

Transformation in the Two Pygmalion Plays by Bernard Shaw and Tawfiq Al-Hakim

Lecturer Muhsin A. N. Al-Sa'di
College of Education/university of Babylon

Pygmalion is originally a myth of Cyprus who is a great sculpture. This artist is a misogynist or at least dissatisfied with all the women of Cyprus so he remains a bachelor. He dreams of a perfect woman so he sculpts a marble woman who has been so beautiful that he prays to Aphrodite, the goddess of love, to find him a wife as lovely as his statue. Feeling pity for Pygmalion, Aphrodite transforms the lifeless statue into a real woman whom Pygmalion marries.

Thus, the keynote for the myth itself and almost the whole later works inspired by this myth is the transformation that takes place to the female character whether a statue or a woman. In the myth, the divine power of the goddess transforms the cold ivory into a warm, living woman. In the other works, transformation is also applicable because a naïve girl is transformed into a lady with different speech, behaviour, attitude, and knowledge.

This myth has had a long and various literary adaptations beginning with the Roman Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to John Marston's *The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image* (1598), Thomas L. Beddoes' *Pygmalion* (1825), and W.S. Gilbert's *Pygmalion and Galatea* (1871).⁽¹⁾

This same myth has inspired the Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950) whose *Pygmalion* (1912) reflects his dramatic genius because the ancient myth has been developed, almost out of recognition, into a lifelike and modern play. Furthermore, among other adaptations of the myth, Shaw's *Pygmalion* is the most widespread and memorable play.

Moreover, one of the most famous Egyptian dramatists inspired by this myth is Tawfiq Al-Hakim (1898-1987). Interestingly, this influential Arab playwright and writer is known to be a misogynist in his early years remaining a bachelor for an unusually long period of time. He is given the epithet "Enemy of Woman". This is probably one of the primary causes that attracts his attention to the myth but his play *Pygmalion* (1942), unlike Shaw's *Pygmalion* which has a realistic approach, deals with the myth from philosophical, psychological, and metaphysical points of view.⁽²⁾

This paper examines the two approaches of Shaw and Al-Hakim to see how these dramatists apply the motif "transformation" in a way that serves the dramatic purpose of each.

II

In Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*, transformation can be traced in the relationship between Higgins and Eliza. This relationship is indeed complex so it is to be tackled in different levels; the most obvious is that of a man and a woman. But this relationship is not simple and ordinary because Higgins wants to transform Eliza, the flower girl, into a duchess so Eliza has to undergo a great disparity to be transformed. Initially, Higgins and Eliza are different in age, experience, education, and thought. Thus, there is a confrontation between two entirely different worlds with their respective values and aspirations.

Higgins is quite skeptical of any prospect of happiness in love or marriage. He thinks that "the woman wants to live her own life; and the man wants to live his, and each tries to

drag the other on the wrong track".⁽³⁾ Higgins is an extraordinary young man who lives by his own ideals. For him, love is to mean "a surrender of individuality"⁽⁴⁾ and this is what he is not ready for. He is reluctant to sacrifice his individuality and creative freedom for a woman's love. Thus, all what he is concerned with is to transform Eliza into an ideal woman all the world admires.

There is no doubt that Higgins regards himself as a creator as far as Eliza is concerned. Being the "creator", he is proud, powerful, and impersonal. He tries to explain to his mother the unique nature of the transformation experience required to Eliza:

You have no idea how frightfully interesting it is to take a human being and change her into a quite different human being by creating a new speech for her. It's filling up the deepest gulf that separates class from class and soul from soul. 63-64

This is why Higgins gets furious when Eliza treats him as an equal and trespasses his superior position as her "creator". He finds it essential to confirm his ability of her transformation so he says, "I tell you I have created this thing out of the squashed cabbage leaves of Covent Garden; and now she pretends to play the fine lady with me".⁽⁹²⁾ He even goes so far as to justify to Eliza the trouble he causes to her because of her new life for "making life", he says, "means making trouble".⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

Higgins transforms the old Eliza into a new one with "the divine gift of articulated speech".⁽¹⁶⁾ The flower girl with the animal-like sounds is transformed into a lady who can express her ideas and emotions coherently and effectively.

