathy to dance with Eliza. Cukor cuts from a rear shot of Karpathy looking at Higgins and Eliza to a reaction shot of Karpathy from Higgins's perspective. Karpathy, however, is not in the same position as he was during the first shot.

⁶⁶ These include both low angle and aerial shots.

⁶⁷ E.g., "Pulses / rushing / faces / flushing".

Wimpole Street, as she does after Freddy's reprise of "On the Street Where You Live", by the following morning "the same street has become drab and autumnal — with gray tree trunks and limbs barren of leaves, brownstone houses devoid of color" (312), thus emphasising the drabness of Higgins's life without her as he sings "I've Grown Accustomed to Her Face".⁶⁸

As Mast goes on to observe, Cukor also uses colour to distinguish between the natural environments of his two main protagonists: "If Higgins's habitat is the cavelike indoors, saturated in deep browns, Eliza's natural habitat is outdoors, blazing with color" (312). As depicted here, however, the vibrant colours of Eliza's pre-transformation environment of Covent Garden overpower any real sense of the squalor of her habitat. This is presumably deliberate on Cukor's part, for his motive is not one of social realism, but rather one of irony, for by associating the spirit of Eliza with colour, he is able to contrast her character with that of the upper classes whom she would aspire to join. Accordingly, "Covent Garden's fashionable antithesis is the Ascot racetrack, where the 'Ascot Gavotte' takes the themes of Art and Nature, monochrome and color into a daytime outdoor world." Here, the 'proper' greys of the men's attire and the blacks and whites of the women's symbolise a world "that . . . is inhabited by people who aren't flowers" (Mast 312). Cukor also uses colour in this scene to signify that Higgins, in his conspicuously inappropriate light-brown rustic-looking suit, is as much an outsider as Eliza.

Use of music. In comparison with the Broadway and London original cast recordings of *My Fair Lady*, both of which use the 1956 production's orchestrations by Robert Russell Bennett and Phil Lang, the film features a much larger orchestra and opulent new arrangements⁶⁹ that emphasise the romantic and sentimental elements of the score, particularly in the greater use of strings. The chorus is also considerably larger than that of the original production. When the costermongers wave goodbye to Eliza at the end of

⁶⁸ The wintry setting here is unrealistic, however, given that this scene takes place approximately six weeks after the Ascot Races of July.

⁶⁹ By Alexander Courage, Robert Franklyn, and Albert Woodbury.

“Wouldn't It Be Lovely?”, it is not the voices of four men that we hear but those of a full choral ensemble.⁷⁰ At the end of the extended “Get Me to The Church on Time”, the extensive use of angelic-sounding high soprano voices⁷¹ in the choir differs markedly in impact from that of the earthier, leaner-sounding chorus in the original production. The greater romanticism of the film score is also emphasised by conductor André Previn’s slow tempi,⁷² and the frequent use of Eliza’s “I Could Have Danced All Night” melody, which features not only in both the Overture and the Intermission/Entr’acte, but is reprised throughout the film from the aftermath of the Ascot Races scene onwards.⁷³ Cukor uses the melody to convey Eliza’s contrasting moods: the exultation of the Embassy Ball — where again she dances with Higgins, thereby re-enacting the words of her song — and the bitter aftermath of her fight with Higgins, as she searches for the ring that he has flung into the fireplace.

Music is also used to indicate moments of impending significance. When Eliza wanders through Covent Garden the morning after her first encounter with Higgins, a sustained note from a violin precedes the latter’s overlaid dialogue on the soundtrack (“You see this creature with her kerbstone English?”). As Eliza continues to wander, the music becomes agitated, reflecting her inner conflict, and we again hear Higgins tell her that she is a “disgrace to the noble architecture of these columns”. The melody then finds its partial resolution in a reprise of a single line from “Wouldn’t It Be Lovely?” (“All I want is a room somewhere”), thus providing reassurance through the use of a familiar tune, as Higgins intones, “I could even get her a job as a ladies’ maid”, before changing to a major key and a new straightforward melody as Eliza stands up, indicating that a decision has been made.

⁷⁰ *Time* magazine, in its 1964 film review, observed: “[W]hen Professor Higgins’ household staff bursts into song, it sounds as if the entire Westminster Choir has been tucked into a linen closet” (3).

⁷¹ These are very much in the Hollywood “heavenly” tradition.

⁷² Mast describes them as “more leaden” than those of the original stage recordings (310).

⁷³ Cukor inserts a brief wordless scene immediately after the Ascot Races sequence in which Pickering comforts a forlorn Eliza to the accompaniment of a wistful violin reprising this melody.

Ways in which the film's aesthetics encourages romance. Unlike the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, Cukor's *My Fair Lady* presents Freddy as a credible romantic alternative to Higgins, eschewing its predecessor's caricature-like depiction of this character. Much of this is arguably due to Jeremy Brett's naturalistic performance as Freddy. Whereas David Tree overacts in the 1938 film and portrays Freddy as a slow-witted and ineffectual would-be suitor, Brett is consistently understated in a performance that suggests a "much less foolish Freddy" (Martin 56). Brett's Freddy is still clearly infatuated with Eliza, but not ludicrously so. At no time does he appear "*frightened*" of the more assertive Eliza, as Lerner's libretto states in the stage version of *My Fair Lady* (146); instead he is merely startled by her unpredictability. A contributing factor to this impression is Brett's relative maturity. Thirty years old at the time of filming, he is seven years older than Tree — an age difference that deemphasises Freddy's callowness.⁷⁴ Brett's more worldly and passionate Freddy does not faint, as Tree's Freddy almost does, when presented with the opportunity to kiss Eliza.⁷⁵ Moreover, there is arguably a romantic chemistry between Hepburn's Eliza and Brett's Freddy in their Ascot Races and Wimpole Street scenes — a quality that is absent in the equivalent scenes with Hiller and Tree in the 1938 film. As Martin observes, "When Hepburn/Eliza sings 'Show me' to [Brett/Freddy], openly asking for love, it is evident that Hepburn and Brett make an attractive couple" (56).

One important aspect of Freddy's greater impact in *My Fair Lady* is due to a change that Lerner makes in his screenplay, which treats Freddy more respectfully than in his libretto in the equivalent film scene to Act II, Scene 2. In the stage musical, as noted in Chapter Five, the scene ends with Eliza ridiculing Freddy by "*crowning him with [her suitcase]*" at the conclusion of her song "Show Me". However, in the film, Eliza does not strike Freddy; she merely rebuffs his attempts to embrace her during her forceful "Show Me". Moreover, at the completion of this song, Lerner restores dialogue from the equivalent

⁷⁴ The choice of a thirty-year-old actor may have been prompted by the fact that Audrey Hepburn was thirty-four at the time (although she appears younger than her years). Warner may have been concerned at the possibility of a younger actor accentuating the age difference between Freddy and Eliza.

⁷⁵ In *My Fair Lady* Freddy attempts to kiss Eliza, but is prevented from doing so by an iron fence that separates the two characters during the latter's rendition of "Show Me".

scene in Shaw's 1941 version (optional scene #5) that emphasises a much more perceptive Freddy than that of the 1938 film. Instead of emulating Tree's stuttering bewilderment when Eliza informs him that she is "going to the river...to make a hole in it", *My Fair Lady*'s Brett/Freddy — clearly comprehending Eliza's distraught state in the parallel scene — grasps her arm and asks her quietly but seriously, "Eliza, darling, what do you mean?"

In further examples of Freddy's romantic aggrandisement in Cukor's *My Fair Lady*, the Overture, which plays during the opening credits of the film, begins with Freddy's "theme" ("On the Street Where You Live"), and continues for 2½ minutes, replacing "You Did It" and other melodies from the stage version of the Overture. It is then followed by the melody of Eliza's "I Could Have Danced All Night", thereby linking Freddy and Eliza (musically) to each other from the outset. This symbolic partnering is further emphasised by the fact that, of all the characters in the film, it is Freddy (in medium shot) whom we first see (together with his mother), followed in the next shot by Eliza. This cinematic device recalls Shaw's visual linking of Freddy and Eliza in Scene 4 of his screenplay.

Moreover, Brett/Freddy's manners towards Eliza are impeccable in their first scene together, and immediately imply a romantic and sensitive man, as opposed to Tree's haughty indifference. While in the 1938 film Tree/Freddy mutters a cursory "Sorry!" when he upsets Eliza's basket of flowers and then continues on his way, Brett/Freddy is no more culpable than Eliza when they collide,⁷⁶ yet apologises to her profusely and attempts to help her in gathering the violets. In an action that minimises the class differences between them (or which suggests that such differences are not important to

⁷⁶ He is stepping backwards when Eliza, who is rushing, collides with the back of him. In the stage version of *My Fair Lady*, their collision occurs when "one of the buskers collides into him. He is thrown backwards and strikes a figure [Eliza] hidden behind a group of people who now come [sic] flying forward and lands in a heap" (19–20).

him), he also maintains eye contact with Eliza as he kneels (smilingly) to help her.⁷⁷ In short, *My Fair Lady* suggests that Freddy is both charming and lacking in snobbery — arguably important qualities if we are to believe that Eliza would consider him matrimonially.

For her part, Hepburn/Eliza is attentive to Freddy and appreciative of his interest when the two meet again in the Ascot Races scene, gracefully acknowledging his gift of the bet on the horse Dover. Freddy's impact in this scene is undermined, however, by the absence of reaction shots, close-ups or medium close-ups on him and by the fact that, in comparison with Eliza, he is shown mostly in profile. For the remainder of the film, Freddy is similarly distanced from the audience. When he performs "On the Street Where You Live" and its reprise,⁷⁸ he is filmed mostly in medium shot (and never closer); when he sings to Eliza at the beginning of "Show Me", Cukor focuses his camera on Hepburn while Brett is afforded only a quarter profile. Freddy's visual marginalisation in these scenes thus suggests a deliberate attempt on Cukor's part to undermine the former's romantic eligibility with respect to Eliza. At the same time, it is possible that commercial considerations may have influenced Cukor's decision to emphasise Hepburn, a major Hollywood star at the time, over the then virtually unknown Brett.⁷⁹ To a lesser extent, Harrison is also neglected (visually) in comparison with Hepburn in that, unlike the latter, he is never afforded a close-up.

⁷⁷ Tree's Freddy, in contrast, avoids looking at Eliza, both in the equivalent scene and when he later returns with a taxi.

⁷⁸ In another respect, however, both scenes are visually effective. When Freddy/Brett sings his reprise of "On the Street Where You Live" thirty-two minutes later in the film, the scene begins with him standing in darkness with his back to the camera in the same position as he had been in when he completed his earlier rendition of the song. Thus Cukor conveys through repetition the sense that Freddy has not moved in the weeks that separate these two performances in the plot.

⁷⁹ Hepburn was then at the height of her fame, having appeared in an almost-unbroken series of commercially successful films during the previous ten years, beginning with *Roman Holiday* (William Wyler, 1953), for which she had won both the (American) Academy Award and the BAFTA Award for Best Actress. Reflecting her box office appeal, she was paid one million (US) dollars for her work in *My Fair Lady*, in contrast with Rex Harrison, who was paid US\$200,000 (McGilligan 282).

Irrespective of Freddy's visual marginalisation in the film, the juxtaposition of Brett's amorous portrayal of the character with that of Harrison's Higgins, who at fifty-five is clearly a much older man,⁸⁰ is in stark contrast to the 1938 film, in which "the sexual competition for Eliza's favours between Leslie Howard as Higgins and David Tree as Freddy is won hands down by Howard's smooth Higgins" (Martin 55–56). Harrison's performance, in any event, is arguably much closer to Shaw's conception of Higgins than Howard's. In contrast with Howard's soft-spoken Higgins, Harrison delivers his lines "explosively" where Shaw's stage play (and Lerner's libretto) requires him to do so.⁸¹ As Lerner observes,

I personally believed that brilliant as he was in the film, Howard was not the complete Higgins. We all ran the film together and I said to Rex [Harrison] that my entire argument could be based on the reading of one line. The line occurs in the scene after the ball when Higgins is 'humbly' taking full credit for Eliza's triumph. When they are alone together, there is a moment when Eliza cries out: 'What is to become of me?' Higgins looks at her and says: 'Oh! That's what is worrying you, is it?' To me, when Leslie Howard delivered the line one could tell he knew full well what she was talking about. You could almost see in his eyes that he was aware of her pain and of strange stirrings within himself. (*Street* 58)

Harrison, in contrast, portrays Higgins in this scene as a man who is oblivious to any romantic "stirrings" — either within himself or Eliza — delivering the line in an almost-offhand, dismissive manner. He also eschews Howard's slightly wounded delivery of "I hadn't quite realized you were going away" two lines later, avoiding the suggestion that Eliza's departure would sadden him unduly. But while Harrison's Higgins avoids any implication that he is a "bereaved Romeo" — to recall Shaw's criticism of Howard's

⁸⁰ Martin describes Harrison's Higgins as a "fatherly bachelor" (56).

⁸¹ I.e., "Cease this detestable boohooing instantly, or else seek the shelter of some other place of worship" in the first Covent Garden scene, and when he thunders at Eliza to "Sit down!" when she arrives at Wimpole Street.

interpretation of the role — an earlier scene in the film suggests that he is already aware of his feelings for Eliza. This occurs immediately before Eliza makes her appearance on the staircase at Wimpole Street dressed for the Embassy Ball. In a line written by Lerner that also features in the stage version of *My Fair Lady*, Higgins tells Pickering that Eliza “matters immensely”, and then appears to reflect on the significance of his acknowledgement. By leaving his camera on Harrison for several seconds after he has spoken these words, Cukor subtly emphasises that the moment is akin to a self-revelation for Higgins.

Elsewhere in the film, Cukor employs a variety of means to imbue the film with suggestions of romance between Higgins and Eliza. At the end of the “Rain in Spain” scene, Cukor cuts from a shot of Higgins and Pickering, as they are discussing where best to “test Eliza in public”, to a medium close-up of Hepburn, who appears to be gazing at Harrison/Higgins in adoration. When minutes later Eliza sings “I Could Have Danced All Night”, Cukor cuts to a close-up of her singing virtually into the camera⁸² as she begins the lines “I only know when he / began to dance with me”. By framing Eliza in this way, Cukor creates the sense of a confessional release on her part to the audience. Later, when Eliza appears at the top of the staircase at Wimpole Street in her Embassy Ball gown, the melody to “I Could Have Danced All Night” is heard softly on the soundtrack as Higgins peruses her appearance, reaching a climax as the latter takes Eliza’s arm and leads her from the room in a manner suggestive of a prince escorting his princess. When Eliza subsequently dances with Higgins at the Embassy Ball, Cukor cuts to a shot of Pickering and Mrs Higgins beaming with contentment, thus suggesting parental approval of the younger couple.

Yet notwithstanding this romantic ambience, Cukor refrains from conveying the impression that Higgins and Eliza will ultimately marry. When Eliza returns to Wimpole

⁸² This is the only occasion on which Cukor frames a character in close-up during a song.

Street in the final scene of the film, she tentatively approaches Higgins,⁸³ who is seated on the other side of the room, after he utters his line “Where the devil are my slippers?”, but then stops halfway. As she stands there, looking over at a slouching Higgins whose hat is pulled down over his face, concealing his expression, she appears slightly rueful. The film ends.

This is a more ambiguous conclusion than that of the 1938 film’s assertive Hiller/Eliza standing against the door of Higgins’s laboratory with an expression of satisfaction. Although Cukor’s ending does not rule out an Eliza-Higgins marriage, the subdued nature of the scene implies a decidedly bittersweet resolution in which only Higgins is the real beneficiary. While Eliza’s return underscores the continuation of her friendship with Higgins — presumably on a more equal footing than before — her abrupt halt as she approaches him symbolises her realisation that, in terms of intimacy, their relationship cannot proceed beyond this point.

***My Fair Lady* in Comparison with Other Hollywood Musicals of Its Time**

In common with a number of other prominent film musicals of the 1960s — including *Mary Poppins* (Robert Stevenson, 1964), *The Sound of Music* (Robert Wise, 1965), *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum* (Richard Lester, 1966), and *Camelot* (Joshua Logan, 1967) — *My Fair Lady* is set in both a different time period and locale than that of (then) contemporary America. Altman classifies all five films as fairy tale musicals, since each sets “its characters in a class, a plot, and a locale which are as far as possible from those familiar to the audience . . .” (185).⁸⁴ With the exception of *Mary Poppins*, however, *My Fair Lady* differs from Hollywood film musicals of its time in that it entirely eschews location filming for sets constructed within a studio soundstage, thus

⁸³ In a curious technical lapse, Eliza’s return is marred by a shadow moving across the room that precedes her arrival. Since audiences may incorrectly assume that the shadow is Eliza’s, her actual appearance seconds later loses much of its element of surprise.

⁸⁴ I.e., Edwardian London (*Mary Poppins*), 1930s Austria (*The Sound of Music*), Ancient Rome (*A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*), and the divided England of the Dark Ages (*Camelot*).

creating a deliberately artificial, theatrical environment. “[*My Fair Lady*] had to take place in a kind of dream world,” Cukor argued in a 1972 interview. “You couldn’t show the real Covent Garden, or the real Wimpole Street — you had to get the essence of things rather than the actuality” (qtd in Lambert 244).⁸⁵ Cukor goes on to cite the Ascot Races sequence as one instance in which a literal translation in the film would have created an aesthetic clash between the realism of the horses and the theatrical nature of the scenes. Consequently, “in the Ascot sequence we gave an *effect* of horses, but we never cut away to the whole, [sic] realistic thing” [original emphasis] (244).

Commentators, nevertheless, are divided over the merits of such stylisation. McGilligan argues that Cukor should have introduced more “concessions to cinema” rather than allowing the Ascot and other “famously stylized” scenes from the original production to be “staged, blocked and photographed just as they had been presented on stage in thousands of performances over the years” (291). Gavin Lambert, in contrast, asserts that “to carry [the Ascot scene] stylization over to a movie was quite daring” (241). Mast concurs, arguing that by incorporating costume designer Cecil Beaton’s “exclusively black-and-white costumes, grotesque in shape and ornamentation, for a stiffly formal musical number in an only apparently natural setting” and shooting “the number in rigidly motionless formal frames . . .”, Cukor underscores “the lifeless rigidity of these fashionable folk” (312).

Cukor’s approach is in marked contrast to the 1954 screen version of Lerner and Loewe’s *Brigadoon*, which, although entirely confined to an MGM soundstage, strives unsuccessfully to achieve a compromise between “the stylized limitations” of its theatrical origins and “the spaciousness of the real outdoors” (Hirschhorn 343). But as McMillin observes, shooting a film on location presents its own problems in terms “of

⁸⁵ This argument may have constituted a degree of self-justification on Cukor’s part, for as McGilligan observes, Warner Brothers had originally planned to film some of *My Fair Lady* in England, and consequently sent Cukor there to inspect various locations, including racecourses. It was only later in the preproduction stage that, with “the budget elevating fast, Jack Warner [decided] that costs could be trimmed if everything was confined to the Burbank [Los Angeles] soundstages” (283).

trying to capture its own version of the theatre's fixed space". He cites the example of *West Side Story* (1961), which was partially filmed on location in New York City, with its "disheartening" clash between gritty realism and theatrical stylisation in the film's opening scene:

There are some brilliant shots of [the street gang] Jets doing jazz ballet turns in streets where nothing else is happening. The street becomes a space to be filled by the energy of something dangerous, this male dancing. . . . The street functions as a stage in this regard. But then the Jets come upon a basketball court, where kids are playing. The space to be filled with dancing suddenly becomes a space for dribbling a basketball, and the awkwardness of putting these dancers into the space of these kids intensifies when one of the Jets demands the ball be passed to him! The Jets are ludicrously out of place snapping their fingers on a playground while ordinary kids shoot hoops. . . . This combination cannot be imagined in a theatre performance of *West Side Story*. No basketballs there, just dancing and a space to dance in, one defined by a high wall perhaps. (175)⁸⁶

In contrast with *West Side Story* and virtually all other Hollywood musicals of its time, *My Fair Lady* contains relatively little dancing. As Altman observes, "hardly a musical exists that does not at some point literally cover the screen with dancing couples. The American film musical seems to suggest that the natural state of the adult human being is in the arms of an adult human being of the opposite sex. Pairing-off is the natural impulse of the musical . . ." (32). Yet in *My Fair Lady*, the character who dances most often is Doolittle – and seldom in conjunction with a partner. On the two brief occasions when Eliza dances with Higgins ("The Rain in Spain" scene and at the Embassy Ball), the romantic implications of these moments are subverted by the inclusion of a third party: in the first instance, Pickering (who dances with both of them), and, in the second instance, Karpathy (to whom Higgins relinquishes his waltz with Eliza). In short, the dancing in

⁸⁶ Hirschhorn also argues that "[T]he sight of the aggressively masculine Jets . . . donning balletic poses as they sauntered down a grimly realistic West Side back street in New York was initially a jolt to the system . . ." (372).

