This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Comparison of Plot and Characters in
Bernard Shaw's 1912 PYGMALION
and its Screenplay in 1938.

presented by

Kristen Jean Koehler

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

MA degree in Theatre

Major professor

Date June 30, 1994

COMPARISON OF PLOT AND CHARACTERS IN BERNARD SHAW'S 1912 *PYGMALION* AND ITS SCREENPLAY IN 1938

By

Kristen Jean Koehler

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Theatre

1994

ABSTRACT

COMPARISON OF PLOT AND CHARACTERS IN
BERNARD SHAW'S 1912 *PYGMALION*
AND ITS SCREENPLAY IN 1938

By

Kristen Jean Koehler

This thesis will explore interpretations of the story of Pygmalion for stage (1912) and screen (1938) by Bernard Shaw. Comparisons will be made in the areas of plot development and character. Included in this study will be background information on the play and screenplay, a discussion of plot structure, a description of the plot development of the play, a comparison of the plot development in the resulting screenplay, and a comparison of characters in both versions.

In consideration of the above material, conclusions will be made concerning the effects of the changes in plot development and character upon the overall dramatic concept of the resulting screenplay.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

From myth to modern times, the romantic story of Pygmalion and Galatea has been a favorite subject of artists from across the media. Whether it is told through oils, as in the painting Pygmalion and Galatea by Jean-Leon Gerome (after 1881), or in music, as the famous musical My Fair Lady (1956) that Alan Jay Lerner, librettist, and Frederick Lowe, composer, created from Bernard Shaw's play Pygmalion (1912), the fantastical story of creator and creation has captured the affections of millions.

The origin of the story is found in myth and the beautiful elegance of Ovid's poetic creation, Metamorphoses. According to Bulfinch's Mythology the story is about a man named Pygmalion who "saw so much to blame in women that he came at last to abhor the sex, and resolved to live unmarried" (62). As his profession was that of a sculptor, he created an ivory statue of a beautiful young woman and soon fell in love with his creation. He would shower the object of his affections with gifts, and he even laid her upon a couch, her head upon a pillow and called her his wife. When the festival of Venus was taking place, Pygmalion asked for a wife "one like my ivory virgin", and when he arrived home he found that when he kissed it seemed warm (63). When he touched it, "the ivory felt soft to his

touch and yielded to his fingers like the wax of Hymettus" (63). His creation was alive. Venus blessed their union, and a child named Paphos was born to the couple.

This thesis will explore interpretations of this story for stage (1912) and screen (1938) by Bernard Shaw called Pygmalion. Comparisons will be made in the areas of plot development and character. Included in the study will be a discussion of plot structure, a description of the plot development of the play, a comparison of the plot of the resulting screenplay, and a comparison of the characters in both versions.

The comparison of the plot development of the play and screenplay will note similarities and differences in content, arrangement, and treatment of materials in the six major steps in plot development which are as follows: opening situation, rising action, turning point, falling action, climax, and the ending's denouement.

In regard to characters, this thesis will note the similarities and differences between the play's and the screenplay's characters in the following areas: the number and size of roles, complexity of characterization, character relationships, and character plausibility (determined by motivations and presence or absence of character growth). Finally, the method of introduction of major characters will be explored.

In consideration of the above material, conclusions will be made concerning the effects of the changes in plot

development and character upon the overall dramatic concept of the resulting screenplay.

Although Bernard Shaw has been a force in the dramatic community whose works, or plays, have been thoroughly critiqued and analyzed by theatre scholars for many years, no studies have been mounted to examine his skill at the distinct craft of writing screenplays and how well his text for the stage translates to the modern screen. The absence of study in this area may be due to the fame that Shaw has held has been in the area of theatre above all, and this fame has overshadowed his ventures into writing for film.

In the interest of understanding an author of Shaw's magnitude, critiquing and analyzing his lesser known or renowned work in media other than the stage should be an illuminating experience in viewing how well Shaw's work translates in the areas of plot development and characters from medium to another. By this examination we may perhaps come to a better understanding of the talents that Shaw holds in the area of screenwriting, and overall how this adds to our appreciation of Shaw as both a playwright and a screenwriter.

Besides the esteem in which the award-winning author is held in the dramatic community, the play Pygmalion has also been admired as a work that is worthy of examination as well. In regards to the 1938 screen version of the play, it was called by New York's Daily Mirror, "a perfect movie" and further "It reveals [Shaw] as a scenarist fully equal to

Hollywood. It's universal in its appeal" (Dukore, Screenplays 85).

The major limitation in a study of this type is that the dramatic structure of a play with its divisions found by way of acts and scenes does not share the same flowing, unbroken quality of a screenplay. Fortunately, at the time the screenplay was completed in 1938, which was near the birth of film as a true art form, the medium was still in its childhood. Therefore, the screenplay of Pygmalion was not impossible to compare to its source because it followed very closely to the structure of the play itself. Whether this was because of the still young art of film making or whether it was because the protective nature of the playwright who was also the screenwriter, comparing the flowing nature of a screenplay and the very different staggered stopping and starting nature of a play proved difficult but not impossible.

The discussion of play plot structure and the nature of film will be explored in the opening sections of chapters II and III. These sections will provide a more detailed account of the structure and the nature of the two distinct forms.

Another challenge encountered in this study, although smaller, was the use of dated and regionalized words which most people do not encounter, understand, or appreciate their intended meaning almost a century later in America. The instances in which this occurred in the text were mainly

found in the play. Very wisely, Shaw removed most of the confusing references for his screenplay version.

Perhaps the most important example of a word in the play not being fully appreciated years later is the use of the word "bloody" in the play and screenplay. In today's world of graphic language, violence, and images, the word "bloody" would seem rather tame in almost any conversation. The amazing stir that arose when word leaked out to the press before the opening of the play in London on April 11th, 1914 seems quite amusing to us now, but in 1914 it was quite scandalous.

Since the main interest of this study is the plot development and characters of the screenplay version of Pygmalion, conclusions will be made only concerning the overall dramatic concept of the resulting screenplay. Also, even though three names are mentioned in the British motion picture's screen credits as adapters (W. P. Lipscomb, Cecil Lewis, and Ian Dalrymple), no attempt will be made to note the contributions of the three. Instead, to assure consistent crediting, this thesis will consider and refer to the work of the resulting screenplay as that of Mr. Shaw.

In addition to these introductory comments, four chapters of information will be presented, as well as a conclusion.

In chapter one, background information concerning the origins of the play, biographical information on the famous playwright and screenwriter, the history of Pygmalion as a

vehicle for the stage, and the history of Pygmalion as a vehicle for the screen will be discussed in order to enhance the overall understanding of the author and his work.

In the first section of chapter two, a discussion of the dramatic structure of plot will examine the six steps in plot development which are the opening situation, rising action, the turning point, falling action, the climax, and the ending which includes the denouement. In the second section of the chapter the development of the plot of the play Pygmalion will be traced with special attention given to the six steps in plot development.

In the third chapter a comparison of the plot development in the screenplay will address similarities and differences in the plot of the screenplay, with regard given to the steps of plot development already mentioned, as well as a brief discussion of the differences between theatre and film.

A comparison of characters in the play and screenplay will be surveyed in the fourth chapter. The major characters of the play and screenplay will be discussed in the areas of complexity of character, character relationships, and character plausibility.

The final section of the paper will address two major questions in regards to the screenplay of Pygmalion. First, what were the effects of the changes in plot development upon the overall dramatic concept of the screenplay? Second, what were the effects of the changes in character

upon the overall dramatic concept of the screenplay?

The following texts of the play and screenplay will be compared:

The Washington Square Press Publication of Pocket Books, which is a division of Simon and Schuster, Inc. (New York), 1973 edition of Shaw's Pygmalion.

The University of Georgia Press (Athens, Georgia) 1980 edition of Shaw's Pygmalion located in The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw edited with an introduction by Bernard F. Dukore.

A note should be given on the text used for the screenplay. The editor of the book, Mr. Dukore, stated that although Shaw once published a 'screen version' of Pygmalion, he never published a version of the story with all the new sequences, instead Shaw "combined new film sequences with uncut and unaltered acts of the stage plays" (459).

Dukore examined four sources for the text of Pygmalion. Among them were the October 1934 holograph manuscript, Constable's 1927 edition of the play (London), Pygmalion a Scenario which was a typed manuscript to be used for translation into Polish, and the Bodley Head edition of the play text which was revised for the Standard Edition.

A variety of secondary sources were consulted for this study. Among those sources were biographies, criticism, and sources which gave insight into the structure and art of dramatic writing.

CHAPTER I

PYGMALION ON STAGE AND ON SCREEN

Shaw wrote the play Pygmalion in 1912 and 1913 though the idea of the play had come to him about fifteen years earlier. The story was written specifically for a talented actress of the day - Mrs. Patrick (Stella) Campbell, who shall be described in further depth later in the text. Shaw in use of the title Pygmalion, alludes to the origin of the story belonging to mythology.

In its mythological origins Pygmalion was the story of a man who had grown to hate all women and decided to live the rest of his life alone and celibate. Pygmalion was a sculptor who had created an ivory statue of a beautiful maiden. The work was so perfect that it looked as if the work had sprung to life and often Pygmalion would touch the statue to reassure himself that the statue was living or not. Pygmalion fell in love with his creation, and he would treat the statue as a living woman. He would buy her gifts, dress her with jewelry, and laid her upon his bed and treated her as his wife. When the festival of Venus came about, Pygmalion attended and asked for a wife like his ivory virgin. When Pygmalion arrived home after the festival, he discovered that his beautiful creation was soft to his touch and opened her eyes upon his kisses. Venus blessed the union, and of this union a son was born.

