

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

The Death of Author in G.B. Shaw's Pygmalion

**A thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts in English**

By

Tanka Prasad Neupane

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February 2008

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the scholarly guidance, invaluable suggestion and constant support of my thesis supervisor Mr. Shankar Subedi of Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. I express my sincere gratitude to him. I am equally indebted to my respected teacher Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English for his cooperation and motivation.

I am also equally grateful to Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Birendra Pandey, Mr. Tika Lamsal, Mr. Ghanashyam Bhandari and Mr. Sadan Adhikari who helped me in many ways during my research.

I am equally indebted to all my teachers of Central Department of English whom I always found to be supportive and cooperative. Similarly, words fail to convey my thanks to my friends Siddhi, Til, Narahari, Balkrishna, Kuber, Sadananda, Jagannath, Rajan, Nabin, Bashu & Sagar who equally encouraged me by providing all kinds of help whenever I needed. My cordial thank goes to Mr. Nawa Raj and Saurav for their incessant help in computer typing and printing.

At last, but not the least, I want to express my deep indebtedness and gratitude to my parents, brothers, sisters and nieces Anjana, Aswina, Prashamsa and Monika without whose continuous financial support and encouragement, my dream to achieve Master's Degree in English would have remained futile.

Tanka Prasad Neupane

February 2008

Abstract

On the surface, G.B. Shaw's *Pygmalion* depicts the hardships faced by both the student and the teacher in the process of teaching phonetics. Shaw has portrayed Higgins as cold, irrational, selfish, and inhuman who always scolds Eliza while he teaches her and also after the completion of teaching process. But it is neither Shaw nor Higgins who understands this drama as dealing about the relationships between the creator and creation. So, all the characters and events in the play are presented by Shaw as he has seen in his contemporary society. Therefore, the relationship of Higgins and Eliza remains as normal as that of other in the society who always seem to be quarreling with each other.

However, on a deep level, Shaw's *Pygmalion* gives some signals to the readers that the central character of the play Higgins struggles for his existence. The play traces the protagonist's aim through individual interests and social activities. Through teaching, he tries to define himself as social reformer. Although he tries hard, he is unable to maintain his relationship with his creation Miss Eliza Doolittle. He is only one of the characters in the play who awakens Eliza's soul and creates new Eliza from the old one and is also compelled to leave his creation to go along her own way of life. This is a clear indication of the fact that the created is no longer in the grip of the creator. The creator can no more manipulate the created. The created goes its own way and is free. It is a striking similarity to Roland Barthes' idea of Death of the Author according to which the meaning of the created text is no longer in the control of the author but is dependent on the way the readers understand it independent of the author's intentions.

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

This thesis titled “**The Death of Author in G.B. Shaw’s Pygmalion**”, submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by **Tanka Prasad Neupane** has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1-14

1.1 George Bernard Shaw as a dramatist 1

1.2 Shaw and his other plays 4

1.3 G.B. Shaw and Pygmalion 7

1.4 Application of Theoretical tools 13

II. Death of the Author: A theoretical methodology 15-33

2.1 Concept of Author in relation to text in Post-structural theory 15

2.2 Barthes' and Foucault's idea of Author 29

III. Death of the Author in Pygmalion: A Textual Analysis 34-53

IV. Conclusion 54-55

Works Cited

I. Introduction

1.1 George Bernard Shaw as a dramatist

George Bernard Shaw is one of the greatest of many Irishmen who had written plays in English language. He was born in Dublin in 1856. He was the only son of his parents and was preceded by two sisters. His father, George Carr Shaw, became a minor official in the Dublin law courts. He was a Dublin stockbroker. Because of such low post in his office, Shaw's father was also complete failure in his life. His mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Shaw was a daughter of an Irish landowner. She was much younger than her husband. She had to neglect her children for one reason or other. But she has a remarkably good singing voice and also has an instinctive love for music. So, from his mother and mother's friends young Bernard learned much good operatic music and this was proved to be very fruitful to him afterwards when he started teaching. When he was just sixteen his mother and sister left Dublin.

At the age of ten Shaw was enrolled in the Wesleyan Connexional School, afterwards known as the Wesley College, but he was never happy there. His general academic interests were literature, music and the graphic arts. In 1872, he came to London to live with his mother and sister. His mother taught music and he began to teach English there. When he started to live with his mother in London, he developed the extraordinary independence of mind and spirit which was to enable him as a man to look upon the world and its affairs without being swayed either by custom or by other people's conventional ideas of right and wrong.

Shaw was employed as a clerk and then a cashier in a land agents office until April 1876. This phase of his engagement in a private office resulted to be the most

fruitful in his literary career. Because of this employment, he had not to depend on other for his food and lodgings. Therefore, he became able to develop his own extraordinary independence of mind and spirit. This enabled him to look upon mankind from different perspectives without being touched by any social values, norms and traditions. It means that he was motivated by his self inner consciousness but not by the path shown by any other literary figure before him. To prove this he himself writes in a preface entitled "*Mainly about Myself*" that he was neither a septic nor a cynic in these matters but he simply understood life differently from the average respectable man and he certainly enjoyed himself more- mostly in ways which would have made him unbearably miserable- he was not separate over the variance.