My Fair Lady — unlike that of the King and Anna in *The King and I*, Maria and Tony in *West Side Story*, or Maria and the Captain in *The Sound of Music* — never culminates in a moment of revelation between its two protagonists.⁸⁷

The absence of any duets in *My Fair Lady* is also highly unusual among Hollywood musicals. Altman argues that, “the duet is the musical’s center of gravity, its method of summarizing in a single scene the film’s entire structure”, and that it “is usually reserved for moments of maximum tension or exultation” (37). Duets, he goes on to write, play “the important function of crystallizing the couple’s attitudes and emotions” and are commonly “delivered in echo fashion: one line for him, one line for her, and so on alternating until the voices merge in a final embrace” (37–38). Yet, as in the stage version of *My Fair Lady*, the only occasion on which Higgins’s and Eliza’s are heard (briefly) in unison is when Pickering also joins them in song (“The Rain in Spain”). Although this scene undoubtedly represents a moment of “exultation”, the involvement of a third party again thwarts its romantic connotations.

My Fair Lady is typical of many film adaptations of Broadway musicals of the 1950s and the 1960s, however, in that the singing voices of at least one of its leading actors is dubbed.⁸⁸ In this instance, the singing of both Audrey Hepburn (Eliza) and Jeremy Brett (Freddy) was provided by so-called vocal doubles Marni Nixon⁸⁹ and Bill Shirley,

⁸⁷ It does, however, serve as a catalyst to Eliza’s realisation that she is in love with Higgins, as expressed in “I Could Have Danced All Night”.

⁸⁸ Other actors whose singing was dubbed in Hollywood musicals include Ava Gardner in *Show Boat* (1951), Deborah Kerr in *The King and I* (1956), John Kerr in *South Pacific* (1958), Natalie Wood in *West Side Story* (1961), Christopher Plummer in *The Sound of Music* (1965), and Franco Nero in *Camelot* (1967). By the late 1960s, however, it had become more common for actors of minimal vocal ability to provide their own singing, e.g., Lee Marvin and Clint Eastwood in *Paint Your Wagon* (Joshua Logan, 1969), and Sophia Loren in *Man of La Mancha* (Arthur Hiller, 1972) — a trend that has persisted to the present day, e.g., Meryl Streep in *Mamma Mia!* (Phyllida Lloyd, 2008).

⁸⁹ Nixon was by this stage an experienced “ghost singer”, having provided the uncredited singing for actresses Deborah Kerr in *The King and I* (1956) and for Natalie Wood in both *West Side Story* (1961) and *Gypsy* (1962).

respectively, although in accordance with longstanding Hollywood practice, neither singer was acknowledged in the film credits.⁹⁰ It was, however, widely known at the time that Hepburn's singing had been dubbed.⁹¹

My Fair Lady is unusual, however, in that Hepburn *initially* provided her own singing for the movie — and, in two instances,⁹² was filmed lip-synching to her prerecorded performances — before Warner Brothers studio executives concluded, as McGilligan notes, “that her voice was simply not up to standard” (287).⁹³ Consequently, in these two songs, soprano Marni Nixon was obliged to synchronise her singing to that of Hepburn's existing filmed performances, rather than pre-recording all of her vocal material before filming had begun, as is usually the case in the production of Hollywood musicals.⁹⁴ In a further departure from standard practice, not all of Hepburn's singing was dubbed, with the initial portions of her performances retained in three additional songs, “Just You Wait”, “The Rain in Spain” and “Without You”.⁹⁵

Although both Rex Harrison (Higgins) and Stanley Holloway (Doolittle) provide their own singing in the film, the former did not pre-record his solo songs, electing instead to

⁹⁰ Acknowledgement was provided in the on-screen credits only in those instances in which an *established* singer had provided the voice for the film's actor, as occurred in the cases of tenor Mario Lanza (for Edmund Purdom) in *The Student Prince* (Richard Thorpe, 1954) and bass Giorgio Tozzi (for Rossano Brazzi) in *South Pacific* (1958).

⁹¹ *Time* magazine referred to the dubbing of Hepburn in its review of the film in its edition of 30 October 1964. The dubbing of Brett, however, remained virtually unknown until Brett himself acknowledged it in the 1994 documentary *My Fair Lady: More Loverly Than Ever*, which he also hosted.

⁹² The songs were “Wouldn't It Be Loverly?” and “Show Me”.

⁹³ Mast argues that, in any event, film audiences were already aware of Hepburn's lack of vocal ability, having heard her singing in *Funny Face* (Stanley Donen, 1957). Hepburn also sang the song “Moon River” in a half-speaking, half-singing performance in *Breakfast at Tiffany's* (Blake Edwards, 1961).

⁹⁴ This is recounted by Nixon on the audio commentary that accompanies the DVD of Warner Brothers' 2000 edition of *My Fair Lady*.

⁹⁵ This also occurs in *West Side Story*. In the song “A Boy Like That/I Have a Love”, Rita Moreno (as the character of Anita) provides her own singing at the beginning of this number, but when the song moves into a higher key, vocal double Betty Wand substitutes for her.

perform them live on the set.⁹⁶ This method had not been employed by the star of a Hollywood musical since the adoption of the aforementioned playback system in 1930, and it constituted a number of technical and artistic challenges for both Harrison and Cukor.⁹⁷ As McGilligan notes, Harrison was obliged to wear a wireless radio microphone while he was singing in order to be able to move freely around the film set.⁹⁸ Presumably anxious to avoid tiring his star by demanding multiple takes of each song to be filmed from different camera angles, Cukor restricted himself to “a two-camera technique [*sic*] for maximum flexibility, and to provide both long shots and close-ups of Harrison as he moved” (McGilligan 288).⁹⁹ Harrison was also obliged to sing *a cappella*, with the orchestral accompaniment added to his performance during postproduction.¹⁰⁰ Although the live-to-camera technique allowed him to alternate between pure speech and half-singing in a seamless fashion with none of the sudden changes in sound quality previously identified by Williams, the technical shortcomings of recording songs on a film set — as opposed to recording under superior sonic conditions in a recording studio — are evident in all of Harrison’s renditions. This creates an unsettling contrast between the relative thinness (in a technical sense) of his recorded songs and the well-captured high fidelity sound quality of that of the other characters’ singing.

⁹⁶ According to Cukor, both he and Harrison felt that Higgins’s songs would “lose [their] directness” if they were lip-synched (Lambert 245).

⁹⁷ There had, however, been occasional instances since 1930 in which a performer had sung a number (or part of a number) live to camera. In *Because You’re Mine* (Alexander Hall, 1952), Mario Lanza sings a partial rendition of the aria “Questa o Quella” *a cappella* in a non-lip-synched performance.

⁹⁸ This was the first time that such a device had been used in a film musical, and retakes were sometimes necessary due to Harrison’s radio microphone picking up unwanted noises from taxis and police cars (Gene Allen, DVD commentary, Warner Brothers’ 2000 edition of *My Fair Lady*).

⁹⁹ According to *My Fair Lady* Art Director Gene Allen, this was the first occasion on which such a microphone had been used during the filming of a musical. Harrison wore the microphone under his tie.

¹⁰⁰ Given the inherent difficulty, especially for a performer who was essentially a non-singer, in maintaining accurate pitch and rhythm while singing unaccompanied, it is not surprising that Harrison’s renditions are arguably less polished (musically) than they had been on either his 1956 or 1959 original cast albums.

Conclusions

In several significant respects, the film version of *My Fair Lady* is closer to Shaw's *Pygmalion* than either its stage musical counterpart or the 1938 *Pygmalion* film. First, it does not dismiss the notion of Freddy as a plausible future husband for Eliza. While the 1938 film undermines Shaw's attempts in his screenplay to create a romantic chemistry between these two characters, portraying Freddy as too callow and insipid to be worthy of Eliza's attention, and the stage version of *My Fair Lady* ultimately implies a symbolic rejection of the former through Eliza's "crowning" of him with her suitcase, the film version of *My Fair Lady* neither ridicules Freddy nor undermines his romantic eligibility. Moreover, in contrast to the 1938 film, in which David Tree's stammering Freddy is never a serious rival in Eliza's affections to Leslie Howard's youthful-looking and implicitly sensual Higgins, the juxtaposition in *My Fair Lady* of Jeremy Brett's more mature, gallant and self-assured Freddy with Rex Harrison's visibly older and strongly paternalistic Higgins represents the differentiation between these two characters that Shaw had desired in the screen version of *Pygmalion*.¹⁰¹ Consequently, the contrast in the *My Fair Lady* film between "Brett's dandy looks and romantic performance [and] Harrison's fatherly bachelor" (Martin 56) creates uncertainty for the audience as regards Eliza's motivation for returning to Wimpole Street in the final scene. As Martin asks rhetorically, "Why, indeed, would Hepburn/Eliza feel an overwhelming 'biological' attraction for Harrison/Higgins, preferring him over Brett/Freddy?" (56).¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ As previously noted, Shaw's preferred choice for the role of Higgins in the 1938 film was Charles Laughton, an actor whose physicality and persona he believed would discourage romanticisation.

¹⁰² This question may not necessarily have occurred to Cukor, whose intention with regard to the meaning of the film's ending has not been established. It is possible that Cukor simply assumed that audiences at the time, accustomed to seeing Audrey Hepburn successfully wooed by men more than twice her age in a series of popular films during the previous decade — e.g., by Humphrey Bogart (thirty years her senior) in *Sabrina* (Billy Wilder, 1954), by Fred Astaire (thirty years her senior) in *Funny Face* (Stanley Donen, 1957), and by Cary Grant (twenty-five years her senior) in *Charade* (Stanley Donen, 1963) — would not have regarded the twenty-one-year age gap between her and Harrison as precluding the likelihood of a romantic relationship.

One could add that, in comparison with Hiller's more expectant and assertive demeanour in the final scene of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, Hepburn's return implies a sense of sadness on her character's part at the possible realisation that the romantic feelings she had expressed so ecstatically at the conclusion of "I Could Have Danced All Night" may never be reciprocated by Higgins. As Martin observes, Asquith's film principally differs from the film version of *My Fair Lady* in that while the former suggests that, "Higgins and Eliza may come to an eventual understanding . . .", "Harrison's mordant Higgins and Hepburn's Eliza make peace between [the two characters] less certain" (54). In short, the ending to the *My Fair Lady* film is carefully ambiguous. As in its stage counterpart, it concludes with the melody to "I Could Have Danced All Night" — a reprise that seemingly supports the inference that romance will ensue. In the film, however, Cukor's employment of the same melody can be regarded as ironic given not only the physical distance between Eliza and Higgins that exists in the scene, but the former's distinctly subdued demeanour.¹⁰³

My own interpretation of the film's ending is that it indicates that the relationship between Eliza and Higgins has reached an impasse. As such, it is faithful to Shaw's sequel, in which further (if disharmonious) contact between Eliza and Higgins does indeed ensue. Moreover, in accordance with the sequel, the film ending is more Shavian than either the 1938 *Pygmalion* film or the stage version of *My Fair Lady* in that it does not preclude Eliza's future marriage to Freddy.

In other respects, the *My Fair Lady* film is closer to Shaw's 1941 version than its stage musical counterpart. It restores the optional bathroom scene, together with the revelation of Eliza's suicidal thoughts to Freddy in the optional Wimpole Street scene (and the latter's concerned response), and an exchange from Act V between Higgins and Eliza in which the latter elaborates on her reasons for wishing to marry Freddy. Thematically, the

¹⁰³ Musicologist Mosco Carner's observations on Puccini's frequent employment of the reprise are arguably appropriate here, for as he notes, its use can serve to illustrate "Dante's line that there is no greater sorrow than to recall a time of happiness in misery" (15).

film version is also closer to all printed editions (and Shaw's screenplay) of *Pygmalion* than the stage version of *My Fair Lady* through its emphasis on the irony of Doolittle's transformation, clarifying (where the stage musical obscures) the predicament of the once-incorrigible sponger who becomes the sponged upon.

Judged purely on its cinematic merit, however, the *My Fair Lady* film generally conforms to Schatz's aforementioned observation that Hollywood adaptations in the 1950s and 1960s suffer from "uninventive direction". Cukor's curious decision to distance audiences from the film through the constant use of medium shots and a largely static camera imbues the film with "an impersonal, oddly perfunctory quality" (McGilligan 292). Moreover, if one compares the visual aesthetics of the screen version of *My Fair Lady* with those of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film, the former emerges as being more akin to a photographed play than a work that has been reconceived for a different medium. As a cinematic representation of the characters of Higgins and Freddy, however, *My Fair Lady* is undoubtedly the more Shavian of the two works.

Conclusions

At the time of *Pygmalion*'s completion in June 1912, Shaw must have recognised that he was risking the misinterpretation of his play by invoking the connotations of Ovid's myth in his title and subtitling the work "a romance". Moreover, by excluding the statue (Galatea) from his title, he would surely have anticipated that audiences would approach the play with the assumption that Pygmalion/Higgins was its central character. Shaw reasoned, however, that *perceptive* theatregoers would recognise the inherent irony in his title given that *Pygmalion* is essentially about Galatea/Eliza and she eventually rejects her "creator" once she has undergone her metamorphosis. In a further twist on Ovid's tale, the play is more a tribute to Galatea/Eliza's innate qualities than it is to her "master"'s abilities.

As it turned out, however, Shaw overestimated audiences' appreciation of these ironies in his socialist and feminist reworking of Ovid's myth, discovering to his dismay that the public had largely taken him at his word when he jokingly referred to the play as "a potboiler". At a time when women were disenfranchised¹ and economically disadvantaged by a patriarchal society, Shaw's audience was unwilling to contemplate the radical notion of an unemployed eighteen-year-old female asserting her independence by spurning the material comforts that her male mentor was clearly content to continue providing for her. Moreover, encouraged by the meddling of the actors who portrayed the roles of Eliza and Higgins in the first English-language production of *Pygmalion* in 1914, the public rejected Shaw's realistic ending, with its omission of any guarantee of romance in Eliza's future independence. Shaw was merely being perverse, audiences concluded, by denying them the opportunity of witnessing the romantic denouement between mentor and pupil, which they inferred would be the inevitable conclusion of *Pygmalion*'s underlying narrative.

¹ Women in the United Kingdom did not receive the right to vote until 1918, when partial suffrage was introduced under the provisions of The Representation of the People Act of 1918. This Act gave enfranchisement to women over the age of thirty who were either married or property owners (Law 36). Universal suffrage was not introduced in the United Kingdom until 1928.

Had *Pygmalion* been written seventy years later, it is unlikely that Western audiences, exposed to two decades of feminist theory, would have regarded a romantic resolution between a teenaged woman and a middleaged, misogynistic bully as either desirable or realistic. Indeed, Willy Russell's 1980 play *Educating Rita* — itself a variation on Shaw's *Pygmalion* — achieved popularity on both stage and on screen² without resorting to romance in its story of the relationship between a working-class woman and a middleaged, alcoholic professor. To the extent, therefore, that Shaw hoped his audiences would identify with Eliza's emotional and spiritual needs — as opposed to those of a male protagonist who wanted his protégée to return to him merely “for the fun of it” and because she was “useful” — his play was strikingly radical for its time in its feminist concerns.

However, in his subsequent attempts to persuade a disbelieving public that Eliza did indeed leave Higgins, and that her announcement of her intention to marry Freddy was neither insincere nor ill considered, Shaw unwittingly laid the foundation for a succession of romanticised adaptations of *Pygmalion*, and through his attempts to dismiss this romanticism obscured the superiority of his original play.

Shaw's first miscalculation was his decision to write a prose sequel to *Pygmalion* in which he sought to erase all ambiguity with regard to Freddy, depicting Eliza's marriage to him as a *certainty* rather than merely a possibility. Although his lengthy rationale for their union was psychologically valid, its impact was negligible in any practical sense given that the sequel was not part of the performing edition of the play. While Shaw may have convinced some *readers* of the play of the likelihood of an Eliza-Freddy marriage, the majority of theatregoers remained oblivious to his sequel and continued to infer that Eliza married Higgins. But, having outlined the case for Freddy, Shaw was not prepared to abandon it. As it turned out, his decision to make his subsequent stage revisions and his screenplay conform to his sequel undermined the radicalism of *Pygmalion*'s ending, since Eliza's independence was partially obscured by the (new) focus on marriage. In the original play, it is arguably irrelevant whether Eliza marries anyone; she simply walks out

² *Educating Rita* (Lewis Gilbert, 1983).

the door at the end of Act V with “her fate . . . as unsettled as yours or mine” (Bentley, *Shaw* 124). Put simply, Shaw’s revisions altered the question facing audiences at the end of both his screenplay and his revised play from “How will Eliza assert her new-found independence?” to the more mundane “Whom will she marry: Higgins or Freddy?” In doing so, Shaw undermined the feminist message of the original play by implying that marriage is the logical consequence of Eliza’s transformation.

Moreover, the promotion of Freddy over Higgins ironically worked against Shaw, since he failed to characterise him sufficiently in his textual revisions and screenplay, and thus inadvertently strengthens the case for Higgins. In *Candida*, Shaw had been able to convince audiences that his heroine, when faced with the choice of remaining with her husband (the Reverend Morell) or eloping with the dashing poet (Marchbanks), had chosen the former because he was “the weaker of the two”, but Morell — unlike the even weaker Freddy — was a major character in the play. Had Shaw *substantially* increased Freddy’s visibility in his revisions, and endowed him with the same clarity of characterisation that distinguishes Doolittle, Mrs Higgins, Pickering et al, audiences might have regarded him as the logical choice for Eliza’s affections. However, it is unlikely that the octogenerian Shaw would have been willing to undertake the radical restructuring that Freddy’s heightened presence in the play would have necessitated. A more practical solution, therefore, would have been for Shaw to have abandoned the notion of promoting Freddy (and with it the question of marriage that it necessarily raises), and instead restricted his revisions to emphasising Eliza’s conviction to leave Higgins.

As it turned out, the makers of the 1938 *Pygmalion* film rejected Shaw’s attempted screenplay resolution in which Higgins imagines Eliza’s married life with Freddy, and instead supplied a conclusion that clearly implied a Higgins-Eliza romance. What seems inexplicable, however, given Shaw’s knowledge of the Dutch and German *Pygmalion* films’ misrepresentation of his screenplay, is that he did not insist on the right of approval of the release print for the 1938 film. Notwithstanding Shaw’s public praise for this adaptation, the irony of a play about transformation undergoing its own metamorphosis

— as it changed from an anti-romantic satire to a love story — cannot have escaped its creator. Subsequently, the Shaw Estate allowed Lerner to base his *My Fair Lady* libretto, at least in part, on the British film because of the mistaken assumption that Shaw had either written or endorsed its screenplay. This was a development of almost-comic irony in the seemingly inexorable romanticisation of *Pygmalion*.

