

Singin' in the Rain (1952)



JANE FEUER

Winking at the Audience

Context

Singin' in the Rain has come to represent the golden age of the MGM musical, but it may not at first appear a worthy candidate for serious analysis. A light, witty entertainment, the film seems to evaporate under the kind of scrutiny film analysis is likely to provide. Although it remains a much-loved and widely admired singing and dancing extravaganza, there does not at first seem to be very much to say about this delightful piece of fluff beyond exclaiming over its perfection. Its entertainment value is self-evident, and the title number would seem to need no explanation beyond being a simple ode to the joy of life. In fact, an HMO provider once simply ran the number as an advertisement for itself. No explanation was deemed necessary to establish the connection between Gene Kelly's happiness at being in love and the presumed benefits of health-care coverage.

Yet to believe that *Singin' in the Rain* is simply *there* is to misunderstand the goals of film analysis. This essay will attempt to show that, underneath the icing, we can uncover a multilayered work that shares many thematic concerns with more seemingly "serious" films, films that—like Woody Allen's *The Purple Rose of Cairo* (1985)—film critics have labeled "self-reflexive" or "intertextual." In the case of Woody Allen's film, a character who believes in the promises made by Depression-era films actually finds herself being addressed by characters in the film she is watching. Soon she finds herself up on the screen and taking part in the narrative. The filmmaker does this to question the illusions created by classical Hollywood movies. Such "self-reflexive" films make references to earlier films in a way that causes the audience to think either about the nature of those earlier films or about the film's own status as a cinematic production. As a "Hollywood on

Hollywood" film, then, *Singin' in the Rain* cannot help but say something about the nature of the film medium and about the film industry it "winks" at. And in saying something about Hollywood, the film inevitably exposes itself as a product of the system it pretends to mock.

In addition to being a much-analyzed film, *Singin' in the Rain* is also a film whose production has been much documented. The Special Edition DVD, released in 2002 for the film's fiftieth anniversary, is a virtual archive of information. It includes not one but two documentaries about the making of this and other Freed Unit MGM musicals, plus commentary by Debbie Reynolds, Donald O'Connor, Cyd Charisse, Kathleen Freeman (who played the elocution teacher), codirector Stanley Donen, screenwriters Betty Comden and Adolph Green, filmmaker Baz Luhrmann, and author/film historian Rudy Behlmer; excerpts from the original films for which the Arthur Freed and Nacio Herb Brown songs were written; outtakes of cut musical numbers; and even clips from early sound films whose look influenced *Singin' in the Rain*. Although these sources contain sometimes conflicting information (and information that conflicts with other histories), they combine to establish that *Singin' in the Rain* is a classic, a film that has been thoroughly studied and one deserving of much study. These study aids also agree that *Singin' in the Rain* tells the true story of the coming of sound to Hollywood in 1927.

Yet the genesis of *Singin' in the Rain* had little to do with a desire on the part of its makers to do an exposé on Hollywood. In this sense it was typical of many other musicals that had already been made by the artists at what has come to be known as the Freed Unit at MGM Studios. Producer Arthur Freed assembled the best and the brightest musical-making artists, and MGM let them create relatively free from interference. Freed had been a lyricist in the 1920s and 1930s and, although credited as associate producer, he was responsible for MGM's purchasing the book and filming *The Wizard of Oz* (1939). He went on to produce some of the best-loved screen musicals: *Meet Me in St. Louis* (1944), *Easter Parade* (1948), *On the Town* (1949), and *An American in Paris* (1951). By the time *Singin' in the Rain* went into production in 1951, Freed had already hired screenwriters Betty Comden and Adolph Green to write a script that spoofed the theater (*The Barkleys of Broadway*, 1949), and with it gently mocked screen legends Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers, who were reunited for that film. Freed was

still involved in the production of *An American in Paris* (at the time considered a much more important musical than *Singin' in the Rain*), a film whose conception was similar to that of this film. That is, MGM would purchase the entire catalog of a songwriting team (in the case of *An American in Paris*, George and Ira Gershwin) and hire scriptwriters to fashion a film around a selection of these songs. This was possible because popular songs tended to express the same range of emotions as the musical film genre itself. They were about falling in love, being in love, rejection in love, the joys of singing and dancing, the joys and sorrows of being alive, and other subjects adaptable to almost any musical. The musical "number" could run the length of the song, much as a music video does today.

