

Myths and Legends in Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*

Hisashi Morikawa

1. Multi-layered Spin on Ancient and Modern Myths and Legends

Of the fifty-three plays by George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950), *Pygmalion* (1912) has been the most commercially successful. Against Shaw's intentions, however, the actors, critics, and audiences assumed Henry Higgins and Eliza Doolittle are indeed united in the end. The play was first presented in Vienna in German translation on October 16, 1913, and then in Berlin and other Central European cities, and in the German community of New York, where it was "pegged as pure romance and comedy, void of political implications."¹ At the British premiere at His Majesty's Theatre, London on April 11, 1914, the audience was delighted with the romantic acting by Herbert Beerbohm Tree (1853-1917) of Higgins "shoving his mother rudely out of his way and wooing Eliza with appeals to buy a ham for his lonely home like a bereaved Romeo."² Disgusted by Tree's sabotage of his directions, Shaw did not return to the theatre after the premiere. The author's absence emboldened Tree to begin throwing a bunch of roses at the last moment to Eliza, played by Mrs Patrick Campbell (1865-1940), thus cementing the romantic impression among audiences. Although the production at His Majesty's was a great success, Shaw was not amused.

Three reasons have generally been given as to why most critics, actors and audiences have expected or hoped for the union of Higgins and Eliza: (1) the Greek myth of Pygmalion, (2) the legend of Cinderella, and (3) the subtitle of "A Romance in Five Acts."³ The mythic concept is most deeply seated in people's psyche: that is, Pygmalion should marry his Galatea. The Cinderella story has also been popular for centuries. And when a play is dubbed a romantic comedy, the audience is ready to accept, or even welcome, a union of lovers, all the more because they seem incompatible in temperaments and/or in surrounding circumstances.

In addition to these classic myths, Shaw alludes to contemporary fictitious

characters in *Pygmalion*. In more ways than one, Henry Higgins is similar to Sherlock Holmes, both in character and behavior. Moreover, Higgins pokes fun at the class system by making a duchess out of a flower girl through teaching her elocution. Here Higgins can be compared to other ambitious scientists from literature, such as Dr Frankenstein and Dr Jekyll, who assume the God's role as Creator. On the other hand, Eliza is no living doll. Her awakening to her own soul and her departure from Higgins's house at the end of Act IV may be likened to those of Nora in *A Doll's House* (1879) by Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906). Reborn as a New Woman, Eliza stands for women's emancipation. Thus the showdown between Higgins and Eliza in Act V could be interpreted as a confrontation between two socio-cultural currents of the 20th century: scientific modernization and feminism. This paper therefore examines *Pygmalion's* relationship to contemporary literature as well as ancient myths, comparing Higgins with Sherlock Holmes and Dr Frankenstein, while discussing Eliza's growth from the viewpoint of women's emancipation and the education of a girl by a middle-aged man found in Shaw's earlier plays, notably *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1898).

2. Higgins as a "Detective"

London streets were not safe and peaceful places to walk in at night around the turn of the century. The contradictions of the prosperous British Empire had become evident in many ways. The murders of prostitutes by Jack the Ripper in 1888-91 were a symbolic indication of dark tides flowing under the capital of the Empire. In fiction, too, there were a number of sinister characters strolling in London. Dorian Gray sought pleasure in brothels while shifting his sins onto his portrait. Mr Hyde stalked the streets at night while Dr Jekyll studied in the laboratory by day. From Eastern Europe Count Dracula sneaked into the megalopolis, symbolizing a threat to Empire from abroad. The Invisible Man typified the vague anxiety about the future of the Empire at the turn of the century.

Compared to these dark figures, Henry Higgins is a happy and harmless stroller. *Pygmalion* opens in Covent Garden at 11:15 p.m. With the Royal Opera House and other

theatres, as well as a huge vegetable market nearby, the area was a well-known red-light district. Just after the performance is finished and the audiences leave, a sudden summer rain brings together various people seeking shelter into the portico of St Paul's church. This is an ideal occasion for the professor of phonetics to gather samples of pronunciation. As the curtain rises, standing apart from everyone else, Higgins is the only character who appears with his back to the audience. Higgins is an observer; he takes note of how people speak. His note-taking leads other characters to suspect him of being a police detective, and frankly their suspicion is not so far fetched because Higgins is in fact a kind of detective since he deduces exactly where people come from by their pronunciation. His methodology reminds us of the one used by that most famous of all detectives: Sherlock Holmes. Holmes also deduces who a person is, what he or she is thinking or going to do, from the evidence of seemingly insignificant items or facts. In short, they are both observers; Higgins collects data from people's pronunciation and Holmes collects evidence from his forensic investigations.