Yet while the stage version of *My Fair Lady* emphasises the probability of a Higgins-Eliza romance — and also minimises several of Shaw’s thematic concerns — its *screen* adaptation is in some ways closer to the original play than the 1938 film. Its ending is more ambiguous with respect to Eliza’s and Higgins’s future relationship than Asquith’s adaptation; despite his revelation of feelings for Eliza, Higgins remains an emotionally stunted individual unlike the sensual, romantic figure depicted by Howard throughout the 1938 film, and it does not rule out the possibility that Eliza and Freddy will become lovers. Moreover, Freddy’s most significant scene, in which he sings the soaring, aria-like “On the Street Where You Live”, allows him a degree of conspicuousness that is absent in both the 1938 film and all of Shaw’s versions of the play.

Notwithstanding these faithful aspects, however, it is unlikely that Shaw would have approved of the *My Fair Lady* film, and even less the stage version, with its overt romanticisation and the diminution of Doolittle’s transformation. In all probability, he would have applauded Bentley’s assertion that,

[*Pygmalion*], like all Mr. Shaw’s plays, begins in parody of romance and melodrama. The people who make films and musical shows out of Mr. Shaw’s plays go back to a point before the beginning. They return to that very romance and melodrama which Mr. Shaw spent all his energies getting away from. (*Lady* 135)

And yet Shaw’s greatest concern, I suspect, would not have been the romanticisation of *Pygmalion*, but rather the supplanting of the play by its musical successors. He would surely have been appalled by the decision of the Shaw Estate, as represented by the

Public Trustee and the Society of Authors, to impose a ten-year ban, beginning in 1956, on all stage productions of *Pygmalion* and screenings of the 1938 film “so as to give [*My Fair Lady*] a clear unrivalled run” (Smoker, *Pygmalion* 5). Although the ban was subsequently lifted for “schools and some small productions and screenings” after protests from the Shaw Society and leading literary figures of the time,³ it effectively lasted until the mid-1970s (6). Only in recent years has *Pygmalion* been performed professionally again with any frequency, while the stage version of *My Fair Lady* has been revived on a regular basis.⁴

Interestingly, however, there are signs that the public’s enthusiasm for romanticised productions of *Pygmalion* has waned, and that this is having repercussions for *My Fair Lady*. Possibly influenced by two recent stage productions of *Pygmalion* at London’s West End and on Broadway,⁵ both of which reverted to the original version of the play and emphasised Eliza’s decision to leave Higgins, a number of new productions of *My Fair Lady* have reportedly downplayed the musical’s romantic aspects.⁶ Moreover, as far back as 1993, when *My Fair Lady* was revived on Broadway at the Virginia Theater, there were directorial attempts to impose a (somewhat) more Shavian interpretation on

³ E.g., Graham Greene, E.M. Forster, T.S. Eliot, and Stephen Spender (Holroyd, *Nunn* 7).

⁴ E.g. on Broadway in 1976, 1981 (with the then-seventy-three-year-old Harrison reprising his role as Higgins), and 1993; at the West End, London in 1979 and 2001; and in Cameron Mackintosh’s touring production of the US in 2007–08.

⁵ At The Old Vic in 2008 (transferred from a 2007 production at the Theatre Royal, Bath), and at the American Airlines Theatre in 2007. See Chapter Four for more details.

⁶ Reviewing the touring Trevor Nunn production at the Aronoff Center, Cincinnati, in 2007, Scott Cain noted that the show was not particularly “heartfelt or romantic”, and that Higgins was “especially harsh and brutish”. Freddy, in contrast, was portrayed as a “fiery[,] lovelorn” suitor (1). Reviewing an unrelated 2009 production at the Showboat Majestic, Cincinnati, Tom McElfresh opined that, “[Michael Shawn] Starks is louder and more harsh than Higgins should be,” and that the question of whether [Higgins and Eliza] get together at the end is left to interpretation. If yes, it won’t be in any conventionally romantic way” (1). In a review of a 2009 production at Chicago’s Marriott Theatre, Tony Adler noted that Kevin Gudahl’s Higgins was “short, bald, and [overweight]” and devoid of Rex Harrison’s and Leslie Howard’s “patrician sex appeal”, while “The romance between Higgins and . . . Eliza Doolittle, is calculatedly un-, even anti-romantic” (1).

the musical. On that occasion, director Howard Davies clashed repeatedly with Lerner's executor (David Grossberg) concerning his intention to "[underscore] some of the darker implications of the fable" (qtd in Weber 1). Davies also wanted to depict Eliza kissing Freddy and to obscure her return to Wimpole Street in the final scene, thus making it "impossible to tell if she's come back or if Higgins is only imagining her" (2). However, these modifications were rejected by Grossberg on the basis that they were unfaithful to Lerner's stage libretto (2-3).

But neither Lerner's libretto nor his screenplay forms the direct basis of a proposed film remake of *My Fair Lady*, which is tentatively expected to be released in 2013. The film, which is being produced by Duncan Kenworthy and Cameron Mackintosh and will be directed by John Madden,⁷ is to be based on a screenplay by Emma Thompson.⁸ Reporting in *Variety*, Tatiana Siegel writes that the film will incorporate more of Shaw's stage version of *Pygmalion* than the 1964 screen version of *My Fair Lady* used, and that, "The goal [of the filmmakers] is to dramatize the emotional highs and lows of Doolittle as she undergoes the ultimate metamorphosis under the tutelage of Professor Henry Higgins" (1). This suggests that Eliza, rather than Higgins, will be the focus of the new film. It will be fascinating to discover if romance will yet again prevail in this adaptation or whether what Shaw called the "revolting tragedy" of an Eliza-Higgins marriage will be averted.

⁷ Madden's directorial credits include the films *Mrs Brown* (1997), *Shakespeare in Love* (1998) and *Proof* (2005).

⁸ Thompson wrote the screenplay for *Sense and Sensibility* (Ang Lee, 1995), for which she won an Academy Award for Best Adapted Screenplay.

Appendices

Appendix One: Synopsis of *Pygmalion*

Note: The text referred to here is that of the 1916 Constable edition. Shaw's idiosyncratic spelling and punctuation, including the absence of apostrophes on contractions such as "I've" and "He's", have been preserved. However, I have substituted his spacing of letters where emphasis is intended with italics.

Act I: 11:15 p.m., Covent Garden, London. The play begins with "*Torrents of heavy summer rain. Cab whistles blowing frantically in all directions.*" Meanwhile a group of people are sheltering under the portico of St. Paul's Church, including "*a lady [Mrs Eynsford Hill] and her daughter [Clara] in evening dress. They are all peering out gloomily at the rain, except one man with his back turned to the rest, who seems wholly preoccupied with a notebook in which he is writing busily.*"

The man, we eventually learn, is Henry Higgins, Professor of Phonetics, and author of Higgins's Universal Alphabet. Higgins is engrossed in transcribing the speech patterns of a Cockney flower girl (Eliza Doolittle), one of the aforementioned group. Meanwhile Clara complains to her mother about the absence of her brother Freddy, who has been dispatched to find a taxi. A moment later Freddie returns empty-handed, much to the annoyance of Clara and her mother. He is immediately sent off again, colliding with Eliza in the process, and upsetting her basket of flowers. "Nah then, Freddy: look wh'y' gowin, deah," Eliza remonstrates. Curious as to how Eliza knows her son's name, Mrs Hill gives the flower girl a sixpence in the hope that the latter will reveal the source of her information. Eliza replies that she had only called him "Freddy . . . same as you might yourself if you was talking to a stranger and wished to be pleasant." Clara bemoans the waste of a sixpence, retreating "*in disgust behind the pillar*".

At this point, "*an elderly gentleman of the amiable military type*" (Colonel Pickering)

takes refuge under the shelter. Eliza attempts to sell him a flower, and is persistent, clearly not believing that he has “nothing less” than a sovereign. Pickering, mildly irritated by her, then finds that he has three halfpence, which he gives to her before retreating to another pillar.

At this point, a bystander urges Eliza to give Pickering a flower, warning her that, “Theres a bloke here behind taking down every blessed word youre saying.” On hearing this, Eliza becomes “*terrified*”, and amid the ensuing hullabaloo Higgins comes forward. Explaining to the suspicious onlookers that he is not a policeman, Higgins produces his notebook in an attempt to placate Eliza. Unable to read his phonetic script (“That aint proper writing”), Eliza’s anxiety increases. Meanwhile Higgins astounds the onlookers by correctly identifying the areas of London that several of them originate from.

The rain now having stopped, the crowd disperses, leaving only Higgins, Colonel Pickering and Eliza on stage. Intrigued by the accuracy of Higgin’s observations, Pickering politely enquires: “How do you do it, if I may ask?” Replying that the answer lies in simple phonetics, Higgins boasts that he can place the accent of any man “within two miles in London. Sometimes within two streets.” Higgins then predicts that Eliza’s “kerbstone English . . . will keep her in the gutter to the end of her days”. He adds, however, that, “[I]n three months I could pass that girl off as a duchess at an ambassador’s garden party”.

Pickering and Higgins suddenly realise that they know each other by repute through their respective interests in dialects, and the former invites the latter to supper. As the two men leave, Eliza again pleads with Pickering to buy one of her flowers, using the excuse that she is “short for [her] lodging”. Higgins then reminds her that she had previously claimed that she “could change half-a-crown”. Eliza reacts by “*flinging [her] basket [of flowers] at his feet*”, crying: “Take the whole blooming basket for sixpence.” The church clock suddenly strikes, and Higgins, “*hearing in it the voice of God*”, throws Eliza a large number of coins as he leaves. Eliza excitedly scoops up the money, and then encounters Freddy, who has returned with a taxi. “*With grandeur*”, Eliza announces that money is no object, and departs in Freddy’s taxi, leaving him alone on the stage. “Well, I’m dashed!” he declares. Act I ends.

Act II: 11:00 a.m. the following day in Higgins's laboratory in Wimpole Street. The act begins with Higgins and Pickering engrossed in a discussion about vowel sounds. Mrs Pearce then informs them that "quite a common girl" with a "dreadful" accent has arrived to see Higgins. The latter, excited at the prospect of demonstrating to Pickering how he makes recordings of his subjects, asks Mrs Pearce to send the girl up.

Eliza Doolittle enters, dressed slightly more tidily than in the previous evening. Immediately recognising the young woman, Higgins brusquely dismisses her, declaring that he already has sufficient "records . . . of the Lisson Grove lingo".

Eliza protests, telling Higgins, "You aint heard what I come for yet." Intrigued, Higgins asks Pickering if they should "ask this baggage to sit down, or throw [her] out of the window". Eliza reacts in terror, but after gentle coaxing from Pickering she sits down and reveals the purpose of her visit:

I want to be a lady in a flower shop stead of sellin at the corner of Tottenham Court Road. But they wont take me unless I can talk more genteel. He said he could teach me. Well, here I am ready to pay him — not asking any favor — and he treats me as if I was dirt.

Pickering, remembering Higgins's boast from the previous evening, bets him "all the expenses of the experiment" that he cannot successfully present Eliza at the ambassador's garden party. Higgins excitedly accepts the challenge, vowing that, "I shall make a duchess of this draggletailed guttersnipe." He instructs Mrs Pearce to burn Eliza's clothes and take her to the bathroom.

In the ensuing commotion, Mrs Pearce implores Higgins to "be reasonable" and Eliza worries that he is "off his chump". Mrs Pearce also raises the issue of Eliza's future after the experiment has ended. "Whats to become of her if I leave her in the gutter?" Higgins replies.

Eliza reluctantly accepts, and is taken away to the bathroom. Mrs Pearce returns shortly afterwards and remonstrates with a bemused Higgins about his bad manners and use of coarse language.

Moments later, the unexpected arrival of Alfred Doolittle, Eliza's father, causes Mrs Pearce some consternation. The former, described by Shaw as "*an elderly but vigorous dustman*" — seemingly "*free from fear and conscience*" — announces that he has come for his daughter. Higgins immediately agrees to give Eliza to Doolittle, much to the latter's discomfort. Doolittle then artfully reveals that his motive for visiting is strictly a pecuniary one:

All I ask is my rights as a father; and you're the last man alive to expect me to let her go for nothing; for I can see you're one of the straight sort, Governor. Well, what's a five pound note to you? And what's Eliza to me?

Shocked and fascinated in equal measure by Doolittle, Higgins agrees to pay him the five pounds. Assuring Higgins that the money will be well spent on "one good spree for myself and the missus", Doolittle departs, meeting a freshly washed Eliza as he leaves. After initially failing to recognise her, he declares himself surprised that "she'd clean up as good looking as that". Higgins then turns his attention to Eliza, reminding her not to be snobbish towards her friends now that she has "risen in the world". Higgins and Pickering concur that they "have taken on a stiff job". Act II ends.

Act III: Between 4:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. at Higgins's mother's Chelsea flat, several months later. The act begins with Mrs Higgins "*dismayed*" by the unexpected arrival of her son. She reminds him that this is her "at-home day", and that his presence will "offend all [her] friends". Higgins airily dismisses her concerns, telling his mother that he has a "phonetic job" for her — a "common flower girl" that he has "picked up". Reassuring his mother that he has "taught [the girl] to speak properly", he explains that he has forewarned Eliza "to keep to two subjects: the weather and everybody's health". The parlor-maid then announces the arrival of Mrs and Miss Eynsford Hill.

Shaw informs us at this point that Mrs Hill is a "*well bred*" woman "*of straitened means*", and that her daughter Clara displays "*the bravado of genteel poverty*". Higgins greets the Hills brusquely, and after an awkward silence Pickering arrives, followed in quick succession by Freddy. Higgins vaguely recognises the Hills, but is unable to place them. Mrs Higgins, embarrassed by her son's lack of social graces, apologises to her guests for

his “trying” manner. Clara, however, sympathises with Higgins for his lack of small talk, lamenting, “If people would only be frank and say what they really think!” Higgins responds gloomily, saying that such behaviour “would really break up the whole show”. Another awkward moment ensues, broken only by the arrival of Eliza, “*exquisitely dressed*”, whose “*remarkable distinction and beauty*” impress the group.

“*Speaking with pedantic correctness of pronunciation and great beauty of tone,*” Eliza greets Mrs Higgins and the Hills. Freddy is immediately infatuated by her, and both he and his mother express their certainty that they have met Eliza before. Higgins then suddenly recalls the circumstances of his first encounter with the Hills, exclaiming, “Covent Garden! What a damned thing!” — to the astonishment of the guests.

The awkward silence that follows is broken by Mrs Higgins’s reference to the likelihood of rain. Eliza responds with a formal reference to the current “barometrical situation”, a pronouncement that causes Freddy to laugh uproariously at her supposed wit.

Unperturbed, Eliza uses this opportunity to discuss the suspicious death of her aunt, whose family, she tells a confused Mrs Eynsford Hill, had “done her in”. Higgins quickly explains that Eliza is merely using “the new small talk”. An emboldened Eliza then continues in similar vein, much to the delight of Freddy, who tells her that she does “the new small talk . . . so awfully well”. Rising from her seat to leave a moment later, Eliza is asked by Freddy if she will be departing on foot. “Not bloody likely,” she responds, causing a “*sensation*”.

After Eliza has left, Mrs Eynsford Hill confesses that she “really cant get used to the new ways”. Clara, however, praises the refreshing nature of this “new small talk”. As the Hills leave, Higgins mischievously urges Clara to emulate Eliza’s language at the three remaining at-home days that she and her mother are scheduled to attend that afternoon. Clara immediately scandalises her mother by repeating the word “bloody”.

Her guests gone, Mrs Higgins reproves Henry for bringing Eliza to her home: “You silly boy, of course shes not presentable.” Blaming her son for the “canal barge” vocabulary that Eliza has learned, she labels Higgins and Pickering “a pretty pair of babies, playing with [their] live doll”. She points out to both men that “the manners and habits” that they

are helping Eliza to acquire will at the same time “disqualify [her] from earning her own living”, citing “poor” Mrs Hill as an example of genteel poverty. Dismissing her concerns, Higgins and Pickering depart, leaving a vexed Mrs Higgins to cry out, “Oh men! men!! men!!!” Act III ends.

Act IV: Midnight at Higgins’s Wimpole Street laboratory, several months later. Eliza enters the room first “*in opera cloak, brilliant evening dress, and diamonds*”. It is immediately apparent that she is upset. Higgins and Pickering follow; both men are in good spirits. Higgins suddenly declares, “I wonder where the devil my slippers are!” Glaring at him, Eliza leaves the room, returning a moment later with the slippers and silently placing them in front of an unseeing Higgins.

As the two men chat amiably about the evening’s activities, it emerges that Eliza has achieved a notable success: “The garden party, a dinner party, and the opera!” Pickering excitedly recounts, adding that, “Youve won your bet, Higgins.” The latter responds with relief (“Thank God it’s over!”), at which “*Eliza flinches violently*”. Announcing that, “(T)he whole thing has been a bore”, Higgins rises to retire saying, “(N)ow I can go to bed at last without dreading tomorrow”.

This last remark produces a “*murderous*” expression on Eliza’s face, but the men remain oblivious to her mood. Pickering then retires for the evening. Higgins follows, but pauses to advise Eliza that he requires tea rather than coffee in the morning from Mrs Pearce. Now alone in the room, Eliza struggles to retain her composure before throwing “*herself furiously on the floor, raging*”. Higgins suddenly returns, bemoaning the disappearance of his slippers. Gathering these items from the floor, Eliza violently throws them at him. Shocked by this outburst, Higgins asks her if anything is bothering her. “Ive won your bet for you, havnt I?” Eliza replies. “Thats enough for you. *I dont matter, I suppose.*”

Calling her a “presumptuous insect”, Higgins informs Eliza that it was *he* who won the bet and not her. Moments later, she responds with fury to Higgins’s comment that, “The creature is nervous, after all,” and attempts to scratch him. Forcibly restrained by Higgins, Eliza cries out in despair: “Whats to become of me?”

“How the devil do I know whats to become of you?” Higgins replies. Attributing her

actions to mere anxiety over the evening's events, he reassures her that she has "nothing more to worry about". He suggests that she find a husband, observing that, "all men are not confirmed old bachelors like me and the Colonel". When he alludes to the possibility of his mother finding someone "who would do very well", Eliza responds: "We were above that at the corner of Tottenham Court Road." Higgins dismisses her comment as "tosh" and announces that he is going to bed.

Eliza then enquires as to whether her clothes belong to herself or to Colonel Pickering, adding that, "He might want them for the next girl you pick up to experiment on." Wounded by this comment, Higgins tells her she "may take the whole damned houseful" — with the exception of the hired jewels. Taking off the latter, Eliza infuriates Higgins by suggesting that she might be blamed if they were to go missing. She then takes off a ring that she identifies as one that Higgins had purchased for her in Brighton. Seizing this object, Higgins angrily tosses it into the fireplace, almost striking Eliza in his rage. Recovering his composure, he rebukes her: "You have caused me to lose my temper: a thing that has hardly ever happened to me before." As he leaves the room, Eliza taunts him: "You'd better leave a note for Mrs Pearce about the coffee; for she won't be told by me." Higgins responds by damning Mrs Pearce, the coffee, Eliza, and his "own folly in having lavished hard-earned knowledge . . . on a heartless guttersnipe". Leaving the room in a deliberately formal manner, he betrays his true feelings "*by slamming the door savagely*".

The act ends with a smiling Eliza "[*expressing*] her feelings in a wild pantomime in which an imitation of Higgins's exit is confused with her own triumph" before she "*finally goes down on her knees on the heartrug to look for the ring*". Act IV ends.

Act V: The following morning in Mrs Higgins's drawing room. The act begins with the parlor-maid advising Mrs Higgins that her son and Pickering are downstairs on the telephone, calling the police. Learning that her son "is in a state", Mrs Higgins asks the maid to inform Eliza "not to come down til I send for her".⁹

⁹ This is the first indication to the audience that Eliza had gone to Mrs Higgins's home between Acts IV and V.