Although the play by Shaw was called a "romance," the greatest departure from its mythological origins was that

Shaw insisted that the aspect of romantic love does not exist in the relationship between Eliza and Henry. It was Shaw's belief that it is romantic enough for a flower girl to be transformed into a lady and, therefore, a romantic relationship between Eliza and Higgins was not necessary. Perhaps the lack of a relationship also existed because of Shaw's immense dislike of the artificiality and "the sentimental, romantic, conventional ideas, and false ideals .n the plays of the period; he had a special dislike for the 'well-made play' because its contrived action gave an untrue picture of the way events occurred in real life" (Goodman 295). Another reason would be that the "excessive dependence of Henry Higgins upon his mother and his lack of interest in young women reflect Shaw's own emotional and sexual constitutions and inclinations" (Goodman 299). Perhaps the lack of the stock happy ending was not as unpleasant idea as most audiences have thought over the years. In the book Versions of Pygmalion by J. Hillis Miller, the author compared the love that Pygmalion had for Galatea to that of an incest, "Pygmalion is Galatea's fathering maker as well as her husband. To sleep with her is to sleep with his own daughter" (10-11).

Randolph Goodman in his book From Script to Stage cites another possible origin of the play Pygmalion that came from a novel by Tobias Smollett called The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle (1751). Although Shaw had no recollection of reading the work, the summary that Goodman provided of

Chapter 87 of the book shows the clear connections between the two stories as follows

> Peregrine is accosted on the road by a beggar-woman and her daughter. The girl is young and beautiful but very coarse and dirty. Peregrine is attracted to her, has a talk with her mother, 'and for a small sum of money purchased her property in the wench.' Peregrine orders his man, Thomas, to take the girl away and clean her up. Despite her screams and curses the girl is bathed and scrubbed, and her clothes are burned. When Peregrine next sees her, he is amazed at the transformation. Believing that the only difference between a person of the upper class and one of the lower resides in his education, Peregrine undertakes to improve the girl's speech and behavior and to pass her off as a lady....The most difficult obstacle he has to overcome, however, is her 'habit of swearing, which she had indulged in from infancy.' The girl passes a preliminary test when she is introduced to a company of gentlemen and impresses them as 'a sprightly young lady, of uncommon learning and taste.' Peregrine then takes her to London, where his Swiss valet gives her lessons in French and dancing, after which she is ready to make her debut at a great ball. She is accepted as a lady of fashion and invited to elegant parties; at one of these she catches another lady cheating at cards and, in her wrath, drops her mask of gentility, lets go a flood of vile language, snaps her fingers in the face of the company, and leaves the room, applying 'her hand to that part which was the last of her that disappeared, inviting the company to kiss it, by of its coarsest denominations'...Shortly afterward, the girl elopes with the Swiss valet; Peregrine becomes angry at first, but then decides to set the young couple up in business as proprietors of a coffee-house and tavern. (209- 300)

Several of the actions in The Adventures of Peregrine Pickle are echoed in Shaw's Pygmalion. For example, buying the common girl from her parent, having the girl unrecognizably transformed by a bath and the burning of her old clothes, the removal of social barriers between the

economic classes by an education, a preliminary test before the final test at the ball (and passing these tests), the use of a vulgar term for titillation, and the transformed girl running off with another man instead of her teacher.

The characters in Pickle are also echoed in Shaw's play as: Pickle as Higgins and Pickering, the Swiss valet as Freddy Eynsford-Hill, the common girl as Eliza, and "the two interesting parents involved, Mr. Doolittle and Mrs. Higgins, are characteristically Shavian creations" (Goodman 300).

Born in Dublin, Ireland in 1856 to an undomestic mother who was a singing teacher and a father who was a drunk, George Bernard Shaw (later the first name was shortened to a G. and then dropped) grew up in a household that "had all the makings of a bad home" (Gassner and Quinn 775).

An uneventful and short career in formal education led to a job in office work. Soon after, at age twenty, Shaw left Dublin for London to embark on a career as a novelist. Between 1879 and 1884 Shaw wrote five unsuccessful novels while he lived with his sisters and his mother who was separated from his father. During this time he also took on several journalistic endeavors. He worked as a book reviewer for the Pall Mall Gazette, an art critic for The World, and a music critic for The Star.

After reading the leaflet "Why are So Many Poor?" a man who once defined himself as being a "member of an individualist state, and therefore nobody's comrade," made a

surprising visit on May 16, 1884 to his first meeting of the Fabian Society (Holroyd, Search 125). He was to find his political home with the Fabian Society which was a group of middle-class intellectuals who spoke of a better society through socialism.

In fact, Pygmalion presents a side of Shaw's socialist philosophy. As a Fabian he believed that the "democratization of society depended upon the removal of the barriers between classes, and the institution of economic and educational equality" (Goodman 300). This idea arises as a theme of Pygmalion.

The beginnings of Shaw's career in the theatre can be traced back to his collaborative effort with a friend and fellow critic William Archer. The two men began working on a play that would soon turn out to be the work credited to Shaw alone - Widowers' Houses (1892). Soon after this first work many other plays would follow. Between the period of 1892 and 1947, Shaw wrote about fifty plays. Among some of them were The Philanderer (1893), Mrs. Warren's Profession (1893), Arms and the Man (1894), Candida (1895), and You Never Can Tell (1899). Although these plays weren't key in establishing him as a success in theatre, it wouldn't be too long until he first moved into public acclaim with the work of the Court Theatre cementing his achievement (Gassner and Quinn 776).

In describing the goals and didactic nature of a Shavian play, The Concise Oxford Companion to Theatre noted

> he set out to appeal to the intellect and not the emotions of his audiences, and introduced on stage subjects previously confined to the lawcourts, the church pulpit, or the political platform - slum landlordism, prostitution, war, religion, family quarrels, health, economics. Thought, not action, was the mainspring of the Shavian play. (500)

In 1898 Shaw married a wealthy Irish heiress named Charlotte Payne-Townshend whom he met through the Fabian Society. The married relationship between the two was a celibate one. Shaw, who had been a virgin until twenty-nine had several affairs in his thirties, decided at forty-three to live his private life in lifelong companionship without family or intercourse (Gassner and Quinn 776).

After writing three very successful plays (Major Barbara, 1905; The Doctor's Dilemma, 1906; and Androcles and the Lion, 1911), Shaw wrote a play which became the playwright's "most popular work and the one that brought him the largest financial returns" - Pygmalion in 1912 (Goodman 297).

In the following year, Shaw's mother died. It was around this time that the playwright spoke of his infatuation with the actress Mrs. Patrick Campbell to friend Ellen Terry. Shaw said that he "fell head over heels in love with her (Mrs. Campbell) in thirty seconds" (Laurence 111).

In 1925 Shaw was awarded the Nobel Prize and he gave the prize money to the Anglo-Swedish Literary Alliance for the promotion of literature and art between Sweden and England.

During the second World War in 1943, Shaw's wife died leaving her husband to outlive "her longer than he wanted to" (Gassner and Quinn 777). At age ninety-one Shaw wrote his last play which was called Buoyant Billions.

On Tuesday, October 31, 1950, Shaw said that he was going to die, and three days later on November 2, 1950 he died in his garden at his home Ayot St. Lawrence as the result of a fall.

Upon his death, Shaw left a fortune, about $1,225,000 - which has tripled since 1950. He asked that the money be used for reforming the English language, but British law negated this request and granted another provision which was to divide the money equally among the Irish National Gallery, the Reading Room of the British Museum, and the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art.

In the book by Richard Huggett entitled The Truth About Pygmalion, a gossipy view of the first production of the play was laid out for all to delight in an insider's view. In fact, when Mrs. Patrick Campbell was in declining years and was pleading with Shaw for permission to print their correspondence for money, Shaw (whose wife was still alive at the time) refused and offered a piece of advice to Mrs. Campbell that surely would have helped her financial situation tremendously, to write the "utter, grotesque truth" of the story of Pygmalion (Huggett 5). Although Shaw and Campbell never got around to writing the story of this undertaking, Mr. Huggett did and he spoke of those involved

in this venture,

> ...Shaw, Mrs. Pat and Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree met and worked together for the first time in their careers. Here were three of the most monstrous egotists the theatre ever produced, all at the height of their talents and fame, all accustomed to getting their own way in everything without opposition, now meeting in headlong collision. Individually they were difficult enough, if not downright fireworks but all three together working on the same play was theatrical dynamite. (5-6)

Huggett also cleverly described the point at which these artists were in their professional lives as

> For Tree, Pygmalion was the final, exultant climax to a long and distinguished life in the theatre. For Mrs. Pat it was the crest of a wave which was soon to crash on to a hard and stony beach. For Shaw, it was a turning point which was to change him from being the darling of the intellectual coteries into a household word...(6)

Surprisingly, the production of Pygmalion was not to open in London, but it first opened for audiences in Germany at the Hofburg Theatre, Vienna on October 16, 1913. It was first presented in English at His Majesty's Theatre in London on April 11, 1914. The following cast members performed in that production:

Clara Eynsford-Hill	Margaret Busse
Mrs. Eynsford-Hill	Carlotta Addison
A Bystander	Roy Byford
Freddy Eynsford-Hill	Algernon Grief
Eliza Doolittle	Mrs. Patrick Campbell
Colonel Pickering	Philip Merivale
Henry Higgins	Herbert Tree
A Sarcastic Bystander	Alexander Sarner
Mrs. Pearce	Geraldine Olliffe
Alfred Doolittle	Edmund Gurney
Mrs. Higgins	Rosamund Mayne-Young
Parlormaid	Irene Delisse.