In addition to being eager and competent observers, Higgins and Holmes share some idiosyncrasies. First, the elements of women, psychology and dream are seldom found in the Holmes stories,⁴ since the detective's reasoning is almost exclusively derived from facts. Nor is the professor of phonetics interested in those matters – a significant characteristic which distinguishes him from many Shavian heroes.⁵ Both Higgins and Holmes are indifferent to how people feel: Higgins does not care for Eliza's feelings – he bullies and tempts her into participating into his experiment (of turning her into a duchess through improving elocution) – whereas Holmes is seldom, if ever, involved in a case of love and passion. They are socially inept: Higgins is always swearing and cannot behave properly during social occasions, such as her mother's at-homes or church weddings, whereas Holmes is a cocaine addict with several idiosyncratic behaviors. They do not love women: Higgins is a confirmed old bachelor with a mother fixation, and Holmes is also unmarried and never falls in love. They are dedicated to, or exclusively interested in, their professions: phonetic experiments and forensic investigations. And in their professions, they both fight against evil: Higgins against the degeneration of the English language and Holmes against criminals such as Professor Moriarty. Above all,

both Higgins and Holmes are geniuses in their own ways.

Furthermore, Higgins and Holmes may also share a particular physiological trait: both appear to be Aspergers. Rodelle Weintraub argues that, “An astute observer of human behavior, Shaw gives us a protagonist, Henry Higgins, who could now be described as a textbook example of an Apergen.”⁶ On the other hand, with only a few changes in terms, the following description of Holmes as an Aspergen rings true for Higgins:

What interests Holmes most is not status but the problems that he is asked to solve. It is puzzles that fascinate Holmes – the intellectual aspects of cases. These satisfy his curiosity. He is clearly bored by social gatherings of affluent people, parties, etc. His interests are narrow: he reads only the criminal news and the agony column. This is a perfect example of autistic narrowness of interests.⁷

Higgins and Holmes live with male companions – Colonel Pickering and Dr Watson – who have some similarities in character and in their relationship to the other two men. As Weintraub points out, both Pickering and Watson have military experience, and have served in South Asia.⁸ The two gentlemen are as intelligent as their companions, though inferior in their specialties. Both of them help their companions handle their human relations. Without the colonel’s social manners, Eliza would never have taken part in Higgins’s experiment, and without the doctor’s chronicles, the amazing adventures of the detective might not have been known to the public. Pickering and Watson are the greatest admirers of their companions’ professional abilities. Just as Watson praises Holmes after he successfully solves a case, Pickering praises Higgins for the success of his experiment at the embassy ball. And just as neither Holmes nor Watson is concerned about the client after the case is over, in Act IV of *Pygmalion*, Higgins and Pickering are only concerned about their successful “transformation” of Eliza, not in Eliza herself. In short, Higgins and Holmes are interested not in human beings but in cases, while Pickering and Watson are mainly interested in their superior companions.

If Higgins is a Sherlock Holmes in a different profession, his education of Eliza can be

interpreted as one of the phonetician's "adventures" to help the underprivileged gain more respectable employment by better pronunciation, just as Holmes saves an innocent client from a false accusation. It would be quite far-fetched to expect that Higgins will marry Eliza: few detectives fall in love with their clients, much less marry them.

3. Higgins as a Scientist

Although he is a great observer of people's speech and accents, Higgins lacks an awareness of or practical ideas about social improvement. To be sure, he thoroughly repudiates Eliza's pronunciation in Act I, saying, "A woman who utters such depressing and disgusting sounds has no right to be anywhere—no right to live."⁹ He declares that Eliza's kerbstone English "will keep her in the gutter to the end of her days," boasting 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" (CP4, 680). However, it is not until Eliza visits him the next day and Pickering offers him a wager that Higgins is seriously determined to improve her spoken English. Just as Sherlock Holmes becomes more interested in a case when it is puzzling and tricky, Higgins takes on a task which he finds challenging.