Shaw had observed a long vendetta between his father and mother. And it was all due to his father's deterioration. His father had no inheritance, no profession, no manual skill, and no qualification of any sort for any definite social function. As a consequence, his mother became a "Bohemian anarchist." She also disliked Shaw for his physical resemblance to the father. Shaw had to endure his mother's negligence but was unable to ameliorate the condition of his family. If he could amend his father's attitude towards his mother, he would have a beautiful world where he would get his parents' love. This desire of childhood was never fulfilled in his real life. He, therefore, made his life completely dedicated in teaching people and making their life better to fulfill his child wishes.

Shaw's life is full of many ups and downs. He is one of the most leading figures of his time and has mingled different elements in his plays. The height of his fame was

reached in 1923 when he published his play *Saint Joan* and it is clear that this and other several plays will be always remembered in the history of English literature.

Shaw was an Irish dramatist, literary critic, a socialist spokesman, and a leading figure in the 20th century theatre. He was a freethinker, defender of women's rights and advocate of equality of income. In 1925, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. Shaw accepted the honor but refused the money.

When Shaw was at the British Museum he began his literary career by writing music and drama criticism, and novels, including the semi- autobiographical *Immaturity*, without much success. A vegetarian, who deliberately avoid alcohol and tobacco, Shaw joined in 1884 the Fabian Society and served on its executive committee from 1885 to 1911.

Shaw was a man of many causes who supported abolition of private property, radical changes in the voting system, campaigned for the simplification of spelling, and the reform of the English alphabet. As a public speaker, he gained the status of one of the most sought-after orators in England. In 1895 Shaw became a drama critic for the *Saturday Review*.

In 1898 Shaw married the wealthy Charlotte Payne- Townshend. They settled in 1906 in the Hertfordshire village of Ayot St. Lawrence. Shaw remained with Charlotte until her death, although he was occasionally linked with other women. He carried on a passionate correspondence over the years with Mrs. Patrick Campbell, a widow and actress, who got the starring role in *Pygmalion*. All the other actresses refused to say the taboo word 'bloody' that the playwright had put in the mouth of Eliza.

The Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen had a great influence on Shaw's thinking. For a summer meeting of the Fabian Society in 1890, he wrote *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891), in which he considered Ibsen a pioneer who, later on declares that it is right to do something hitherto regarded as infamous. He died in 1950 having produced his last and important play *The Apple Cart* some 20 years before in 1929.

1.2 Shaw and his other plays

To express against the values and norms of society was considered to be breaking of laws of the nation in Shaw's time. He wrote *Mrs. Warren's Profession* for the first time in 1894. This play was written to draw attention to the truth that prostitution is caused, not by female depravity and male licentiousness, but simply by underpaying, undervaluing, and overworking women so shamefully that the poorest of them are forced to resort to prostitution to keep body and soul together.

This play, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* was more a social work as it was intended to reform the social follies like prostitution. Moreover, it was also intended to raise voices against women's domination in the society. So, this single play comes with double messages which were unbearable for the contemporary despotic ruler Lord Chamberlin. By the act of Parliament which was despotic as well as super monarchical, this play was considered to be as immoral and otherwise improper for the stage. So its performance was banned in the society. Because of this, the writer was also banned as an unscrupulous author which was a great damage in his literary carrier.

This play was mostly intended to the audiences like the clerical members of Christian Social Union and of women well experienced in Rescne, Temperance, and

Girl's club work. So, it has been ultimately performed on the stage after a long delay of years with enormous success which brought happiness as well as change in Shaw's face.

G.B. Shaw in the field of drama is not just a social reformer but also attacks on the emerging issues of contemporary world. By this, it becomes clear that he was not confined just to his society by his mind but was broad enough to grasp the burgeoning issues around the world and attacks on them. For this, critics often makes attack on him as a literary person who treats the bad subject matter as good and good as bad, important as trivial and trivial as important, serious as laughable and laughable as serious, and so forth. One similar example of his is the '*Arms and the Man*'. This play is especially a satire on western where the most criticized Swiss officer is not a conventional stage soldier. He suffers from the want of food and sleep. His nerves go to pieces after three days under fire, ending in the horses of a rout and pursuit; he has found by experience that it is more important to have a few bits of chocolate to eat in the field than cartridges for his revolver. This indicates the denial of the existence of courage, patriotism, faith, hope, and charity.

In his later life, Shaw lost faith in human and his progress. So, his plays consist ideas which seem to contain the germ of endless development but not for the human race rather for some new and higher species which will supersede it as Man has superseded the ape which may nevertheless survive him. In his another famous play which is entitled as '*Man and Superman*', he arrived at the conclusion that it is necessary to breed a race of men in whom the life-giving impulses predominate before the New Protestantism becomes politically practicable. The matured form of his ideal is the ethical man, convinced of the bankruptcy of education and progress as practiced and understood,

inspired with faith in the world-will, and resolved, not to adapt a new philosophy for man as he is, but to develop the power “two time more abundantly.” According to him, the man’s tragedy at present is constituted because of its brevity. So, his main idea in *Man and Superman* is to bring out the whole humanity out from this tragedy.

