"And They Lived Happily Ever After???!": Disney's Animated Adaptation of *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937) and Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels* (1939)

David McGowan

This is an Accepted Manuscript of the chapter: McGowan, David, "'And They Lived Happily Ever After???!': Disney's Animated Adaptation of *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937) and Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels* (1939)", *It's the Disney Version!: Popular Cinema and Literary Classics*, edited by Douglas Brode and Shea T. Brode (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), pp. 1-12. ISBN: 978-1442266063.

Walt Disney's *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937) was the first American feature-length animation.[1] The adaptation of the Grimms' fairy tale *Snow White* played an important part in attempting to justify a production more than eight times the length of the usual short cartoon.[2] Several commentators in the press questioned whether animated drawings could sustain an

audience's interest over this extended running time, and some even dubbed the film "Disney's Folly" ahead of its release.[3] The film became one of the highest grossing of the year, proving that animators could break away from their sole reliance on the limited revenue stream of short films. Reviews were largely positive, and Disney was presented with an honorary prize at the Academy Awards: a full-size statuette and seven miniatures. The Fleischer brothers responded to Disney's success by producing *Gulliver's Travels* (1939), an animated feature based on Jonathan Swift's novel.[4] This chapter will consider the role of adaptation in these first two examples of American animated features, and examine the impact of the medium itself on the original texts.

Snow White and Adaptation

The credits for Disney's *Snow White* state that the film is "adapted from Grimms' Fairy Tales," and do not reference any other source. The opening sequence underscores its literary heritage by showing a lavish hardback book, which provides a text-based prologue before the animation begins. Despite the "old-fashioned" design of the volume's typeface, it does not quote directly from any extant version the story, and is itself an adaptation created specifically for the film.[5] Numerous academics have faulted Disney for the various omissions and changes to the tale, arguing that the iconic status of the film – and its implicit claims of authenticity to the Grimms' version – has served to obscure the meaning of the original text.[6] This is often termed "Disneyfication," described by Richard Schickel as "that shameless process by which everything the studio…touched, no matter how unique the vision of the original from which the studio worked, was reduced to the limited terms Disney and his people could understand."[7] It is certainly true that the film emphasizes the romantic within its narrative, including having Snow White and the Prince meet much earlier. A common criticism is that the Disney film softens the

sense of the grotesque often found in the Grimms' tales. It is the Prince's kiss that revives Snow White in the Disney adaptation, rather than the poisoned apple being dislodged (and, in some interpretations, literally vomited) from her throat after the Prince's servants stumble with the coffin.

M. Thomas Inge's essay on *Snow White* lists eighteen significant differences between the Disney film and the Grimms' text, but also attempts to justify the decision-making process from page to screen. He notes that many changes were simply "common sense" such as toning down the scenes of violence, and increasing Snow White's age from seven in the Grimms' text to a teenager in the film, to make the romance more palatable for contemporary audiences. Furthermore, Inge highlights that the Grimms' *Snow White* was not the origin of the tale, but itself a version of an existing work:

> The basic plot structure of the story of "Snow White" can be found in hundreds of variants collected by folklorists in Europe, Asia, Africa, and North and South America, many of which pre-date the Grimm version. They all tend to follow the same basic structure of nine episodes [as outlined by Maria Tatar]: "origin (birth of heroine), jealousy, expulsion, adoption, renewed jealousy, death, exhibition, resuscitation, and resolution." If we place the Disney version in this tradition, we see that he has made only one major change in the structure: that of deleting the first element, the birth of Snow White and the death of her mother…. There were plenty of technical and dramatic justifications for this deletion, but the remainder of the traditional structure was maintained. Thus, Disney's version is a legitimate variant in the "Snow White" cycle of tales.[8]

Such assertions have not always led to a significant reappraisal of Disney's work. While acknowledging that the Grimms were at times also "creative 'contaminators'" of existing tales, fairy tale scholar Jack Zipes nonetheless distinguishes between the Grimms' "finishing touches" and "the prudish changes made by that twentieth-century sanitation man, Walt Disney."[9] Although his analysis of the films is often revealing, Zipes arguably over-emphasizes his own neo-Marxist reading and isolates Disney's adaptive process in an attempt to argue that the studio has "obfuscated the names of Charles Perrault, the Brothers Grimm, Hans Christian Andersen, and Collodi."[10] His (somewhat pejorative) assertion that Disney "Americanized" *Snow White* by turning it into an "entertainment [commodity]" downplays the existence of many other versions of the story already available for mainstream consumption in the United States ahead of Disney's film.[11]