Entering the room, Higgins immediately informs his mother that Eliza has “bolted”. Mrs Higgins replies that he “must have frightened her”; Higgins indignantly denies this. He is then joined by a flustered Pickering, who is annoyed that that the policeman he has been speaking to “suspected us of some improper purpose” in seeking Eliza.

Their conversation is interrupted by the arrival of Alfred Doolittle, “brilliantly dressed in a new fashionable frockcoat” and other stylish accoutrements. Doolittle immediately accuses Higgins of having “destroyed [his] happiness” by delivering him “into the hands of middle class morality”. Revealing that Higgins had commended him to American philanthropist Ezra D. Wannafeller as England’s “most original moralist”, Doolittle explains that Wannafeller has since died, leaving the dustman “a share in his Pre-digested Cheese Trust worth three thousand [pounds] a year” with the proviso that he lecture for the Wannafeller Moral Reform World League “up to six times a year”.

Doolittle laments that far from enjoying his newly-acquired wealth, “everybody touches me for money” and “I have to live for others and not for myself: that’s middle class morality.” When Mrs Higgins suggests that he simply “repudiate” Wannafeller’s legacy, Doolittle replies meekly that he hasn’t “the nerve”.

Mrs Higgins then reveals that Eliza is upstairs and that the latter has informed her of Higgins’s and Pickering’s “brutal” behaviour towards her. Rebuking both men for their lack of sensitivity, Mrs Higgins announces that Eliza will not be returning to Wimpole Street, but “is quite willing to meet [Higgins and Pickering] on friendly terms and to let bygones be bygones”. Hearing this, Higgins reluctantly agrees to behave himself, and Mrs Higgins asks Alfred Doolittle to repair to the balcony “until [Eliza] has made it up with” the two men.

A “[s]unny, *self-possessed*” Eliza appears and enquires after Higgins’s health. The latter responds by snapping at her, and ordering her to “come home; and [not] be a fool”. Ignoring Higgins, Eliza turns to Pickering, telling him that it was because of his “really nice manners” that she learnt how to be “a lady”. She then cites the moment that he first called her “Miss Doolittle”¹⁰ as signifying “the beginning of [her] self-respect”, and

¹⁰ This moment occurs early in Act II.

suggests that the real “difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how shes treated”.

At this Higgins predicts that Eliza “will relapse into the gutter in three weeks without me at her elbow”. Vowing that she will never relapse, she immediately disproves this by reverting to her Cockney “A-a-a-a-ah-ow-oo!” at the sight of her father, who has quietly returned to the room. Higgins responds to Eliza’s relapse “*with a crow of triumph*”. Doolittle explains to Eliza that he has come into money, and that the latter’s “stepmother” is now so “intimidated” by “middle class morality” that she feels obliged to marry him. Eliza reluctantly agrees to attend her father’s wedding (“If the Colonel says I must, I — I’ll [*almost sobbing*] I’ll demean myself”); Pickering and Mrs Higgins also decide to attend. The latter leaves the room to dress for the wedding, and Doolittle and Pickering depart. Higgins and Eliza remain.

“*Eliza goes out on the balcony to avoid being alone with Higgins,*” but is immediately joined by the latter. Returning to the drawing room, she “*makes for the door*”, but is again thwarted by Higgins, who “*gets his back to the door before she reaches it*”. “Well, Eliza, youve had a bit of your own back, as you call it,” he tells her. “Have you had enough? and are you going to be reasonable? Or do you want any more?” Eliza replies that he only wants her to return so that she can “pick up [his] slippers and put up with [his] tempers and fetch and carry for [him]”. “If you come back I shall treat you just as I have always treated you,” Higgins responds. “I cant change my nature; and I dont intend to change my manners.”

Ignoring his claim that he treats “all human souls” in exactly the same way, Eliza tells Higgins that he is “a motor bus: all bounce and go, and no consideration for anyone”. Informing Higgins that he will have to get used to life without her, she draws an admission from him that, “I have grown accustomed to your face and appearance. I like them, rather.” Asking her to come back “for the fun of it”, Higgins suggests that he could adopt her if she wishes, or that alternatively she could marry Pickering.

“I wouldnt marry *you* if you asked me; and youre nearer my age than what he is,”¹¹ Eliza responds, adding moments later that Freddy is infatuated with her. The latter remark annoys Higgins, who responds by implying that she has a fundamental choice to make between “the life of the gutter” and the world of “Science and Literature and Classical Music and Philosophy and Art”. She deserves to marry an ambassador, he adds, for “I’m not going to have my masterpiece thrown away on Freddy.”

Eliza replies that, “You think I like you to say that. But . . . I wont be coaxed round as if I was a baby or a puppy. If I cant have kindness, I’ll have independence.” She announces that she will become an assistant to Professor Nepean,¹² a phonetician whose name immediately evokes a furious reaction from Higgins. “That imposter!” Higgins shouts, and he momentarily “*lays hands on her*” before “*stamping with rage at having forgotten himself*”. Eliza further seeks to antagonise him by declaring that she will “advertize it in the papers that your duchess is only a flower girl . . .” and that she will teach his methods “for a thousand guineas”. “You damned impudent slut, you!” Higgins responds (“*wondering at her*”), adding in the next breath: “By George, Eliza, I said I’d make a woman of you; and I have. I like you like this.”

Their conversation is interrupted by the return of Mrs Higgins. Learning that Higgins will not be permitted to come to the wedding (“He cant behave himself in church,” Mrs Higgins advises), Eliza turns to him, saying, “Then I shall not see you again, Professor. Good-bye.” Unperturbed, Higgins calls out after Eliza, asking her to buy him a ham, a Stilton cheese, a pair of gloves, and a tie. “Buy them yourself,” Eliza replies “*disdainfully*” as “*She sweeps out.*” Turning to his mother, Higgins confidently predicts that Eliza will “buy em all right enough”. His mother departs to join Eliza. Now alone, Higgins “*rattles his cash in his pocket; chuckles; and disports himself in a highly self-satisfied manner*”. The play ends.

¹¹ Higgins corrects her grammar at this point (“Than he is : not ‘than what he is.’”), causing Eliza to lose her temper.

¹² This is the only occasion in the play on which Professor Nepean is mentioned.

Appendix 2: Synopsis of New Sequences in Shaw's 1934–38 Screenplay

Note: Unless otherwise stated, the textual source for the following synopsis is Shaw's 1938 manuscript of his *Pygmalion* screenplay (HRC SHAW 25.7). I have italicized Shaw's instructions and descriptions in order to differentiate them from his dialogue.

I. Prologue (Scenes 1–5). Shaw writes that, "*The film begins with a summer thunderstorm in London.*" In a short prologue he establishes first the setting, then Eliza's identity and occupation, and finally the character of Freddy. He begins by describing a series of brief shots: a darkening sky, a cut to Piccadilly Circus, where Eliza is seated among a group of middle-aged or elderly flower sellers, and then a cut to a closer shot of Eliza and her nearest companion. He provides the following description of Eliza:

(H)er good looks are not yet discoverable: she is dirty and her ill-combed hair is dirty. Her shawl and skirt are old and ugly. Her boots are deplorable, her hat, an old black straw with a band of violets, indescribable. ELIZA is listless, discouraged and miserable.

To her elderly companion, Eliza complains that, "I 'avn't sold a bloody thing since five o'clock, I 'avn't. What's the good of doing anything in this weather?"

Shaw then describes a series of shots in rapid succession: a flash of lightning, Eliza rushing away, rain, people scurrying for cover, another street scene "*continuing the business of people caught in a heavy shower*", and finally Freddy, who fleetingly appears while he attempts to hail a taxi. At this point Eliza re-emerges, only to disappear again "*in Freddy's footsteps*". The Prologue ends.

II. The drive to Angel Court and the interior of Eliza's lodgings (Scenes 17–23).

Shaw changes the ending to Act I so that Freddy interacts more with Eliza, to whom he now bids "goodbye" (twice). Eliza also converses with the the hitherto-silent Taximan, revealing her naïvete and pride in the process:

TAXIMAN. Where to?

ELIZA. Bucknam Pellis.

TAXIMAN. What d'ye mean – Bucknam Palace?

ELIZA. Don't you know where it is? In the Green Park, where the King lives.
(*To Freddy*) Goodbye, Freddy. Don't let me keep you standing there. Goodbye.

FREDDY. Goodbye.

He goes.

TAXIMAN. Here? What's this about Bucknam Palace? What business have you got at Bucknam Palace?

ELIZA. Of course I havnt none. But I wasn't going to let him know that.

Shaw employs a dissolve to cut from the end of the play's Act I to a new bridging scene at Angel Court. After some brief banter between Eliza and the Taximan, Shaw employs camera angles from two different perspectives: one of Angel Court from the perspective of an archway towards which Eliza is trudging; the other a rear view of Eliza "*wearily dragging along with her basket*" until "*she disappears into a doorway.*"

The screenplay now takes us into Eliza's lodging. Shaw describes her room with its damp and loose-hanging wallpaper, its broken window pane, its newspaper cuttings on the wall of "*a popular actor and a fashion plate of ladies' dresses, all wildly beyond poor Eliza's means . . .*", and its empty birdcage. These are Eliza's "*only visible luxuries*", Shaw tells us; "*the rest is the irreducible minimum of poverty's needs . . .*".

Eliza enters the room. Shaw describes her relief as she dumps her basket, takes off her shawl, and sits at her table, taking "*handfuls of money from the pocket of her apron*" and jingling the silver "*at her ear like a child's rattle*". Shaw then employs a montage sequence that gently mocks her naïve dreams of grandeur. This begins with a close-up of Eliza jingling her money while "*her habitual anxious poor woman's expression changes very gradually into a happy smile*". The shot fades out into another close-up of Eliza, "*still in her dirty make-up, wearing her best hat with three enormous ostrich feathers*" and looking "*dreadfully ugly in it but very self-satisfied*".

Shaw then describes a further fade-out into another close-up, this time depicting Eliza

dressed in the manner of Queen Alexandra, though “*with an expression of extreme hauteur*” and “*still ridiculous in her dirty make-up . . .*”. The image of Eliza as Queen Alexandra then fades out into a shot of Eliza in her lodging after nightfall, as she prepares herself for sleep — taking off only her skirt, boots and stockings, and going to bed “*without any further change*”. She then blows out the candle and the scene ends in darkness.

III. The bathroom at Wimpole Street (Scenes 25–29). Instead of occurring offstage, as it does in the original play, Eliza’s first bath at Wimpole Street occurs in the middle of Act II. Shaw cuts from Eliza’s cries as she is led away by Mrs Pearce to a shot of the two women on the stairs. He then cuts to another shot on the landing above, taking the pair through a door into “*A good servant’s bedroom, light, clean, and cheerful.*” This will be Eliza’s bedroom. “O-oh, I couldn’t sleep here, missus,” Eliza cries. “It’s too good for the likes of me.” In response, Mrs Pearce equates cleanliness first with self-esteem (“You’ve got to make yourself as clean as the room: then you won’t be afraid of it”), and then with virtue (“You know you can’t be a good girl inside if you’re a dirty girl outside”).

Entering the bathroom, Eliza initially expresses disbelief — “You expect me to get into that and wet myself all over! Not me” — then fear (“it would kill me”), and finally “*abject terror*” as Mrs Pearce “*sets to work with the scrubbing brush*”.

The scene underlines both Eliza’s naïvete and impoverished circumstances: “Don’t you take off all your clothes every night when you go to bed?” Mrs Pearce asks. “No. Why should I?” replies Eliza. “Do you mean that you sleep in the underclothes you wear in the daytime?” Mrs Pearce again enquires. “What else have I to sleep in?” replies Eliza.

Mrs Pearce dons “*a pair of white rubber gloves*”, filling the bath with hot and cold water, which she tests with a thermometer. “*She then takes a formidable looking long handled scrubbing brush and soaps it profusely with a ball of scented soap.*” Then “*defly snatching the gown away and throwing Eliza down on her back*”, Mrs Pearce begins her “*vigorous lathering*” amid “*a tempest of yells*”.

IV. Entr’acte (no scene number); source: CS 480. In the 1934 screenplay, this constitutes a wordless bridging scene between Acts II and III depicting the time period

from the beginning of Eliza's lessons until her first appearance at Mrs Higgins's home. Shaw writes that music – though “*not jazz*”, he cautions – should accompany the scene, which he offers “*only [as] a suggestion: but it would mark the break in the play, and would be a relief to the string of interiors*”. Rather than employing what he calls “*the stale device of exhibiting a calendar with Father Time tearing off the months*”, Shaw writes that the period from October to February should be represented by dancers who “*pursue each other across the scene*” of “*A woodland with a lake and distant hills.*”

The dresses of the dancers change with the seasons. The landscape also changes, shewing the fall of the leaf in October, the freezing of the lake and the snow in December and January, and the approach of Spring in February.

Note: Shaw retained the entr'acte in his 1938 revisions, but it appears that he was later persuaded by Gabriel Pascal and Anthony Asquith — producer and director, respectively, of the British *Pygmalion* film — to substitute it with a short scene depicting a phonetics lesson.

The phonetics lesson (no scene number); source: CS 245–46. The phonetics scene dissolves from the Higgins–Pickering exchange that concludes Act II in both the play and screenplay (“Pickering: we have taken on a stiff job”/“Higgins: we have”) into a shot of Higgins's study the following day. Eliza, Pickering, and Higgins are all initially seated — with Eliza “*feeling like a hospital outpatient at a first encounter with the doctors*” — but “*Higgins, constitutionally unable to sit still, discomposes her still more by striding restlessly about.*” Higgins repeatedly orders Eliza to say her alphabet, and then disparages the sounds that she makes:

HIGGINS [*with the roar of a wounded lion*] Stop. Listen to this, Pickering. This is what we pay for as elementary education. This unfortunate animal has been locked up for nine years in school at our expense to teach her to speak and read the language of Shakespear and Milton. And the result is Ahyee, Be-yee, Ce-yee, Deyee.

Reducing Eliza almost to tears, he persists: “Say a cup of tea. . . . Put your tongue forward until it squeezes against the top of your lower teeth. Now say cup.” Eliza

responds: “C-c-c – I cant. C-Cup.” Pickering immediately praises her, while a surprised Higgins observes, “By Jupiter, she’s done it at the first shot.” Higgins then moves on to “T” sounds, before ordering her to practise them on her own. “Another lesson at half-past four this afternoon,” he reminds her, as “*Liza, still sobbing, rushes from the room.*” (The scene then dissolves into Act III.)

V. The ambassador’s reception (1934: Scenes 32–34; 1938: Scenes 32–35); source (1934 version only): CS 481. *Note:* Mrs Higgins’s angry exclamation, “Oh, men! men!! men!!!,” at the conclusion of Scene 31 (Act III) dissolves into this scene.

In his 1934 screenplay, Shaw restricts the scene to a brief depiction of Pickering, Eliza, and Higgins arriving at the unnamed Ambassador’s Quarters in London. Pulling up in a Rolls-Royce car, the three alight, with Eliza “*in opera cloak, brilliant evening dress, diamonds; fan, flowers, and all accessories*”. As they walk up the steps, “*Higgins, bringing up the rear, is elephantine and sulky.*” The three are then announced as they enter the first flight of a “*grand staircase within the [Embassy] building*”. Eliza enters the Embassy first, followed by Pickering and Higgins. The scene then changes to the second flight, where the Ambassador and his wife are receiving their guests. Shaw writes that, “*Nothing of their greeting civilities or the responses thereto can be distinguished in the din of conversation.*” Eliza is then “*received and greeted*”, getting “*through the ordeal gracefully*” as she “*passes into the crowd*”. The scene fades out with a shot of Pickering introducing Higgins to the Ambassador’s wife.

The 1938 version differs from the earlier scenario from the point at which the trio of Higgins, Eliza and Pickering enter the “*spacious hall from which the grand staircase rises*”. Eliza excuses herself to go to the ladies’ cloakroom. During her absence, Higgins is approached by “*an important looking young man with an astonishingly hairy face*” and “*an enormous moustache, flowing out into luxuriant whiskers*”. The man introduces himself as Nepomuk, “*your first pupil, your best and greatest pupil*”.

Nepomuk boasts that he is “*indispensable at these international parties*” because he can place the origin of any man in Europe “*the moment he opens his mouth*”. He then implies that he is a blackmailer:

This Greek diplomatist pretends he cannot speak nor understand English.¹³ He cannot deceive me. He is the son of a Clerkenwell watchmaker. He speaks English so villainously that he dare not utter a word of it without betraying his origin. I help him to pretend; but I make him pay through the nose. I make them all pay. Ha ha!

His services required by the hostess, "*Nepomuk hurries away up the stairs.*" "If he finds [Eliza] out I lose my bet," Higgins tells a nervous Pickering. Eliza then joins them and the three ascend the stairs to the first landing, where they are presented to the ambassador and his wife. Her curiosity aroused, the latter instructs Nepomuk to "find out all about [Eliza]". The next scene depicts "*the reception in full swing*". Eliza enters, making a considerable impression on the guests, who "*make a lane for her as though she were a great personage*".

Nepomuk bursts in and declares to the hostess, who is engaged in conversation with Higgins, that Eliza "is a fraud". She cannot be English, he says, because "Only foreigners who have been taught to speak it speak it well." Furthermore, he declares, she is a Hungarian of royal birth: "Only the Magyar races can produce that air of the divine right, those resolute eyes. She is a princess." Higgins demurs: "I say [she is] an ordinary London girl out of the gutter and taught to speak by an expert." Nepomuk reacts with amusement — "Oh maestro, maestro, you are mad on the subject of cockney dialects. The London gutter is the whole world for you."

Returning to Higgins and Pickering, an anguished Eliza laments, "I don't think I can bear much more. . . . An old lady has just told me that I speak exactly like Queen Victoria. I am sorry if I have lost your bet." Pickering reassures her by replying that she has won his bet "ten times over". An impatient Higgins declares, "I have had enough of these chattering fools," and "*The scene fades as the three make for the stairs.*"

VI. Eliza's departure from Wimpole Street (1934: Scenes 38–47; 1938: Scenes 37–46). This consists of a number of scenes that constitute a bridging sequence between

¹³ The original typed text had read: "This Greek diplomatist pretends he speak or understand English." Shaw corrects the sentence in handwritten additions.

Acts IV and V. In quick succession we see the stairs, the landing, and Eliza's bedroom. Eliza enters the room and takes off her evening dress, hanging it in the wardrobe, which she then "*shuts . . . with a slam*". She quickly changes into a walking dress, and then after gathering a few possessions leaves the room, taking "*a last look at herself in the glass*". Shaw then cuts to a "*Close-up of her reflection in the glass, registering fierce resentment and determination. She suddenly puts out her tongue at herself.*" Eliza then leaves the room, turning off the light as she does so and plunging the shot into darkness.

At this point Shaw writes in an underlined "Note":

All through this Scene ELIZA expresses in all her movements her raging resolution to be gone as an act of vengeance on the heartless HIGGINS. But her self-command is perfect.

Shaw now cuts to an exterior of Higgins's house. He writes that, "*FREDDY, in evening dress and overcoat, is at the railings, gazing up at the second floor, in which one of the windows is still lighted.*" This is evidently Eliza's window, for the light then goes out, prompting Freddy to say, "Goodnight, darling, darling, darling."

Emerging on the hall steps, Eliza is surprised to find Freddy there. "I spend most of my nights here," he explains. "It's the only place where I'm happy." Breaking down in tears, Eliza asks him, "Freddy: you don't think I'm a heartless guttersnipe, do you?" At this, Freddy "*loses all self-control and smothers her with kisses. ELIZA responds blissfully. They stand there in one another's arms.*"

Their embrace is spoiled by the arrival of an elderly police constable, who is "*scandalized*" by their behaviour. "Sorry, constable. We've only just become engaged," Freddy calls out as they run away. The scene then changes to Cavendish Square. "There's nobody in the world now but you and me, is there?" Eliza asks Freddy. "Not a soul," he replies, and the couple indulge in another embrace. Interrupted again — this time by a "*much younger constable*" — the pair flee, and the scene changes to Hanover Square. "I think it'd be lovely to wander about for ever," Eliza declares. A taxi materialises, and Eliza suggests they drive all night in the cab, as "the police won't touch us there". In the morning, she says, "I'll call on old Mrs Higgins and ask her what I ought to do." Freddy

agrees, and “*follows ELIZA into the cab. THEY drive off.*” (The scene dissolves into Act V.)