Shaw went on to write other plays like *The Devil’s Disciple* and *Captain Brassbound Conversion*. Until Shaw came in the field of literature, there had been no any modern British dramatist who took the current social, political, religious and female issues as the subject matter for their plays. Most of his plays also raised the female issues. In some of his such plays, he reaches out to touch the woman’s psyche and explains the importance of females. He declares that the woman’s value is more dominant than that of man in the society. Woman’s values have something new and inventive that have created separate world with new and different light.

Major Barbara, no doubt, is Shaw’s another major play. In this play, his woman character, Barbara, is the most intelligent, educated and rational who is always ranked as superior than any other male in the play. She is the protagonist in the whole play. She is one of the intellectual and ideal heroines who have fought in the society against male traditions. Shaw has used the philosophical and reasonable dialogues with energetic voice through the mouth of Barbara.

Shaw has portrayed the character of Barbara with argumentative and reasonable words in the play which have showed that women are more intellectual. Barbara, who has the strength in her voice, competes with her lover and father. She is stronger in her ideas than in power. Moreover, she has demonstrated the code of conduct, a philosophy of life and revolutionary discovery with ideas and knowledge. The justice and betterment are

found in women's world rather than in male's world. Both emotion and passion are removed from her mind and rather she has the harshest sound to the established society. The leading idea that the women should have courage to raise voice against suppression and for the right of women is presented in the title '*Major Barbara.*'

As the time passed, Shaw read more widely in science, he became genuinely interested in the intricacies of mathematics. In his monumental philosophical poem, *Back to Methuselah*, he describes the Nymph as finding her chief diversion in studying the properties of numbers. Here, he conceived man as successfully willing his own salvation. In his '*tour de force*', and '*In Good King Charles's Golden Days*' he gives the leading role to the supremely great mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton.

So, to conclude in short, G.B. Shaw wrote not only on one issue but on various issues which he thought to be the most important of his contemporary society. While writing, he was always conscious about the well-being and enlistment of whole humanity.

1.3 G.B. Shaw and Pygmalion

The story of *Pygmalion* is taken by Shaw from the Greek legend. In this legend, Pygmalion, the protagonist, is a sculptor who falls in love with a statue made by him. He is in so deep love with his statue that he starts to supplicate Aphrodite, the Goddess of love. Because of this, the Goddess also changed the statue into a living woman called Galatea. So, Pygmalion also becomes able to achieve his creation and marries with Galatea.

G.B. Shaw ignores the original version of love affairs and makes twist of it for his own benefit to suit his purpose. In this later and modern *Pygmalion*, the story of the play

moves round the two major characters: Mr. Henry Higgins, an expert in phonetics, and Miss. Eliza Doolittle, a poor, uneducated, and most shabby girl.

Higgins's job, in the play, is to teach Eliza the fashionable speech of the society. However, he undertakes this job and makes it possible for that poor creature to face with the cultured and aristocratic society with in a few months. She is not suspected by anybody in that society and she becomes able to convince all the people of the society that she really belongs to high class of people.

In the process of teaching phonetics to Eliza and even after its completion, Higgins's attitude towards Eliza, in some critics' view, is very dominating. He has taken this job as mere professional experiment. He fully ignores Eliza's self-being, her feelings and takes her just as a talking-machine. This sort of domineering behavior of Higgins to Eliza is also shown in the dialogue between these two characters in the act II of the play.

Higgins. Somebody is going to touch you, with a broomstick, if you don't stop sniveling. Sit down.

Liza. (*Obeying slowly*) Ah-ah-ah-ow-oo-o! One would think you was my father.

Higgins. If I decide to teach you I'll be worse than two fathers to you.

Here (he offers her his silk handkerchief)!

Liza. Whats this for?

Higgins. To wipe your eyes. To wipe any part of your face that feels moist. Remember: that's your handkerchief; and that's your sleeve. Don't mistake the one for the other if you wish to become a lady in a shop. (25-26)

In *Pygmalion*, Shaw has highlighted Eliza's character with powerful dialogues and reasonable thinking in poetic and scientific language. She becomes stronger than her creator with revolutionary attitude who gains the power to upside down the norms and values of contemporary society. Higgins though tries to highlight the simplicity and innocence of Eliza by using high sounding words, is not able to do so. On the contrary, with her revolutionary attitude that has developed along with her language skill, Eliza discards the notions of superior people of society like Higgins. But by taking this single point, it would be an unjust done to this play if we take it as Eliza's revolution against male domination. In this context, she has done nothing more for the society instead of the steps taken to be free from her creator's hand. It would be early if we take Eliza's steps as revolutionary or Higgins attitude and behavior as domination. If it was a revolution done by Eliza, she must have spoken about the female rights. Still more, if it was a male domination, Higgins should not have become unhappy when he is left alone by Eliza. Higgins' behavior is just like the one done to his people by a teacher.

In The play, the experiment of teaching phonetics to Eliza Doolittle, the flower girl, completes and it proves to be one of the most successful experiments though somewhere she mistakenly uses some mocking colloquialism. The modern *Pygmalion*, Mr. Henry Higgins discovers in his surprise that he has not merely given the cockney girl a superficial polish but he has also awakened a human soul. But this change has affected only Eliza's life. She seems to be only a means of entertainment for both Higgins and Colonel Pickering. It is so because they pay no any least of attention towards Eliza after she won the prize for them. By this point we also should not take this play as a romance done by Higgins and Pickering over Eliza.