In this way Comden and Green were instructed to create a film based on the song catalog of Freed himself and his partner Nacio Herb Brown. The conception of the film was thus not the desire of a team of freely chosen artists to express themselves by mocking Hollywood; it was rather the much more commercial command to do something with a valuable and already presold property—the song catalog. And yet, Comden and Green had already "winked" at the legitimate theater and would go on to spoof the production of Broadway musicals (in *The Band Wagon*, 1953) and the overly commercialized nature of early TV shows (in *It's Always Fair Weather*, 1955). Somehow, the idea that Comden and Green came up with for *Singin' in the Rain* (that is, to base the script in the period of very early film musicals, for which many of the songs had originally been written, and therefore to take an affectionate but tongue-in-cheek look at the idiocies of that period) was also in line with their own themes as expressed across a series of musicals. In this sense, it both is and is not valid to say that *Singin' in the Rain* was an "original film musical" rather than one adapted from another medium, a book or a Broadway show. The fact that the script had to accommodate an already written collection of popular songs dictated that it would be created within the commercial imperatives of the film industry. The fact that it was to be an MGM musical meant that it would be a genre film like so many others, and not the original creation of its author or director. These circumstances shaped the kind of film *Singin' in the Rain* would become, but they have not prevented it from becoming a classic fifty years later, nor from being analyzed as a work of art that has distinctive form as well as content.

One of the circumstances of this method of creation was that Freed Unit musicals were never really “integrated” in the way that they are said to be. Unlike, say, *Oklahoma!* (1955), the songs were not conceived alongside the book. They are generic songs that fit a generic moment rather than the organic product of a single vision. Even *Singin’ in the Rain*’s title number, with its perfect fit to the situation of falling in love, and to that of “singin’” and (added for the film) “dancin’” in the rain, is not about the specific situation, as are songs in a more fully integrated musical such as *Oklahoma!*, which goes so far as to describe a particular surrey with a particular fringe on top in the lyric. It is hard to imagine a song about such a historically specific mode of transportation (with “isinglass curtains”) being transferable to another show. When songs similar to the 1943 Broadway production of *Oklahoma!*’s “Surrey with the Fringe on Top” were written for MGM musicals—say, “On the Atchison, Topeka and the Sante Fe” for *The Harvey Girls* (1946)—the numbers were not expected to fill slots in later musicals. But Freed and Brown wrote Tin Pan Alley-type songs that were expected to be “hits” when sold as sheet music. These songs were sufficiently generic to fill up virtually every song slot in *Singin’ in the Rain*.

Thus the numbers in *Singin’ in the Rain* might be described as “modular” rather than “organic.” It was the job of the scriptwriters, musical arrangers, choreographers, scenic artists, and directors to make the prewritten songs appear to be organic and fully integrated into this particular musical. A successful musical like this one gives the illusion of being conceived as a whole, but this is one of many “illusions” perpetuated by the film. In fact, it can be said that *Singin’ in the Rain* is a film about the differences between illusion and reality. It is thus a film with a theme. But in expressing this theme, *Singin’ in the Rain* does not just show us the value of illusion for the characters in the film and for audiences of films; it also perpetuates a whole series of other illusions about itself. Thematic analysis can trace the development of the illusion-versus-reality theme through the film; ideological analysis can reveal the film’s own confusion between illusion and reality.