VII. Outside Mrs Higgins’s flat on Chelsea Embankment (1934: Scenes 49–51; 1938: Scenes 48–51); source (1934 version only): CS 482. In his 1934 screenplay, Shaw adds a brief coda reuniting Eliza with Freddy outside Mrs Higgins’s flat in Cheyne Walk on Chelsea Embankment. After Higgins — as in the play — “*rattles his cash; chuckles; and disports himself in a highly self-satisfied manner . . .*”, he goes out on to the balcony to observe the departure of Eliza and Mrs Higgins for Doolittle’s wedding. “*Smiling benevolently down to the party beneath*”, he watches Doolittle “*in a courtly manner*” holding open the car door for Mrs Higgins. Doolittle then “*gets in himself, leaving Liza on the pavement*”.

Freddy materializes. Evidently expecting him (“Here he is, Mrs Higgins”), Eliza asks if Freddy may accompany them to the wedding. “Certainly, dear. Room for four,” Mrs Higgins replies. Eliza then kisses Freddy, causing Higgins’s smile to change “*to an expression of fury*”. Higgins “*shakes his fist at the kissing couple below*”. Shaw then cuts back to the Embankment, where “*Liza cocks a snook prettily at Higgins, and gets into the car.*” Removing his hat “*in the Chaplin manner*”, Freddy “*follows Liza into the car*”, and the car drives away accompanied to the music of the wedding march. The 1934 screenplay ends.

In the 1938 version, the ending departs from the play after Higgins’s request that Eliza buy him a ham, a Stilton cheese, a pair of gloves and a tie. Instead of telling him to “Buy them yourself” — and then abruptly leaving — Eliza chides Higgins over his poor memory for domestic matters, adding, “What you are to do without me I cannot imagine.” She then “*sweeps out*”.

In the eight exchanges between Higgins and his mother that follow, the latter declares that she understands Eliza’s decision to marry Freddy “perfectly” given that “After Eliza’s six months slavery with you Freddy is just the sort of boy any girl would want to marry.” She worries as to how Freddy will be able to support Eliza, however. Higgins responds that, “Pickering and I will have to keep them both,” but acknowledges that

despite his uselessness Freddy can, at least, “make love to [Eliza]”, adding that, “I don’t do that sort of thing; and Pickering’s too old.” Mrs Higgins then admonishes her son for being “a terrible elocutionary bully”, but implies that Eliza too possesses a domineering streak: “That’s why Eliza wants the kindly little baby man whom she can bully.” A motor horn then alerts them that Mrs Higgins’s car has arrived, and Higgins announces that, “I am going down with you.”

The scene cuts to “*Mrs Higgins’s limousine standing opposite her garden gate in Cheyne Walk. Inside the car are Liza and Freddy looking out for Mrs. Higgins.*” Higgins and his mother appear, the former “*overcoated and hatted exactly as the first scene in Covent Garden*”. At the sight of Freddy, Higgins exclaims, “What the devil are you doing here?” Explaining that Eliza had invited him, Freddy then thanks Higgins “for promising to set us up in a flower shop”, prompting Eliza to say, “Sh-sh-sh, Freddy: I haven’t asked him yet.” Mrs Higgins’s limousine then abruptly drives away, “*leaving HIGGINS on the pavement, stranded and amazed*”. “A squashed cabbage leaf! A lady in a flower shop!” he exclaims to himself.

Shaw then describes a montage sequence, involving first a dissolve to “*a vision of the past*” that depicts Eliza “*looking her dirtiest and most wretched*”, grumbling to herself about the “unmanly coward” Higgins, while the latter looks on. Music from the church in Covent Garden is then heard, causing Higgins to remove his hat. The scene fades out into “*a vision of the future*”, this time depicting,

A florist’s shop in South Kensington, full of fashionable customers. ELIZA [is] behind the counter, serving in great splendor. The name of the shopkeeper, F. HILL, is visible. Half the shop is stocked with vegetables. Freddy, in apron and mild muttonchop whiskers, is serving. Dreamlike silence.

This scene then fades out into the earlier shot of Higgins outside his mother’s gate in Cheyne Walk. A “*visibly rapt*” Higgins attracts the attention of a policewoman, who enquires: “Anything wrong, sir?” “*Waking up*”, Higgins responds “*impressively*”, “No: nothing wrong. A happy ending. A happy beginning. Good morning, madam.” “*Impressed*”, the policewoman wishes him a good morning as well. Higgins then “*raises*

his hat and stalks away majestically” while “The policewoman stands at attention and salutes.” The screenplay ends.

Appendix Three: A Structural Comparison Between *My Fair Lady* (Stage Version) and the Stage and (1938) Screen Versions of *Pygmalion*

The 1916 version of <i>Pygmalion</i>	The 1938 <i>Pygmalion</i> film	The 1941 version of <i>Pygmalion</i>	The 1956 text of <i>My Fair Lady</i>
Act I: Covent Garden. 11:15 p.m. Summer.	Scene 1: Covent Garden (daytime): establishing scene	Act I: Covent Garden. 11:15 p.m. Summer.	
	Scene 2: Covent Garden (evening)		Act I: Scene 1: Covent Garden. A cold March night. <i>Songs:</i> Why Can't the English? (Higgins) & Wouldn't It Be Lovely? (Eliza)
			Act I: Scene 2: Tenement section – Tottenham Court Road. Immediately following. <i>Song:</i> With a Little Bit of Luck (Doolittle)
	Scene 3: Eliza's taxi ride home	Additional Scene #1: Eliza's taxi ride home	
	Scene 4: Eliza's lodgings	Additional Scene #1 (contd): Eliza's lodgings	

Act II: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, the following morning.	Scene 5: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, the next morning	Act II: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, the following morning.	Act I: Scene 3: Higgins's study, Wimpole Street, the next morning <i>Song:</i> I'm an Ordinary Man (Higgins)
	Scene 6: The bathroom at Higgins's house, Wimpole Street	Additional Scene #2: The bathroom	
			Act I: Scene 4: Tenement section – Tottenham Court Road <i>Song:</i> With A Little Bit of Luck (Doolittle) (Reprise)
	Scene 7: Higgins's laboratory (Doolittle's visit)	Act II: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, the same day.	Act I: Scene 5: Higgins's study, later that day (followed by three vignettes punctuated by blackouts to indicate time lapses) <i>Songs:</i> Just You Wait (Eliza); The Rain in Spain (Eliza, Higgins, Pickering); I Could Have Danced All Night (Eliza)
Scene 8: Higgins's laboratory. Montage: Higgins teaching Eliza	Additional Scene #3: The phonetics lesson		
Act III: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, several months later.	Scene 9: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat	Act III: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, several months later.	Act I: Scene 6: Near the race meeting, Ascot. A July afternoon.

			Act I: Scene 7: Inside a club tent, Ascot. Immediately following. <i>Song:</i> Ascot Gavotte (Ensemble)
	Scene 10: Higgins's laboratory: Higgins reassures Eliza.		
	Scene 11: Higgins's laboratory. Montage: Higgins teaching Eliza, interspersed with Freddy's unsuccessful visits to Wimpole Street.		Act I: Scene 8: Outside Higgins's house, Wimpole Street. Later that afternoon. <i>Song:</i> On the Street Where You Live (Freddy)
	Scene 12: Higgins, Eliza, and Pickering preparing to depart from Wimpole Street for the Embassy Ball.		Act I: Scene 9: Higgins's study. Six weeks later.
	Scene 13: The Embassy Ball.	Additional Scene #4: The Embassy Ball	Act I: Scene 10: The promenade of the Embassy. Later that night.
			Act I: Scene 11: The ballroom of the Embassy. Immediately following.

Act IV: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, midnight. Summer.	Scene 14: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street. That same night.	Act IV: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street, midnight. Summer.	Act II: Scene 1: Higgins's study. 3:00 the following morning. <i>Songs:</i> You Did It (Pickering, Higgins, servants); Just You Wait (Eliza) (reprise)
	Scene 15: Eliza's departure with Freddy outside Higgins's house and in the neighbouring streets.	Additional Scene #5: Eliza's departure from Wimpole Street and encounter with Freddy.	Act II: Scene 2: Outside Higgins's house, Wimpole Street. Immediately following. <i>Songs:</i> On the Street Where You Live (Freddy) (reprise); Show Me (Eliza, Freddy)
	Scene 16: Eliza's return to Covent Garden.		Act II: Scene 3: Flower market of Covent Garden. 5:00 that morning. <i>Songs:</i> Wouldn't It Be Loverley? (reprise); Get Me to the Church on Time (Doolittle)
	Scene 17: Higgins's discovery that Eliza has left him (Higgins's bedroom, then his laboratory).		Act II: Scene 4: Upstairs Hall of Higgins's house. 11:00 that morning. <i>Song:</i> A Hymn to Him (Higgins)
	Scene 18: Piccadilly Circus.		

Act V: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, the following morning.	Scene 19: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat.	Act V: Mrs Higgins's Chelsea flat, the following morning.	Act II: Scene 5: The conservatory of Mrs Higgins's house. Later that day. <i>Song: Without You (Eliza)</i>
	Scene 20: Eliza and Freddy departing in a car.		
	Scene 21: Higgins striding through the streets of London.		Act II: Scene 6: Outside Higgins's house, Wimpole Street. Dusk, that afternoon. <i>Song: I've Grown Accustomed to Her Face (Higgins)</i>
	Scene 22: Higgins's laboratory, Wimpole Street.		Act II: Scene 7: Higgins's study. Immediately following.

Appendix Four: Other Shavian Musical Adaptations

The commercial success of the stage version of *My Fair Lady* “lured many librettists and song writers into prolonged negotiations [with the Shaw Estate] over *The Devil's Disciple*, *Major Barbara*,¹⁴ [and] *Man and Superman*” (Holroyd, *Laugh* 71). Although

¹⁴ In 1977 composer-lyricist Leslie Bricusse and composer Henry Mancini collaborated on the musical adaptation of this play, which was to have starred Julie Andrews in the title role (Stirling 262). An article in the *Variety* of 29 March 1994, however, suggested that Bricusse and Mancini had not been able to complete the work.

none of these projects eventuated, musical adaptations of eleven other Shaw plays¹⁵ have been performed professionally since 1967, with varying degrees of commercial and critical success.

Androcles and the Lion was the first of these adaptations. A ninety-minute musical adaptation for television, with a book by Peter Stone, and lyrics and music by Richard Rodgers, it featured Norman Wisdom as Androcles and Noël Coward in the role of Caesar. Block writes that the musical was broadcast on one occasion only (NBC, 15 November 1967), and that “although [it] was generally well received, from Rodgers’s perspective the broadcast ‘didn’t come off well, I’m afraid.’ History seems to agree with Rodgers. As of this writing [2003] the published songs and original cast recording are out of print and no commercial videotape has been released” (*Rodgers* 225). *Androcles and the Lion* was subsequently adapted into an opera of the same title with libretto and music by Philip Hagemann in 2000. Excerpts from this work were performed by the New York City Opera in May 2001 at Manhattan’s West-Park Presbyterian Church (Kozinn 1).

In 1968, *Her First Roman*, a Broadway musical version of *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1898), played for two weeks at New York’s Lunt-Fontanne Theater. Ken Mandelbaum argues that the musical’s failure was largely attributable to an inferior book by its composer-lyricist Ervin Drake:

¹⁵ These are: *Androcles and the Lion*; *Caesar and Cleopatra*; *The Admirable Bashville*; *You Never Can Tell*; *Candida*; *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets*; *Passion, Poison, and Petrification*; *The Music Cure*; *The Six of Calais*; *The Millionairess*; and *The Shewing Up of Blanco Posnet*. Brief details of adaptations of the first nine of these plays are included in the main text in this section. As regards the musicalisation of *The Millionairess* (1936), I have only been able to establish that it was adapted in 2009 as a Greek-language musical, with libretto by Nonika Galinea and music by Stamatis Kraounakis, and performed at the Athens Concert Hall in October 2009. Isidor Saslav writes that *The Shewing Up of Blanco Posnet* (1909) was turned into a two-act musical entitled *Blanco!*, and that it was produced by Vincent Dowling for the Great Lakes Shakespeare Festival in Cleveland, Ohio in the late 1970s (2). However, I have not been able to establish the name(s) of the composer and librettist. The work has not been published.

Drake's book . . . followed the highlights of Shaw's plot, retaining occasional passages of Shaw's dialogue, but simplified and watered down its source throughout. And what Drake failed to realize was that Shaw was less interested in telling the story of Caesar and Cleopatra than he was in using their story to comment satirically on contemporary morality. All that was left in the musical was the plot, with Shaw's all-important philosophical musings absent. (Mandelbaum 209)

The Admirable Bashville (1901) has been adapted on two occasions: as *Bashville in Love* (1995), with book and lyrics by Charles Marowitz and music by Michael Valenti,¹⁶ and *Bashville* (1983), with book by David William and Benny Green,¹⁷ lyrics by Benny Green, and music by Denis King. The latter work was nominated for Best Musical of the Year in the United Kingdom in 1983, and played for three weeks in August of that year at the Open Air Theatre in London's Regent's Park. Reviewing the original cast album that was recorded that same year, Steven Suskind writes that its music "is charmingly entertaining, lively (in a turn-of-the-century way) and stocked with cheerful tunes" (1). Lyricist Benny Green and composer Denis King also collaborated on *Valentine's Day* (1991, Chichester Festival Theatre), a musical version of *You Never Can Tell* (1897). Reviewing the work, Sheridan Morley writes that despite its fidelity to Shaw's play and a strong cast – together with lyrics "that sound as if they might have been speeches from the play," the musical was hampered by its score, which had "a distinct flavor of the 1950s rather than the 1890s . . .", and by an over-abundance of leading characters and subplots. He concluded that Shaw's play "turns out to be rather less suited to musicalization than must at first have appeared, but there is still great charm here" (1).

¹⁶ *Bashville in Love* was performed by the Texas Stage Company, Fort Worth, and was subsequently voted Best New Musical of the Year by the *Dallas Morning News*. The score was published in 1998 by Samuel French.

¹⁷ Together with jazz musician John Dankworth, Green also wrote a musical about Shaw's relationship with actress Ellen Terry entitled *Boots With Strawberry Jam*, which was performed in Nottingham, England in 1967 (D. Green 126).

Passion, Poison, and Petrification, or the Fatal Gozogene is another Shaw play that has been musicalised twice. In 1975 it was adapted into an opera of the same name by Bruce Taub. Reviewing a 1976 performance of the work at the Carnegie Recital Hall in the *New York Times* of 3 April 1976, John Rockwell writes that, “Mr. Taub’s music . . . is full of energy, noise and quotations, and punctuates the obvious pictorial moments with innocent decisiveness” (qtd in Taub 1). In 1988, a separate adaptation of the play, employing the original title, formed one third of Philip Hagemann’s *Shaw Trilogy*. Hagemann subsequently adapted *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets* (1910) into a thirty-minute opera in 2008. This work, together with Hagemann’s *Passion, Poison, and Petrification* comprised a double bill entitled *Shaw Sings!*, which was performed at New York City’s Symphony Space on 20 June 2008. Reviewing *Shaw Sings!* in the *New York Times*, Anthony Tommasini writes that, “The quality of understated suspense in . . . ‘Dark Lady’ lends poignancy to what might have been a mere romp,” but while Hagemann is faithful to Shaw’s “zany spirit” in *Passion, Poison and Petrification*, “[t]he absurdities of the plot might have come across with more Shavian wit had he not composed such an overwrought score, however admirably swift-paced” (1).

Possibly the most critically acclaimed Shavian musical adaptation since *My Fair Lady* is *A Minister’s Wife* (libretto by Austin Pendleton, lyrics by Jan Tranen, and music by Josh Schmidt), a ninety-five-minute one-act version of *Candida*, which premiered at Chicago’s Writers’ Theatre on 4 June 2009, and played for an extended season. Reviewing the musical in *Variety*, Steven Oxman singles out Schmidt’s score, writing that, “[its] characters move from singing to speaking and vice-versa without conventional setup. The score doesn’t punctuate the action but is woven deeply into it, unearthing a musical voice for the characters that enhances the drama’s emotional conflict . . .” (1).

Chris Jones, writing in the *Chicago Tribune*, concurs:

[Schmidt is] a dazzling formative match for Shaw. With extensive use of staccato and pizzicato whimsy, he embodies, musically, Shaw’s famous sense of humor at the expense of pompous British characters. . . .

But what Schmidt's score . . . really accomplishes is the musical expression of human yearning. This is a play with repressed characters who lurch, hopelessly and uncontrollably, on, at, and away from each other. The same could be said about their love of political moralism. And when Schmidt's gorgeous arpeggios start to peel from the fine little orchestra hidden behind the back walls of Brian Sidney Bembridge's set, I swear you feel all that passion flowing from these hopelessly heady souls. As beautifully sung by the luminous Kate Fry, an ideal Candida, the climatic number 'Spoiled From the Cradle' (a shrewd title from lyricist Jan Tranen) is a magnificent creation. (1)

What may ultimately prevent *A Minister's Wife* from achieving major commercial success, however, is its apparent lack of instantly recallable melodies. Isidor Saslav argues that, "It would take more than one hearing [of *A Minister's Wife's* score] to allow all its musical subtleties and sensitivities to be fully appreciated." In this respect, he goes on to write, "[I]ts music [is] more closely related to the modern psychologizing musicals of [Stephen] Sondheim, which generally eschew the singable number in favor of music that rather lights up the inner psyches of their characters[,] but without using overly singable tunes" (3).

Appendix Five: Chronological List of Films Based on Shaw's Plays¹⁸

1927: *Saint Joan* (Cathedral Scene only) (UK)

Producer: Vivian Van Dam

Director: Widgey Newman

Screenwriter: Bernard Shaw (original play only)

Production Company: Phonofilms

¹⁸ Sources: Costello (153–61) for pre-1965 films, Burt (67) for *Great Catherine*, and Ouzounian (1) for *Caesar and Cleopatra* (2009 version).