The Grimms' text was clearly the best known prose version in 1930s America, which may explain why the film's credits posit it as the sole source of adaptation. However, production material highlights that the Disney team consulted a variety of other versions of the story, such as Joseph Jacobs' "retelling" in the collection *Europa's Fairy Book.*[12] Publicity for the film also included Disney's recollection of seeing, as a young boy, a silent feature-film version, *Snow White* (1916), adapted from a 1912 Broadway production written by Winthrop Ames under the pseudonym Jessie Braham White.[13] Ames had purchased the rights of an earlier play, *Snowwhite and the Seven Dwarfs* [*sic*] by Marguerite Merington, which was an English adaptation of a nineteenth-century German play by Karl August Goerner. Disney himself reportedly received a waiver from the publishers of the Braham White play in 1936, and bought out Paramount's rights to the play (but not the film) in 1937. Karen Merritt has argued that these works offer precedents

for the alterations and omissions from the Grimms' story found in Disney's version.[14] The 1916 film, for instance, also brings the initial meeting between Snow White and the Prince to the beginning of the narrative, and somewhat anthropomorphizes a number of animal characters, albeit more awkwardly in live-action than Disney would later achieve in animation. Each of the theatrical versions introduce musical sequences, a precedent for the integration of (original) songs in Disney's film. As such, many accounts that criticize Disney in comparison to the Grimms' narrative fail to consider how the process of adaptation was already worked-through in these intermediary texts.

It should not be suggested, however, that the Disney version was entirely derivative of these works. Merritt has argued that:

> By choosing a children's play that was a proven property, both as a children's theater staple and as a silent film, Disney was creating an element of security for his risky venture…. As the feature developed over time, the scaffolding provided by the plethora of sources fell away, as the animators created original solutions to the dramatic problems posed by expanding the slight fairy tale to a feature-length narrative.[15]

Many of the scenes, as realized in the finished film, were specifically designed to showcase the sophistication of the Disney Studio's animation techniques. This was a unique trait in terms of previous adaptations of *Snow White* and, due to the film's pioneering feature-length, was also a significant modification of the approach to adaptation within the American cartoon industry as a whole.

The Early History of Animated Adaptation

Fairy tales and other "classic" (read: out of copyright) literature texts had been a recurring source for short one-reel American animated films from the silent era onwards, but often only as a loose structure for unrelated gags. Walt Disney's first animated series in 1922, the *Laugh-O-Grams*, was a collection of "modernized" fairy stories, but the surviving cartoons display extended scenes with only a tenuous link to the original narratives. For instance, the pilot film *Little Red Riding Hood* (1922) begins with the mother preparing doughnuts for Grandma, with the family cat making the holes with a shotgun. It ends with a title card stating "And they lived happily ever after???!", highlighting the processes of parody and burlesque which permeate the entire narrative. The cartoon displays none of the sincerity in its happy ending that Disney would later bring to *Snow White* and many of his subsequent feature-length adaptations.

Donald Crafton has argued for the consolidation of the "character continuity series" during the 1920s, in which cartoons were constructed and promoted around a central protagonist (akin to the star system in live-action), rather than a recurring theme or a collection of one-off films.[16] Literature continued to be a useful source of material for long-running series in need of new plots, but was still largely overwhelmed by the personality of the leading characters. Coincidentally, Disney released an adaptation of *Gulliver's Travels* starring Mickey Mouse, entitled *Gulliver Mickey* (1934), while the Fleischer Studios produced a version of *Snow-White* (1933) with Betty Boop in the title role.