Eliza's remarkable transformation achieved by an extraordinary education leads some critics to believe that Higgins has a "Socratic" character with great intellectual skills.⁽⁵⁾ Interestingly, Eliza comes to Higgins to be educated but she learns from him more than he expects i.e. she initially comes to be instructed in phonetics but she learns about life as a whole.

These critics envision the relationship between Eliza and Higgins in a different level. They claim that Eliza's transformation is undertaken by Higgins as a scientific experiment. For Higgins, the scientist, the Cockney flower girl is no more than a "guinea pig". She is only an instrument to prove a scientific hypothesis that is the power of phonetics to transform the human character.⁽⁶⁾

In this respect, Higgins tells his mother " It's the most absorbing experiment I ever tackled".⁽⁶⁴⁾ Eliza herself remarks to Higgins that Pickering might need clothes for "the next girl you pick up to experiment on".⁽⁷⁸⁾ At the end, she gets fed up so she asks Pickering "Will you drop me altogether now, the experiment is over".⁽⁹²⁾

It is also noticeable that Higgins' transformation of Eliza even implies a master-slave relationship. Higgins considers Eliza a "property", for he says " The girl doesn't belong to anybody – is no use to any body but me".⁽²⁹⁾ He talks of Eliza as a "slave" whom he has bought for five pounds. He is the only one authorized to transform her into another form. When Higgins' mother suggests that Eliza should live with her father, he protests that "she doesn't belong to him. I paid him five pounds for her". ⁽⁸⁸⁾. He even explicitly expresses his opinion to Eliza, "No use slaving for me and then saying you want to be cared for: who cares for a slave".⁽⁹⁹⁾

Eliza yields to this process of transformation because she seeks social and economic promotion. At the beginning, she assumes that knowledge is the key to all the glories in life. She thinks that the high position guarantees a happy life. But at the end, the experience completely disorients her because she discovers the emptiness of her new life. She suddenly awakens to the disparity between the sweet illusion of her dream and the bitter truth of her

reality. With all his experience and knowledge, Higgins can neither perceive nor respect the human being behind the flower girl even after her transformation. This is why Eliza is embittered when she tells Higgins that she just wants a little kindness, and since he is rude and never willing to stoop to show her some, she will depart his house and marry the poor Freddy.⁽⁷⁾

In Higgins' world, Eliza experiences the despair of isolation and the absence of meaning. Eliza realizes that knowledge sometimes becomes the bitter fruit because it may lead to a reality which is hard to accept or deal with.

Eliza yearns for her "flower basket" which has given her independence. She bitterly blames Higgins for making her an artificial duchess " Why didn't you leave me where you picked me . . .? ".⁽⁷⁵⁾ Thus, Eliza's violence when she throws the slippers at Higgins suggests a slave's rebellion against her master. Fleeing from his house at midnight, she appears to be a fugitive slave seeking her freedom or emancipation from his tyranny.

Some critics say that Eliza represents a doll to Higgins who wants to transform her in the way he likes. This idea is introduced in the stage direction which describes Higgins as " rather like a very impetuous baby ".⁽²¹⁾ Being unaware of the offence he might make to the people, Higgins is called by Mrs. Higgins a "silly boy" who must " stop fidgeting and take [his] hands out of [his] pocket ".⁽⁵³⁾ Mrs. Higgins even describes her son and his friend Colonel Pickering as " a pretty pair of babes, playing with [their] live doll ".⁽⁶³⁾ When Eliza deserts him, he flies into rage, making appeals and threats like a naughty child whose favourite doll is snatched away.⁽⁸⁾

He is unaware that it is dangerous to play with a human doll because if he "breaks" it, in the process of transformation, he cannot put it together again or substitute the damaged parts.⁽⁹⁾

Nevertheless, after the transformation Higgins makes to Eliza, he himself undergoes a rather similar process. Peter Ure reflects that Shaw's Pygmalion involves " the notion that every educative process is . . . a two-way one ".⁽¹⁰⁾ At the beginning, he considers her an unreasoning, unfeeling creature. He believes that Eliza's education is going to elevate her to a higher existence and therefore make her a happy person. Thus, after the transformation, he is amazed at her misery and seeming ingratitude. Instead of joy, she undergoes bitter states of agony and despair. Shockingly, instead of thanking him for his effort, she hurls his slippers in his face. She tells him that the love of a poor and weak "fool" like Freddy is preferable to the cold indifferent "superman" like him. Thus, her transformation works on him too so he admits to Eliza at the end of the play " I have learnt something from your idiomatic notions: I confess that humbly and gratefully ".⁽⁹⁸⁾