For the New York opening of the play, Mrs. Campbell once again played Eliza and this time Philip Merivale played Higgins at the Park Theatre on October 12, 1914.

Surprisingly, studio heads did not find Shavian drama as being "too highbrow" nor did they consider Shaw as "box office poison" after the failure of the screen version of Arms and the Man, but the producer of the film did encounter many difficulties with getting a British production of the story in motion (Dukore 65-6). There were several reasons why this occurred. First, Gabriel Pascal, the producer, was considered quite inexperienced as well as the trying agreement which gave him the right to produce the screen version of Pygmalion, but the play's film rights were still retained by the author (Dukore 66). Finally, this production took longer to get backing because Shaw was not so anxious to have his plays filmed that he would accept a contract which did not suit his desires.

Despite the dragging that occurred before the play was produced, a contract was agreed upon and the first showings of Pygmalion occurred on October 6, 1938 in London and December 7, 1938 in New York it opened. Those credited among the production in cast and crew of this screen version are as follows:

Henry Higgins	Leslie Howard
Liza Doolittle	Wendy Hiller
Alfred Doolittle	Wilfred Lawson
Mrs. Higgins	Marie Lohr
Colonel Pickering	Scott Sunderland
Mrs. Pearce	Jean Cadell
Freddy Eynsford-Hill	David Tree

Mrs. Eynsford-Hill	Everley Gregg
Clara Eynsford-Hill	Leueen MacGrath
Count Aristid Karpathy	Esme Percy
Ambassadress	Violet Vanbrugh
Vicar	O.B. Clarence
First Bystander	Wally Patch
Second Bystander	H.F. Maltby
Third Bystander	George Mozart
Sarcastic Bystander	Ivor Barnard
Ysabel	Iris Hoey
Perfide	Viola Tree
Duchess	Irene Brown
A Grand Old Lady	Kate Cutler
Her Son	Leo Genn
A Lady	Kathleen Nesbitt
First Constable	Cecil Trouncer
Second Constable	Stephen Murray
Taxi Driver	Frank Atkinson
Parlormaid	Eileen Beldon
Hairdresser	Anthony Quayle
PRODUCER	Gabriel Pascal
DIRECTORS	Anthony Asquith Leslie Howard
SCREENPLAY & DIALOGUE ADAPTERS	Bernard Shaw W.P. Lipscomb, Cecil Lewis, Ian Dalrymple
SET DESIGNER	Laurence Irving
DRESS DESIGNER	Professor L. Czettell
EXECUTED BY	Worth and Schiaparelli
PHOTOGRAPHY	Harry Stradling
CAMERA	Jack Hildyard
EDITOR	David Lean
MUSIC	Arthur Honegger
ADDITIONAL COMPOSITION	Dr. William Axt
CONDUCTOR	Louis Levy
ART DIRECTOR	John Bryan
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR	Teddy Baird
RECORDIST	Alex Fisher
PRODUCTION MANAGER	Phil G. Samuel.

Due to the inspiration of the talented playwright and screenwriter and to the talented pool of artists who helped create and establish the rich history of this work for stage and screen, Pygmalion has had a long-lasting love affair with audiences from across the globe.

CHAPTER II

PLAY PLOT, STRUCTURE, AND CONTENT

With its beginnings traced back to the earliest rites of primitive man, the simplest pantomime would tell a story or the plot, "I came upon a fierce animal, he growled and attacked me, I crouched, I cast my spear, released my arrow, killed him, and brought him home" (Gassner, Masters 8). We still find the same interest that our primitive forefathers found in a good story, but, more specifically, what are the components of plot?

In searching for a scholarly definition of this term, I was surprised to find that several authors avoided offering a quick, concise definition to readers perhaps because in scholarly conscience they couldn't because they would be "cheating" their readers by not exploring every single aspect of the term. Nonetheless, a definition of the components of plot could be found under "dramatic structure" in Theatre Language: A Dictionary of Terms in English defined as "In a dramatic composition, the arrangement of plot materials in a unified effective form, including exposition, complication, climax, denouement" (Bowman and Ball 112).

When discussing the structure of a play by Shaw, several other playwrights' names arise who were said to be intentional and unintentional sources of his structural inspiration for how he crafted his own plays. Through closer examination, Shaw's structural influences can be

traced to the structural style of playwright Henrik Ibsen, who, in turn, was influenced by "the well-constructed but artificial" well-made" plays of Eugene Scribe, whose successor was Victorien Sardou (Gassner and Quinn 911-12). In fact, Shaw was said to be one of the first to find genius in the work of Ibsen, and interpreted Ibsen's formula to be exposition, situation, discussion and used this formula in his own work (Marx 116).

Yet, before Shaw had heard of Ibsen in 1887 he was collaborating on a play with fellow writer and friend William Archer, and an interesting argument would follow over the plot construction of their work when Shaw came to a standstill on their work and came to Archer for a skeleton of the last three acts. Archer was a great advocate of mid-nineteenth-century French Theatre, and Shaw denounced the "sterile artifice of constructed drama" saying their play had an organic growth "like a flowering plant" and could never be "manufactured...according to plans and specifications supplied by an inventor" (Holroyd, Search 276). The incongruity of the whole event was that "if Shaw wishes to do without plans and specifications, why has he based his play on a French model, and why was he coming to Archer to ask for more sections of the event-plot or 'Skeleton'" (Holroyd, Search 276)?

The unintentional influences of Scribe and Sardou, in the form of using the techniques of the well-made play, can be found in Shaw's work despite Shaw's attempts to "kill"

the well-made play through his criticism as an English drama critic for the Saturday Review (May 27, 1895) (Gassner and Quinn 912). Further, Shaw's famous accusation of "Sardoodledom" attacked the "Sardou type of play for its irrelevance to the point of immorality" (Gassner and Quinn 576).

In Milton Marx's book entitled The Enjoyment of Drama, he described the how the plot is developed throughout the structure of the play. In regards to the first act, it should accomplish the following: overall it should set the groundwork for the rest of the play, be especially clear in establishing relationships, initiate atmosphere and the opening situation, introduce most of the characters of the play, begin the plot movement, provide expository material, and indicate conflicts which should leave the audience asking, "What's next for our hero?" (40-46).

After the plot movement has been started and the groundwork has been laid in the first act, the second act's main concern is to provide rising action, which comes about from complications caused by the conflicting forces in the play (Marx 46-7). The main purpose of the rising action is to lead up to the turning point in the play.

In a five-act play structure, the turning point in the play usually occurs in the third act. The turning point is when the action has taken "a definite direction towards the ending" (Marx 47). In other words, the final answer to the questions raised during the first act will be answered at

the climax of the play, but it "begins to come into direct view for the first time at the turning point" (Marx 47). So, according to Marx, the turning point must do the following: "concern the main character, follow logically from the rising action and lead directly to the climax, it must be the decisive clash in the plot, and it must also represent the crisis in the general conflict that expresses the theme" (50).

Falling action is the next segment in dramatic structure. Very simply, it is the part of the play in between the turning point and the climax. One of the final parts of dramatic structure is the climax. The climax is the moment that the highest emotional interest level is reached. The placement of the climax at the end of the play is due to the fact that anything after this point is a letdown and emotionally it is the end of the story (Marx 53).

Finally, the ending, which contains the denouement, is the last part of the play that follows the climax. It is usually very short, and its purpose is "to bring the audience back to earth from an emotional height" and of the denouement is to tie up the loose ends of the play (Marx 54).

Pygmalion is a play in 5 acts with 2, 4, 2, 2, and 1 scene respectively.

The play opens late in the evening in London during a heavy summer rainstorm. Pedestrians are running about

looking for shelter and cabs after a theatrical performance just let out. During this act we meet most of the important characters in the play. Among those gathered under the portico of a church are the Eynsford-Hill family, Eliza Doolittle, Colonel Pickering, and Henry Higgins.

Mrs. Eynsford-Hill and her daughter Clara open the play wondering where Freddy, Clara's brother, can be since he has been out looking for a cab for rather a long time. As they discuss their situation, Freddy arrives and announces that there is not a cab to be found. After scolding him for not looking hard enough, Freddy is sent back out into the rain to look for a cab. As he dashes off he collides with a young, dirty-looking flower girl and he scatters her flowers all about.

Eliza calls after the stranger by name and tells him to watch where he is going. Mrs. Eynsford-Hill, concerned that such a lowly creature would know her son by name, approaches the flower girl and asks how the girl how she knows her son's name. After convincing the lady to pay for the ruined flowers, Eliza tells her that she merely calls all strangers Freddy or Charlie.