Gulliver Mickey begins with the Mouse reading *Gulliver's Travels*, and then subsequently retelling the tale to a group of children under the pretense that it is his own life story. The imagined sequence sees Mickey washed up on the island of Lilliput, and taken prisoner by the diminutive residents. The cartoon presents the spectacle of Mickey Mouse seemingly at play

with the warring villagers, due to the ineffectual nature of their tiny weapons. This is followed, somewhat bizarrely, by Mickey fighting a giant spider that terrorizes the town: a potential reference to the second part of Swift's text, where Gulliver encounters several large animals on the island of Brobdingnag, but with little similarity in terms of narrative. The film concludes in the "present-day" with Mickey continuing to exaggerate these "heroic" tales, only to jump in fright when one of the children dangles a rubber spider on a string in front of his face. The Lilliputian tale remains unresolved, and Mickey gamely laughs at his own comeuppance.

The Fleischers' *Snow-White* condenses the plot – perhaps taking the title too literally – by having the character accidentally fall down a snow-laden hill into an icy "coffin," rather than being deliberately poisoned by the Queen. The Dwarfs barely feature, serving only to transport the already comatose Snow White to a cave, where the narrative reaches its climax. This final section deviates entirely from the source text, and includes an extended musical number featuring Koko the Clown (a protagonist from the earlier Fleischer series *Out of the Inkwell*) with the singing voice of jazz musician Cab Calloway. The magic mirror betrays the Queen, turning her into a dragon-like creature, and revives Snow White. A brief chase sequence occurs until another of Betty's co-stars, Bimbo the Dog, defeats the dragon by literally pulling her body inside-out. While the surprising grotesqueness of this action may seem somewhat worthy of the Brothers Grimm, despite being unique to the film, the majority of the cartoon presents variations of formulas associated with the *Betty Boop* series rather than the plot of *Snow White*.

The seven-minute running times of these films may have limited the potential for complexity, but the lengthy comedic digressions within this already-economical structure indicates a conscious decision to privilege humor over faithfulness to the original stories. Disney's *Snow White* thus took a very different approach by overtly stressing fidelity (even if, as

noted above, its own adaptive processes are ultimately rather complicated). The film aims to present itself as a respectful – and, by extension, *respectable* – work, seemingly in contrast to the narrative "poaching" and deviation of many earlier cartoons. As Michael Barrier has noted, that Disney ultimately chose not to produce his first feature starring Mickey Mouse, a seemingly obvious choice for a sure-fire hit, is revealing.[17] *Snow White* was a project designed to bring prestige to the studio and not just mainstream success.

Snow White **and the** ***Silly Symphonies***

The trajectory of Disney's feature was also heavily influenced by developments in his series of *Silly Symphonies* animated shorts, which had already broken from the wider traditions within the animation industry by largely avoiding recurring characters, overt slapstick humor, and repetitive chase formulas. As production of *Snow White* began, the *Symphonies* became increasingly experimental, using animation to evoke tone and mood, and present sophisticated, often three-dimensional, effects. Films such as *The Old Mill* (1937) integrated Disney's multiplane camera, which was used for a number of extended scenes in *Snow White*. For instance, Snow White's traumatic descent into the forest after escaping the huntsman is dealt with in a few short sentences in the Grimms' text.[18] In the Disney adaptation, the scene lasts over a minute. It emphasizes Snow White's vulnerability by showing the ominous, seemingly inescapable depth of the forest, and subjectively imagines the trees and foliage transforming into scary monsters. The sequence remains broadly faithful to the original tale, but elaborates upon the source material to provide a showcase for the evolving Disney Studio aesthetic.

The *Symphonies* also saw significant developments in the use of sound. While the earliest film of the series, *The Skeleton Dance* (1929), mostly foregrounded the synchronicity between

the characters' movements and the musical effects, later instalments began to experiment with music as an additional means of developing emotion. The songs in *Snow White* further the film's narrative, but once again go beyond the relative economy of the Grimms' version. "Some Day My Prince Will Come," for instance, elaborates and foreshadows the romantic union of Snow White and her beau. Even the more comedic sequences, such as "Whistle While You Work," which develops a brief mention of housework in the original text into a full musical number, helps to emphasize the change brought about by Snow White's presence.[19] The song also attempts to integrate the comedic business of her cute animal helpers within a wider dramatic narrative, as opposed to the "comedy-for-its-own-sake" mentality that drove a significant proportion of short cartoon production outside of the *Symphonies*.