Some other critics see that Eliza-Higgins' relationship is like an artist and his masterpiece. In this respect, Higgins' role as an artist is parallel to Pygmalion, the mythical artist.⁽¹¹⁾ Higgins' pursuit of phonetics is artistic in the sense that it seeks to create harmony and beauty in the human speech. He transforms the "detestable" and "disgusting" sounds of the flower girl into the musical and beautiful expressions used in "the language of Shakespeare and Milton and the Bible".⁽¹⁶⁾

Higgins refers to himself as a poet. He attributes his frequent application of the words "bloody", "boots", "butter", and "bread" to "alliteration . . . natural to a poet".⁽³⁷⁾

In fact, many critics recognize the artist in the Shavian phonetician. Charles A. Berst thinks that Higgins is an artist in his "sense of diction" but he is a "cerebral one".⁽¹²⁾ Matlaw agrees that "Higgins' artistry and passion . . . are cerebral; didactic and philosophic"⁽¹³⁾

J.L. Wisenthal ⁽¹⁴⁾ and Desmond McCarthy also perceive the artist in Higgins. McCarthy points out that Higgins displays the "attractive combination of egotism and disinterestedness of artists with creative force in them". ⁽¹⁵⁾

Higgins creates out of Eliza an ideal combination of visual and verbal beauty and elegance. Not even a real English duchess speaks as perfectly as Eliza does. In this sense, Higgins, like his mythical counterpart, is a dreamer of perfection. The mythical Pygmalion's statue is an embodiment of his vision whereas Eliza, as a duchess, is Higgins' dream objectified as a human being.

Martin Meisel romanticizes the relationship between Higgins and Eliza depicting him as the prince and her as Cinderella. Like Cinderella, Eliza is suddenly transformed into a lady who is entitled to live in a high society. Thus, many fairy-tale associations of Cinderella-story are traceable in the play such as the stepmother, the coach, the ball, and the slippers. ⁽¹⁶⁾

But Shaw gives himself full freedom to deal with the elements of the fairy-tale to suit his own artistic purpose. The golden coach, in Cinderella-story, is represented by the taxi Eliza hires in act I to go up leaving poverty behind. It is a mark of her ambitious spirit which seeks a higher destiny. Then, the cruel stepmother is represented by Alfred Doolittle's mistress who turns Eliza out to earn her own living. Hurling the slippers in Higgins' face signifies Eliza's rejection of slavery and her stubborn attempt to reach independence. Education is the magic which transforms Eliza into a dazzling image of beauty and refinement. ⁽¹⁷⁾

In act II, Higgins threatens Eliza with the nearly same plight of Cinderella referring to her being hit by a broomstick, " If you're naughty and idle you will sleep in the back kitchen among the black beetles, and be walloped by Mrs. Pearce with a broomstick".⁽³¹⁾ Moreover, when Higgins tries to coax Eliza to submit to his experiment of educating her, he depicts to her the splendid image of Cinderella sitting in a marvelous coach: " At the end of six months you shall go to Buckingham Palace in a carriage, beautifully dressed".⁽³¹⁾The Cinderella ball is the ambassador's garden party in which Eliza passes off as a princess. But unlike Cinderella, "Eliza does not find her prince; . . . she finds herself".⁽¹⁸⁾

Higgins does not comprehend that although Eliza's transformation is a great success from his scientific point of view, it is unjustifiable on a purely human level. This is because no man is entitled to use " a human being as a means to an end even if the purpose is noble ".⁽¹⁹⁾

Eliza experiences the humility of being a mere "experimental object" in Higgins' laboratory. Besides, in any experiment, there is the possibility of error and failure. Thus, if man is made the sample, it is hard to imagine what failure may cost the human victim.⁽²⁰⁾

Yet, the transformation process of Eliza benefits even Higgins who learns from it more than he anticipates. The outcome is indeed a great surprise to him. He has planned to create an artificial duchess, capable of exquisite speech but he is amazed to find that the flower girl is transformed into a real woman, intelligent and independent. Eliza really emerges from her hard transformation, though hurt, more mature and utilizes her self-knowledge to gain self-confidence.