In short, Higgins is interested in nothing but the pursuit of the science of phonetics:

He [Higgins] is of the energetic, scientific type, heartily, even violently interested in everything that can be studied as a scientific subject, and careless about himself and other people, including their feelings. He is, in fact, but for his years and size, rather like a very impetuous baby "taking notice" eagerly and loudly, and requiring almost as much watching to keep him out of unintended mischief. (CP4, 685)

On the one hand, Higgins's proposal that he will make a lady out of Eliza seems a purely scientific enterprise; on the other, the proposal suggests a baby wanting to play with a toy merely for "mischief." When Mrs Pearce wants to stop him doing "anything foolish," he declares:

HIGGINS [*becoming excited as the idea grows on him*] What is life but a series of inspired follies? The difficulty is to find them to do. Never lose a chance: it doesn't come every day. I shall make a duchess of this draggletailed guttersnipe. (CP4, 691)

Although the language is hyperbolic, he is no different from a boy excited about a new game. In fact, Higgins sees Eliza as a mere object or a tool. He has gotten enough samples of her Lisson Grove lingo in Act I that when he sees her in Act II, he says that the girl is “no use ... I'm not going to waste another cylinder on it” (CP4, 687). Shortly after that he calls her “this baggage” (CP4, 688) and then “this draggletailed guttersnipe.” In short, Higgins thinks of Eliza as a guinea pig in a scientific experiment. He commands Eliza to perform like a doll or a robot (a term not yet invented in 1912). Pickering, the experiment's financial backer, is no different from Higgins in treating Eliza as a toy, though he is far more polite and considerate to her than is Higgins.

When bullying fails, Higgins tempts Eliza with chocolates, which resonates with multi-layered connotations in myth and legend. In the biblical sense, it is as if Eve were tempted by the serpent with an apple, with Higgins playing the tempting devil and Eliza the weak human succumbing to temptation. On the level of popular Edwardian novels, the situation is a twist on the plot of the aristocrat seducing an innocent girl; chocolate was a status symbol of aristocracy in the 17th and 18th centuries and associated with amorousness.¹⁰ When offered chocolates, Eliza halfheartedly retorts, “How do I know what might be in them? I've heard of girls being drugged by the like of you” (CP4, 695). At the same time, Shaw's spin on popular literature may also lead audiences to expect a romantic ending for Higgins and Eliza, since the chocolates hint at intimate feelings between tempter and tempted.

Higgins is a self-centered scientist. He pays no attention to Eliza's or anyone else's feelings when he is engaged in the study of phonetics. In this sense he resembles Dr Frankenstein and Eliza the “monster.”¹¹ Mary Shelley (1797-1851) wrote *Frankenstein* in 1818, the story of the scientist who, defying God, tries to create a perfect human android

but ends up making a monster. Higgins also tries to make a “perfect lady” out of Eliza, and as far as we see of Eliza as played by Wendy Hiller in the 1938 film of *Pygmalion*, and especially by Audrey Hepburn in the 1964 musical adaptation, *My Fair Lady*, she looks so artificially beautiful at the ball that she resembles more a robot than a human being. While Frankenstein banishes his creation for its ugliness, Higgins loses interest in his creation once the experiment is over. The education of Eliza has been just an “adventure” in phonetics, and he exclaims: “Thank God it’s over!” (CP4, 746)

Higgins is an irresponsible Pygmalion. Disillusioned with real women, Pygmalion in the Greek myth makes a statue of an extremely beautiful woman named Galatea. Up until the embassy ball Higgins follows Pygmalion’s path: a confirmed bachelor, Higgins is not interested in women and, as a scientist, attempts to make a perfect lady out of a flower girl. But Galatea is a statue and Eliza is a human being, and whereas a statue can be put in a room and adored forever for its beauty, Eliza cannot remain dressed up for the ball all her life. Higgins never considers the consequences of his experiment, or the fate of his flower girl.

Women know better. Not until Act IV is Eliza able to think of her future, but the older women are already aware of the risks embedded in the experiment. Already in Act II Mrs Pearce pragmatically asks Higgins, “I want to know on what terms the girl is to be here. Is she to have any wages? And what is to become of her when youve finished your teaching? You must look ahead a little” (CP4, 695). But her advice is ignored. In Act III, “the problem of what is to be done with her afterwards” is raised by Mrs Higgins to Higgins and Pickering. But the “two infinitely stupid male creatures” are so absorbed in the experiment and the progress of its subject that they ignore that point (CP4, 737). As Mrs Higgins says, they are “a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live dolls” (CP4, 734). Mrs Higgins’s exclamation, “Oh, men! men!! men!!!” (CP4, 738), reveals the men’s insensibility and looks ahead to what will happen after the experiment is over.