Higgins has less thought about the changes that are brought in Eliza by his teaching of phonetics. So, after the experiment is successfully over, Higgins thinks that Eliza can go back to adapt her previous life style again. He can't think that by learning to speak properly, she has also acquired a higher status in the society. Nor he has the power to think once about her previous ambition. On the other hand, Eliza's sense of belonging neither to her previous society nor to any new one makes her more determined. This also enables her not to be dependent upon her creator, Mr. Higgins. It leads the play to end with Eliza leaving her creator's house to face the outer world alone.

G.B. Shaw's *Pygmalion* has been gravitating the attention of various critics. They have tried their best to unfold the various aspects and approaches to fulfill the purpose of this text. Regarding this play, G.B Shaw himself writes in the preface; "I wish to boast that *Pygmalion* has been an extremely successful play, both on stage and screen, all over Europe and North America as well as at home. It is so intensely and deliberately didactic, and its subject is esteemed so dry that I delight in throwing it at the heads of the wiseacres who repeat the parrot cry that art should never be didactic. It goes to prove my contention that great art can never be anything else." (04-05)

This single statement expressed by Shaw in the preface helps to clarify the popularity that the *Pygmalion* achieves in the literary field.

On the other hand, some of other critics viewed it as a comedy that presents the criticism of life. *Desmond MacCarthy* calls the play *Pygmalion* a "misnomer" as he does not see the appropriateness of the title. In his article, "*Pygmalion and Shaw*" he says "the play has a story of an artist who turns a flower girl into a work of art and by his self-central refrains from the love affair." (51)

Finally, MacCarthy's point is that Higgins has not the least care of what all the training has cost Eliza or how hard she has tried to learn; it means that sculptor knows nothing about how much suffering the statue has to undergo.

Similarly, Archibald Hinderson in his "*George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century*" says "Pygmalion is a thoroughly modern play with old fashioned touches carrying the rational discussion throughout and ending with a mildly emotional situation. In the play, the story is artificial, pleasantly comic; the social implications reside in minor characters and behind the tale." (615)

However, the main theme of the play shows a psychological disposition of Shaw himself. To present in other words, this play is the product of Shaw's own psycho- sexual history. Almost the same idea has been displayed by another critic Nicholas Grene in his comment on Shaw. He says that *Pygmalion* is the product of "Shaw's own.....Oedipal feelings for his mother who died not long after he finished the play, and his relationship with Mrs. Patrick Campbell, the leading lady, with whom he had the one passionate (if unconsummated) affair of his long celibate married life." (111-112)

It means, Shaw's hidden impulses led him to create a male dominant world where he transmitted himself onto fictional figure of Higgins to rule over this world.

Another prominent critic of English literature, David Daiches has viewed Shaw's *Pygmalion* from different angle. He says that "the theme of *Pygmalion* comes from the sparkle of Shaw's mind not from the fully realized dramatic projection of a complex vision of life." (1107)

Hence, when Higgins has not the least care about what all the training has cost Eliza or how hard she has tried to learn, Eliza also slams the door of Higgins's house for

ever. All the behavior showed to Eliza by Higgins helps Eliza to be a more revolutionary character in the play and she is free to make her own choice. So, she chooses Mr. Freddy Eynsford Hill as her real suitor instead of choosing her creator, Mr. Henry Higgins. This shows that the artist has no more right to control over his art after the art is complete and perfect.

In this way, though different critics have analyzed this act from different perspectives, all the critics have agreed with the point that Higgins is the real creator of Eliza. He teaches her not only the phonetics and the proper use of language but also about her culture. But the result comes in contrary from Higgins's wishes. He had wished to marry himself with Eliza or had seen Colonel Pickering as her real suitor. Eliza doesn't agree with this point and chooses Freddy in place of Pickering. For her, it doesn't matter about how Higgins has tried to bring her in this present condition. So, she slips away forever from Higgins's hand. This point goes to prove my contention that it doesn't matter about how hard the creator has to suffer for his creation. The creation is ultimately free and has right to face the outer world alone. There is no any sort of right of the creator over his creation when the creation is perfect. So, the creation is ultimately free and self-dependent and there doesn't exist any kind of relationship between the creation and its creator. But no critics have viewed this play yet through this angle. My dissertation would view this play from the spectacles that the artist just leads his art towards a new way of life and is compelled to leave it alone in its own way. Hence, this thesis would be unique.

1.4 Application of Theoretical tools

Poststructuralism as a criticism emerged in late 1960s. Its main concern is that to understand the fuller meaning of the text, readers should distance the author from the text as the birth of reader invites the death of Author.

Some of the critics believe that poststructuralism is only a fuller working out of the implications of structuralism. In this respect it might appear as a continuation of structuralism. But some other critics have believed that it is different from structuralism as it denies the scientific pretensions of structuralism. Like structuralism, Poststructuralism has its roots in the linguistic theory of Saussure. Saussure's claim is that there is no natural relationship between the signifier and signified. For him, the relationship between them is only arbitrary, and in language there are only differences without positive terms. Some of the most prominent figures related with poststructuralist criticism are: Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault etc.