Analysis

The film’s opening sequence provides a good illustration of the way it sets up an opposition between illusion and reality by creating a

contradiction between what we are told on the audio track and what we are shown on the visual track. As Don Lockwood narrates the story of his career for the audience of fans at the movie premier, we see a series of images that contradict the narration. While Lockwood speaks of “dignity,” the images are far from dignified. Lockwood tells the fans that he performed for mom and dad’s society friends, but we are shown images of two very young punks (Don and Cosmo) hoofing in sleazy pool halls and even being evicted. As Lockwood describes his early experiences of Shaw and Molière, we actually see the two young punks trying to sneak into a horror film. The high-class parents are nowhere to be seen. The Conservatory of Fine Arts is revealed to be a honky-tonk café where Don played not the violin but the fiddle. And the exclusive dramatics academy consists of vaudeville routines performed at amateur night—and so on, until we see the beginning of Don’s film career as a (replacement) stunt double. The sequence not only contrasts the self-aggrandizement of the voice-over with the presumed true story shown in the visuals, it also sets us up for Don’s first encounter with Kathy Selden. Both are revealed as having intellectual pretensions that they must shed in order to come together as a couple both professionally and offscreen; for “refinement,” as a fan in the premier audience notes, is characteristic of Lina Lamont in *The Royal Rascal* and therefore must be a phony quality. And the fact that we in the audience “secretly” get to delight in scenes from lowbrow art, sets us up for the film’s final claim that the best art in any category is the Hollywood musical itself.

In his audio commentary, *Moulin Rouge!* (2001) director Baz Luhrmann admires this sequence for its economy in providing exposition at the beginning of the film. Moreover, as Luhrmann notes, the sequence “winks” at the viewer and reminds you that you are watching a movie. This self-reflexive effect makes *Singin’ in the Rain* seem both modern and modernist, the latter implying that, like all great modernist works, the film is acutely aware of its own status as a created artifact.

The opening sequence sets up an obvious split between sound and image, truth and lies. Put in the context of the film as a whole, it corresponds to another opposition: that between Lina Lamont, who thinks Don loves her because he makes love to her in films, and Kathy Selden, who is destined to be his “true” love and who—at least initially—scorns the “dumb show” of silent cinema. Lina represents fakery because her

image and her voice do not correspond to each other. Kathy represents sincerity and authenticity because her voice and image correspond perfectly. Lina is associated with the dishonesty of silent cinema, which fools audiences into thinking that actors are what they appear to be; Kathy is associated with the authenticity of musical performance in which singing and speaking always come "from the heart." There is even an implied contrast between the black-and-white sequences we are shown both of *The Royal Rascal* and *The Duelling Cavalier* and the vibrant Technicolor of the "Broadway Ballet" sequence that Don "describes" for the producer. Since the only other footage from *The Dancing Cavalier* we ever get to see is the tail end of the recording process for "Would You?" the presentation of the ballet implies a switch from stiff and motionless black-and-white footage with bad sound to fully mobile 1952 Technicolor footage with all the dynamism of an MGM musical. The device of having Don describe the "Broadway Ballet" and then having viewers see it completed is obviously one of "winking." This is acknowledged when the producer says (after fourteen minutes of our viewing the ballet) "I can't quite visualize it. I'll have to see it on film first," and Cosmo replies, "on film it'll be better yet." The filmmakers acknowledge that they know and we know that the elaborate number we are viewing would not actually have been possible in the 1920s: *Singin' in the Rain* sometimes appears to be taking place just as *The Jazz Singer* was released in December 1927, even though MGM didn't make its first musicals in that year since the conversion to sound stages took until 1929. In the film, the studio closes down to make the conversion "for a few weeks." And although many musicals from 1929–30 were shot entirely—or included some numbers—in two-strip Technicolor, they did not include three-strip Technicolor ballets. All of these factual "errors" seem curious in a film whose makers claim it tells the "true story" of the coming of sound.