III

Unlike the realistic approach employed by Shaw, Tawfiq Al-Hakim follows an allegorical and metaphysical approach which has a remarkable similarity to the original myth. But Al-Hakim has made some modifications to the myth to suit his dramatic intentions.

Al-Hakim's play portrays how Pygmalion, the great artist, who has so far led a celibate life, falls in love with a beautiful, female statue which he has made. Because he is dissatisfied with the ivory, unresponsive statue, called Galatea, Pygmalion yearns for transforming it into a lively woman. Hence, he prays to Venus, the goddess of love, to breathe life into the ivory Galatea. But when Venus grants his wish, the mortal Galatea disappoints Pygmalion with her foolish conduct. Then, she runs off with Narcissus, Pygmalion's foster son. Pygmalion realizes that she is " a trivial creature . . . a foolish woman running away with a foolish youth".⁽²¹⁾ Apollo intervenes to save Pygmalion's marriage by transforming the foolish Galatea into a noble and devoted wife. Yet, Pygmalion gets tired of his mortal wife because he finds her neither interesting nor inspiring. Thus, he asks the gods to transform her again into an ivory statue, "Give me back my work and take yours! . . . give me back my art . . . I want her an ivory statue again".(129) Even when this request is granted by the gods, the artist develops a strange aversion to the statue. It torments him with the memory of his "dead" wife. In a moment of despair, Pygmalion destroys the statue so he ends as a bereaved husband and a ruined artist.

It is noteworthy that in Al-Hakim's play, Pygmalion is revealed as a man with the natural human desires and needs. Although he assumes the role of a superman, life forces him to recognize his human instincts. He recognizes that the lifeless beauty that he has created is utterly inadequate in a human relationship. He cannot derive lasting satisfaction from contemplating a speechless statue. This abstract beauty has to be transformed into a concrete one. Only human beauty can receive and express human love. Thus, Pygmalion's attitude is transformed so he prays to Venus to breathe life into his statue.

But Al-Hakim's play suggests that the statue's transformation to a mortal woman is a fall. Now Galatea is a woman possessed by a "cat spirit"(61) having no loyalty and following her own desire. Because she is irresponsible, Galatea runs off with Narcissus.

Pygmalion's suspicion of the female sex is confirmed by his wife's thoughtlessness. Although Apollo performs a miracle and improves the mortal Galatea morally, she cannot live up to Pygmalion intellectually. Besides, Pygmalion is alarmed to think that Galatea is destined to grow old and die. Faced with the dilemma of choosing between a woman and a statue, Pygmalion determines to save his work of art. He addresses the gods referring to Galatea's transformation, " You have turned this glorious work . . . into a trivial creature".(61-62)

But when he regains his masterpiece, his human conscience does not allow him a moment of peace. He now yearns for the mortal woman he has "killed".

To cope with the artist's mysterious, dazzling life, Al-Hakim has given his play a mythical atmosphere with its timeless past. The gods are believed to descend on earth and interfere in human affairs. The divine miracle which transforms the ivory statue into a flesh-and-blood woman is made acceptable within the context of the play. In so doing, Al-Hakim is forcing even the spectator to be an artist because he has to get into the dreamy world of the play if he wants to believe and comprehend the events and their down-to-earth purposes.

To confirm the idea that art is sublime and gets harmed if it is joined with an earthly passion, Al-Hakim adds a subplot to his play. It is the love story of Narcissus and Esmene. Although Esmene's love to Narcissus creates a man out of that "childish" youth, Narcissus outgrows his attachment for her because of her fake feelings. Esmene is added by the

playwright as another specimen of the female sex. She is only attracted to Narcissus' physical beauty. She lacks the imagination to move beyond the world of flesh and sensuousness. But the artist's vision, as Al-Hakim tries to affirm, should soar beyond and above the material world.