Roland Barthes, in his essay 'The Death of Author', emphasizes on the creative activity of meaning, though meaning in comparison to its productiveness is less important. In this essay, he analyzes the concept of author from poststructuralist point of view. He says that language has the power to control the meaning of a text rather than the author. Here, he is agreed with the Heideggerian principle who says that language makes man to speak. Hence, Barthes' view regarding the author is that whenever the author proceeds to write a text, the voice loses its origin and the author enters into his own death.

In Nietzsche's concept God is regarded as the creator of human being. But the birth of science in the world has invited the death of God. Man still makes prayer to the

shadow of God as his creator which is a futile work. This point is that to know the full meaning of life, one should be free of praying such shadows. In a similar way, we should distance the author from the text though the author is the creator of the text. To know the meaning of a text, the readers should not relate the author's biography with the text which is also the concept of all poststructuralist philosophers.

Similarly, Michel Foucault in '*What is an Author?*' deals with the relationship between text and author. For him, the author becomes outsider when the text gets its complete shape. Foucault relates writing with a game which constantly breaks its own rules and regulations and goes beyond its limits. The writer, while writing, need not to manifest the act of writing rather he has to create a space where the subject of writing constantly disappears. So for Foucault too, the meaning is more important than the personality of writing.

II. Death of the Author: A theoretical methodology

2.1 Concept of Author in relation to text in Post-structural theory

In the essay “The Death of Author”, Roland Barthes enters to a sort of poststructuralist or deconstructive view of the author. In his view, the author of a text is dissolved as an ego that controls the book by which readers try to interpret the meaning. Barthes sees the language as controlling the meaning of a text rather than the author. He creates the term “scripter” for this linguistically created author. So, Barthes also agrees with the Heideggerian idea who says that man makes to speak.

Whenever the writer proceeds to write something the voice loses its origin and the writer enters into his own death. Only writing is possible when the author loses his presence from the text and let ideas flow through the medium of language. In any text, no doubt, the author is a modern character who is produced by our society of the middle ages, influenced by English empiricism, French rationalism and the personal faith of the reformation. Hence, it would be logical to say that in literary text, it should be positivism which is influenced by capitalist ideology that has given the greatest importance to the author. What these would refer is that the influence created by literature upon the audience is centered on the author, his person, his history, his taste, his passions etc.

Though the author has great influence over the literary work, some of the critics have already tried to subvert it. In France, Mallarme for the first time saw the importance to substitute language for the subject to be the owner. For Mallarme, as for Barthes, it is language which speaks not the author. Mallarme's all works speak in suppressing the author in favour of writing. Similarly, surrealism helped to subvert the image of the author. Lastly, outside literature itself, linguistics destructs the author with analytic

instrument, showing speech-act as an empty process, which works without the presence of the author in a text. So, linguistically also, the author is nothing but the one who writes, just as I is nothing but the one who says I.

The absence of any author from his creation is not only a historical fact. But it is like the author himself distancing from his creation at every level. In this context Barthes in his essay 'The Death of the Author' writes:

The removal of the Author (with Brecht we might speak here of a veritable *distancing*, the Author diminishing like a figure at the far in of the literary stage) is not only a historical fact or an act of writing: it utterly transforms the modern text (or-which is the same thing- the text is henceforth produced and read so that the author absents himself from it at every level). Time, first of all, is no longer the same. The Author, when we believe in him, is always conceived as the past of his own book: book and author are voluntarily placed on one and the same line, distributed as a *before* and an *after*: the Author is supposed to *feed* the book, i.e., he lives before it, thinks, suffers, lives for it; he has the same relation of antecedence with his work that a father sustains with his child. Quite the contrary, the modern *scripter* is born *at the same time* as his text; he is not furnished with a being which precedes or exceeds his writing, he is not the subject of which his book would be the predicate; there is not time other than that of the speech-act, and every text is written eternally *here* and *now*. (1131-32)

The author is always taken as the past of his own work. Author and his works are always placed at the same time. The author is supposed to search for the subject matter to write. He lives before his work and thinks and suffers for it. So, he has the same relationship with his work like that of a father with his child. Barthes, here invents a term “scripter” for the author and proceeds to say that the modern “scripter” is born at the time when he starts to write his text.

Now, it is apparent that a text consists not only of a line of words, releasing “theological” meaning but several writings, none of which is original. So, Barthes concludes that the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousand sources of culture. To put author with the text is to close the writing. If a reader seeks meaning of a text by relating it with the background of the author, then he is blocked to understand the meaning of the text as the text consists of multiple writings. So, to understand the meaning clearly of a text, readers should ignore the author as the birth of the reader must be required by the death of the author.

Frances Wayres of Indiana University has different view regarding the author and the work they produce. According to Wayres, the writers of the generation of 1898 are not following the way and depicting the national themes that were shown by the earlier generation. They are, rather, focusing on the dilemmas of subjectivity and their consequences. In their works they addressed themselves in relation to external reality and individual self. This generation was much surprised to see as how it was possible for them to pour their ideas and feelings through language. Many writers saw language as a source of self-betrayal as words belong not just to oneself but to others.