Yet, elsewhere in the film the "winking" effect is not as obvious. For instance, there is a montage sequence showing the transition to sound in which we are escorted through a series of numbers presumably being shot at Monumental Studios. The ensuing "Revolution in Hollywood" takes us through an elaborate montage sequence presumably of footage from 1927 or early 1928 talkie musicals—with all the musical production numbers done to Freed and Brown songs (this is doubly ironic: not only were there few talkies in 1928, but also many of the

Freed and Brown songs were written in the 1930s). The numbers are fully formed and shot in 1950s Technicolor with elaborate moving camera effects and post-1933, Busby Berkeley-style high shots. Although Busby Berkeley did stage a high-angled color musical number for the 1930 film *Whoopie!* it did not look like this one. The sequence even uses animated footage of chorus girls' legs. While the songs and motifs (for example, a "college musical" in which a young man sings into a megaphone) may be true to the period, the film techniques and actual settings of the numbers most assuredly are not, as the inclusion of the originals of some of these numbers on the DVD demonstrates. For example, if you look at the original presentation of what the DVD calls Freed and Brown's first hit love song, "You Were Meant for Me," in *The Broadway Melody* (1929), it has none of the dynamic camera movement of the self-reflexive soundstage presentation in *Singin' in the Rain*. The male lead simply croons it in a static two-shot to the showgirl "Queenie," who is trying to resist him because her sister is in love with him (and yet the lyric was clearly intended for the original situation, with its dialogue reference to staying up all night thinking about her). The "coming of sound" montage sequence implies that these early talkies sprang up instantaneously in 1927 when *The Jazz Singer* premiered: but of course none of the "original" MGM numbers were shot before 1929. And the fashion-show sequence seems borrowed from the Gene Kelly Columbia Studios film *Cover Girl*, which was not made until 1944.

The elaborate moving-camera effects and full MGM audio stand in complete contrast to the inept and technologically crude sequences that are being shot contemporaneously for Don and Lina's first talkie. Here the immobilized camera is enclosed in a soundproof booth, and Lina's microphone is attached to a cable that is not even taped to the floor, so that when the producer pulls on it, Lina herself topples over. There is a discrepancy between the on-screen 1920s camera that is supposed to be shooting the number on the soundstage and the 1950s MGM camera that is really recording what we the audience are seeing (and not just recording it, but editing it, too). Unlike the "Dignity, Always Dignity" voice-over, which clearly marks the gap between "reality" and appearance, there is no clear acknowledgment that the filmmakers know that we know the technology we are witnessing is far in advance of the period shown.

A similar sleight of hand occurs in the love song Don sings to Kathy on the soundstage, "You Were Meant for Me." Don confesses that he is unable to express his feelings in the mundane world of the studio lot. He lures her into what Luhrmann calls the "heightened world" of the soundstage where he employs every cinematic trick to add to the illusion of romance that he wants to convey. The soundstage sequence is prefaced by Kelly's declaration, "I'm such a ham, I guess I'm not able to [say how I feel] without the proper setting." He leads Kathy inside to a deserted soundstage strewn with bits of moviemaking paraphernalia. "This is the proper setting," he tells her, and when she replies, "Why, it's just an empty stage," Kelly creates an entire number to show her that the world of the imagination is just a step away from the real world of the studio lot. Kelly sets the scene: he pulls a switch to reveal "a beautiful sunset." Another machine produces "mist from the distant mountains." He switches on "colored lights in a garden" and "directs" Kathy in a scene wherein "milady is standing on her balcony in a rose-trellised bower." He floods the scene with moonlight and adds "500 kilowatts of stardust" and a soft summer breeze created by turning on the wind machine. But none of this artifice seems to matter when Don says his first line, "You sure look lovely in the moonlight, Kathy," and we do not doubt his sincerity. Even though we have winked at all the technologically created illusion, we know that the simplicity of the scene and the sincerity of the song must be "real." At first, the shooting of the number reveals the lights and the wind machine, but as we are drawn into the number with the words of the song, the camera arcs around to conceal the technology of the image-making, choosing instead to reveal only a romantic view of the lovers on the ladder. The ultraromantic lyric of this old-fashioned love ballad (after all, it was written in 1929) covers the scene in stardust, especially when matched with the sincerity of Gene Kelly's delivery. The dance that follows is a curious blend of authenticity and artifice. The steps are simple and almost childlike (skipping). At the end, we come to realize that artifice is at the heart of the reality effect of cinema.