Just as they finish talking, an older gentleman rushes in from the rain. Eliza, seizing the moment for another sale, tries to sell the gentleman a flower. After badgering him to buy a flower, the gentleman gives her some change and walks off. As he does a bystander tells Eliza to be careful because another gentleman has been writing down everything

she has said. After whining that she is a good girl and generally creating a scene, the notetaker quiets her by showing her what he has taken down. Since it is phonetic shorthand, Eliza can't read a word, but the man reads off the exact words of Eliza in her Cockney dialect.

As the group which has gathered around begins to talk to the notetaker, who is Henry Higgins, he immediately identifies where each person is from by the dialect. Soon after, the rain stops and the group scatters while the older gentleman asks of Higgins' talents. Higgins even goes so far as to boast that "in three months I could pass that girl off as a duchess at an ambassador's garden party. I could even get her a place as lady's maid or shop assistant, which requires better English" (Shaw, Pygmalion 11). This skillfully planted statement alludes to the movement of things to come. The two soon discover that they are colleagues. The older gentleman turns out to be Colonel Pickering whom Higgins was preparing to visit in India, and Pickering came to London to visit Higgins. As the two begin to leave, Eliza asks for money for her lodging. Higgins reminds her that she is not short for her lodging, but he throws her a bunch of coins anyway.

Finally, Freddy shows up with a cab for his mother and sister to find that they have already left. Eliza takes the cab that Freddy has found back to her lodging thanks to the money that Higgins has given her.

At the beginning of Act II it is the next day in

Higgins' laboratory in his home on Wimpole Street. Higgins has just shown Pickering his whole setup. Mrs. Pearce, Higgins' motherly housekeeper, enters looking perplexed. She announces that a strange girl has come asking for the professor. Thinking this a good opportunity to show Pickering his techniques and observe her accent, he has her shown in to the laboratory/drawing room.

When Eliza is shown in and Higgins recognizes her from the preceding evening, her orders the flower girl to leave since he has already recorded her accent and has no use for her. Eliza does not oblige to his order, and when Pickering asks what she has come for we learn Eliza's objective or her desire,

> 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 zif I were dirt. (Shaw, Pygmalion 20)

With the small amount that Eliza is able to pay for her lessons, Higgins calculates that proportionally it is a very large sum considering her average daily income. Pickering then starts the plot movement by making a wager that drives the rest of the play along. He bets Higgins the expenses of the experiment and the cost of Eliza's lessons that Higgins can't teach Eliza to speak well enough to be passed off as a lady at an ambassador's garden party in six months. Aroused by the bet, Higgins accepts the wager and has Eliza sent off to be cleaned, have her old clothes burned, and have new

clothes sent.

After voicing her objections to such a plan because the girl might be married or have parents who would object, Mrs. Pearce takes Eliza off questioning what is to become of the girl when they have finished their experiment. Spurred on by her question, Pickering asks if Higgins is a man of good moral character in regards to women. Higgins answers that he is and will remain a confirmed bachelor and would not take advantage of the girl.

Mrs. Pearce soon returns with the news that Eliza's father has arrived. Wary of a plot against them, Higgins tells Alfred Doolittle to take his daughter and be off. Doolittle reacts with surprise, after all Doolittle just wants a five-pound note so that he can get drunk with his common-law wife. The dustman's view of himself as being a member of the undeserving poor and his pessimistic view of middle class morality amuse Higgins and the professor offers Doolittle ten-pounds instead of five. Refusing the ten-pounds because it would be too much for a drinking spree, Doolittle takes the requested five-pound note and begins to leave. As he leaves, Eliza enters and Doolittle doesn't recognize the cleaner version of his own daughter. Eliza is disgusted by her father's intentions until her new clothes arrive, and she is off with an "Ah-ow-oo-ooh!"

The second act ends with the first speech lesson for Eliza. Throughout the lesson Eliza tries to shake her Cockney accent despite the bullying of her overzealous

professor.

The third act opens in the drawing room of Henry's mother, Mrs. Higgins. "Some months" have passed since we last saw Henry. It is her day to receive guests in her home. She is very upset that her son has decided to pay her a visit on her at-home day because Henry has such bad manners that he has offended many of her friends in the past. She is further disturbed by her son's announcement that he has invited a common flower girl to her home. He tries to persuade his mother by saying that he has taught her how to speak properly and that she will only speak on two subjects - the weather and everybody's health. Since Henry has made Eliza's speech sound more genteel, he explains that he needs his mother's help to see if she is presentable in social situations not by how well she speaks, but on what subjects she chooses to speak.

Henry and Mrs. Higgins are interrupted by the parlor maid who announces the arrival of the first two visitors who are Mrs. and Miss Eynsford-Hill. Soon after, Colonel Pickering is shown into the parlor and then Freddy Eynsford-Hill. After a little small talk, a new elegant-looking Eliza is shown into the room. She is introduced to all of the other visitors and then takes off on her two subjects for conversation.

Despite her restriction to the two simple subjects and the beautiful precision of her speech, Eliza "fails her smaller test" before the final test of the garden party by

showing that she is not ready for the social scene because she is not aware of what is socially acceptable [i.e. "Walk. Not bloody likely. I'm going in a taxi" (Shaw, Pygmalion 55)]. At this moment a common cliche seems to suit this situation - it was possible to take the girl out of the gutter, but it was not possible to take the gutter out of the girl. Higgins tries to cover for Eliza by calling her unsuitable subject matter and words as a new kind of small talk.

Soon after this fiasco, Eliza leaves as well as the other guests. Pickering and Henry are left to revel in Eliza's performance, while Mrs. Higgins reminds them that Eliza may be a "triumph of your art (phonetics) and of her dressmaker's; but if you suppose for a moment that she doesn't give herself away in every sentence she utters, you must be perfectly cracked about her" (Shaw, Pygmalion 57). Mrs. Higgins then echoes a concern brought up by Mrs. Pearce in the previous act which is what is to become of Eliza, and furthermore since she has been living with Higgins and Pickering and, therefore acquiring Henry's bad manners and habits, she will be disqualified from **any** job. Yet, her son and the Colonel seem to pay no heed to her concerns, and they soon leave.

The final scene in Act III serves as the turning point for the play. It takes place at an Embassy on a summer evening just before the six months are up. Eliza will meet her final test head on. Pickering and Higgins are greeted

at the reception by a former pupil of Higgins named Nepommuck who is there mainly for the purpose of spotting frauds, like Eliza, among the guests for the host and hostess. As Nepommuck exits, Eliza joins the two and they ascend the staircase to meet the host and hostess. Eliza's entrance creates quite a stir among the guests, and she makes her way across the room. An excited Nepommuck joins the professor and his hosts and starts the suspense by stating, "I have found out all about her. She is a fraud" (Shaw, Pygmalion 64). Nepommuck continued that she could not be English because she spoke it too perfectly, as if it were a foreign language to her. Finally, the suspense breaks, the turning point occurs, and Henry wins his bet when Henry's own pupil answers that Eliza is a Hungarian of royal blood.

Act IV begins in the Wimpole Street laboratory at midnight as they are arriving home from the ball. The falling action after Eliza's turning point at the ball is only a short segment of the play before the climax occurs in the first scene of the act. As Pickering and Higgins are "winding down" from the exciting evening and congratulating themselves on their success, an almost tragic-looking Eliza enters. She fetches Higgins slippers and listens in on their conversation that didn't include one word of praise directly to her. After their discussion, Pickering retires for the evening as well as Higgins.

Consumed with emotion, Eliza throws herself to the

floor as Higgins looks in to inquire about his slippers. Eliza responds by throwing his slippers at him with all of her force. Confused by her anger, and amazed by her belief that she won the bet and he didn't, Higgins enrages Eliza by stating that she was nervous about what was to become of her. At this point, the climax of the entire play occurs as Eliza lets out a suffocated scream and darts her nails at his face. Higgins then becomes the dominant force as he overpowers her and throws her into an easy-chair [i.e. the stage direction for Eliza: "crushed by superior strength and weight" (Shaw, Pygmalion 72). An explosion of tension occurs at this point in the play, sexual tension as well, and emotionally the play is over when we know that nothing can happen between the two characters on an intimate level. Higgins chooses to push her away instead of pulling her closer.

Yet, the question remains that if she is not going to stay with Higgins, what is she fit for? Since Higgins never really listened to the concerns of his mother or Mrs. Pearce, he finally decides that perhaps Eliza could marry someone. When Eliza counters that she was better off before because at least she only sold flowers and not herself, Higgins believes he has resolved the problem when he says that Pickering can set her up in a flower shop and he retires to bed.

Before allowing him to leave, Eliza has the pleasure of hurting Higgins the way he has hurt her when she inquires

which clothes are hers to keep, returns the ring he gave her, and tells him she won't be doing his errands anymore.

The final act takes place in Mrs. Higgins' drawing room. A parlor maid enters to tell Mrs. Higgins that her son and Colonel Pickering are downstairs calling the police. Mrs. Higgins tells the maid to have Eliza remain upstairs until she is sent for. Henry then enters announcing that Eliza is missing. As Mrs. Higgins expresses her concern for the involvement of the police in this matter, the arrival of Alfred Doolittle is announced. After being quite surprised not to find the dustman that they expected, they discover that Doolittle has been pulled mercilessly into the world of "middle-class morality" thanks to a friend of Higgins who left him a small fortune of money in exchange for Doolittle lecturing on moral reform.