Regarding the prestige of the author of any literary work, Barthes goes on to say that in literature “the epitome and culmination of capitalist ideology has attached the greatest importance to the ‘person of the author’ (Barthes 143). So, it becomes clear that our society has a tradition to interpret any work of art in relation to the author’s biography. But some writers of the second half of the nineteenth century gave most priority to the subject matter rather than its writer. In this regard, Foucault’s concept of “sovereignty of the subject” is decentered by the writers like Nietzsche and Marx. Instead of supporting Foucault in this view, they claimed that the author’s inner world is already removed from the text when they produce it. For Barthes too, the discontinuity and dispersion are a consequence not only of the separation of author from text but also of the fact that writing itself is a “multidimensional space in which a variety of writing’s.... blend and clash . . . a tissue of quotations”. (The Death of Author, 146). Other certain writers like Mallarmé also saw the need of substituting the writer by language. For him and others too, it is the language that speaks by the author but not the author himself/herself.

By the title of Barthes’s “The Death of the Author”, it is apparent that the one who dies or disappears individual author conceive on the Cartesian model as an interior thinking substance. For modern writers, Barthes says, writing is like inscription, not expression. The belief in the author entails a relation of antecedence with the book for which he “thinks, suffers, and lives” (145). Later, the scripiter simultaneously comes into being with the text. When the author has to express something, the scripiter needs to inscribe it. And if the writer has anything else to express, he is bound to do that through an already created dictionary.

So, when an Author proceeds to write something, in reality, he is not writing anything new but just inscribing what is already existed there. Hence the text also bears multi dimensional space which consists of different writing which is not original as they are inscribed from the already created dictionary. In this context Barthes writes

. . . a text consists not of a line of words, releasing a single “theological” meaning (the “message” of the Author God), but of a multi- dimensional space in which are married and contested several writings, none of which is original: the text is a fabric of quotations, resulting from a thousands sources of culture. Like Bouvard and Pecuchet, those eternal copyists, at once sublime and comical, whose profound absurdity *precisely* designates the truth of writhing, the writer can only imitate an ever anterior, never original gesture; his sole power is to mingle writings, to counter some by others, so as never to relay one; if he seeks to *express himself*, at least he knows that the interior “thing” he claims to “translate” is itself no more than a ready-made lexicon, whose words can be explained only through other words , and this ad infinitum. . . . Succeeding the Author, the scripiter no longer contains passions, moods, sentiments, impressions, but that immense dictionary from which he draws a writing which will be incessant: life merely imitates the book, and this book itself is but a tissue of sign, endless imitation, infinitely postponed. (1132)

In his famous essay “What is an Author?” Foucault speaks of the kinship between the writing and death because in our culture, writing is linked to sacrifice and to the sacrifice of life itself. In this he points to “the voluntary obliteration of the self” and also cites

Flaubert, Proust, and Kafka as examples of the transformation of the writer into a “victim of his own writing” (Language 117).

Here, he also rejects Derrida’s conception of “écriture” which, though it tries to “elaborate the conditions of any text” has merely transposed the empirical characteristics of an author to a “transcendental anonymity” (119-20)

While writing a text, an author can impose a limit and also can postulate a meaning a “final signified” but in his writing, Barthes goes to make it clear that there is no any fixed meaning because it is made up of multiple meanings. Even that multiplicity constantly undermines itself. Barthes further states that this “refusal of a fixed meaning is also a refusal of God and his hypostases, reason, science and law” (147). By Barthes, it means not to say that only the modern texts have these multiple meanings. Rather, all the texts that have ever been published have no fixed meaning as Barthes goes on to locate a text’s “unity” not in it’s origin but in it’s destination, that is in the reader, it looks as if he is substituting one unified and ‘final signified” for another. In s/z, he writes: “this I which approaches the text is already itself a plurality [of other texts, of codes which are infinite]” (10). This plurality is for Barthes necessarily undefined and can easily slide into a infinity of cadis. Its impersonality, its anonymous historicity, obliterates the very source of diversity in meaning.

Here, what concerns more is that neither Foucault nor Barthes views the Authors’ demise with any sense of pathos or tragedy. On the contrary, they took it as a kind of liberation. Unamuno also agrees with them and expresses the same idea on their behalf. He says that the author can not remain the owner of the text. For him this dispossession is highly disturbing because he sees it in entirely personal matter. In order to possess

consciousness, either as speaker or as author, he says, one must separate oneself from others and even from one's own external self. The impossible desire to win the split-off self is a function of a view of others and of language of threats to one's very being. Unamuno's persistent sense of the vulnerability of a self constantly endangered by others leads to his view of life and especially writing, as anxious and tragic activity.

In relation to Barthes, as mentioned by Frances Wayres in his article 'Unamuno and The Death of the Author,' Unamuno also calls the task of writing wretched and miserable as it is the beginning of the writer's own death. For him speech is a sad compulsion where in its absence we can't share our ideas, between two speakers there is the intervening of medium of language, the world, that belongs to neither one nor the other. He tells us about how once, in the country, listening to a peasant boy singing, he had felt a kind of mystical transport as if he were hearing "the voices of the other world that throbs within our world" (63). The writer can convey some inkling of such ineffable experience through metaphorical language. That is why he constantly believed that language moves toward ossification and that the growth of an idea is threatened by the tendency to rigid formulation.