4. Eliza’s Awakening to Her Own Soul and Declaration of Independence

Eliza asks Higgins to teach her to speak English appropriate for a lady in a flower

shop. In other words, she wants to use two kinds of English: her native cockney dialect and Standard English for a respectable job. With modernization, more people move from the countryside to the city, often choosing to speak Standard English to hide their native dialect. The same thing occurs between classes: when those in the working class want to obtain a lower middle class job, they have to acquire more respectable pronunciation and grammar. They may speak in their native accents at home, but they use a more universally accepted language at work. This is one of the results of urbanization.¹² The more modernized one becomes, the more likely one is to use two or more dialects as the occasion requires.

At the end of Act I, Higgins gives Eliza a handful of money. It is just a whim for him, but for Eliza it is means of getting out of her poverty: she is going to spend it on lesson fees so Higgins can teach her proper pronunciation. Her resolve tells us that Eliza is not an ordinary heroine in a fairy tale. While Cinderella just waits for a prince to arrive, Eliza knows that there is no prince. Living apart from her father, she is already an independent, strong-minded girl full of vitality, although she barely manages to keep her body and soul together as a street flower girl.

In Acts I and II Eliza repeats again and again, “I am a good girl, I am,” (CP4, 676, 694, 696, 698), which is how she voices her self-respect. For besides being economically poor, she is also poor in pronunciation, social manners and her ability to express herself. Fortunately, as Higgins and Pickering report to Mrs Higgins, she has a good ear and plays the piano beautifully at the first hearing – aptitudes that help her make enormous progress. But Eliza is only partially developed as a lady when she visits Mrs Higgins in Act III. What is funny in this Act is the disparity between how Eliza speaks and what she says. Higgins limits the topics to the weather and one’s health, but her recitation of a weather report is awkward, and her story of her aunt’s death would be appropriate only if told in cockney in her native neighborhood.

In Acts IV and V of *Pygmalion*, we see Eliza grow into a mature woman. In spite, or rather because, of her tremendous success at the embassy ball, Eliza becomes aware of her loss of identity. She cannot sell flowers with her newly-acquired refined English, nor can she go on playing the lady at balls, as she is a mere fraud. What is worse, neither

Higgins nor Pickering pays attention to her after they come home in Act IV. No wonder “*Eliza’s beauty becomes murderous*” (CP4, 747). She has now realized she has been treated as a guinea pig in an experiment. Just as Frankenstein’s monster desperately seeks its identity, Eliza wishes to know who she is now. After throwing his slippers at him, she confronts Higgins with, “Whats to become of me? Whats to become of me?” (CP4, 748), but her question is lost on him: Eliza has awakened as a human being, but Higgins is insensitive to her despairing soul. Moreover, he irresponsibly suggests that she get married. To this suggestion she emphatically retorts:

LIZA. We were above that at the corner of Tottenham Court Road.

HIGGINS [*waking up*] What do you mean?

LIZA. I sold flowers. I didnt sell myself. Now youve made a lady of me I’m not fit to sell anything else. I wish youd left me where you found me. (CP4, 750)

Eliza is now keenly conscious of what Mrs Pearce and Mrs Higgins had warned in Acts II and III. Together with their precaution, the audience recognizes that what it is witnessing is not only Eliza’s personal despair but the problem that all women face in real life. It is at the same time the problem of men’s insensibility, of which few men, if any, are aware. Eliza’s predicament reflects that of Nora at the end of Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House*. Nora leaves her home in order to be a human being before being a wife or a mother and her husband Torvald is left behind, oblivious to what is wrong with her, or more precisely, with himself. Likewise, Higgins has no idea what Eliza is angry at. It is not until she leaves his house that he realizes how important this “squashed cabbage leaf” has become to his life.

A Doll’s House ends with Nora’s departure from her house; a generation later, *Pygmalion* offers an opportunity for the woman to elaborate her case. Eliza tells Pickering, intentionally ignoring Higgins, about “the difference between a lady and a flower girl”:

LIZA. ... the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves but

how she's treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, because he always treats me as a flower girl, and always will; but I know I can be a lady to you, because you always treat me as a lady, and always will. (CP4, 769)

What she means by being a "lady" is not class distinction but the decent treatment of other human beings, or warmer human relationships. Indifferent to social manners, Higgins is rude to everybody, treating a duchess like a flower girl and never inspiring respect and decency in others. Now that she has awakened to her soul, Eliza doesn't want him to pass her over: she merely wants him to be friendly. But Higgins is incorrigible and he will not change his attitude.