Believing that Eliza can stay with her father due to his new financial situation, Mrs. Higgins informs the group that Eliza is upstairs and sends for her. When Eliza comes into the room she is not the picture of what Henry saw last night, instead she looks calm and self-possessed. After refusing to go to Wimpole Street with Pickering and Henry, Eliza's father re-enters the room, he has come to ask Eliza to attend his wedding. Eliza agrees to go to the wedding and goes upstairs to get ready. Mrs. Higgins and Pickering agree to attend the wedding as well and leave to prepare for the wedding.

As Eliza is leaving, Higgins has one final discussion

with her. He asks her to return to Wimpole Street with him, but he will not treat her any differently than he has treated anyone. His manners will not change. So, she will not find what she wants which she states is

> a little kindness...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. (Shaw, Pygmalion 97)

The options that Eliza is faced with for her future are: to return to her old life at Tottenham Court Road selling flowers, return to Wimpole Street as one of "three old bachelors" with Higgins and Pickering, move into her father's house, or marry Freddy and provide a life for him by teaching phonetics. She infuriates and then pleases Higgins by speaking of teaching phonetics. With her new found spirit of independence and her stubborn nature, the audience knows that Eliza is going to be just fine with her decision to marry Freddy.

CHAPTER III

PLOT DEVELOPMENT COMPARISON OF SCREENPLAY

In his Prologue of The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw, Bernard Dukore described an interview which was published shortly before Bernard Shaw turned ninety. Shaw had been asked, if he had his time over again would he write for the screen rather than the stage, and his answer was very simply a 'yes' (Dukore 1). Dukore explained that by this time Shaw had a dozen years experience as a screenwriter, won an Academy Award for the best screenplay of 1938 (Pygmalion) and apparently saw a future for himself in the cinema (1). Although the medium of film making as an art was still rather young, Shaw proved himself to be an artist who was capable of working successfully in both media - for the stage and for the screen, but from what theatrical beginnings did the work of this playwright and screenwriter emerge?

In the Introduction of Stage to Screen: Theatrical Method From Garrick to Griffith, A. Nicholas Vardac set up the period precipitating the emergence of film as an art form by linking "the birth of the need for the motion picture" with the scientific, questioning spirit of the 17th century which flowed into David Garrick's theatrical attempts in the 18th century "at achieving a greater pictorial realism in staging" through the use of stagings by P. J. de Loutherbourg, the proscenium "picture frame," and modifications in lighting and character interpretation

(xvii).

From the evolution of the realistic reforms of Garrick on the stage, Vardac set another momentous chronological landmark for his book in 1915 with the advent of the motion picture as a "full-fledged and autonomous art form" in the work of D. W. Griffith's The Birth of a Nation (165). The author explained that although the first screenings of the Edison-Armat vitascope were in 1895 and 1896, several years would pass before

> "the technique of the camera and the photoplay achieved its selectivity, its unity of purpose, its dramatic emphasis, its interplay of episodes, transition, and dramatic climax, its aesthetics of pictorial composition, dynamic and static, in short, before it attained the status of an art form." (Vardac 165)

Given the interrelatedness of these two chronological landmarks for the stage and the screen, how does the work of the theater compare with that of film?

In An Anatomy of Drama Martin Esslin gave several similarities and differences that exist between the two vehicles. Esslin cited that a "basic unity of the dramatic mode of communication" existed between the theatre and the mass media of the cinema, television, and radio while noting the plays that have been filmed, the plays that have been made from films, television plays have been produced in the theatre, and television shows that feature films daily (77). Further evidence of this "basic unity" can be shown through the "interchange" of artists between the two because there

may be differences but they "are merely modifications of one basic dramatic craft" (Esslin 77 -8).

Most of the similarities and differences between theatre and the mass media that are described by Esslin could be put under a heading of control. Depending upon what role an individual might be put in, i.e. actor or director or audience member, and considering personal preferences and feelings about the element of control, generally more elements of control can be found in the mass media.

As a director an individual might wish to work in the mass media because more control can be found within this vehicle. Esslin mentions in regards to the pre-recorded media that the director has "infinitely greater scope for varying the venue of action, much greater flexibility in structuring it through devices like montage and editing" (78). Therefore, the director can have even more control by giving his point of view of the action through his artistic choices of the camera angles and the use of the microphone. In other words, "in mechanical media the director's power over the audience's point of view is total" (Esslin 79).

Meanwhile, the actor may often prefer the excitement of live theatre over that of film because of the relationship that can be found with the audience. Esslin stated that the main asset of stage drama lies in "the feedback from the audience to the actors" (78).

Other differences mentioned between the two media by

Esslin were: the lack of mass psychology in media found in the media which comes into the spectator's home, i.e. the "infectiousness of laughter," (80); the varying distance between action and spectator in film but not theatre (81); and while it is still an event to go to a film or the theatre, that aspect does not exist in the continuous stream of information and entertainment that is piped into our homes daily through television and radio (82).

Of the influences that each medium has had on each other, Esslin concludes that the mass media has had several effects upon the theatre. Among them are: the breakdown of "the rigid well-made play" structure (83); the acceptance of narration and cinematic techniques, such as cross-cutting quick scenes (83-4); the creation of a new more sophisticated and intelligent audience for the theatre (84); and the nourishing of new creative talent "awakened by radio and television drama" (84-5). Finally, the theatre has also had an effect upon the mass media in the way that it may serve as a "training ground" and be more experimental in nature because it does not have the same cost and monumentally "cumbersome technology" of its dramatic counterpart (Esslin 84).

Since the plot line of the screenplay is practically the same from a chronological event-by-event standpoint, the following description of the plot line will be as brief as possible giving the major plot actions, and will allow the changes to be noted in the third and final section of this

chapter entitled "Changes in the Screenplay."

The screenplay opens to a summer thunderstorm in London. Eliza Doolittle and an old woman who are flower vendors are caught out in the summer rain. After a few words, the woman takes her basket and hurries off in the rain. Eliza then follows. Next, a young man, Freddy Eynsford-Hill, is seen trying to hail a taxi in the downpour but to no avail.

A group of people are gathered under the portico of a church in shelter from the sudden rain. Among the group are Mrs. Eynsford-Hill and her daughter Clara. They are waiting for Freddy to find them a taxi. When Freddy returns with the news that he can't find a cab, the two women send him back out in the rain. As he is running off, he collides with the flower girl, Liza or Eliza, that we met earlier and spills her flowers. She yells after him, "Nah then, Freddy: look wh' y' gowin, deah" (Dukore 227). Freddy's mother, curious at how such a lowly creature could know her son by name, approaches the young girl and asks Liza her query. After finding out that it was just Liza's way of being friendly by calling everyone Freddy or Charlie, Mrs. Eynsford-Hill walks off and a gentleman rushes in out of the rain. Liza, being rather bothersome, tries to get the man, who is Colonel Pickering, to buy some flowers and instead gets some change. The members of the crowd warn the girl against taking the money because a man has been taking down every word she says. The man turns out to be Professor

Henry Higgins who is an expert at phonetics. After showing off his talents of identifying people's origins by their dialects, he asserts that he could even change the lowly creature Liza into a lady by teaching her how to speak properly. One of the members from the crowd turns out to be Colonel Pickering who has come to London to meet Higgins. The two then go off to discuss their shared interests.

After piquing her interest in becoming a lady, the two gentlemen are surprised to have Liza come visit them to ask for lessons. After Pickering makes a wager for Higgins to pass the girl off as a lady, Higgins accepts the venture. Liza is taken off to be cleaned, and her clothes are burned. While Liza is being taken care of by Mrs. Pearce, Alfred Doolittle, Liza's father shows up to blackmail Higgins and Pickering into giving him money. First outraged by Doolittle's attempts and then amused, Higgins gives the man some money for his daughter.

After giving lessons to Liza, Higgins decides to put her to a test at his mother's house on a day which she has visitors. The Eynsford-Hill family turns out to be the guests and they become thoroughly taken and amused by Liza's inappropriate behavior, for which Higgins covers. Mrs. Higgins, Henry's mother, points out to her son and the Colonel after Liza has left, that the girl is not ready to be presentable.

Some time later Liza is given and passes her final test at a ball. She creates such a stir that the Host and

Hostess of the party have a former pupil of Higgins figure out her real social origins. The test is passed when the former pupil declares that the beautiful guest is nothing less than Hungarian royalty.

After the long evening Higgins, Pickering, and Liza arrive back home. The two men are delighted with their recent success and neglect to share their victory and praise with Liza. Upset by this treatment, Liza makes her anger known to Higgins, breaks off her ties with the Professor, and makes plans to leave the house.

As Liza leaves the house, she runs into Freddy who has fallen deeply in love with her. The two find comfort and affection in each other an run off together into the night.

The next morning arrives, and Liza has already found her way to Mrs. Higgins house. Henry arrives at the house perplexed by Liza's disappearance. He has called the police and is very surprised to find that Liza has sought refuge at his mother's house. While waiting for Liza to appear, Alfred Doolittle shows up in wedding clothes angry that Higgins has forced him into a life of "middle-class morality" (Dukore, 264). He has come to invite his daughter to his wedding.

Liza agrees to go to the wedding, and as everyone is getting ready to leave, Higgins stops Liza. He asks Liza if she was ready to come back stating that his manners will not change because he treats everyone the same way. Liza refuses to come back to Higgins' house and leaves for her

father's wedding with her new mate Freddy.