Unamuno is very far from accepting with equanimity of Barthes formulation that "the inner 'thing' (the author) thinks to 'translate' is itself only a ready formed dictionary, its words explainable through other words" (Unamuno and The Death of the Author 67). His idea is that although words belong to the world and not to the speaker, there is an inner fountain, an intimate and invisible substance that comes from "roots" within the writer. He frequently sees the inner world as the only locus of freedom. This is in quite contradiction to Barthes's view of the liberating activity of a writing that refuses "to

assign a 'secret' an ultimate meaning, to the text. Instead of the book being a tissue of signs, an imitation that is lost, infinitely deferred" (Barthes 147), it grows out of the hidden realm of freedom. Of course the very concept of 'inner' freedom presupposes an outer world forever immune to the actions of people, a frozen, changeless world.

Unamuno sees freedom as possible only against others, in dissociation and isolation.

From these all, now it becomes apparent that there is no clear division in Unamuno's writings between the notion of the author's inner being and that of the person who does not write. Both are enslaved by the language of the society and by the external nature of their acts. He even speaks of the "eternal self or nucleus" that is almost smothered by the external self ruled by "passion, iniquity and egoism", a self that in time builds up a thick crust or shell that distances an individual from it and others. Yet this outward shell determines actions. Therefore he recommends a retreat from the outer world and from the empirical self into a realm of sheer virtuality. The external world is a place of total expropriation, a land of alienated consciousness, of dead souls. Foucault would certainly reject any concept of an inner world of free subjectivity. Speaking of the "Polymorphous techniques of subjugation" (Power 96). He insists that "We should try to grasp subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects. The individual is an effect of power . . . and the element of its articulation." (97-98)

Unamuno's mere positing of inner and outer selves and the images of materiality that he uses to describe them are evidence enough that both are reified, though he is eager to describe the first in terms of life, flexibility and freedom. Parallel to the notion of inner/outer selves, and equally reified, is that of two worlds, each created by a different "instinct". For him, this is a survival instinct which creates for us the reality and truth of

the perceptible world. Since man does not live as an isolated individual but as a member of society, society owes its being and continuance to the instinct of perpetuation. Reason arises from this rather instinct or, rather, from society. Reason is therefore a social product whose origin is perhaps language.

Now, he explains the social and communal nature of language and says that thinking is like speaking to oneself, which in turn is a consequence of speaking with others. He further says that the interior language in a human being comes from the exterior one. By this it seems that the outer world precedes the inner one and the later depends on the former. Yet, he returns to the image of two separate causal chains when he posits "another reality" that is produced by the instinct of perpetuation. This instinct, he also calls love, identifying it as the foundation of human society. The individual maintains his separate existence through the instinct of survival and perpetuates himself in society thanks to the instinct of perpetuation. Language and reason link the two instincts and through language one instinct turns out to be the result of the other.

Unamuno wants us to believe that literature is an expression of the self, yet he alternates constantly between seeing his writing as life giving substance and guarantee of immortality. His literature as death so is countered by Barthes "Death of the Author". We move from anguish and lament over a compelling yet fatal practice to the view of writing as that which liberates a "truly revolutionary activity" both are extreme formulations of the question of subjectivity.

According to Frances Waynes, the views of Unamuno, as well as those of Barthes and Foucault can be set in the larger social and intellectual frame provided by Volshinov/Bakhtin. In *Marxism and Philosophy of Language* (1928), Volshinov/Bakhtin

insists on the social nature of the self and of language from which it arises. This, of course is the consistently held position of the Bakhtin circle. He says that consciousness itself can arise and become a viable fact only in the material embodiment of signs. And according to him, our understanding is a response to a sign with signs. This chain of ideological creativity and understanding is consistent and continuous. This is perfectly congruent with what Unamuno says, about how thinking is speaking to oneself which in turn is a result of speaking with others. In several places, he speaks of the social nature of language, describing it as a simple fact and not a form of alienation. But we have seen how that argument easily gives way to the notion of the incommunicative, private self, and that self, Unamuno imagines, not as a linguistic entity but a material one.

Unamuno's concepts of materiality, whether that of "appearances" or that of a physical spirit, have nothing to do with Voloshinov/Bakhtin's "materiality of signs and communications. Unamuno would often disintegrate the 'materialization of communication" into the ghostly worlds of appearances. Sociality, which for Voloshinov/Bakhtin is the very basis of the individual psyche, is for Unamuno either the arena for the conquest of fame or the place from which one flees inwards into the soul's warmth. So in Unamuno's concept any writer writes for the popularity that s/he would achieve after the text is published. His assertion is that the writer/ author lies within the text and hence becomes popular with the text but he disregards the existence of readers who stand outside from the text and are always ready to interpret the text differently than its author. According to Voloshinov/Bakhtin the inner psyche of human can only be understood and interpreted as a sign but it is not analyzable as things. Frances Wayres observes that in *The Tragic Sense of Life* by Unamuno he explains as the interior

language springs from the exterior. But, unlike Voloshinov/Bakhtin, he does not connect that observation to his definition of consciousness. For Unamuno, consciousness has nothing to do with anything outside itself. It has nothing to do with the perception of objects or others: it does not derive from dialogue or social interaction and it is not linked to ideology. Rather, it is the painful experience of its own limits. It is the wish to be every thing and the simultaneous awareness that one is not every thing, not others, not God, not the whole of the universe.