It is noteworthy that transformation is also a keynote in Al-Hakim's Pygmalion. This is evident in the relationship of Pygmalion as a creator and Galatea as his creature. Pygmalion undoubtedly considers himself a creator. He is able to transform the abstract beauty in his mind into an actual statue. Apollo and Venus who witness the miraculous beauty of the ivory Galatea recognize Pygmalion's supreme power of creation. Pygmalion insists that his creative genius is even superior to the creative powers of the Olympic gods " Oh, gods . . . leave me alone . . . for my self and my creatures! . . . I am but your equal; I have even excelled and exceeded your power".(61) Apollo and Venus envy Pygmalion because he enjoys the privilege of creative freedom whereas the gods are prisoners of the 'system'; Apollo expresses this idea:

The power of art and the creation faculty of these people are sometimes able to create beautiful creatures that we, gods, cannot compete to do the same for these people are free in sublimity whereas we are prisoners of the system.(27)

It is true that Pygmalion does not possess the absolute powers of the gods, yet his ability to actualize and transform the ideal beauty into a statute is unmatched. Ironically, Pygmalion, the mortal being has created an immortal, ideal statue whereas the immortal gods have transformed it into a mortal, foolish being. This is an indicator of the supreme power of the artist.⁽²²⁾ This is why Pygmalion is very proud of his art when he says, "Art is my power . . . my miracle . . . my weapon".(123)

But Pygmalion, the artist, has been suffering because of his creative power, for he must live alone without the joy of the social interaction of the natural being. Leading a god-like life, he gets fed up; "For the first time" Pygmalion says, " I feel the burden of creation and its coldness, loneliness, and cruelty".(38) The dilemma of Pygmalion is that he is a blend of divine, being a nonesuch artist, and human, being a natural man. Because of this double nature, Pygmalion wavers between his divine sublimity and human needs.

At the beginning, the divine part of his soul wins so Pygmalion's whole existence is governed by an ambitious goal that is to create an ideal beauty. In pursuit of this goal, he has chosen a hard life and turned his back to the joy and ease of the ordinary man. Then, Pygmalion's arduous effort to reach his aim is rewarded by a superb victory. This is embodied by Pygmalion's ability to transform his abstract beauty into a real, peerless statue. Once this miracle of beauty is actualized in front of Pygmalion's eyes, his urge for perfection is satisfied.⁽²³⁾

Now the human part begins to work on Pygmalion because he develops a strange uncontrollable passion for the statue. Thus, he falls in the greatest temptation of the human life. He probably forgets or deliberately ignores his old fears and doubts about women and love. Pygmalion, the man, abandons himself to passion and humbly begs Venus to transform the statue into a woman. Thus, a masterpiece of art is transformed into a mortal wife who shatters, by her foolish, earthly behaviour, her romantic image in Pygmalion's mind. Galatea is marvelous as long as she is an ivory figure or a dream; but once she acquires a human life, the dream vanishes.

Galatea, the marvelous masterpiece, symbolizes the triumph of art over life. As an ivory statue she is enchantingly beautiful and inspiring. But as a woman she loses her mysterious charm. For instance, she shocks Pygmalion when she carries a broom; a symbol of

the indignity of domestic life. Pygmalion thoroughly contemplates Galatea while sweeping and says to himself "Oh . . . and a broom . . . in her hand!".(108)He realizes that the living woman is, physically and morally, inferior to his artistic creation. Thus, he rejects her and demands his statue again.

Even when Pygmalion regains his statue, he cannot recapture his old pride in it. The new statue seems to Pygmalion an irritating mockery of first fabulous one; besides, it is a reminder of the woman he has lost. Pygmalion's resentment culminates in destroying the statue so he loses both the divine and the human parts.⁽²⁴⁾ This is because Pygmalion has neither been satisfied with his lonely life as a creative artist nor is he content with the human, earthly love.

IV

The subtitle of Shaw's Pygmalion is "A Romance" which can be taken as a key to the meaning of the play. Martin Meisel perceives in Pygmalion some distinct features of the Victorian "romantic comedy". Meisel observes that the basic characteristic motifs of the Victorian romantic comedy are the misalliance between classes and the Cinderella story of transformation.⁽²⁵⁾ But the audience of the romantic comedy usually wishes and expects the hero and the heroine to be united in marriage. Shaw, who often plays ironically with his audience's stereotypes, tries in Pygmalion to contradict his audience's expectations by making Higgins and Eliza apart.