Luhrmann sees this number as an example of "winking," of making the audience aware they are watching a movie. Yet the way this number is shot first reveals and then conceals the sources of cinematic illusion. The film uses the technique of demystification and remystification, first exposing the technology of film production and then

covering it up with cinematic magic. By the number's end, we are fully drawn into the romantic setting we now are supposed to believe is as real as Don's love for Kathy. Moreover, in at least two other places in *Singin' in the Rain*, the use of the wind machine is concealed entirely: first, when Kathy's scarf blows in the wind just outside the soundstage where "You Were Meant For Me" takes place; and, later, in the "veil dance" segment of the "Broadway Ballet," where, according to the archival materials, great effort was expended to make Cyd Charisse's veil blow in time with the music.

These observations point to an aspect of *Singin' in the Rain* that only ideological analysis can reveal. On a thematic level, the film makes a clear statement about the kind of illusion only film technology can create. Bad films and bad actors are ones that let the technology interfere with the illusion of a fantasy world that musicals strive to create. These are associated with silent, black-and-white, and early sound films, but also with the bad character Lina Lamont, whose image is always in excess of her talent (a talent that is revealed through the voice). Up until the very end of the film, Lina Lamont is still attempting to conceal her lack of vocal talent, a lack that is finally revealed when Don and Cosmo pull aside the curtain at the final premiere to reveal the actual source of the audio track. We see Lina's final performance from the most demystifying camera angle in the film: the shot from the wings that shows in equal proportion Lina mouthing in front of the curtain and Kathy singing behind it. Throughout *Singin' in the Rain*, the good characters make music effortlessly and spontaneously, while the bad character (Lina) has to expend tremendous effort to do anything besides appearing to look good. For example, when Lina, Don, and Cosmo have to take elocution lessons to prepare for their first talkie, Lina struggles unsuccessfully to achieve round tones, while Don and Cosmo move effortlessly into the "Moses Supposes" number. Not only do they spontaneously master proper diction, but they also manage to flawlessly pull off a competition dance sequence using the props at hand in the teacher's office.

Spontaneity thus becomes the hallmark of a successful musical performance. The DVD archives describe the way Donald O'Connor was encouraged to improvise in the number "Make 'Em Laugh," which appears to be a spontaneous outpouring of pratfalls and sight gags on Cosmo's part but which naturally had to be choreographed to the

music. Surely, the climax during which Cosmo does three consecutive running-up-the-wall backflips could not have been filmed in one spontaneous take. In "Good Mornin'," the trio spontaneously come up with a solution to the problems of *The Duelling Cavalier* when they realize it could be made into a musical, *The Dancing Cavalier*. But no number is more dependent on the idea of spontaneity than the famous title number performed by Gene Kelly seemingly alone on a simple set. The set, the steps, and the song could not be more basic, but this apparent simplicity only conceals the fact that this was a highly technical and carefully produced number. Holes had to be excavated to create puddles, "rain" had to be piped in, even the taps of Gene Kelly's feet had to be laboriously postsynchronized. Codirector Stanley Donen describes the problems that occurred when Los Angelenos came home after work and turned on their sprinklers en masse, thereby creating a drought on the set. Yet the cinematic illusion of spontaneity is perfect. That the nature of this illusion is purely cinematic became obvious to me in the 1980s when I attended the original Broadway stage version of *Singin' in the Rain*. The show followed the film closely, even attempting to re-create the title number on the stage with "real" stage rain. Although the choreography was virtually the same, the technology required to produce rain on the live stage completely broke my fascination with the dancing. In 2002, Pittsburgh's Civic Light Opera staged a wonderful version of the Broadway show in honor of the film's fiftieth anniversary. Unfortunately, on opening night the sprinkler system failed to shut off, and it "rained" for the rest of the show (including during the "Broadway Ballet"). Instead of enjoying the show, I spent the entire second act worrying that the dancers would slip and fall on the drenched stage. Of course, the movie addresses these potential technical problems only in self-consciously localized and isolated moments, such as the sequence of filming of *The Dancing Cavalier*.