- Cast: Sybil Thorndike (Saint Joan)
First Screening: Unknown
- 1931: *How He Lied to Her Husband* (UK)
Producer: John Maxwell
Director: Cecil Lewis
Screenwriter: Bernard Shaw
Production Company: British International Pictures
Principal Cast: Robert Harris (Her Lover), Edmund Gwenn (Her Husband), Vera Lennox (Herself)
First Screening: 10 January 1931
- 1932: *Arms and the Man* (UK)
Producer: John Maxwell
Director: Cecil Lewis
Screenwriter: Bernard Shaw
Production Company: British International Pictures
Principal Cast: Frederick Lloyd (Major Paul Petkoff), Maurice Colbourne (Major Sergius Saranoff), Barry Jones (Captain Bluntschli), Charlton Morton (Major Plechanoff), Wallace Evennett (Nicola), Margaret Scudamore (Catherine Petkoff), Angela Baddeley (Louka), Anne Grey (Raina Petkoff)
First Screening: 4 August 1932
- 1935: *Pygmalion* (Germany)
Producer: Eberhard Klagemann
Director: Erich Engel
Screenwriters: Heinrich Oberlander and Walter Wassermann
Production Company: Klagemann-Film der Tobis-Rota
Principal Cast: Gustaf Grundgens (Henry Higgins), Jenny Jugo (Eliza Doolittle), Eugen Klopfer (Alfred Doolittle), Anton Edthofer (Colonel Pickering), Vivigenz

Eickstedt (Freddy Eynsford Hill, renamed Freddy Hill), Hedwig Bleibtreu (Mrs Higgins)

First Screening: 2 September 1935

1937: *Pygmalion* (The Netherlands)

Producer: Ludwig Berger

Director: Ludwig Berger

Screenwriter: Ludwig Berger

Production Company: Filmex Company of Amsterdam

Principal Cast: Johan de Meester (Henry Higgins), Lily Bouwmeester (Eliza Doolittle, renamed Elisa Doeluttel), Matthieu van Eysden (Alfred Doolittle, renamed Doeluttel), Edward Verkade (Colonel Pickering), Wim Kan (Freddy Eynsford Hill, renamed Mevrouw van Heteren-Hill), Emma Morel (Mrs Higgins)

First Screening: 26 February 1937

1938: *Pygmalion* (UK)

Producer: Gabriel Pascal

Director: Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard

Screenwriters: Bernard Shaw, W.P. Lipscombe, Cecil Lewis, Ian Dalrymple (credited on USA version only)

Production Company: Gabriel Pascal Productions

Principal Cast: Leslie Howard (Henry Higgins), Wendy Hiller (Eliza Doolittle), Wilfrid Lawson (Alfred Doolittle), Scott Sunderland (Colonel Pickering), David Tree (Freddy Eynsford Hill), Marie Lohr (Mrs Higgins), Esme Percy (Aristid Karpathy), Jean Cadell (Mrs Pearce)

First Screening: (UK version) 4 October 1938 (press preview), 6 October 1938 (general release); (USA version) 7 December 1938

1941: *Major Barbara* (UK)

Producer: Gabriel Pascal

Director: Gabriel Pascal

Screenwriter: Bernard Shaw

Production Company: Gabriel Pascal Productions

Principal Cast: Wendy Hiller (Major Barbara), Rex Harrison (Adolphus Cusins), Robert Morley (Undershaft), Robert Newton (Bill Walker), Emyln Williams (Snobby Price), Sybil Thorndyke (The General)

First Screening: 7 April 1941

1945: *Caesar and Cleopatra* (UK)

Producer: Gabriel Pascal

Director: Gabriel Pascal

Screenwriter: Bernard Shaw

Production Company: Gabriel Pascal Productions

Principal Cast: Claude Rains (Caesar), Vivien Leigh (Cleopatra), Flora Robson (Ftataeteeta), Francis L. Sullivan (Pothinus), Basil Sydney (Rufio), Cecil Parker (Britannus), Stewart Granger (Apollodorus)

First Screening: 13 December 1945

1953: *Androcles and the Lion* (USA)

Producer: Gabriel Pascal

Director: Chester Erskine

Screenwriters: Chester Erskine and Ken Englund

Production Company: R.K.O Pictures

Principal Cast: Maurice Evans (The Emperor), Victor Mature (The Captain), Alan Young (Androcles), Jackie (The Lion), Reginald Gardiner (Lentulus), Lowell Gilmore (Metellus), Robert Newton (Ferrovius)

First Screening: 16 October 1953

1957: *Saint Joan* (USA)

Producer: Otto Preminger

Director: Otto Preminger

Screenwriters: Graham Greene

- Production Company: Wheel Productions
Principal Cast: Jean Seberg (Saint Joan), Richard Widmark (The Dauphin), Richard Todd (Dunois), Anton Walbrook (Cauchon), John Gielgud (The Earl of Warwick), Felix Aylmer (The Inquisitor), Harry Andrews (John de Stogumber)
First Screening: 11 May 1957
- 1958: *The Doctor's Dilemma* (UK)
Producer: Anatole de Grunwald
Director: Anthony Asquith
Screenwriters: Anatole de Grunwald
Production Company: Comet Productions
Principal Cast: Leslie Caron (Mrs Dubedat), Dirk Bogarde (Louis Dubedat), Robert Morley (Sir Ralph), Alastair Sim (Cutler Walpole), John Robinson (Sir Colenso Ridgeon), Felix Aylmer (Sir Patrick Cullen)
First Screening: 17 December 1958
- 1958: *Helden [Arms and the Man]* (Germany)
Producer: H.R. Sokal and P. Goldbaum
Director: Franz Peter Wirth
Screenwriters: Johanna Sibelius and Eberhard Keindorff
Production Company: Bavaria-Filmkunst
Principal Cast: O.W. Fischer (Bluntschli), Liselotte Pulver (Raina), Ellen Schwiers (Louka), Jan Hendricks (Sergius), Ljuba Welitsch (Katharina), Kurt Kasznar (Petkoff), Manfred Inger (Nicola)
First Screening: 20 November 1958
- 1959: *The Devil's Disciple* (USA)
Producer: Harold Hecht
Director: Guy Hamilton
Screenwriters: John Dighton and Roland Kibbee
Production Company: Brynsford, S.A. and Hecht-Hill-Lancaster Films, Ltd.

Principal Cast: Burt Lancaster (Rev Anthony Anderson), Kirk Douglas (Richard Dudgeon), Laurence Olivier (General Burgoyne), Judith Anderson (Janette Scott), Eva Le Gallienne (Mrs Dudgeon)

First Screening: 20 August 1959

1960: *Frau Warrens Gewarbe* [*Mrs Warren's Profession*] (Germany)

Producer: Heinz-Gunter Sas

Director: Akos von Rathony

Screenwriters: Eberhard Keindorff and Johanna Sibelius

Production Company: Real-Film G.M.B.H.

Principal Cast: Lilli Palmer (Frau Warren), O.E. Hasse (Sir George Crofts), Johanna Matz (Vivie), Helmut Lohner (Frank Gardner), Rudolf Vogel (Samuel Gardner)

First Screening: 12 January 1960

1960: *The Millionairess* (UK)

Producer: Pierre Roubé

Director: Anthony Asquith

Screenwriters: Wolf Mankowitz

Production Company: Dimitri de Grunwald Productions

Principal Cast: Sophia Loren (Epifania), Peter Sellers (Dr Kabir), Alastair Sim (Sagamore), Vittorio de Sica (Joe), Dennis Price (Adrian), Gary Raymond (Alastair)

First Screening: 20 October 1960

1964: *My Fair Lady* [based on *Pygmalion*] (USA)

Producer: Jack Warner

Director: George Cukor

Screenwriter: Alan Jay Lerner

Production Company: Warner Bros. Pictures

Principal Cast: Rex Harrison (Henry Higgins), Audrey Hepburn (Eliza Doolittle), Stanley Holloway (Alfred P. Doolittle), Wilfrid Hyde-White (Colonel Pickering), Jeremy Brett (Freddy Eynsford Hill), Gladys Cooper (Mrs Higgins), Theodore Bikel (Zoltan Karpathy), Mona Washbourne (Mrs Pearce)

First Screening: 21 October 1964

1968: *Great Catherine* (UK)

Producer: Jules Buck

Director: Gordon Flemyng

Screenwriter: Hugh Leonard

Production Company: Warner-Pathé

Principal Cast: Peter O'Toole (Captain Charles Edstaston), Zero Mostel (Potemkin), Jeanne Moreau (Catherine), Jack Hawkins (The British Ambassador)

First Screening: 1968 (exact date unknown)

2009: *Caesar and Cleopatra* (Canada)

Producer: Barry Avrich

Director: Des McAnuff

Screenwriters: Based directly on Bernard Shaw's play (and filmed at the Stratford Shakespeare Festival in 2008)

Production Company: Melbar Entertainment Group

Principal Cast: Christopher Plummer (Caesar), Nikki Michelle James (Cleopatra), Diane D'Aquila (Ftataeteeta), Steven Sutcliffe (Brittanus), Peter Donaldson (Rufio)

First Screening: 31 January 2009

Appendix Six: Chronological List of Television Adaptations of *Pygmalion*¹⁹

1948: *Pygmalion* (UK)²⁰

Producer: Royston Morley

Director: Unknown

Writer: Bernard Shaw (play only)

Production Company: Unknown

Principal Cast: Ralph Michael (Henry Higgins), Margaret Lockwood (Eliza Doolittle), Gordon Harker (Alfred Doolittle), Arthur Wontner (Colonel Pickering)

First broadcast: 8 February 1948

1963: *Pygmalion* (USA)²¹

Producer: George Schaefer

Director: George Schaefer

Writer: Robert Hertung; Bernard Shaw (play only)

Production Company: Hallmark

Principal Cast: James Donald (Henry Higgins), Julie Harris (Eliza Doolittle), George Rose (Alfred Doolittle), John Williams (Colonel Pickering), John D. Irving (Freddy Eynsford Hill), Gladys Cooper (Mrs Higgins), Dorothy Sands (Mrs Pearce)

First broadcast: 6 February 1963

1973: *Pygmalion* (UK)²²

¹⁹ This is not a complete list, and comprises only those adaptations that I have been able to verify *independently* of such film and television databases as the Internet Movie Database (which lists a number of additional non-English-language television adaptations).

²⁰ The first known television broadcast of *Pygmalion*, it was well received critically at the time (Conolly, *BBC* 134). Shaw himself did not view the programme.

²¹ Source: *Enser's Filmed Books and Plays*. Ed. Ellen Baskin. 6th edition. Burlington, VT and Hants: Ashgate, 2003, p. 339.

²² This version, which I have viewed, is based on the 1941 edition of *Pygmalion*, and includes three of Shaw's "optional" scenes (the bath scene, the phonetics lesson, and the Embassy Ball). It also includes Shaw's amended ending to Act I, but alters the directions so that a gallant Freddy now hands Eliza her

Producer: Christopher Morahan

Director: Cedric Messina

Writer: Bernard Shaw (play only)

Production Company: B.B.C.

Principal Cast: James Villiers (Henry Higgins), Lynn Redgrave (Eliza Doolittle), Emrys James (Alfred Doolittle), Ronald Fraser (Colonel Pickering), Nicholas Jones (Freddy Eynsford Hill), Lally Bowers (Mrs Higgins), Angela Baddeley (Mrs Pearce), Nepommuck (John Westbrook)

First broadcast: 1973 (exact date unknown)

1981: *Pygmalion* (UK)²³

Producer: Pat Sandys

Director: John Glenister

Writer: Bernard Shaw (play only)

Production Company: Yorkshire Television

Principal Cast: Robert Powell (Henry Higgins), Twiggy (Eliza Doolittle), Arthur English (Alfred Doolittle), Ronald Fraser (Colonel Pickering), Mona Washbourne (Mrs Higgins)

First broadcast: 1981 (exact date unknown)

1983: *Pygmalion* (Canada/USA)²⁴

Producer: Dan Redler

basket as she sits in her taxi. At no point does the production suggest that Higgins is romantically interested in Eliza, and it ends, as in the 1941 (and 1939) editions, with the former declaring to his mother that Eliza is going to marry Freddy. Of particular interest are a brief series of photographs superimposed over the closing credits in which Eliza and Freddy are depicted happily on their wedding day and subsequently in their florist/greengrocer's shop, which, in accordance with Shaw's sequel, is named "F. Hill." A DVD of this production was released in 2006 by BBC Video Limited (E2536).

²³ Source: *Halliwell's Television Companion*. Eds. Leslie Halliwell and Philip Purser. 3rd edition. Boulder: Paladin, 1987, p. 198.

²⁴ This version, which was filmed in Canada, was based on the original play, as opposed to the 1939 or 1941 versions (Berard and Englund 400).

Director: Alan Cooke

Writer: Bernard Shaw (play only)

Production Company: Astral Television Films and Twentieth Century Fox
Television

Principal Cast: Peter O'Toole (Henry Higgins), Margot Kidder (Eliza Doolittle),
Donald Ewer (Alfred Doolittle), John Standing (Colonel Pickering), Ron White
(Freddie Eynsford Hill), Frances Hyland (Mrs Higgins), Helen Beavis (Mrs
Pearce)

First broadcast: 14 July 1983

Bibliography

Works Cited

- Adler, Tony. "My Fair Lady." *Chicago Reader*, 10 Dec. 2009. Web. 25 Jan. 2010.
<<http://www.chicagoreader.com/chicago/Event?oid=1242401>>
- Aldgate, Anthony, and Jeffrey Richards. *Best of British: Cinema and the Society from 1930 to the Present*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1999.
- Allen, Gene. *My Fair Lady*. Dir. George Cukor. DVD commentary. Warner Bros., 2000.
- Allers, Franz, ed. *My Fair Lady: Vocal Score*. London: Chappell and Co., 1958.
- Altman, Rick. *The American Film Musical*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- . *Genre: The Musical*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Andrew, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.
- Andrews, Julie. *Home: A Memoir of My Early Years*. New York: Hyperion, 2008.
- Aragay, Mireia. *Books in Motion: Adaptation, Intertextuality, Authorship*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.
- Archerd, Army. "Mancini Ailing, But Still Scoring 'Victor/Victoria.'" *Variety*, 29 Mar. 1994. Web. 1 June 2009. <<http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117862454.html?categoryid=2&cs=1>>
- Armes, Roy. *A Critical History of British Cinema*. New York: Oxford UP, 1978.

Asquith, Anthony. "The Play's the Thing." *Films and Filming* 5 (Feb. 1959): 13.

Atkinson, Brooks. "Theater Review." *On Stage: Selected Theater Reviews from the New York Times, 1920–1970*. Eds. Bernard Beckerman and Howard Siegman. New York: Arno Press, 1973. 374–75.

---. "'My Fair Lady': Shaw's 'Pygmalion' Turns into One of the Best Musicals of the Century." *Popular Culture*. Ed. David Manning White. Manchester, New Hampshire: Ayer, 1975. 117–18.

Babington, Bruce, and Peter Williams Evans. *Blue Skies and Silver Linings: Aspects of the Hollywood Musical*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1985.

Bakker, Gerben. "Stars and Stories: How Films Became Branded Products." *An Economic History of Film*. Eds. John Segwick and Michael Pokorny. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2005. 48–85.

Balázs, Béla. *Theory of the Film*. [1949] Translated by Edith Bone. New York: Dover, 1970.

Banfield, Stephen. *Sondheim's Broadway Musicals*. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1993.

Barchilon, Jacques, and Henry Pettit, eds. *The Authentic Mother Goose Fairy Tales and Nursery Rhymes*. Denver: Alan Swallow, 1960.

Barrios, Richard. *A Song In The Dark: The Birth Of The Musical Film*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.

Barthes Roland. *Image – Music – Text*. Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Baskin, Ellen, ed. *Enser's Filmed Books and Plays: 1928–2001*. 6th edition. Burlington, VT and Hants: Ashgate, 2003.

Bauschatz, Paul. "The Uneasy Evolution of *My Fair Lady* from *Pygmalion*." *Shaw* 18 (1998): 181–96.

Bazin, André. *What is Cinema?* Vol. II. Translated by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: California UP, 1971.

Beardsmore, Hugo Baetens. "A Sociolinguistic Interpretation of *Pygmalion*." *English Studies* 60 (1979): 712–19.

Beja, Morris. *Film and Literature*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1979.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.

Bentley, Eric. *Bernard Shaw 1956–1950*. New York: New Directions, 1957.

---. "A Directly Sensuous Pleasure." *New Republic* 134 (9 Apr. 1956): 29.

---. "My Fair Lady." *Modern Drama* 1.2 (Sept. 1958): 135–36.

---. (as Eric Russell Bentley) "The Theory and Practice of Shavian Drama." *Accent* 5 (Autumn 1944): 5–18.

Berard, Jeanette M., and Klaudia Englund. *Television Series and Specials Scripts: 1946–1992*. Jefferson: McFarland and Company, 2009.

Bernstein, Leonard. *The Joy of Music*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1960.

Berry, Patrick. "Critical Remediation: Locating Eliza." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 11 iii, 2007. Web. 28 Jan. 2009. <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/11.3/binder.html?topoi/prior-et-al/about/abstract_berry.html>

Berst, Charles A. *Pygmalion: Shaw's Spin on Myth and Cinderella*. New York: Twayne, 1995.

---. *Bernard Shaw and the Art of Drama*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973.

Bertolini, John A. *The Playwriting Self of Bernard Shaw*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.

Betts, Ernest. *The Film Business: A History of British Cinema 1896–1972*. New York: Pitman, 1973.

Birnie, Arthur. *An Economic History of the British Isles*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Bissell, Claude T. "The Novels of Bernard Shaw." *Critical Essays on George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Elsie B. Adams. New York: G.K. Hall and Ontario: Maxwell Macmillan, 1991. 59–73.

Blacker, Irwin R. *The Elements of Screenwriting: A Guide for Film and Television Writers*. New York: Macmillan, 1986.

Blandford, Steve, Barry Keith Grant, and Jim Hillier. *The Film Studies Dictionary*. London: Arnold, 2001.

Block, Geoffrey. *Enchanted Evenings: The Broadway Musical from Show Boat to Sondheim*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

---. *Richard Rodgers*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003.

---. "The Melody (and the Words) Linger On: American Musical Comedies of the 1920s and 1930s." *Cambridge Companion to the Musical*. Eds. William A. Everett and Paul R. Laird. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 77–97.

Bluestone, George. *Novels into Film*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1957.

Bordman, Gerald. *American Musical Theatre: A Chronicle*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.

Bordwell, David. "Historical Poetics of Cinema." *The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches*. Ed. R. Barton Palmer. New York: AMS, 1989. 369–98.

Bordwell, David and Thompson, Kristin. *Film Art: An Introduction*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2008.

Bordwell, David, Staiger, Janet and Thompson, Kristin. *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*. London: Routledge, 1985.

Bourne, Stephen. *Brief Encounters: Lesbians and Gays in British Cinema 1930–1971*. London and New York: Cassell, 1996.

Boyum, Joy Gould. *Double Exposure: Fiction Into Film*. New York: Universe, 1985.

Brett, Jeremy. "More Lovely Than Ever: My Fair Lady Then and Now." *My Fair Lady*. Dir. George Cukor. DVD Featurette. Warner Bros., 2004. (Two-disc Special Edition DVD)

Briden, E.F. "James's Miss Churm: Another of Eliza's Prototypes?" *Shaw Review* 19 (1976): 17–21.

Bridgewater, T.H. "Obituary: Cecil Lewis." *The Independent* 29 Jan. 1997. Web. 16 June 2009. <<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/obituary-cecil-lewis-1285736.html>>

Brooks, Harold F., and Jean R. Brooks. "Dickens and Shaw." *Dickensian* 59 (May 1963): 93–99.

Brownlow, Kevin. *David Lean: A Biography*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

Buhler, Stephen M. *Shakespeare in The Cinema: Ocular Proof*. Albany: New York State UP, 2002.

Burack, A.S., Ed. "From Our Rostrum." *The Writer* 53.2 (Feb. 1940): 52–55.

Burt, Daniel S. *The Biography Book: A Reader's Guide to Non-Fiction, Fictional and Film Biographies of More Than 500 of the Most Fascinating Individuals of All Time*. Westport, CT: Oryx, 2001.

Cain, Scott. "My Fair Lady." *Talkin' Broadway*, 20 Sep. 2007. Web. 23 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.talkinbroadway.com/regional/cincy/cincy162.html>>

Carner, Mosco. "Puccini's 'La Bohème.'" Giacomo Puccini. *La Bohème*. Colin Davis, cond. Philips Classics, 1979. CD liner notes.

Cartmell, Deborah. "The Shakespeare on Screen Industry." *Adaptations from Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. Eds. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. London: Routledge, 1999. 29–37.

Chappelow, Allan. *Shaw—The "Chucker-Out": A Biographical Exposition and Critique*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1969.

Chatman, Seymour. "What Novels Can Do That Films Can't (and Vice Versa)." *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980–81): 121–40.

Chopra-Gant, Mike. *Hollywood Genres and Postwar America: Masculinity, Family and Nation in Popular Movies and Film Noir*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Citron, Stephen. *The Wordsmiths: Oscar Hammerstein 2nd and Alan Jay Lerner*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.

Clark, Kenneth. *The Other Half: A Self-Portrait*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Coelsch-Foisner, Sabine. "Pygmalion and My Fair Lady: From Social Satire to Musical Romance." *Interlitteraria* 11 (2006): 233–45.