Several changes took place when the play was edited to become the screenplay. Of the changes that shall be noted, several should come under the heading of "additions." In other words, the additions were created specifically for the screenplay and can't be found in the play. The screenplay, which was mainly an "elaboration of the stage script" went through at least four revisions (Goodman 313). Shaw had used the printed version of the script, which he called the book, in creating the basis for the screenplay.

Randolph Goodman in From Script to Stage: Eight Modern Plays noted in regard to the additions for the screen, that Shaw

> in red ink throughout the script, he made slight alterations in the dialogue and stage business. In addition, he wrote, in pencil, about thirty pages of script, consisting of full-length scenes as well as suggestions and comments for the director. Several of the items...are characteristically Shavian and each is headed 'Note' (Goodman 303).

Of the several scenes which were added to the screenplay which were said to give the story "greater fluidity and cinematic quality" (Goodman 313), I did not consider the scenes to be "added" scenes for the purpose of my study. The reason why I didn't consider them was because every single one mentioned was already found in the play's script and the decision to use or not use these scenes in the play is irrelevant because the text does exist whether it is used in common play practice or not. Of the scenes

which were mentioned as being "added" to the screenplay which I did not classify as such were as follows: the taxi driver taking Eliza home after the opening scene; Eliza getting a bath by Mrs. Pearce; Eliza's tutoring scene with Higgins; the Embassy reception (which introduced the former pupil of Higgins named Nepommuck in the play and screenplay, which later changed to Count Karpathy in the final screen version); and one of the three endings of the play which was shot and used in which Higgins is seated and listening to an old recording of Eliza's voice and Eliza returns and finishes the speech after which Higgins gives a final self-satisfied victory smile, crunches down in his seat, and pushes his hat over his eyes.

Also, since the flowing nature of the screenplay Pygmalion does not contain formal divisions such as acts yet still follows the same events chronologically, the sections of the screenplay which contain the events of a certain act are referred to by the structural divisions of a play despite its own lack of formal division. In other words, in the interest of discussing the events of the screenplay section by section, they are discussed by act numbers even though the formal division does not exist.

In "Act I" of the screenplay there were fourteen additional lines, a line being a portion of dialogue occupying a single row in the script, of dialogue spoken by characters in five different instances. Six of the lines are from the added scene at the very beginning of the film

between Eliza and an old woman. Two added lines of dialogue soon follow with an extra appearance of Freddy trying to hail a taxi. The next two lines of added dialogue are spoken by Higgins mid line in regard to the upstarts "who have to be taught to speak like ladies and gentlemen" (Dukore 231) instead of mentioning the purely British references to Kentish Town. Next, Pickering has an inconsequential added line, and the last added lines of dialogue in Act I is given to the voices of a boys choir who are subtly reminding Higgins of his lack of charity through their music.

The majority of the additions in Act I can be found in the form of "Notes," as mentioned earlier, and in the form of setting directions. Seven additions in these two forms took up approximately three pages of text which were suggestions or directions from Shaw to the director. Most of the added text was added to establish the atmosphere of the opening situation within the first act. Other additions took the form of describing Higgins and Eliza as characters. Perhaps the most important note that was added in the screenplay text can be found in Act I when Shaw voices his concern for the casting choices of Higgins and Freddy and tries to remove any possible thoughts on Higgins as a love interest. Shaw noted

> Higgins is not youthful. He is a mature, well built, impressive, authoritative man of 40 or thereabouts...It is important that in age and everything else he should be in strong contrast to Freddy, who is 20, slim, goodlooking, and very

> youthful. (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) (Dukore 226).

In the closing moments of Act I the final additions show Eliza in her home and, therefore, provide insight into her personality from her environment or her living conditions.

In Act II there were eleven additional lines of dialogue spoken by characters on five different occasions. After the first inconsequential added line by Higgins, a word substitution takes place when "slum prudery" (Dukore 236) is added in place of the British reference to "Lisson Grove prudery" (Shaw 23). Shortly thereafter, Higgins has two added lines when speaking with Mrs. Pearce, who has six, when they are both referring to the bath that Mrs. Pearce has just given Eliza. The final added line of dialogue in Act II comes from Higgins when he is questioning if Alfred Doolittle should be given a fiver.

Act II also has about a half page of additional notes and screen description by Shaw. There are eight instances which total twenty-six additional lines of notes and screen description in this particular act. The first seven instances of eighteen lines provide the action of the bath given to Eliza by Mrs. Pearce and the action leading up to that point and after that point when Mrs. Pearce sees Higgins and the Colonel after the "heartrending" experience (Dukore 240). The final addition in Act II, and perhaps the

most important, consists of the note by Shaw regarding the character of Alfred Doolittle. Shaw notes

> The first appearance of Doolittle should be impressive and threatening. The audience should have a good look at him as he appears in the doorway.
>
> A strong point must be made of the change in his expression from the outraged avenging father to the irresistibly charming old rascal on the line 'Well, what would a man come for? Be human, Governor.'
>
> After this change, Doolittle should be thoroughly liked by the audience.
>
> This must be managed by close-ups. At his exit also a feature must be made of the look at Mrs. Pearce and the wink at Higgins. (Dukore 241)

Act III was the section of the play which had the least additions to it by the author. There was only one additional insignificant line which was spoken by Mrs. Eynsford-Hill thanking Mrs. Higgins "for a most exciting afternoon" (Dukore 251).

There were no additional notes or suggested cinematic action given by Shaw for Act III of his screenplay.

In Act IV a line substitution takes place when Eliza speaks of what she is now suited for since Higgins' involvement in her life and her transformation into a lady. The line "I was above that before you came interfering with me" (Dukore 260) was added in place of a British reference in the line "We were above that at the corner of Tottenham Court Road" (Shaw 74).

Concerning the addition of notes and suggestions for cinematic action, three separate instances occurred with the addition of nine total lines. The first two instances

containing two lines each were brief descriptions of the location, blocking, and emotional attitude of Eliza after Higgins exits from their climactic interchange. The final instance containing additional lines was a note from Shaw concerning the scene between the infatuated Freddy and Eliza who is "hungry for comfort" (Dukore 262). The first three lines show Shaw's directions for Eliza's emotional timbre for the scene, "...Liza expresses in all her movements her raging resolution...But her self command is perfect" (Dukore 262). The final two lines are a line substitution in which Shaw describes the location of the lovelorn Freddy outside Eliza's window.

In the final act of the screenplay, instead of the brief interchange between Mrs. Higgins and her son at the very end of the play, a whole scene of dialogue and directions for cinematic action were added. This additional page and a half of text included a scene between Mrs. Higgins and her son in which she discusses Eliza's future with Freddy. The following scene has Freddy thanking Higgins for agreeing to set up the young lovers in a flower shop. At the very end of the screenplay Shaw has Higgins standing at his mother's garden gate remembering while fading in and out of a vision of the Eliza of the past and of the future, when a policewoman comes along and breaks Higgins out of his spell. When asked if anything was wrong, a happy Higgins replies, "No: nothing wrong. A happy ending. A happy beginning. Good morning, madam" (Dukore

272).

The remainder of this chapter will address the dialogue and directions that can be found in the play Pygmalion but not in the screenplay or the "deletions". The same references will be made to the sections of the screenplay's "acts" despite the lack of these formal divisions. Finally, Shaw did not add several lines of play dialogue because of their lack of importance was not great enough to add more bulk to the screenplay. So, it should be noted that these unimportant deletions will not be discussed so that more noteworthy omissions and sections of text which have been deleted may be discussed in greater detail.

In "Act I" of the screenplay the first two instances of major deletions of sections of dialogue occurred with a conversation between Mrs. Eynsford-Hill, her daughter, and a bystander and the second was an enlarged conversation between Freddy and his mother and sister. Through the first instance of eleven lines of text a derogatory view of Freddy is first shared with the audience, i.e. "If Freddy had a bit of gumption...Other people got cabs. Why couldn't he" (Shaw 3). The second instance of line deletion occurred when Freddy first arrived back after not finding a cab. The deletion of these sixteen lines also shows Freddy as incompetent and whining while deleting some references to London landmarks that wouldn't make sense to a wider audience. For example, references to Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, and Ludgate Circus were removed. The final

major deletion of lines from Act I came in the form of cinematic directions concerning the lifestyle of Eliza through describing her home environment. As mentioned earlier in the "additions" section, a revised section of text on Eliza's surroundings was included instead.

In the second act of the screenplay the first deletion occurred with the ten line conversation between Pickering and Higgins describing more specifics of the science of phonetics, "I can pronounce twenty-four distinct vowel sounds; but your hundred and thirty beat me. I can't hear a bit of difference between most of them" (Shaw 18). This may have been done because it might have confused the audience with more unnecessary facts.