Another key milestone of the *Symphonies* was in personality animation, in which characterization was increasingly achieved at the level of animation itself. Most cartoon protagonists of the period only displayed a limited number of externalized and rather broad traits, which were often made more explicit by repeated animation from film-to-film in attempts to cut costs. Disney's *The Three Little Pigs* (1933) is seen to have been an important breakthrough in this regard. Although each of the pigs is broadly similar in appearance, each has a recognizable and unique personality, reflecting their attitudes from the original fable. The Dwarfs in *Snow White* extend Disney's new approach. Whereas the Betty Boop version had presented the Dwarfs as essentially seven copies of a single design, with no overt differences, Disney set out to present each one as an individual entity.

The brevity of the Grimms' text means that the Dwarfs are not significantly articulated outside of their collective group. The Braham White play preceded Disney's film in naming the characters – dubbing them Blick, Flick, Glick, Snick, Plick, Whick, and Quee – but did not

distinguish specific characteristics beyond a few comedic sequences with Quee (whose antics could potentially be seen as a partial inspiration for Dopey).[20] Disney developed his own names for the Dwarfs which went through a lengthy period of brainstorming before being finalized as Doc, Grumpy, Happy, Sleepy, Bashful, Sneezy, and Dopey.[21] Although identifying the Dwarfs in relation to a singular, dominant trait may appear somewhat reductive, it marks a significant departure from presenting such figures as a homogenous group. Furthermore, the sight of the Dwarfs, including Grumpy, shedding a tear at Snow White's apparent demise hints at a much deeper psychological complexity to the characters than their names (and earlier comedic antics) might have initially implied.

To reiterate Merritt's earlier assertion, Disney's developments of the animated form offered a unique contribution to what was, ultimately, a relatively short tale in its earlier text-based versions. The film generally does not attempt to sustain the audience's attention during the feature-length by adding further complications to the plot. Rather, it uses the spine of the existing story as a means of creating extended sequences driven by Disney's experimentations with animation and sound.

Adapting *Snow White*'s Success

Alan Bryman argues that "so successful is the Disney company at what it does, namely applying a distinctive template to stories and legends…that its style is frequently copied. As a result, audiences are sometimes unsure about what is and is not a Disney film."[22] *Snow White* is perceived to have influenced a wave of Hollywood movies attempting to match its appeal.[23] In particular, MGM's *The Wizard of Oz* (1939) shares many aesthetic qualities with Disney's film, including the narrative of a young girl's quest in a fantasy environment, emphasized by the use

of Technicolor, and the presence of witches, humorous companions, and songs. The live-action screwball comedy *Ball of Fire* (1941) also presents a variation of the *Snow White* tale, in which a gangster's moll on the run from the law seeks refuge with eight professors (one of whom, played by Gary Cooper, ultimately assumes the "Prince" role as her virtuous love interest).

Many cartoon producers also attempted to launch their own features to capitalize on this new craze, although only the Fleischers managed to move beyond the planning stages. The impetus in this case actually came from their distributor, Paramount, who offered significant investment to relocate the studio from its base in New York to Florida.[24] Following the move, it appears that the unit was increasingly pressured by Paramount to align itself more closely to the Disney model of animation. The jazz soundtracks of many earlier Fleischer shorts, such as the Betty Boop *Snow-White*, is replaced in *Gulliver's Travels* with more mainstream "crooning," and character designs tend towards cuteness rather than the humorous grotesque of earlier works. In particular, there is a strong similarity between the bluebirds in the forest during *Snow White*'s "With a Smile and a Song" sequence, and the bluebirds that watch the Princess serenade the Prince with the song "Faithful" in *Gulliver's Travels*.