Never has a film gone so far to give the appearance of effortless-ness while condemning those who use the same techniques to fool the audience. At the preview screening of *The Duelling Cavalier*, the fact that Lina's and Don's voices go out of sync is cause for great hilarity at their expense on the part of the not-very-appreciative audience. The irony is revealed in rumors relating that Jean Hagen actually had a good singing voice and at one point dubbed one of Debbie Reynolds's

numbers! Various sources cite a voice double for Debbie Reynolds in "Would You?"; whether or not this is true, we know that MGM regularly dubbed the voices of actresses (Cyd Charisse had different voice doubles in several of her Freed Unit musicals; nobody seemed to notice or care). And even more fundamentally, we know that musical numbers at MGM were never recorded live, but always lip-synced to prerecorded song tracks, whether one's own or dubbed. Since all numbers were prerecorded, the issue of vocal "authenticity" was beside the point at MGM: no one's vocals were "real." Yet they made a claim to being real.

The artifice of the dubbing process is revealed to startling effect in the 2001 TV film *Life with Judy Garland: Me and My Shadows*. Actress Judy Davis re-creates some of Judy Garland's best-remembered film performances by using the prerecordings Judy Garland herself had made at MGM. The uncanny effect of Judy Davis's body producing Judy Garland's voice is compounded during a sequence when Judy/Judy is seen on a soundstage recording "The Man That Got Away" for the 1954 version of *A Star Is Born*. Judy Davis lip-syncs her way through one of the torch songs most identified with Judy Garland, but at one point the recorded voice soars onward while the actress halts the filming of the number to tell the George Cukor character that she has missed a mark. While the 2001 film never winks at its own artifice or the fact that one Judy is impersonating the other in body but not in voice (indeed, admirers of this telefilm believe that Judy Davis was actually "channeling" Judy Garland), it is perfectly willing to demystify the playback process through which all Hollywood musicals were made in the 1950s.

Probably the most outrageous claim made in the plot of *Singin' in the Rain* is that Kathy Seiden would ever under any circumstances have been given screen credit for her vocals dubbed for Lina. In short, this most beloved of films, which cherishes spontaneity and authenticity, is lying to us at every level. The question for an analysis of the film is, what are we to say about these lies? In the most fundamental sense, all art lies in being more perfect than life and in concealing the difficulty of its own creation. Because they are technological, films lie even more. Although Jean-Luc Godard once said that cinema is "truth 24 times a second," no film can be totally honest about the labor that went into its making. Whereas some (modernist) films attempt to reveal their own conditions of production, it is impossible to do so always and fully.

Each act of demystification inevitably brings with it a moment of remystification. So to condemn *Singin' in the Rain* for concealing its own technology would be unfair, and not very illuminating.

What we can do is to explain the paradoxes that a satiric film like this reveals. To reveal paradoxes is to believe that the film cannot help but remystify every time it cuts from an exposing camera angle to a concealing one. It is to believe that it is the nature of art to be ultimately unable to distinguish between illusion and reality, even to believe that the function of art is to make illusion real. In this sense, my reliance on archival sources about the production of the film is really cheating. Aside from providing amusing anecdotes, the knowledge that, say, Debbie Reynolds did not know how to dance before this film, might be construed not just as irrelevant to an interpretation of the film but as a positive hindrance to reading the film. Does she dance in the film? Does she dance well enough to keep up with professional hoofers Kelly and O'Connor? If so, the revelation of her amateur status can only detract from our enjoyment of her dancing in the film. Following this line of reasoning places *Singin' in the Rain* well within a long tradition of literary and filmic works that try to capture the essential paradox of art: that it is both illusory and real.