The next deletion of importance provided insight into the feisty, independent spirit of Eliza. This instance was a conversation between Higgins and Eliza when she told him that her money was good enough for him and scoldingly remarks that if he were a gentleman he would ask her to sit down when she was bringing him business. The next major portion of text to be deleted was a little over a page long in which Higgins shows his whimsy when he figures out that Eliza is offering him a proportionally large sum of money to give her lessons in relation to her average daily income. The final three deletions of major importance are related to questions of morality. The first of the three that was not found in the screenplay was a remark which Pickering made to Higgins in regard to his unflattering treatment of Eliza

when he said, "Youre certainly not going to turn her head with flattery, Higgins" (Shaw 22). This remark looks below the dirt and grime for the first time and sees a woman underneath. The second deletion heads straight for a question of morality when Pickering asks Higgins very openly, "Are you a man of good character where women are concerned" (Shaw 30). The answer to which gives us an explanation for the lack of interest that Higgins shows for women when Higgins states

> ...I find 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...So here I am, a confirmed old bachelor, and likely to remain so...teaching would be impossible unless pupils are sacred...Ive taught...the best looking women in the world. I'm seasoned. They might as well be blocks of wood. I might as well be a block of wood... (Shaw 30 -1)

The final deletion with moral implications comes from a passage between Pickering, Alfred Doolittle, and Higgins. Once again Pickering has a question of morality when he asks Doolittle why he doesn't marry his common-law wife. Doolittle explains that he would like to but she doesn't want to because this way he still has to buy her presents and clothes and further he gives Higgins some advice regarding his daughter

> Take my advice, Governor, marry Eliza while she's still young and dont (sic) know no better. If you dont youll (sic) be sorry for it after. If you do, she'll be sorry for it, after; but better her than you...(Shaw 39)

Three deletions of importance occur in the third act of

the screenplay. The first is a interchange between Henry and Mrs. Higgins when he comes to visit her on her day for visitors. This section further proves Henry's nature and gives insight into his relationship with his mother when she scolds him for visiting. She states "...Go home at once...I'm serious, Henry. You offend all my friends: they stop coming whenever they meet you" (Shaw 48).

The second deletion of importance occurs at the end of the Eynsford-Hills visit. In this section the reference of Higgins being eligibly attractive in matrimony through the failed flirtation of Clara Eynsford-Hill. The deletion of importance can be found in form of a stage direction for Clara in which Shaw suggests Clara convey that she is one "[who considers Higgins quite eligible matrimonially]" (Shaw 51). The final deletion in Act III of the screenplay can be found in the section of dialogue that takes place right after Eliza makes her dramatic exit from her first test as a lady. It is throughout this section that Shaw skillfully entertains the topic of what is politically correct behavior within the different social classes. Mrs. Eynsford-Hill has been convinced by Henry that the shocking language used by Eliza is just the "new small talk" and she admits to being unable to get used to the new ways. Clara shows her transparent desire to be in vogue when she responds to Henry's temptations to use the new shocking language.

Act IV did not contain any major deletions from the text of the play.

The final act of the screenplay Pygmalion contains two major deletions of text from the play. The first deletion of importance was the second major speech of Alfred Doolittle in Act V. Through this speech we see a man who has been caught in the trap of "middle-class morality," is unhappy about this new situation, and yet he doesn't have the guts to go back to the lifestyle of being among the "undeserving poor." Doolittle describes his situation in the deleted section as so

> ...It's easy to say chuck it; but I havnt the nerve...If I was one of the deserving poor, and had put by a bit, I could chuck it; but then why should I, acause the deserving poor might as well be millionaries for all the happiness they ever has. They dont know what happiness is. But I, as one of the undeserving poor, have nothing between me and the pauper's uniform but this here blasted four thousand a year that shoves me into the middle class... (Shaw 85)

The final deletion of the text is perhaps the longest deletion from the script at almost four pages in length. In this section the final remnants of a possible relationship between Higgins and Eliza ever existing is deftly removed from the text. A softer side of Higgins is shown for ever so briefly a moment after he requests that Eliza stay with Pickering and himself at Wimpole Street, "...I shall miss you, Eliza...I have learnt something from your idiotic notions: I confess that humbly and gratefully. And I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them rather" (Shaw 94).

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISON OF CHARACTERS

In the book The Art of Dramatic Writing: Its Basis in the Creative Interpretations of Human Motives Lajos Egri, the author, provides a very clear interpretation of the different elements that make up the "bone structure" of character. He illustrates the depth of a well-developed character by comparing just as any object has three dimensions (depth, height, and width), humans have an additional three of physiology, sociology, and psychology (Egri 33). Physiology, or our physical make-up, can influence a character in many ways such as "helping to make us more tolerant, defiant, humble, or arrogant. It affects our mental development, serves as a basis for inferiority and superiority complexes" (Egri 33).

Meanwhile, sociology as the second dimension of a human being concerns the many surrounding factors outside the human that are effecting it and may include such factors as home environment, who and what the character's parents were like, and what the subject's education, or lack thereof, played in upbringing the individual (Egri 33). In other words, while the first aspect determining dimensionality could be categorized under nature, the second one could be categorized under nurture.

The third and final aspect of character dimensionality is the offspring of the two other dimensions and it is psychology. "Their combined influence gives life to

ambition, frustration, temperament, attitudes, complexes" (Egri 34).

Mr. Egri also provided a more in-depth "step-by-step outline of how a tridimensional-character bone structure should look" (36). Under the first heading of "Physiology," he noted eight determining factors which are of a physical nature. Among them are: sex; age; height and weight; color of hair, eyes, skin; posture; appearance; defects; and heredity (36). Under the second heading of "Sociology," he noted nine determining factors which are of an environmental factor. Among them are: class; occupation; education; home life; religion; race, nationality; place in the community; political affiliations; and amusements, hobbies. Under the final heading of "Psychology," he noted 10 determining factors which are of a psychological nature. Among them are: sex life, moral standards; personal premise, ambition; frustrations, chief disappointments; temperament; attitude toward life; complexes; extrovert, introvert, or ambivert; abilities; qualities; and I.Q (37).

Mr. Egri provided further insight into several other existing elements which a well-developed character needs in order to flourish. Those mentioned will be character growth, strength of will, the pivotal character, and the unity of opposites.

Defined by the author, "Growth is a character's reaction to a conflict in which he is involved. A character can grow through making the correct move, as well as the

incorrect one - but he must grow, if he is a real character. In regards to the essence of change, Egri states

> The only thing that one really knows about human nature is that it changes. Change is the one quality we can predicate of it. The systems that fail are those that rely on the permanency of human nature, and not its growth or development...Regardless of the medium in which you are working, you must know your characters thoroughly. And you must know them not only as they are today, but as they will be tomorrow or years from now. (59-60)

The strength of will in a character was another section in which Egri gave insight into the dramatic workings of a character. Of will he explains

> A weak character cannot carry the burden of contracted conflict in a play. He cannot support a play. We are forced, then, to discard such a character as a protagonist. There is no sport if there is no competition; there is no play if there is no conflict. Without counterpoint there is no harmony. The dramatist needs not only characters who are willing to put up a fight for their convictions. He needs characters who have the strength, the stamina to carry this fight to its logical conclusion. (75)

The pivotal character was also discussed in regards to its function in the overall framework of character construction. Considered to be the protagonist, the pivotal character is "the one who creates conflict and makes the play move forward. The pivotal character knows what he wants. Without him the story flounders...in fact, there is no story...A pivotal character must not merely desire something. He must want it so badly that he will destroy or be destroyed in the effort to attain his goal" (Egri 104).

Finally, Mr. Egri described a term or phrase called the

"unity of opposites." Often misunderstood, this term does not refer to "opposing forces or wills in a clash...The real unity of opposites is one in which compromise is impossible" (115).

The only addition or deletion of characters that were noted within the two texts that were used for this study was the addition of an "Old Woman" to the first opening moments in Act I. This character has only three lines of text and will be mentioned briefly in the final section of this chapter.

Other than the addition just mentioned, the overall effects that the major deletions found in the screenplay had upon character were to make some characters less complex and to remove the possibility of some relationships. The additions that could be found throughout the text, mainly those headed "Note," seemed to mainly clarify the playwright's intentions on control of the characters.

Considered by this researcher to be the most well-developed of Shaw's characters in the Pygmalion screenplay and play text, Henry Higgins is a character which seems to take on a life of his own in the script. The only major, noteworthy change that was found within the text of the screenplay regarding the character of Professor Henry Higgins is the removal of the question of a possible romantic relationship between Higgins and his pupil Eliza.

In the Introduction of The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw by Bernard F. Dukore, Dukore states of the

removal of the romantic relationship

> ...he removes virtually every suggestion 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. Shaw retains Higgins's statement that he is a confirmed bachelor. He deletes Pickering's insistence that Higgins must not take advantage of Liza, Doolittle's advice that Higgins marry her, and Higgins's confession to Liza: 'You never asked yourself, I suppose, whether I could do without you...I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather...' (Dukore 71 - 2)

Further, Dukore asserts of the addition of "explicit statements" from the screenwriter to clarify the relationships between Freddy and Eliza vs. the relationship between Higgins and Eliza

> Although the play Pygmalion raises the question of romance between Liza and Higgins only to reject such a notion and to stress its irrelevance, the screenplay goes further to deny it. While the play dramatizes neither scenes of wooing nor of flirtation between them, and while it ends with Higgins acknowledgement that she will marry Freddy, generations of actors, audiences, an readers...steadfastly deny the play's denial of romance between professor and pupil...In the screenplay...explicit statements that create different theatrical and cinematic expectations - that Higgins and Freddy contrast each other in age (forty vs. twenty) and appearance (not youthful vs. very youthful and handsome) - and tell the director and screenplay reader...any suggestion of romance between Liza and Higgins 'should be most carefully avoided'... (70 - 1)

Other than the meticulous deletion of the possible romantic relationship between Eliza and Higgins, the character of Higgins is very well-developed. In regard to the "bone structure" discussed by Mr. Egri previously, readers of Pygmalion are able to answer many of the

questions pertaining to the physiology, sociology, and psychology of Higgins. It is possible to construct a very clear picture of this pivotal character and understand his motivations throughout. It is possible to see Higgins as the intellectual giant in his field, but as emotionally and socially he is more on the level of an insect. A confirmed bachelor who has a disturbing attachment to his mother, and who, otherwise, is sexually a eunuch. In short, a whining, moaning, bullying child.