The adaptation of the source text also mimics Disney's approach in essentially taking key plot points and using them as a showcase for animation techniques. Scenes from the book, such as the villagers discovering Gulliver washed up on the beach and tethering him down, are turned into extended sequences full of visual spectacle. Compared to *Snow White*, however, the Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels* departs widely from the original literary material. As noted, Disney had the opportunity to elaborate and expand upon the relatively simple story of *Snow White*, which already had a history of being re-told by new authors in new contexts. Swift's original text is much longer but also much more complex in its parody of the travel writing genre

and its satiric parallels to the contemporary English aristocracy. According to the credits, the film is "Based on Jonathan Swift's Immortal Tale": a statement which attempts to make a claim for the continued relevance of the story to new audiences, although the links between page and screen are in fact relatively few. Some changes to the original text are, again, "common sense" or at least partially justifiable against wider adaptation traditions. Most notably, the film bases itself solely on the first (and relatively self-contained) part of the novel, the voyage to Lilliput – a decision shared with most earlier (and, in fact, subsequent) cinematic versions of the text. In addition to this tighter focus, the residents of Lilliput speak English, allowing them to converse freely with Gulliver, eliminating the communication problems experienced in the original novel. Furthermore, given the targeted family audience and the content restrictions imposed by the Production Code Administration in the United States, the Fleischers perhaps wisely choose not to visualize Swift's description of Gulliver defecating, or finding a "unique" way to extinguish a fire through urination when the palace catches fire.

Like Disney's *Snow White*, the Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels* begins with a text-based prologue, implicitly presented as an extract from the source novel but actually written specifically for this production. It mimics the first-person narration of Swift's text, before the film (perhaps unavoidably) switches to an objective, third-person approach for the remainder of its duration. This nonetheless has significant repercussions upon the narrative. In Swift's work, aspects of the story that the narrator did not experience first-hand are retrospectively described through "translated" documents that he later acquires. By contrast, the film spends considerable time in the company of two squabbling Kings, which is largely a new addition to the story. In the novel, Gulliver ultimately refuses to assist the King of Lilliput's plans to overthrow the neighboring Blefuscu, and escapes the island after being charged with treason. In the film, the

son and daughter of the respective Kings are due to wed, but war erupts over which of the two provinces' anthems to play at the ceremony. Gulliver ultimately creates a happy ending by showing how the harmonies of both songs fit together when sung in unison.

Many original aspects of the Fleischer's *Gulliver's Travels* are designed to push the narrative towards a more conventional romantic plot, coupled with a sense of the fantastic. The villagers' fascination towards the seemingly "giant" Gulliver echoes the interaction between Snow White and the Dwarfs, and both films conclude with the union of a Prince and his bride. It is possible, therefore, to read the Fleischer film not only as an adaptation of Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, but as a direct response to, and perhaps even an adaptation of, Disney's version of *Snow White*.[25] The process of translating a book to the screen does not only engage with the histories of that particular text, but rather draws upon a much larger series of intertexts, including, in this case, Disney's film.

Extending (and denying?) adaptation

Disney ultimately resisted the temptation to capitalize on the success of *Snow White* by establishing an ongoing movie series featuring its popular characters. However, recent research indicates that a sequel – albeit a short rather than a second feature – was at least contemplated.[26] The proposed storyline appears to have been designed to incorporate two sequences partially-completed (but deleted) from the original film, which would be re-contextualized to take place during a subsequent "annual visit" by Snow White to the Dwarfs' cottage. The official reasons for the sequel's cancellation remain unclear but may reflect Disney's approach to the *Silly Symphonies*, which had largely avoided follow-ups. Having experienced a significant audience response to the *Symphony* short *The Three Little Pigs*, the studio produced three further cartoons

featuring the characters, but Disney later expressed disappointment in the results. In 1966, he noted "I could not see how we could possibly top pigs with pigs. But we tried, and I doubt any one of you reading this can name the other cartoons in which the pigs appeared."[27] During Walt's lifetime, no direct sequels were produced to any of the studio's animated features.[28] Nonetheless, the inclusion of Snow White and the Dwarfs into the "official" Disney roster, alongside characters originated entirely by the studio itself, has served to complicate issues surrounding adaptation and ownership. The television series *House of Mouse* (2001-03) features a nightclub hosted by Mickey Mouse, with guests ranging from Donald Duck and Goofy, to Snow White, the Dwarfs, Hercules, and Winnie the Pooh. Similarly, patrons can "meet" Snow White at the Disney theme parks, together with many representative stars from other Disney franchises. Snow White has also been inducted into the Disney Princess marketing brand, which also includes other characters such as Cinderella, Mulan, and Pocahontas, each of whom originates from stories and folklore that predate the Disney versions.[29] Such examples serve to create significant links between otherwise separate texts. Characters are removed from their respective literary universes and exist together under an all-encompassing Disney umbrella. While the *Snow White* feature credits an earlier, non-Disney text (even if it fails to acknowledge the influence of intermediary works), many subsequent Disney *Snow White* spin-offs are more ambiguous about their point of origin.