Conclusion

Ideological analysis of the film goes even further. As Carol J. Clover has written, "So wide is the gap between what *Singin' in the Rain* says and what it does that one is tempted to see a relation between the two—to see the moralizing surface story of *Singin'* as a guilty disavowal of the practices that went into its own making" (158). That is to say, the film's lies—its gaps and omissions—are symptoms of underlying anxieties that speak to its own status as a classical Hollywood film. While Clover wants to trace the way the film covers over its racial origins in African American music and dance, one could interpret *Singin' in the Rain* as a film that expresses anxiety at many other levels. In particular, as a self-reflexive Hollywood-on-Hollywood musical, it seems especially troubled by the studio system as a whole and the kind of illusionistic films produced therein. Just before the film began shooting, the long-reigning head of MGM studios, Louis B. Mayer, was replaced by Dore Schary as head of production. As Cyd Charisse explains in her audio

commentary on the DVD, Dore Schary wanted MGM to make more serious, "theatrical" films. Although this had no *direct* influence on *Singin' in the Rain*, indirectly it does mark the beginning of the end of the era of musicals that this film is considered to crown. Both the kind of entertainment represented by the MGM musical and the kind of production system represented by MGM were coming under threat. Yet by making *The Duelling Cavalier* into *The Dancing Cavalier*, *Singin' in the Rain* appears to be telling us that the proper response to all artistic and economic changes is to make a musical, preferably one that very much resembles the MGM musical itself. Making musicals becomes the means to salvation for the studio system itself. The film suggests that the musical is the type of film that can respond to any and all technological changes in the industry.

Other Comden and Green films of this period address the threat posed by television to the film industry (in *It's Always Fair Weather*) and the threat that the greater high-culture pretensions (associated with Schary at MGM) posed to films that were merely entertaining (in *The Band Wagon*). But *Singin' in the Rain* deals directly with the Hollywood filmmaking process and considers the direct threat posed to the kind of entertainment Hollywood represented at the time of the transition to talkies. Although in 1952 musicals were, in hindsight, on their way out, *Singin' in the Rain* is especially clever at memorializing the time when they were charging in to rescue Hollywood itself.

Credits

United States, 1952, MGM

Directors: Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly
 Producer: Arthur Freed
 Screenplay: Betty Comden and Adolph Green
 Cinematography: Harold Rosson
 Editing: Adrienne Fazan
 Original Music: Nacio Herb Brown and Lennie Hayton
 Art Direction: Randall Duell and Cedric Gibbons
 Set Decoration: Jacques Mapes and Edwin B. Willis
 Costume Design: Walter Plunkett
 Makeup: Sydney Guilaroff and William Tuttle
 Other Crew: Jeff Alexander (music arranger: vocal arrangements), Arthur Freed (lyricist), Lennie Hayton (musical director), and Wally Heglin

Feuer

CAST:

Don Lockwood	Gene Kelly
Cosmo Brown	Donald O'Connor
Kathy Selden	Debbie Reynolds
Lina Lamont	Jean Hagen
R. F. Simpson (President, Monumental Pictures)	Millard Mitchell
Dancer	Cyd Charisse
Roscoe Dexter (Director, Monumental Pictures)	Douglas Fowley
Zelda Zanders aka Zip Girl	Rita Moreno

Bibliography

- Altman, Rick. *The American Film Musical*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- Barrios, Richard. *A Song in the Dark: The Birth of the Musical Film*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.
- Clover, Carol J. "Dancin' in the Rain." *Critical Inquiry* 21 (1995): 722-47. Rpt. in Cohan 157-74.
- Cohan, Steven. "Case Study: Interpreting *Singin' in the Rain*." *Reinventing Film Studies*. Ed. Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams. London: Edward Arnold, 2000. 53-75.
- . *Hollywood Musicals: The Film Reader*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Feuer, Jane. *The Hollywood Musical*. 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1993.
- Singin' in the Rain*. Dirs. Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly. 1952. Two-disc Special Edition DVD. Warner Home Video, 2002.
- Wollen, Peter. "*Singin' in the Rain*." London: BFI, 1992.