Cohan, Steven, ed. *Hollywood Musicals, The Film Reader*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Colbourne, Maurice. *The Real Bernard Shaw*. New York: Dent, 1949.

Conolly, L.W. "Introduction." *Pygmalion*. Bernard Shaw. London: Methuen, 2008. xiii–li.

---. *Bernard Shaw and the BBC*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2009.

Conrich, Ian and Tincknell, Estella. *Film's Musical Moments: Music and the Moving Image*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006.

Corliss, Richard. *Talking Pictures: Screenwriters of Hollywood*. London: David & Charles, 1975.

Costello, Donald P. *The Serpent's Eye: Shaw and the Cinema*. Indiana: Notre Dame UP, 1965.

Crafton, Donald. *The Talkies: American Cinema's Transition to Sound 1926–1931*. Berkeley: California UP, 1999.

Crane, Milton. "Pygmalion: Bernard Shaw's Dramatic Theory and Practice." *PMLA* 66.6 (1951) 879–85.

Creel, James Melton. "The Phonetic Play: Pygmalion from Manuscript to First Printing." PhD Thesis. U of Texas at Austin, 1985.

Crompton, Louis. *Shaw the Dramatist*. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1969.

Dervin, Daniel. *Bernard Shaw: A Psychological Study*. London: Associated UP, 1975.

Dixson, Miriam. *The Real Matilda: Women and Identity in Australia — 1788 to the Present*. 4th ed. Sydney: New South Wales UP, 1999.

Donnelly, K.J. *British Film Music and Film Musicals*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Dukore, Bernard F. *Bernard Shaw, Playwright: Aspects of Shavian Drama*. Columbia: Missouri UP, 1973.

---. "Introduction." *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw*. London: Prior, 1980. 1–178.

---. *Shaw's Theater*. Gainesville: Florida UP, 2000.

---. "The Ablest Man in Bulgaria." *Shaw* 22 (2002): 67–82.

---. "Introduction." *Bernard Shaw and Gabriel Pascal*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1996.

Dunne, Michael. *American Film Musical Themes and Forms*. North Carolina: McFarland, 2004.

Durbach, Errol. "Pygmalion: Myth and Anti-Myth in the Plays of Ibsen and Shaw." *George Bernard Shaw's Plays*. Ed. Sandie Byrne. 2nd edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 2002. 527–37.

Dyer, Richard. *Heavenly Bodies: Film Stars and Society*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2004.

Eisenbud, Jule. "Possible sources of Shaw's *Pygmalion*." *Notes & Queries* 24 (1977): 442–44.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*. Translated by Jay Leyda, ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1949.

Engel, Lehman. *Words with Music*. New York: MacMillan, 1972.

---. *The American Musical Theater*. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

"Entertainment Jazz Musician Benny Green Dies." Obituary. *BBC News*, 23 June 1998. Web. 31 January 2010. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/118354.stm>>

Ervine, St John. *Bernard Shaw: His Life, Work and Friends*. London: Constable, 1956.

Evans, T.F. *Shaw: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Ewen, David. *New Complete Book of the American Theater*. New York: Henry Holt, 1970.

Feuer, Jane. *The Hollywood Musical*. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1993.

Gainor, J. Ellen. *Shaw's Daughters: Dramatic and Narrative Constructions of Gender*. Michigan: Michigan UP, 1991.

Ganz, Arthur. *George Bernard Shaw*. New York: Grove, 1983.

Gänzl, Kurt and Lamb, Andrew. *Gänzl's Book of the Musical Theatre*. London: Bodley Head, 1988.

Garebian, Keith. *The Making of 'My Fair Lady'*. Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1998.

Geraghty, Lincoln. *Fifty Key British Films*. Eds. Sarah Barrow and John White. London: Routledge, 2008.

Gessner, Robert. *The Moving Image: A Guide to Cinematic Literacy*. New York: Dutton, 1970.

Gibbs, A.M. *The Art and Mind of Shaw: Essays in Criticism*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1983.

---. Ed. *Shaw: Interviews and Recollections*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.

---. *A Bernard Shaw Chronology*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.

---. *Bernard Shaw: A Life*. Florida: Florida UP, 2005.

- . "Shaw and Creative Evolution." *Irish Writers and Religion*. Ed. Robert Welch. Savage, Maryland: Barnes & Noble, 1992. 75–88.
- Gilbert, W.S. *Pygmalion and Galatea*. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing, 1918.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *The Flight to Italy: Diary and Selected Letters*. Translated by T.J. Read. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Gottfried, Martin. *Broadway Musicals*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1979.
- Goldberg, Michael. "Shaw's Pygmalion: The Reworking of Great Expectations." *Shaw Review* 22 (1979): 114–22.
- Goodman, Randolph. *From Script to Stage: Eight Modern Plays*. San Francisco: Rinehart Press, 1971.
- Gordon, David J. *Bernard Shaw and the Comic Sublime*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.
- Grant, Barry Keith. "The Classic Hollywood Musical and the 'Problem' of Rock 'n' Roll." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 13.4 (Winter 1986): 195–205.
- Grant, Mark. *The Rise and Fall of the American Musical*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2005.
- Green, Benny. *A Hymn To Him: The Lyrics of Alan Jay Lerner*. London: Pavilion, 1987.
- Green, Dominic. *Benny Green: Words and Music: A Biography by Dominic Green*. London: London House, 2000.
- Greene, Nicholas. "Introduction." *Bernard Shaw: Pygmalion: A Romance in Five Acts*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Penguin, 2003.

---. *Bernard Shaw: A Critical View*. London and Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1984.

Griffith, Gareth. *Socialism and Superior Brains: The Political Thought of Bernard Shaw*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Griffith, James. *Adaptations as Imitations*. London: Associated UP, 1997.

Guy, Stephen. "Calling All Stars." *The Unknown 1930s: An Alternative History of the British Cinema 1929–1939*. Ed. Jeffrey Richards. London: I.B. Tauris, 1998. 99–120.

Halliwell, Leslie and Philip Purser, eds. *Halliwell's Television Companion*. 3rd edition. Boulder: Paladin, 1987.

Haralovich, Mary Beth. "The Proletarian Woman's Film of the 1930s: Contending with Censorship and Entertainment." *Screen* 31.2 (Summer 1990): 172–87.

Harper, Sue. "From Wholesome Girls to Difficult Dowagers: Actresses in 1930s British Cinema." *British Cinema, Past and Present*. Eds. Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson. London: Routledge, 2000. 137–51.

Harris, Frank. *Frank Harris on Bernard Shaw*. London and Southampton: Camelot, 1931.

Harrison, Rex. *Rex: An Autobiography*. London: MacMillan, 1974.

Havely, Cicely Palser. "Happy Ever After? The Ending of Shaw's *Pygmalion*." *English Review* 7 (1996): 22–29.

Henderson, Archibald. *George Bernard Shaw: His Life and Works*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1911.

---. *Bernard Shaw: Playboy and Prophet*. New York and London: D. Appleton and Co, 1932.

---. *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Hill, John, and Pamela Church Gibson. *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Hilton, Julian. "Theatricality and Technology: Pygmalion and the Myth of the Intelligent Machine." *New Directions in Theatre*. Ed. Julian Hilton. Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1993. 156-173.

Hirschhorn, Clive. *The Hollywood Musical*. London: Octopus Books, 1981.

Hodgdon, Barbara. "From the Editor." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 53.2 (2002): iii-x.

Hoellering, Franz. "Pygmalion." *American Film Criticism: From the Beginnings to Citizen Kane: Reviews of Significant Films at the Time They First Appeared*. Eds. Stanley Kauffmann and Bruce Henstall. New York: Liveright, 1972.

Holroyd, Michael. *Bernard Shaw. Volume I: 1856-1898: The Search for Love*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1988.

---. *Bernard Shaw. Volume II: 1898-1918: The Pursuit of Power*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1989.

---. *Bernard Shaw. Volume III: 1918-1950: The Lure of Fantasy*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1991.

---. *Bernard Shaw. Volume IV: 1950–1991: The Last Laugh*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1992.

---. "Introduction." *Pygmalion and Major Barbara*. New York: Bantam, 1992.

---. "Trevor Nunn Versus Bernard Shaw." *The Shavian* 9.2 (2001): 57.

Hornby, Richard. "Beyond the Verbal in *Pygmalion*." *SHAW* 3 (1983): 121–27.

Houn, Harry. "Pygmalion – Do I Hear a Waltz?" *Playbill*. 19 October 2007. Web. 21 May 2008. <<http://www.playbill.com/news/article/1120687.html>>

Huggett, Richard. *The Truth about 'Pygmalion'*. London: William Heinemann, 1969.

Hugo, Leon. "In Search of Shaw: An Interview with Dan Laurence." *SHAW* 15 (1995): 185-202.

Hummert, Paul A. *Bernard Shaw's Marxian Romance*. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1973.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Jones, Chris. "Gorgeous Score of 'Minister's Wife' Makes 'Candida' Story Dance." *Chicago Tribune*, 5 June 2009. Web. 30 Jan. 2010. <http://leisureblogs.chicagotribune.com/the_theater_loop/2009/06/gorgeous-score-of-ministers-wife-makes-candida-story-dance-.html>

Jones, John Bush. *Our Musicals, Ourselves: A Social History Of The American Musical Theatre*. Lebanon, NH: New England UP, 2003.

Joshua, Essaka. *Pygmalion and Galatea: The History of a Narrative in English Literature*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

Kamina, Pascal. *Film Copyright in the European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Kauffmann, Stanley. *Living Images: Film Comment and Criticism*. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

---. "Stanley Kauffmann interview [with Bert Cardullo]: on Shaw's *Pygmalion*: Play and Film." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 31:4 (2003): 242–47.

Kennell, Vicki Renée Munro. "The Persistence of Pygmalion: Inscribed Selves in Twentieth-Century British Narrative." PhD Thesis. Purdue U, 1998.

---. (as Kennell, Vicki R.) "Pygmalion as Narrative Bridge Between the Centuries." *Shaw* 25 (2005): 73–81.

Kerman, Joseph. *Opera as Drama* (New and Revised Edition). Berkeley: California UP, 1988.

Kislan, Richard. *The Musical: A Look at the American Musical Theater*. New York: Applause, 1995.

Kivy, Peter. *Osmin's Rage: Philosophical Reflections on Opera, Drama, and Text*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.

Knapp, Raymond. *The American Musical And The Formation Of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.

Kozinn, Allan. "From Historical to Virtual, 11 New American Operas." *New York Times*, 3 May 2001. Web. 25 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/05/03/arts/from-historical-to-virtual-11-new-american-operas.html?pagewanted=1>>

Kreuger, Miles. "Some Words About 'Show Boat'." Jerome Kern and Oscar Hammerstein II. *Show Boat*. John McGlinn, cond. EMI Records, 1988. CD Liner notes.

Krevolin, Richard. *How to Adapt Anything into a Screenplay*. Hoboken: John Wiley, 2003.

Laing, Heather. "Emotion by Numbers: Music, Song and the Musical." *Musicals: Hollywood and Beyond*. Eds. Bill Marshall and Robynn Stilwell. Exeter: Intellect, 2000. 5–13.

Lambert, Gavin. *On Cukor*. New York: G.P. Putnam, 1972.

Larkin, Colin, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Stage and Film Musicals*. London: Virgin, 1999.

Laufe, Abe. *Broadway's Greatest Musicals*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1970.

Laurence, Dan H. *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography. Volume I*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

---. *Bernard Shaw: A Bibliography. Volume II*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

Lauter, Paul. "'Candida' and 'Pygmalion': Shaw's Subversions of Stereotypes." *Shaw Review* 3 (1960): 14–19.

Law, Cheryl. *Suffrage and Power: The Women's Movement, 1918–1928*. London, I.B. Tauris, 1997.

Leary, Daniel. "From Page to Stage to Audience in Shaw." *Shaw* 3 (1983): 1–23.

Lees, Gene. *Inventing Champagne: The Worlds of Lerner and Loewe*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Leitch, Thomas. "Twelve Fallacies in Contemporary Adaptation Theory." *Criticism* 45.2 (2003): 149–71.

---. *Film Adaptation and Its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 2007.

Lerner, Alan Jay. *The Street Where I Live*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978.

---. *My Fair Lady: A Musical Play by Alan Jay Lerner*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1956.

---. "Pygmalion and My Fair Lady." *The Shaw Bulletin* 10 (1956): 6–7.

---. *The Musical Theatre*. London: Collins, 1986.

Levinson, Jerrold. "Film Music and Narrative Agency." *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*. Eds. David Bordwell and Noël Carroll. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1996: 248–82.

Lewis, Cecil. *Never Look Back: An Attempt at Autobiography*. London: Hutchinson, 1974.

Long, Robert Emmet. *George Cukor: Interviews*. Jackson, USA: Mississippi UP, 2001.

Low, Rachael. *The History of the British Film [Volume VI] 1929–1939: Films of Comment and Persuasion of the 1930s*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979.

---. *The History of British Film, Volume VII: The History of the British Film 1929–1939: Film Making in 1930s Britain*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Lyden, John C. *Film as Religion: Myths, Morals, and Rituals*. New York: New York UP, 2003.

MacCarthy, Desmond. *Shaw's Plays in Review*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1969. Reprint.

McDonald, Tamar Jeffers. *Romantic Comedy: Boy Meets Girl Meets Genre*. New York: Wallflower, 2007.

McElfresh, Tom. "My Fair Lady (Review)." *City Beat*, 18 Sep. 2009. Web. 22 Jan. 2010. <[http://www.citybeat.com/cincinnati/article-18807-my-fair-lady-\(review\).html](http://www.citybeat.com/cincinnati/article-18807-my-fair-lady-(review).html)>

McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

---. *An Autobiography of British Cinema: By the Actors and Filmmakers Who Made It*. London: Methuen, 1997.

McGilligan, Patrick. *George Cukor: A Double Life*. New York: St. Martin's, 1991.

McLamore, Alyson. *Musical Theater: An Appreciation*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 2004.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

McMillin, Scott. *The Musical as Drama*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006.

Macnicol, John. *The Politics of Retirement in Britain 1878–1948*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Macey, David. *Dictionary of Critical Theory*. London: Penguin, 2000.

Maertz, Gregory, ed. *Middlemarch*. George Eliot. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2004.

Maltby, Richard. *Hollywood Cinema*. 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell, 2003.

Mandelbaum, Ken. *Not Since Carrie: Forty Years of Broadway Flops*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Manvell, Roger. *Theater and Film*. New Jersey/London: Associated UP, 1979.

Marcus, Millicent. *Filmmaking by the Book: Italian Cinema and Literary Adaptation*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins UP, 1993.

Marshall, Bill and Stilwell, Robynn. "Introduction". *Musicals: Hollywood and Beyond*. Exeter: Intellect, 2000.

Martin, Sara. "Resistance and Persistence: *Pygmalion* and *My Fair Lady*, Two Film Versions of G.B. Shaw's *Pygmalion*." *Enter Text* 1.2 (Spring 2001): 37–60. Web. 1 July 2005. <<http://www.brunel.ac.uk/4042/entertext1.2/martin.pdf>>

Mast, Gerald. *Can't Help Singin': The American Musical On Stage And Screen*. Woodstock: Overlook, 1987.

Matlaw, Myron. "The Denouement of *Pygmalion*." *Modern Drama* 1 (1958): 29–34.

---. "Will Higgins Marry Eliza?" *Shavian* 12 (1958): 14–19.

Matthew-Walker, Robert. *From Broadway to Hollywood: The Musical and the Cinema*. London: Sanctuary, 1996.

- Mayne, Fred. *The Wit and Satire of Bernard Shaw*. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.
- Medhurst, Andy. "The Musical." *The Cinema Book*. Ed. Pam Cook. London: British Film Institute, 1997. 106–14. Reprint.
- Meisel, Martin. *Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Theater*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.
- Metz, Christian. *Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*. Trans. Celia Britton, Annwyl Williams, et al. London: MacMillan, 1982.
- Miles, Geoffrey. *Classical Mythology in English Literature: A Critical Anthology*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Miller, Jane M. "Some Versions of Pygmalion." *Ovid Renewed: Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Charles Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988. 205–14.
- Miller, J. Hillis. *Versions of Pygmalion*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1990.
- Minney, R.J. *'Puffin' Asquith: A Biography of the Hon Anthony Asquith, Aesthete, Aristocrat, Prime Minister's Son and Film Maker*. London: Leslie Frewin, 1973.
- Mitchell, B.R. *British Historical Statistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Mordden, Ethan. *Coming Up Roses: The Broadway Musical in the 1950s*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998.
- . *Medium Cool: The Movies of the 1960s*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.
- . *The Hollywood Musical*. Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1982.

Morley, Sheridan. *International Herald Tribune*, 21 Aug. 1991. Web. 21 Aug. 2007.
<http://www.iht.com/articles/1991/08/21/lond_3.php retrieved 21/8/07>

Mueller, John. *Astaire Dancing: The Musical Films*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.

Mugglestone, Lynda. "Shaw, Subjective Inequality, and the Social Meanings of Language in *Pygmalion*." *Review of English Studies: A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and the English Language*. 44.175 (Aug. 1993): 373–85.

Murphy, Robert, ed. *The British Cinema Book*. 2nd ed. London: British Film Institute, 2001.

Mycroft, Walter Charles. "Shaw—and the Devil to Pay." *Films and Filming* 5 (Feb. 1959): 14–15.

Myer, Michael Grosvenor. "Dickensian Echoes in Shaw: *Our Mutual Friend* and *Pygmalion*." *Notes & Queries* 31 (1984): 508.

Myer, Valerie Grosvenor. "*Peregrine Pickle* and *Pygmalion*." *Notes & Queries* 28 (1981): 430–31.

My Fair Lady. Dir. George Cukor. Perf. Rex Harrison, Audrey Hepburn, Stanley Holloway, Wilfrid Hyde-White, Jeremy Brett. Warner, 1964. DVD.

Napper, Lawrence. "British Cinema and the Middlebrow." *British Cinema, Past and Present*. Eds. Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson. New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2001. Reprint. 110–123.

Naremore, James. "Introduction: Film and the Reign of Adaptation." *Film Adaptation*. Ed. James Naremore. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000. 1–16.

Orr, Christopher. "The Discourse on Adaptation." *Wide Angle* 6.2 (1984): 72–76.

Osborne, Robert A. *Academy Awards Illustrated: A Complete History of Hollywood's Academy Awards: 1965 Edition – 37th Year*. La Habra: Ernest E. Schworck, 1965.

Ouzounian, Richard. "Caesar and Cleopatra: Play Even Better on Big Screen." *Toronto Star*, 30 Jan. 2009. Web. 30 Dec. 2010. <<http://www.thestar.com/Entertainment/article/579467>>

Ovid. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Garth Translation into English Verse*. New York: Heritage Press, 1961.

Oxman, Steven. "A Minister's Wife" (Review). *Variety*, 10 June 2009. Web. 23 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.variety.com/review/VE1117940435.html?categoryid=33&cs=1>>

Paris, Barry. *Audrey Hepburn*. New York: Berkley, 2001.

Pascal, Gabriel. *Pygmalion* screenplay. 1938. Unpublished manuscript.

Pascal, Valerie. *The Disciple and His Devil*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Patch, Blanche. *Thirty Years with G.B.S.* London: Victor Gollancz, 1951.

Pearson, Hesketh. *Bernard Shaw*. London: Methuen, 1961.

---. *Beerbohm Tree: His Life and Laughter*. London: Methuen, 1956.

Pedersen, Lisë. "Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* Vs. Shaw's *Pygmalion*: Male Chauvinism vs. Women's Lib?" *Fabian Feminist: Bernard Shaw and Women*. Ed. Rodelle Weintraub. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP (1977): 14–22.

Perry, George C. *The Great British Picture Show: From the Nineties to the Seventies*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.

Peters, Margot. *Bernard Shaw and the Actresses*. New York: Doubleday, 1980.

Peters, Sally. *Bernard Shaw: The Ascent of the Superman*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1996.