Merchandising of Snow White and the Dwarfs further extends audience engagement predominantly with the Disney versions of the characters. As J.P. Telotte notes,

> on the day that *Snow White* opened, [Disney's product licensing office] had in place a complete merchandising campaign that involved agreements with over seventy

> companies, thereby marking the start of an elaborate nexus of entertainment and advertisement that would eventually become a model for the American marketplace.[30]

Alongside objects such as toys and musical scores, the studio also released several storybook adaptations, each of which present the events of the film, including the elements that deviate from earlier versions of the tale.[31] The pervasiveness of the Disney branding – to the point of extending back into print – can potentially serve to diminish knowledge of the original adapted work(s).

A raft of merchandise similarly accompanied the initial release of the Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels*, again including a children's storybook. As with the Disney novelizations, the text recalls the film's narrative, instead of reproducing or abridging Swift's writings.[32] Between 1940 and 1941, the Fleischers also released three sets of short films showcasing characters created for the *Gulliver* feature. These cartoons reflect the earlier "star-led" traditions of animated filmmaking, rather than continuing the "prestige" adaptive processes of *Snow White* and *Gulliver's Travels*. Although nominally set on the isles of Lilliput and Blefuscu and broadly maintaining a "period" setting, the events of the spin-off films are dictated by generic comedic formulas, and do not explicitly adhere to Swift's work (or even reference the source novel in the credits).[33] There are many elements which hark back to the animated feature – the returning characters, the reprise of its musical score, and so on – but there is an implicit resistance to acknowledge a wider history of adaptation. The authorship of the short films appears entirely subsumed by the Fleischer Studio.

Ultimately, none of the Fleischers' spin-off series was particularly successful, and each was rapidly cancelled. Even Gabby, widely touted by the studio as the breakout star of the

feature, failed to make a significant impression in his own cartoons. Today, these films are largely forgotten, and the Fleischers' storybook version of *Gulliver's Travels* is out of print. The feature itself has had a relatively tumultuous history. Although the film made money on its initial release, the Fleischer brothers were ousted from the studio after their follow-up feature, *Mr. Bug Goes to Town* (1941), fared poorly at the box-office. Having subsequently fallen out of copyright, the Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels* has had a multitude of home video releases, mostly from low-quality duplicated prints. There is no "official" version of the film currently available.[34]

Part of the uniqueness of Disney, therefore, is the level of control it has been able to retain and exert on its properties. As Rudy Behlmer notes, "the Disney policy carefully allows for full-scale theatrical reissue of most of their features approximately every seven years. *Snow White* was reissued in 1944, 1952, 1958, 1967, and 1975."[35] Subsequent releases of *Snow White* on VHS, DVD, and most recently Blu-ray, have continued this practice, with each product only available for a limited period before, in the studio's terminology, going back to the "Vault." The removal of *Snow White* from circulation posits each cyclical reissue as an "event," often accompanied by a new range of tie-in merchandising. Through this marketing strategy, the film is simultaneously presented as both timeless and of renewed relevance to each subsequent generation.

Disney's absorption of individual, pre-existing texts into its own studio portfolio clearly polarizes critical response. There is validity to arguments that the continued prominence of the *Snow White* animated film, now well over seventy years old, can at least partially sever the earlier traditions of the text, and complicate audience expectations in terms of other adaptations which deviate from Disney's version of the story. In some ways, however, the tradition echoes

the Grimms' process of collecting and retelling folklore, which similarly has become canonized, and at times mistaken as the sole origin of the work. While it is tempting to read Disney's film – and particularly its associated merchandise – as simply devouring and destroying all that comes before it (and others, like the Fleischers, attempting to do the same), there is arguably a strong historical precedent for authors placing their own distinctive mark upon an existing text.