Finally Eliza declares her independence, that she can do without him. She says she will marry Freddy, because she knows he needs her. In addition, she will teach phonetics, or what Higgins has taught her, in order to support Freddy and herself. This enrages Higgins, who finds it blasphemous of her to steal the secret of his methods and discoveries and teach them to the public. It is as if the esoteric secrets of the Church became known to the public, available to any layman. So far Higgins has towered over Eliza as the creator of a "perfect lady." However, when she has grown from a robot-like lady into an independent woman, Eliza deprives him of his god-like status and demands they be equal human beings. The new relationship results not from her ascension to the world of gods but from the dethronement of Higgins and his science. The phonetics professor is no longer a scientific God: his discoveries will be assessed by the sum of money Eliza will earn through teaching others how to speak like a duchess. At first Higgins is outraged at the presumptuous pupil's declaration of independence, but he acknowledges their new relations after all:

HIGGINS. Five minutes ago you were like a millstone round my neck. Now you're a tower of strength: a consort battleship. You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl. (CP4, 781)

It is questionable, however, whether Higgins realizes that he has been dethroned by Eliza.

In the above statement, he still retains his condescending air in recognizing her as a “consort battleship.”

Esoteric academic teachings are of little use in a capitalistic society unless they are profitable. Higgins’s dethronement is jokingly anticipated in Act I when Pickering asks him if he makes a living at a music hall by pinning down where people come from by their accents. Although the Sequel claims that Eliza will not teach phonetics but open a flower shop with Freddy, Higgins’s God-like status is sufficiently shaken by Eliza in Act V. To use the terms of the ancient myth, once she becomes human, Galatea does not fall in love with her creator Pygmalion, but rebels against him and demands equal treatment. It should be remembered that Shaw wrote the play in the heyday of the suffragist movement.

5. Education of a Young Girl into a Woman by a Middle-Aged Man

Prior to *Pygmalion*, Shaw had written about two cases of middle-aged men teaching young girls to become women: Nicola teaches Louka in *Arms and the Man* (1894) and Caesar teaches Cleopatra in *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1898). In neither case are they united in the end; on the contrary, each girl defies her mentor and marries a younger man. Nicola teaches Louka how to be a good maid, but she is never satisfied with being a servant. Sensing that she has a soul above a servant’s, Nicola lets Louka marry Sergius. *Caesar and Cleopatra* has closer structural parallels with *Pygmalion*. First, there are five acts from the meeting of the hero and the heroine to their final parting. Next, the transfiguration of the heroine takes place between Acts III and IV: Cleopatra grows from girl to queen when she is pulled out of the sea, and Eliza plays a perfect lady at the embassy ball. In addition, the confrontation comes in Act IV. A major difference is that while Cleopatra fails as a queen from Caesar’s viewpoint, Eliza brings forth a feminist claim that Higgins doesn’t understand or cannot easily refute; thus a more heated discussion ensues in Act V. Cleopatra finds Caesar so god-like that she cannot love him; as the curtain falls she is waiting for Mark Antony, not hoping for Caesar to return to Egypt. But she “cant help crying, all the same” (CP2, 292). Cleopatra’s ambivalent

feelings are consistent with the last part of the Sequel to *Pygmalion*: “Galatea never does quite like Pygmalion: his relation to her is too godlike to be altogether agreeable” (CP4, 798).

6. Crossroads of the Scientist’s Self-Righteousness and the Woman’s Liberation

With its multi-layered references to ancient and modern myths and legends, *Pygmalion* is a parable. First, it displays the strengths and weaknesses of a scientist. Higgins is dedicated to the study of phonetics, believing that he can contribute to humankind through the development of his science. By making a duchess of a flower girl, he challenges, and succeeds in making a dent in, the seemingly frozen British class system. Thus he may be one of the revolutionaries in the cause of human development. However, the phonetician is a bully who does not care for other human beings and their feelings. He declares, “I can do without anybody. I have my own soul: my own spark of divine fire” (CP4, 775). To be sure, he concedes to Eliza, “But I shall miss you, Eliza. ... I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather” (CP4, 775). But this does not mean he loves or needs her; just after the above concession, he retorts to her accusation:

ELIZA. And you dont care a bit for her [Mrs Pearce]. And you dont care a bit for me.

HIGGINS. I care for life, for humanity; and you are a part of it that has come my way and been built into my house. What more can you or anyone ask? (CP4, 775)

Higgins’s “care for life and humanity” is so abstract and self-centered that no woman can live with him. Even his mother does not like to see him very often.

Scientists are apostles of development; their achievement enables the modernization of society. But modernization has a dark side, which Victor Frankenstein exemplified in literature. Henry Higgins may be another such scientist; the duchess he created out of Eliza looks like a robot who speaks perfect English and has perfect social manners.