Phillips, Gene D. *Beyond the Epic: The Life and Films of David Lean*. Lexington: Kentucky UP, 2006.

---. *Major Film Directors of the American and British Cinema*. London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1990.

Phillips, Patrick. *Understanding Film Texts: Meaning and Experience*. London: British Film Institute, 2000.

Plain, Gill. *John Mills and British Cinema: Masculinity, Identity and Nation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006.

Porten, Lili. "The Metamorphosis of Commodities in Shaw's *Pygmalion*." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 17.3 (Fall 2006): 69–86.

Priestley, J.B. *English Journey*. London: Heron Books, 1949.

Pudovkin, V.I. *Film Technique and Film Acting*. Ed. and trans. Ivor Montagu. New York: Grove, 1958.

Putzell, Sara Moore. "Another Source for *Pygmalion*: G.B.S. and M.E. Braddon." *Shaw Review* 22 (1979): 29–32.

Pygmalion. Dir. Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard. Perf. Leslie Howard, Wendy Hiller, Scott Sunderland, Wilfrid Lawson, Marie Lohr, David Tree. Gabriel Pascal Productions, 1938. DVD.

Pygmalion. Dir. Cedric Messina. Perf. Lynn Redgrave, James Villiers, Ronald Fraser, Emrys James, Lally Bowers, Nicholas Jones. BBC TV, 1973. DVD.

Quinn, Martin. "The Informing Presence of Charles Dickens in Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*." *Dickensian* 404 (1984): 144–50.

Rattray, R.F. *Bernard Shaw: A Chronicle*. London: Legrave, 1951.

---. "The Subconscious and Shaw." *Quarterly Review*, 291 (1953): 210–22.

Ray, Robert B. *A Certain Tendency of the Hollywood Cinema, 1930–1980*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985.

Reid, John Howard. *Cinemascope Two: Twentieth Century Fox*. Raleigh: Lulu, 2009.

Reinhold, Meyer. "The Naming of Pygmalion's Animated Statue." *The Classical Journal*, 66.4 (Apr.–May 1971): 316–19.

Reynolds, Jean. *Pygmalion's Wordplay: The Postmodern Shaw*. Gainesville: Florida UP, 1999.

---. "Deconstructing Henry Higgins, or Eliza as Derridean 'Text'." *SHAW* 14. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1994: 209–17.

Reynolds, Peter. *Novel Images: Literature in Performance*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Richards, Jeffrey. "British Film Censorship." *The British Cinema Book*. 2nd ed. Ed. Robert Murphy. London: British Film Institute, 2001. 155–62.

---. *The Age of the Dream Palace: Cinema and Society in Britain 1930–39*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.

Riis, Thomas L., and Ann Sears. "The Successors of Rodgers and Hammerstein from the 1940s to the 1960s." *Cambridge Companion to the Musical*. Eds. William A. Everett and Paul R. Laird. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 137–66.

Robertson, James C. *The British Board of Film Censors: Film Censorship in Britain 1896–1950*. Kent: Croom Helm, 1985.

---. *The Hidden Cinema: British Film Censorship In Action 1913–1975*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1993.

Robinson, Paul. *Opera & Ideas: From Mozart To Strauss*. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

Roll-Hansen, Diderik. "Shaw's *Pygmalion*: The Two Versions of 1916 and 1941." *Review of English Literature* 8.4 (1967): 81–90.

Roman, Robert C. "G.B.S. on the Screen." *Films in Review* II (Aug. –Sept. 1960): 406.

Rosen, Marjorie. *Popcorn Venus: Women, Movies & The American Dream*. London: Peter Owen, 1975.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Ryall, Tom. "A British Studio System: The Associated British Picture Corporation and the Gaumont-British Picture Corporation in the 1930s." *The British Cinema Book*. 2nd ed. Ed. Robert Murphy. London: British Film Institute, 2001. 35–41.

---. *Anthony Asquith*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006.

Santoro, Patricia J. *Novel into Film: La Familia de Pascual Duarte and Los Santos Innocentes*. Newark: Associated UP, 1996.

Sargeant, Amy. *British Cinema: A Critical History*. London: British Film Institute, 2005.

Saslav, Isidor. "Shaw in Chicago Again." *Swans Commentary*, 10 Aug. 2009. Web. 12 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.swans.com/library/art15/saslav13.html>>

Schatz, Thomas. *Hollywood Genres: Formulas, Filmmaking, and the Studio System*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Schonberg, Harold C. *The Lives of the Great Composers*. 3rd ed. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1997.

Sears, Ann. "The Coming of the Musical Play." *Cambridge Companion to the Musical*. Eds. William A. Everett and Paul R. Laird. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. 120–36.

Seeger, Linda. *The Art of Adaptation: Turning Fact and Fiction into Film*. New York: Henry Holt, 1992.

Shafer, Stephen C. *British Popular Films 1929–1939: The Cinema of Reassurance*. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Shaw, Bernard. *The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. London: Prior, 1980.

---. *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters 1874–1897*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1965.

---. *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters Vol. 2: 1898–1910*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1972.

---. *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters Vol. 3: 1911–1925*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1985.

---. *Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters Vol. 4: 1926–1950*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1988.

---. *Bernard Shaw Theatrics*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1995.

---. *The Quintessence of Ibsenism: Now Completed to the Death of Ibsen*. [1913] Rockville, MD: Wildside Press, 2009.

---. *The Intelligent Women's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*. [1928] New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1984.

The Great Composers: Reviews and Bombardments. Ed. Louis Crompton. Berkeley and London: California UP, 1978.

---. *Agitations: Letters to the Press 1875–1950*. Eds. Dan H. Laurence and James Rambeau. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1985.

---. *Bernard Shaw on Cinema*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997.

---. *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*. London: Constable, 1916.

- . *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*. London: Constable, 1939.
- . *Androcles and the Lion, Overruled, Pygmalion*. London: Constable, 1941.
- . *Geneva, Cymbeline Refinished, Good King Charles*. London: Constable, 1946.
- . *Pygmalion: A Scenario*. Unpublished screenplay. 1938. U of Texas at Austin. HRC SHAW 25.7.
- . *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw: Collected Plays With Their Prefaces, Volume IV*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1972.
- . *Bernard Shaw's Non-Dramatic Literary Criticism*. Ed. Stanley Weintraub. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1972.
- . *Bernard Shaw's Letters to Siegfried Trebitsch*. Ed. Samuel A. Weiss. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.
- . *Bernard Shaw and Gabriel Pascal*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1996.
- . *Bernard Shaw and His Publishers*. Ed. Michel W. Pharand. Toronto and London: Toronto UP, 2009.
- . *Shaw: An Autobiography 1856–1898*. Ed. Stanley Weintraub. London and Toronto: Max Reinhardt, 1970.
- . *Bernard Shaw: The Drama Observed. Volume II: 1895–1897*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.

- . *Bernard Shaw: The Drama Observed. Volume IV: 1911–1950*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.
- . *Everybody's Political What's What?* London: Constable, 1944.
- . "Mr Shaw's New Play." *The Observer* 2 November 1913, p. 11.
- . *The Portable Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Stanley Weintraub. London: Viking Penguin, 1977.
- . *Bernard Shaw's Nondramatic Literary Criticism*. Ed. Stanley Weintraub. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1972.
- . *Bernard Shaw's Book Reviews: 1884 to 1950*. Ed. Brian Tyson. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1996.
- Shaw, Bernard, and Mrs. Patrick Campbell. *Bernard Shaw and Mrs. Patrick Campbell: Their Correspondence*. Ed. Alan Dent. London: Victor Gollancz, 1952.
- Sheckels, Theodore F. "Filming Peter Carey – From the Adequate to the Distorted." *Antipodes* 13.2 (1999): 91–94.
- Siegel, Tatiana. "Knightley eyes Columbia's 'Fair Lady'." *Variety*, 5 June 2008. Web. 10 Mar. 2009. <<http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117986985.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>>
- Silver, Arnold. *Bernard Shaw: The Darker Side*. Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1982.
- Simon, John. "Addled Adaptations." *National Review* 41.5 (1989): 46–48.
- . "Shavian Cream: A Hyperkinetic Pygmalion and a Virtuoso Performance in Man and Superman Rise to the Top at Another Memorable Shaw Festival." *New York Magazine Theater Review* (16 Aug. 2004): 140–41.

Sklar, Robert. *Movie-Made America: A Cultural History of American Movies*. 2nd ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Slide, Anthony. *Fifty Classic British Films 1932–1982: A Pictorial Record*. Mineola, New York: Dover, 1985.

---. *'Banned in the USA': British Films in the United States and Their Censorship, 1933–1960*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 1998.

Smith, George Davey, Daniel Dorling, and Mary Shaw. *Poverty, Inequality and Health in Britain 1800–2000: A Reader*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2002.

Smoker, Barbara. "Man of Letters." *The Genius of Shaw: A Symposium*. Ed. Michael Holroyd. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979. 212–21.

---. "Pygmalion and My Fair Lady." *The Shavian* 10.3 (2006): 2–8.

Smollett, Tobias. *The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle*. Whitefish: Kessinger, 2004.

Solomon, Stanley J. "The Ending of 'Pygmalion': A Structural View." *Educational Theatre Journal* 16.1 (Mar. 1964): 59–64.

Stam, Robert. "Introduction: The Theory and Practice of Adaptation." *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Eds. Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo. Malden: Blackwell, 2004. 1–52.

Starks, Lisa S. "Educating Eliza: Fashioning the Model Woman in the 'Pygmalion Film'." *Post Script* 16.2 (1997): 44–55.

Stead, Peter. *Film and the Working Class: the Feature Film in British and American Society*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Stearns, David Patrick. “‘West Side Story’: Between Broadway and the Opera House.” *Leonard Bernstein Conducts West Side Story*. Deutsche Gramophon, 1985. Audio cassette liner notes.

Stevens, Risë. *The Art of Singing: Golden Voices of the Century*. Videocassette. Elektra/Wea, 1997.

Steyn, Mark. *Broadway Babies Say Goodnight: Musicals Then and Now*. London: Faber and Faber, 2001.

Stirling, Richard. *Julie Andrews: An Intimate Biography*. New York: St. Martin's, 2008.

Street, Sarah. “British Film and the National Interest.” *The British Cinema Book*. 2nd ed. Ed. Robert Murphy. London: British Film Institute, 2001. 28–34.

Strauss, Erich. *Bernard Shaw: Art and Socialism*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1942.

Sturgis, Granville Forbes. *The Influence of the Drama*. New York: The Shakespeare Press, 1913.

Suskind, Steven. “On the Record: Ethel Merman's ‘Balloon’ and *Bashville*.” *Playbill News*, 18 September 2005. Web. 7 October 2007. <<http://www.playbill.com/news/Article/95128.html>>

Sutton, Martin. “Patterns of Meaning in the Musical.” *Genre: The Musical*. Ed. Rick Altman. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Swain, Joseph P. *The Broadway Musical: A Critical And Musical Survey*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2002.

Taub, Bruce. "Selected Reviews." *Bruce J. Taub, Composer*. Web. 23 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.brucetaub.com/bjreview.htm>>

Testa, Carlo. *Masters of Two Arts: Re-creation of European Literatures in Italian Cinema*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2002.

Thomas, Bob. *Clown Prince of Hollywood: The Antic Life and Times of Jack L. Warner*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.

Thompson, Kristin. *Breaking the Glass Armor: Neoformalist Film Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.

Thompson, Kristin, and David Bordwell. *Film History: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.

Tobias, James. "Cinema, Scored: Toward a Comparative Methodology for Music in Media." *Film Quarterly* 57.2 (2004): 26–36.

Tommasini, Anthony. "The Zany Spirit of Shaw, Adapted into Operas." *New York Times*, 21 June 2008. Web. 16 Jan. 2010. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/21/arts/music/21enco.html>>

Törnqvist, Egil. *Between Stage and Screen: Ingmar Bergman Directs*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 1995.

Turner, Graeme. *Film as Social Practice*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 1999.

Ure, Peter. "Master and Pupil in Bernard Shaw." *Essays in Criticism* 19 (1969): 119–39.

Valency, Maurice. *The Cart and the Trumpet: The Plays of George Bernard Shaw*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated UP, 1975.

Ward, A.C. *Bernard Shaw*. London: Longmans, Green, 1951.

Wardle, Irving. "The Plays." *The Genius of Shaw: A Symposium*. Ed. Michael Holroyd. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979.

Weber, Bruce. "Fighting for the Soul of Eliza Dolittle [sic]." *The New York Times*, 15 Dec. 1993. Web. 12 May 2008. <<http://www.nytimes.com/1993/12/15/theater/Fighting-for-the-soul-of-eliza-dolittle.html>>

Weintraub, Rodelle. "Introduction." *Fabian Feminist: Bernard Shaw and Woman*. Ed. Rodelle Weintraub. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977. 1–12.

---. "Henry Higgins: A Classic Aspergen." *ELT: English Literature in Transition 1880-1920* 49.4 (2006): 388–97.

Weintraub, Stanley. *Journey to Heartbreak: The Crucible Years of Bernard Shaw 1914–1918*. New York: Weybright and Talley, 1971.

---. *The Unexpected Shaw: Biographical Approaches to G.B.S. and His Work*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1982.

Weissman, Philip. *Creativity in the Theater: A Psychoanalytic Study*. New York and London: Basic Books, 1965.

Williams, Alan. "The Musical Film and Recorded Popular Music." *Genre: The Musical*. Ed. Rick Altman. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Williams, Nicholas. "Shaw reinterpreted." *Shaw* 26 (2006): 143–61.

Wilson, Dolly Smith. "Gender: Change and Continuity." *A Companion to Contemporary Britain 1939–2000*. Eds. Paul Addison and Harriet Jones. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell, 2005. 245–262

Wilson, Edmund. "Bernard Shaw at Eighty." *The Triple Thinkers: Twelve Essays on Literary Subjects*. London: John Lehmann, 1952.

Wisenthal, J.L. *The Marriage of Contraries: Bernard Shaw's Middle Plays*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1974.

Wolf, Stacy. *A Problem Like Maria: Gender and Sexuality in the American Musical*. Michigan: Michigan UP, 2002.

---. "'We'll Always Be Bosom Buddies': Female Duets and the Queering of Broadway Musical Theater." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 12.3 (2006): 351–76.

---. "'Defying Gravity': Queer Conventions in the musical *Wicked*." *Theatre Journal* 60:1 (March 2008): 1–21.

Wood, Linda. "Low-Budget British Films in the 1930s." *The British Cinema Book*. 2nd ed. Ed. Robert Murphy. London: British Film Institute, 2001. 53–59.

Woolf, Virginia. "The Cinema." *Collected Essays, Volume 2*. Ed. Leonard Woolf. London: Chatto and Windus, 1966.

Additional Works Consulted

Adams, Elsie B., ed. *Bernard Shaw and the Aesthetes*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State UP, 1971.

---. "Introduction." *Critical Essays on George Bernard Shaw*. New York: G.K. Hall and Ontario: Maxwell Macmillan, 1991. 1–11.

Andrew, Dudley. *The Major Film Theories*. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976.

Apel, Willi. *Harvard Dictionary of Music*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap, 1972.

Balcon, Michael. *Michael Balcon Presents...A Lifetime of Films*. London: Hutchinson, 1969.

Bawden, Liz-Anne, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Film*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976.

Bazin, André. *What is Cinema?* Vol. I. Translated by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: California UP, 1967.

Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. London and New York: Routledge, 1980.

Billington, Michael. "Theatre Review: Pygmalion/Animal Farm." *The Guardian*, 16 July 2007. Web. 10 June 2008. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2007/jul/16/theatre>

Buhler, Stephen M. *Shakespeare in The Cinema: Ocular Proof*. Albany: New York State UP, 2002.

Carpenter, Charles A. *Bernard Shaw and the Art of Destroying Ideals*. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1969.

Carnevale, Francesca, and Julie-Marie Strange. *20th Century Britain: Economic, Cultural and Social Change*. 2nd ed. Harlow, England: Pearson/Longman, 2007.

Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan. Eds. *Adaptations from Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Casper, Drew. *Postwar Hollywood 1946–1962*. Malden, Massachusetts, 2007.

Chatman, Seymour. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1990.

Dukore, Bernard F. “The Middleaged Bully and the Girl of Eighteen: The Ending They *Didn't* Film.” *Shaw Review* 14 (171): 102–06.

Elsen, Albert E. *Rodin's Art: The Rodin Collection of the Iris and B. Gerald Cantor Center of Visual Arts at Stanford University*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003.

Erens, Patricia, ed. *Issues in Feminist Film Criticism*. Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana UP, 1990.

Franzblau, Susan H. “Deconstructing Attachment Theory: Naturalizing the Politics of Motherhood.” *Charting a New Course for Feminist Psychology*. Lynne H. Collins, Michelle R. Dunlap, Joan C. Chrisler, Eds. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002. 93–110.

Gehring, Wes, ed. *Handbook of American Film Genres*. Connecticut: Greenwood, 1988.

Geraghty, Christine. *Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008.

Goodman, Randolph. *Drama on Stage*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson, 1961.

Hatchuel, Sarah. *Shakespeare: From Stage to Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Holton, Sandra Stanley. *Feminism and Democracy: Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain, 1900–1918*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 1986.

Horsley, Phyllis M. "Thémiseul De Saint-Hyacinthe." *Comparative Literature Studies* 4 (1942): 6–13.

Jackson, Holbrook. *Bernard Shaw*. London: E. Grant Richards, 1907.

Jorgen, Jack J. *Shakespeare on Film*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1977.

Lazere, Donald. "'enry 'higgins 'eartily 'issed.'" *The Village Voice*, 22 July 1971: 50–58.

Manvell, Roger. *Shakespeare and the Film*. Worthing: Littlehampton, 1971.

Mehring, Margaret. *The Screenplay: A Blend of Film Form and Content*. Boston and London: Focal Press, 1990.

Mundy, John. *Popular Music on Screen: From the Hollywood Musical to Music Video*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1999.

Murphy, Robert, ed. *Directors in British and Irish Cinema: A Reference Companion*. New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Raymer, Jessica Lynn. "Pygmalion vs. *My Fair Lady*: A Comparison of the Vision of Two Authors and What Each Play Says to Women." MA Thesis. U of Nevada, 1999.

Ryall, Tom. "Anthony Asquith (1902–1968)." *BFI Screenonline*. Web. 1 July 2009.
<<http://www.screenonline.org.uk/people/id/447391/>>

Shaw, Bernard. *Bernard Shaw: The Drama Observed. Volume I: 1880–1895*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.

---. *Back to Methuselah*. (Standard Ed.) London: Constable: 1931.

---. *Cashel Byron's Profession*. London: Constable, 1932.

---. *Love Among the Artists*. London: Constable, 1932.

---. *Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant: The Second Volume Containing the Four Pleasant Plays By Bernard Shaw*. London: Constable, 1952.

---. *Pygmalion*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1939.

---. *Pygmalion*. London: Constable and Company, 1939.

---. *The Diaries: 1885–1897, Volume 1*. Ed. Stanley Weintraub. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1986.

---. *Bernard Shaw: The Drama Observed. Volume III: 1897–1911*. Ed. Bernard F. Dukore. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.

---. *To a Young Actress: The Letters of Bernard Shaw to Molly Tompkins*. Ed. Peter Tompkins. London: Constable, 1960.

Stam, Robert. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2000.

---. *Literature Through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Vesonder, Tomothy G. "Eliza's Choice: Transformation Myth and the Ending of Pygmalion." *Fabian Feminist: Bernard Shaw and Women*. Ed. Rodelle Weintraub. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977. 39–45.

Weintraub, Rodelle, Ed. *Fabian Feminist: Bernard Shaw and Woman*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977.

Weintraub, Stanley. *Bernard Shaw: A Guide to Research*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992.

Whitman, Robert F. *Shaw and the Play of Ideas*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1977.

Worthen, W.B. "Drama, Performativity, and Performance." *PMLA* 113.5 (Oct. 1998): 1093–1107.