From "draggle-tailed guttersnipe" to "duchess," Eliza Doolittle serves as a major element of interest in Pygmalion due to her transformation and "the social themes that derive in part from her metamorphosis" (Dukore 70).

A clearly motivated character Eliza wants more than anything at the beginning of the story to rise above her social class in life or, as she would put it

> I want to be a lady in a flower shop. 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 zif I was dirt. (Dukore 235)

At the end of the story, after the transformation into a lady has taken place, the enlightened Eliza informs her teacher of her new desires

> I dont care how you treat me. I dont mind your swearing at me. I shouldnt mind a black eye: Ive had one before this. But [standing up and facing him] I wont be passed over (Dukore 270)

The "new" Eliza is one who is still fiercely independent, yet who has changed because she now recognizes

her own self worth, no thanks to the dehumanizing insults slung at her by her teacher, but thanks to her friendship with his colleague Colonel Pickering. Guttersnipe no longer, the transformation into a lady is now truly complete when Eliza recognizes this self respect.

Through the craftsmanship of Shaw, the transfixing evolution or growth of Eliza lends to the plausibility of h character already clearly defined by the strong "bone structure" created by the author. Eliza is not a weak character who will lie down and let herself "be passed over." She is strong enough in her will and desires to play opposite of Higgins in which a powerful "unity of opposites" may be played out to its logical conclusion. Therefore, since a compromise is impossible in the way that Eliza will not find what she needs from a personal relationship from Higgins, and he will not change to give it to her, the death of the relationship or the separation of the two at the end is the only logical conclusion.

Pickering, serving as a foil for both Higgins and Mr. Doolittle, shows the audience how he can be more of a fatherly figure to Eliza than her own father and how he can teach Eliza more about being a lady than her professor, as Eliza says

> ...I owe so much to you that I should be very unhappy if you forgot me...But it was from you that I learnt really nice manners; and that is what makes one a lady, isn't it? (Dukore 267)

If one character had to be chosen as the mouthpiece of the author, Eliza's father, Alfred Doolittle, would be the closest choice throughout the play and screenplay (although in the screenplay his role was reduced somewhat). His charming yet roguelike appearance in the story cleverly moves along the socialist theme of the removal of social barriers between classes through educational and economic equality. Moving from being among the "undeserving poor" to "a victim of middle-class morality," Mr. Doolittle came "closest to uttering Shaw's ideas in the form of a parody" (Goodman 302).

Henry's mother, Mrs. Higgins, is the loving mother whom Henry idolizes among other women, especially young. This is a topic which is brought up by his mother, "Well, you never fall in love with anyone under forty-five. When will you discover there are some rather nice-looking young women about?" (Dukore 247). Higgins only replies,

> Oh, I cant be bothered with young women. My idea of a lovable woman is somebody 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. (Dukore 247)

So, in a sense, she is the one who creates the lack of romantic interest on behalf of Henry towards Eliza. In effect she has "crippled her son emotionally...but she would be shocked to learn that her image stands between her son and his sexual freedom" (Goodman 302).

Freddy Eynsford-Hill, considered by this observer to be the weak link in the chain of Shaw's characters, serves as

the romantic love interest for the elegant and attractive Eliza. The reason for the weak link is because Freddy is not given enough time on stage in presence or in conversation to be developed as a character who is worthy of Eliza's hand. We see Freddy become infatuated with Eliza at Mrs. Higgins home in Act III, but the next time we see Freddy is after the climactic moment between Eliza and Higgins after the evening reception in Act IV. Also, what little information is known about the young man is that he is a bumbling, infatuated idiot who can't possibly provide for Eliza's elevated social status. Freddy, along with his mother and his sister, is among the "financially and socially impoverished" (Goodman 302). Although Shaw made it very clear on several occasions that Freddy is the one who sweeps Eliza off her feet in the end, Shaw was either selfishly hoarding all of Eliza's precious stage and screen time on a character that was already well-developed - Higgins, or he mistakenly believed that he had provided enough of a relationship between Eliza and Freddy to be palpable. Nevertheless, a clearly satisfying relationship, to the audience, is never established between Eliza and Freddy.

Despite the weak presence of Freddy, Randolph Goodman best summed up the effectiveness of Shaw's characterization,

> ...Pygmalion differs from most of Shaw's plays in that each person depicted is carefully individualized and complexly motivated. Not one is a puppet nor a mere spokesman for the

playwright, but each plays his part strongly in a clear conflict of wills. (302)

CONCLUSIONS

Looking at the resulting screenplay of Pygmalion (1938) of which was based upon the play (1912), the changes that Shaw made through the text's plot development and characters to accommodate the cinematic version effected the overall dramatic concept in several ways.

First, the traces of a romantic love interest which were found within the play were not found in the screenplay. Shaw deleted almost all of the text which raised the question of a possible romantic entanglement, and further he added actual notes within the directions of the screenplay that answered any questions that producers or directors might have had on this matter of the heart.

Second, Shaw cut a lot of lines from the play in general, but most of the lines that he did cut were to reduce the amount of unnecessary expository material and material that was repetitive. Bernard Dukore addressed this matter as such,

> What is less dramatically essential or depicted elsewhere, he removes; for instance, the similarity between Higgins and Doolittle, Higgins dependence on Liza, and his lecture on the difference between life at his flat and life in the gutter. (73-74)

Also, a clear attempt was made to reduce the number of regionalized references with a larger world audience in mind.

Third, Shaw had also cut dialogue from the screenplay whose purpose had been on stage to allow time for costume

changes and make-up changes which were no longer necessary thanks to the magical art of film editing. An example of this would have been the scene which was occurring while Eliza was taking her bath and preparing to make her first step in her transformation. In the screenplay the conversation that Higgins and Pickering and later Mrs. Pearce had was not necessary for screen time.

So, overall with the majority of the changes being in the area of deletions from the play script, the major plot action in the cinematic version had no choice but to move along much faster than its stage predecessor.

Dukore summed up the main element of the difference between the characters found in the play and of those found in the screenplay in regards to achieving their desires as so

> More appropriate to the spirit of comedy is the end of the screenplay, for in it and not in 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. Although Doolittle, as in the play laments his fate, it is difficult to feel sorry for so jolly a character whose material situation has appreciably improved. (72)

So, finally how does this all measure up in the end? Was the spirit of the story of Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion a successful move from stage to screen?

My decision is in agreement with Frank Shelley who wrote in his book Stage and Screen this criticism of the screenplay

...the real trouble with Pygmalion was the fact that Shaw's symphonic, Mozartian, or rather Haydnesque dialogue had to be sacrificed to a considerable extent in order to comply with the rhythm of those successive shots that make up a scene on the screen. For no play which depends for its effect mainly on its dialogue is suitable in the least for filming. In other words, all good plays resent being filmed, because they are inspired not only with a sense of **drama**, but also with a sense of the theatre - of its static scene and its dynamic response. The screen cannot indulge in either of these. (35)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bowman, Walter Parker and Robert Hamilton Ball. Theatre Language: A Dictionary of Terms in English of the Drama and Stage From Medieval to Modern Times. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

Bulfinch, Thomas. Bulfinch's Mythology. New York: Cromwell, 1959.

Dukore, Bernard F., ed. The Collected Screenplays of Bernard Shaw. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980.

Egri, Lajos. The Art of Dramatic Writing: Its Basis in the Creative Interpretation of Human Emotions. New York: Simon, 1946.

Esslin, Martin. An Anatomy of Drama. New York: Hill, 1976.

Gassner, John. Masters of the Drama. New York: Random, 1940.

Gassner, John and Edward Quinn, eds. The Reader's Encyclopedia of World Drama. New York: Cromwell, 1969.

Goodman, Randolph. From Script to Stage: Eight Modern Plays. New York: Rinehart, 1971.

Hartnoll, Phyllis, ed. The Concise Oxford Companion to Theatre. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972.

Holroyd, Michael. Bernard Shaw: Volume I, 1856-1898, The Search for Love. 3 Vols. New York: Vintage, 1988.

---. Bernard Shaw: Volume II, 1898-1918, The Pursuit of Power. 3 Vols. New York: Random, 1989.

Huggett, Richard. The Truth About Pygmalion. New York: Random, 1969.

Laurence, Dan H., ed. Bernard Shaw: Collected Letters (1911-1925). New York: Viking, 1985.

Marx, Milton. The Enjoyment of Drama. New York: Appleton, 1961.

Miller, J. Hillis. Versions of Pygmalion. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990.

Shaw, George Bernard. Pygmalion. 1916. New York: WSP of Pocket Books-Simon, 1973.

Shelley, Frank. Stage and Screen. Film Quarterly Series 1. London: Pendulum, n.d.

Vardac, A. Nicholas. Stage to Screen: Theatrical Method From Garrick to Griffith. New York: Blom, 1968.