---

[1] Limited experiments with feature animation had occurred previously in other countries. Lotte Reiniger's German film *The Adventures of Prince Achmed* (1926) is the oldest surviving animated feature, and some evidence suggests that Italian-born Quirino Cristiani may have set an earlier precedent in Argentina in 1917. See Giannalberto Bendazzi, *Cartoons: One Hundred Years of Cinema Animation* (London: John Libbey, 1994), 49-52.

[2] Brothers Grimm, "Snow White," in *The Complete Fairy Tales*, ed. and trans. Jack Zipes (London: Vintage Books, 2007), 237-46.

[3] Richard Hollis and Brian Sibley, *Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs & the Making of the Classic Film* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987), 33-35.

[4] Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Albert J. Rivero (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002).

[5] At least one Disney storybook adaptation has subsequently reproduced (and expanded beyond) the text found in the film's prologue. See *Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (New York: Viking, 1979).

[6] For an evaluative summary of various critical objections to the film, see Lucy Rollin, "Fear of Faerie: Disney and the Elitist Critics," *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 12, no. 2 (1987).

[7] Richard Schickel, The *Disney Version: The Life, Times, Art and Commerce of Walt Disney* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1997), 225.

[8] M. Thomas Inge, "Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs: Art, Adaptation, and Ideology," *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 32, no. 3 (2004): 137-42.

[9] Jack Zipes, *The Brothers Grimm: From Enchanted Forests to the Modern World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 31; Zipes, *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion: The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2006), 67.

[10] Zipes, *Fairy Tale as Myth/Myth as Fairy Tale* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1994), 72.

[11] Zipes, *Brothers Grimm*, 59.

[12] David R. Williams, "Extracts from Story Conference Notes Relating to 'Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs' in the Disney Archives, Burbank, California," 1987, Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs Collection, British Film Institute Library Special Collections, London.

[13] Walt Disney, "Why I Chose Snow White," *Photoplay Studies* 3, no. 10 (1937): 7.

[14] Karen Merritt, "Marguerite Clark as America's Snow White: The Resourceful Orphan Who Inspired Walt Disney," *Griffithiana* 64 (1998): 5, 17.

[15] Merritt, "Marguerite Clark," 19.

[16] Donald Crafton, *Before Mickey: The Animated Film, 1898-1928* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 271-97.

[17] Michael Barrier, *The Animated Man: A Life of Walt Disney* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 101.

[18] Grimm, "Snow White," 238-39.

[19] The messy living habits of Disney's Dwarfs deviates from the Grimms' tale, which describes the cottage as already "indescribably dainty and neat" when Snow White arrives. In the original story, the household duties occur as part of her agreement to continue living with the Dwarfs after she is discovered sleeping in the bedroom (Grimm, "Snow White", 239-40).

[20] Jessie Braham White, *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs: A Fairy Tale Play Based on the Story of the Brothers Grimm* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1913).

[21] Names that were ultimately rejected include Practical, Jumpy, Baldy, Hickey, Nifty, Sniffy, Stubby, Lazy, Puffy, Stuffy, Shorty, Wheezy, Burpy, Dizzy, Tubby, Deafy, Hoppy, Weepy, Dirty, Hungry, Thrifty, Shifty, Woeful, Doleful, Soulful, Awful, Snoopy, Blabby, Neurtsy, Gloomy, Daffy, Gaspy, Hotsy, Jaunty, Biggy, Biggy-Wiggy, and Biggo-Eggo. The name Gabby, subsequently used by the Fleischers for a character in *Gulliver's Travels*, was coincidentally also touted as a potential moniker for one of Disney's Dwarfs. See Williams, "Extracts"; Rudy Behlmer, *America's Favorite Movies: Behind the Scenes* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1982), 42.

[22] Alan Bryman, *The Disneyization of Society* (London: SAGE Publications, 2004), 5-6.

[23] Aljean Harmetz, *The Making of The Wizard of Oz* (London: Pavilion Books, 1989), 3-4.

[24] Leslie Cabarga, *The Fleischer Story*, Rev. ed. (New York: DaCapo Press, 1988), 144.