Fortunately, the inhumanness of Higgins's experiment is offset by the fact that Eliza awakens to her soul for herself.

Pygmalion is also a parable of feminism. To use Higgins's words, Eliza is awakened to her own "spark of divine fire" in Act V. She has grown into an independent woman who can do without Higgins. Shaw's Galatea does not need her creator once she has gotten her own life. She chooses someone who needs her as a partner. Freddy is poor, weak and good for nothing, but he needs her and cannot do without her.

Pygmalion was written just before World War I – a time when people believed that improvement could be achieved in a peaceful, civilized way; if scientific development and feminism were to join together, the combination might enable further development of mankind and society. The play is a gem of optimism before the deluge of a world war. Still, Higgins the scientist and Eliza the woman remain separate: Shaw the dramatist is not that optimistic. The end of the play suggests that man is not yet aware that women's problem is also men's problem and that men as well as women must be liberated. Higgins remains a "baby" to the end in dealing with human relationships. He has yet to learn to respect the "spark of divine fire" in other people.

Notes:

1. Peter Conolly-Smith. "Shades of Local Color: *Pygmalion* and Its Translation and Reception in Central Europe, 1913-1914." *SHAW: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies*, vol. 29. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2009: 127.
2. Bernard Shaw. *Collected Letters 1911-1925*. Edited by Dan H. Laurence. London: Max Reinhardt, 1985: 228.
3. Mariko Oe. *My Fair Ladies: Bernard Shaw no Kainarasarenai Hiron-tachi (My Fair Ladies: Untamed Heroines in Bernard Shaw's Plays)*. Tokyo: Keibunsha, 2005: 85-87.
4. Takao Tomiyama: *Sherlock Holmes to Seiki-Matsu (Sherlock Holmes and the Fin de Siècle)*. Tokyo: Seidosha, 1993: 462.
5. Higgins's indifference to dreams makes him distinct from other Shavian heroes,

many of whom are dreamers – Marchbanks, Caesar, Tanner, Keegan and Shotover, to name a few.

6. Rodelle Weintraub. “Bernard Shaw’s Henry Higgins: A Classic Aspergen.” *English Literature in Transition* 49, 2006: 389. On the same page, Weintraub introduces the disorder as follows:

According to *DSM-IV Diagnostic Criteria for Asperger’s Disorder* and *Gillberg’s Criteria for Asperger’s Disorder*, an Aspergen has difficulties in social interaction, lacks empathy, or has difficulties with it, has trouble with social role-taking and has unusual responses to the environment similar to those in autism. Cognitive and communicative development are within normal range and may be quite advanced, which is one of the distinguishing characteristics from classic autism, and verbal skills are usually strong. (Ibid.)

7. Michael Fitzgerald. *The Genesis of Artistic Creativity: Asperger’s Syndrome and the Arts*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 2005: 85. Fitzgerald demonstrates that the creator of Holmes, Arthur Conan Doyle is an Aspergen.
8. Rodelle Weintraub, 397.
9. Bernard Shaw: *The Bodley Head Bernard Shaw: Collected Plays with their Prefaces*, Vol. 4. London: Bodley Head, 1972: 679. All quotations from Shaw’s plays and prefaces are from the Bodley Head edition, subsequently abbreviated CP and given parenthetically in the text.
10. In Act I of *Arms and the Man* (1894), Raina gives chocolate creams to the tired and hungry fugitive officer Bluntschli, which marks the first gleam of their love.
11. Yuko Noguchi: “Josei no Jiritu – Eliza no Unmei ya Ikani? (Women’s Independence – Eliza’s Destiny)” *Koza My Fair Lady – Audrey to Manabo, Eigo to Eikoku-Shakai* (*Lessons on My Fair Lady – Study English and British Society with Audrey*). Edited by Hiroshi Yonekura. Tokyo: Eichosha, 2005: 55-57.
12. Shaw had already introduced “bilingual” characters in *John Bull’s Other Island* (1904). Hodson, the valet of Tom Broadbent, talks to his master in Standard English, but he switches to his native cockney to Matthew Haffigan, an Irish villager. An opposite example is Tim Haffigan, who uses the language of a stage

Irishman to Broadbent though in reality he was born in Glasgow. The last example is the Irish ex-priest Peter Keegan. As an intellectual he usually speaks Standard English, but when he talks to the grasshopper at the beginning of Act II, he uses his vernacular accent to pour his heart out.