In his attempt to satirize the class distinction among the different levels of his society, Shaw suggests that the problem is just a matter of speech. Higgins, the great phonetician, is able to solve the problem by transforming the flower girl into a duchess. From Higgins' point of view, the difference lies in pronunciation. Thus, a common phonetic system can remove the social barriers. In this case, Higgins can be considered a social reformer who strives for equality. He treats a duchess as a flower girl because he seems to think that there is no real difference between the two. His proclamation to Eliza that he cares for life and humanity emphasizes the reformer side of his character.

Unlike the social hierarchy in Shaw's Pygmalion, the distinction in Al-Hakim's play is intellectual. Thus, at the top of the hierarchy, the artist is crowned whereas everything is crawling at his feet. He is the genius and the superman who is entitled to enjoy the spiritual ecstasy of art. But he is not to be transformed into a falling being. He is completely denied any sensual pleasure which is the share of the common mortals. Pygmalion's fall from his height is the outcome of his transformation when he tries to enjoy the earthly pleasure. Al-Hakim's play seems to draw a distinction between the intellectual activity and the physical work. In other words, the play explores the relationship between art and life, clearly giving priority to art because it is immortal and immutable.⁽²⁶⁾

In employing the motif of transformation, Al-Hakim's play raises various philosophical questions about the artist's relationship to life and in

particular to the woman who is, according to Al-Hakim, life's greatest temptation. Throughout the play, it is clear that Al-Hakim suggests that the artist should live like a priest who is not to be transformed into an ordinary man chasing his desires. His faith in art should be unwavering and absolute. Once he falls into the trap of life, he can never rise again.

To confirm the idea that the woman plays a negative role in the artist's life, Al-Hakim portrays Galatea as a subsidiary character. She is no match to her arrogant husband. Her intellect does not cope with him so she appears meek when he orders her, "Silence, woman!". Her only reply is "Have I said anything wrong, dear Pygmalion"(115).

Shaw is, on the other hand, known to be a feminist so Eliza's reaction to Higgins' haughtiness is different. She never submits to Higgins' tyranny because she has a deep sense of personal pride. Furious with Higgins for claiming that she has no feelings, she declares, " I got my feelings same as anyone else".(29)

But although the motif "transformation" is evident in both plays, yet Shaw and Al-Hakim have employed it differently to reach certain dramatic intentions. It is undeniable that both heroes are similar in some aspects. For instance, both Higgins and Pygmalion are egocentric. They are occupied with their ambitions, gains, and losses. They consider others as much as they serve their ego and fulfill their purposes. Yet, in Al-Hakim's play, Pygmalion suffers because of the conflict between art and life whereas Shaw's Higgins is never torn between his human needs and his professional zeal. To the end, Higgins is not transformed into a new condition; contrarily, he clings to his "intellectual life". Thus, all what he invites Eliza to is to join him in an intellectual fellowship.

Notes

1. G.M. Kirkwood, *A Short Guide to Classical Mythology*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959), 82.
2. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tawfiq_el-Hakim Access on 4.8.2011.
3. Bernard Shaw, *Pygmalion: A Romance*, ed. By A.C. Ward (London: Longman Group, 1957), 35. All the subsequent references to the text are taken from this edition and the pages will parenthetically be referred to.
4. Norbert F. O' Donnell, "The Conflict of Wills in Shaw's Tragicomedy", *Modern Drama*, Vol.4 (1962), 418.
5. Maurice Valency, *The Cart and the Trumpet: The Plays of George Bernard Shaw*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 194.
6. Ibid., 198.
7. Charles A. Berst, *Bernard Shaw and the Art of Drama*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973), 206.
8. Myron Matlaw, "The Denouement of *Pygmalion*", *Modern Drama*, Vol. 1 (May, 1958), 32.
9. The same child-doll relationship is observable in Henrick Ibsen's famous play *A Doll's House*. Like Eliza, Nora lives with her husband, Torvald, without being aware that she has been a doll. For further illumination, see: Ramji Lall, *Ibsen: A Doll's House*, (New Delhi: Rama Brothers, 2010), 194-7.
10. Peter Ure, "Master and Pupil in Bernard Shaw", *Essays in Criticism*, Vol. 19 (April, 1969), 129.
11. Henry B. Richardson, "The Pygmalion Reaction", *Psycho-analytic Review*, Vol. 63 (1956), 458.
12. Berst, 200.
13. Matlaw, 30.
14. J.L. Wisenthal, *The Marriage of Contraries: Bernard Shaw's Middle Plays*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 118.
15. Desmond McCarthy, *Shaw's Plays in Review*, (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1951), 111.