[25] It should nonetheless be reiterated that the Fleischer Studio had been one of the most distinctive cartoon producers for much of the 1930s (at a time when many other units, such as Warner Bros. and MGM, were frequently mimicking aspects of Disney's Mickey Mouse and/or *Silly Symphonies* films). The Fleischers pioneered a number of animation techniques that predated similar approaches by Disney. Indeed, Mark Langer suggests that the major technological innovations of this period – including several of the advances ultimately integrated

into *Snow White* – were "motivated chiefly by competition" specifically between Fleischer and Disney ("The Disney-Fleischer Dilemma: Product Differentiation and Technological Innovation," *Screen* 33, no. 4 [Winter 1992]: 351). Although the critical and commercial success of *Snow White* made it an unavoidable point of reference for the Fleischers' *Gulliver's Travels*, this should not undermine the important contributions made by *both* studios in the lead-up to feature production.

[26] See the documentary "Snow White Returns," *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs: Platinum Edition*, DVD (Walt Disney Studios Home Entertainment, 2009).

[27] Walt Disney, quoted in Schickel, *The Disney Version*, 156.

[28] Between the mid–1990s and 2000s, the Disney Studio embarked upon a number of (predominantly direct–to–video) follow–ups to their earlier features, including *Cinderella II: Dreams Come True* (2002) and *Bambi II* (2006). These sequels have at times been accused of profiteering from, and sullying, the "classic" status of the original films and, following the Disney merger with Pixar in 2006, production was discontinued (Joe Strike, "Disney DTV Sequels: End of the Line," *Animation World Network* 2007, http://www.awn.com/animationworld/disney-dtv-sequels-end-line [8 Aug. 2015]). There were no plans announced for a *Snow White* sequel ahead of this cancellation.

The Dwarfs admittedly did return in a number of government-funded cartoons – such as *Seven Wise Dwarfs* (1941) and *The Winged Scourge* (1943) – during the Second World War, but these were produced for propaganda and/or educational purposes, rather than as entertainment releases that continued the narrative of the original film.

[29] For an analysis of the Disney Princess brand, see Marc DiPaolo, "Mass-Marketing 'Beauty': How a Feminist Heroine Became an Insipid Disney Princess," in *Beyond Adaptation: Essays on*

Radical Transformations of Original Works, ed. Phyllis Frus and Christy Williams (Jefferson: McFarland, 2010), 168-180. With reference to *Beauty and the Beast* (1991), he argues that the subsequent marketing distilled the strength of Belle's character as presented in the film in order to make her conform to a generic Princess stereotype.

[30] J.P. Telotte, *The Mouse Machine: Disney and Technology* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 98-99.

[31] For a comprehensive overview of Disney's *Snow White* merchandising, see Hollis and Sibley, 73-87. Over the years, the studio has continued to publish storybook tie-ins for its movies based upon folklore and fairy tales, including further versions of *Snow White*. See Jane Yolen for an analysis of two Disney books based on their film version of *Cinderella* (1950). She argues that "the story in the mass market has not been the same" since the release of Disney's film and its associated merchandise, although arguably overstates her own subjective case for the "true meaning" of the original text ("America's Cinderella," in *Cinderella: A Folklore Casebook*, ed. Alan Dundes [New York: Garland, 1982], 302–3).

[32] *The Story of Gulliver's Travels: Authorized Edition, As Adapted from Paramount's Full-Length Feature in Technicolor* (London: Birn Brothers, 1939).

[33] The three instalments featuring Twinkletoes, the incompetent carrier pigeon, are based around disastrous postal deliveries. The two films starring the assassins Sneak, Snoop, and Snitch focus on their continued criminal mishaps. Gabby, the town crier, appeared in eight cartoons, and was permitted the most variation in terms of narrative, ranging from being appointed King of Lilliput after an assassination threat, in *King for a Day* (1940), to simply attempting to change the diaper of a mischievous baby, in *All's Well* (1941). Each cartoon establishes a broad slapstick routine

around Gabby's bumbling, know–it–all personality. There is no direct reference to Gulliver in any of the films.

[34] A recent "unofficial" release from the independent studio Thunderbean has finally made a high-quality version of the film available for home audiences. See *Fleischer Classics Featuring Gulliver's Travels*, Blu-ray/DVD (Thunderbean, 2014).

[35] Behlmer, *America's Favorite Movies*, 59-60.