16. Martin Meisel, *Shaw and the Nineteenth Century Theater*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963) 169-170.
17. Ibid., 174.
18. A.R. Jones, "George Bernard Shaw", *Contemporary Theater*, Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, (London: Edward Arnold, 1962), 69.
19. J. I. M. Stewart, *Eight Modern Writers*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 168.
20. O' Donnell, 414.
21. Tawfiq Al-Hakim, *Pygmalion*, (Beirut, Dar Al- Ketab Allubnani, 1974), 62. All the subsequent references to the text are taken from this edition and the pages will parenthetically be referred to. The translation of the references is mine.
22. George Tarabishi, *Lu'bat Al-Hulm wel Waqi': Dirasa fi Adab Tawfiq Al-Hakim(The Game of Dream and Reality: A Study in the Literature of Tawfiq Al-Hakim)*, (Beirut: Dar Al-Tali'a lil Tiba'a wel Nashr, 1972), 99.
23. Ibid., 110.
24. Ahmed Othman, *Al-Massadir Al-Classikiya li Masrah Tawfiq Al-Hakim(The Classical Sources of Tawfiq Al-Hakim's Drama)*, (Cairo: Al-Hay'a Al-Masriya Al- A'mma lil Kutub,1978),PP. 69-70.
25. Meisel, 160.
26. [http:// www. 17nfm.com/vb/showthread.php?p=145802](http://www.17nfm.com/vb/showthread.php?p=145802) Access on 4.8.2011

Bibliography

- Berst, Charles A. *Bernard Shaw and the Art of Drama*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Al-Hakim, Tawfiq. *Pygmalion*. Beirut, Dar Al- Ketab Allubnani, 1974.
- Jones, A.R. "George Bernard Shaw". *Contemporary Theater*. Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies, London: Edward Arnold, 1962.
- Kirkwood, G.M. *A Short Guide to Classical Mythology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.
- Lall, Ramji. *Ibsen: A Doll's House*. New Delhi: Rama Brothers, 2010.
- Matlaw, Myron ."The Denouement of *Pygmalion*". *Modern Drama*. Vol. 1 (May, 1958).
- McCarthy, Desmond *Shaw's Plays in Review*.New York: Thames and Hudson, 1951.
- Meisel, Martin. *Shaw and the Nineteenth Century Theater*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- O' Donnell, Norbert F. "The Conflict of Wills in Shaw's Tragicomedy", *Modern Drama*, Vol.4 (1962).
- Othman, Ahmed. *Al-Massadir Al-Classikiya li Masrah Tawfiq Al-Hakim(The Classical Sources of Tawfiq Al-Hakim's Drama)*. Cairo: Al-Hay'a Al-Masriya Al- A'mma lil Kutub,1978.
- Richardson, Henry B. "The Pygmalion Reaction", *Psycho-analytic Review*, Vol. 63 (1956).
- Shaw, Bernard. *Pygmalion: A Romance*, ed. By A.C. Ward. London: Longman Group, 1957.
- Stewart, J. I. M. *Eight Modern Writers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

- Tarabishi, George *Lu'bat Al-Hulm wel Waqi': Dirasa fi Adab Tawfiq Al-Hakim*(*The Game of Dream and Reality: A Study in the Literature of Tawfiq Al-Hakim*). Beirut: Dar Al-Tali'a lil Tiba'a wel Nashr, 1972.
- Ure, Peter. "Master and Pupil in Bernard Shaw", *Essays in Criticism*, Vol. 19 (April, 1969).
- Valency, Maurice. *The Cart and the Trumpet: The Plays of George Bernard Shaw*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Wisenthal, J.L. *The Marriage of Contraries: Bernard Shaw's Middle Plays*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tawfiq_el-Hakim
- <http://www.17nfm.com/vb/showthread.php?p=145802>