The search for the image of himself in the opinions of others, in his legend, in fame or reputation and the feared depersonalization that accompanies it are dramatized in both essays and fictions. In *How to Write a Novel* (1927), a hybrid of fiction and essay, both Unamuno as "author" and Jugo, the character and authorial alter-ego, seek to be eternal and immortal through writing. To attain the promise of bookish perpetuation, Unamuno argues that history is created in books and does not exist outside them. But it also exists in those who read the books. Thus the author's life depends on his readers and there in lies the problem. The legendary Unamuno is always in danger of being absorbed by the story fabricated jointly by himself and others. In this regard, he says that the history devours him as an author and when the history ends he also ends with it. He explains that there is another unknown and Unknowable self. But the record of his attempt to reach that self shows repeated failures.

In Barthes concept, the world of others and that of language constantly threatens to appropriate the writer's solitary self. Yet, that self can be made only in words. Unamuno sees his life as strictly parallel to his writings. Many essays end with a last but it is never the last efforts to achieve perpetuation through those writings. In *How to Write*

a Novel, Unamuno relentlessly examined the hazards the novelist confronts in his production of a fictional work as well as in the creation of his own personal myth in fame. Far from disappearing into textuality, this author struggles for personal identity and personal survival. When he concludes "I myself am my work" (989), he fuses inner and outer, author and text. He will not accept the sacrifice of his life in writing, he will not in Foucault's terms, be transformed into "a victim of his own writing." When Unamuno says that "yes-but I do not want to die in it," Barthes response to this is that "the scripter is born simultaneously with the text".

On the other hand, as far as American Criticism is concerned, it's reaction to Barthes is not yet clear. In Paul de Man's view, the recent translation of Barthes's work from French to English is useful but still inadequate first step in introducing his work in English. *The Critical Essays*, mostly prefaces written for commercial editions stem from the period that precedes the development of Semiology-roughly 1963-and are mostly interesting in showing Barthes' discontent. With the prevailing methods of literary study during the fifties in France, and his delight at discovering the new perspective opened by his readings in linguistics in de Man's view, Barthes is primarily a critic of literary ideology and, as such, his work is more essayistic and reflective than it is technical. Barthes played an active part in the recent Battles of the books and his work bears the traces of his involvements. This contribution of his should be read and understood as an intellectual adventure rather than as the scientifically motivated development of a methodology.

In Barthes's social myths, the referential, representational effectiveness of literary language is greater than in actual communication because, like his catch as catch can

wrestles, it is so utterly devoid of message. The referential suggestiveness that literature vermeans accounts for the fact that one responds with strongest emotion to a fictional narrative than to an actual event is of course illusory and something for which a science for literature should account without being taken in by it.

Around 1920s, while spiritualism was no longer the pressing cultural problematic but the question of authorship was at that time too. While some critics believed that there must be a direct connection between the writer and the work, with style reflecting personality, others argue that the author is a textual phantom, a discursive construct whose relation to specific person is loose and perhaps even irrelevant. In this regard, as well as in the question of authorship, it would be more relevance to discuss about Oscar Wilde's Gothic Romance.

Oscar Wilde's posthumous Gothic Romance as stated by Elana Gomel in her article 'Oscar Wilde, The Picture of Dorian Gray, and the (Un) Death of the Author', was special because it so eerily resembled his own Gothic parables of authorship. The relationship between art and artist, between textuality and subjectivity, constitutes a central concern of Wilde's oeuvre, just as it shaped his individual fate. This concert is clear in Wilde's essays, but it is his masterpiece, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, that represents his most complex, nuanced and surprisingly contemporary meditation on the charged relation between the body and the text.

In the preface to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Wilde writes that to reveal art and to conceal the artist is art's aim. But from the close study of Elana Gomel of the novel, the total picture is revealed as an independent and autonomous *object d'art* only when both its Creator and its model are dead. By her study of the novel, it seems that the

violence that separates art from artist indicates a strain and hostility in their relationship. The paradox that the artistic creation is possible only through the death of the self indicates a split between two concepts of subjectivity: the physical subject rooted in the limited and mortal body, and the textual subject, infinitely reproducible and potentially immortal. As the text is born argues Sartre, the umbilical cord linking it to the writer is decisively cut that our books remain in the air all by themselves and that their words, instead of pointing backwards toward the one who has designed them, will be toboggans, forgotten, unnoticed, and solitary, which will hurt the reader into the midst of a universe where there are no witnesses. But what Sartre imagines as a painless separation between the body and the text is charged with tension, since by readily consensus, the textual author still implies a particular writer.

Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is a novel about the perils of identity. The true scandal of this book lies in the opposition Wilde's so presciently establishes between the hunger for identity, achieved through identification with an external model, and corporal desire, of whatever kind, that ruptures this narcissistic self-presence by admitting the other. To escape into art as Dorian does is immoral not because it unleashes forbidden desire altogether and freezes his ideal self in a sterile and solitary perfection.

In the case of authorship, Wayne Booth's famous introduction of the concept of the "implied author" was meant to circumvent the "intentional fallacy" by finding a way to talk about the intentions of the author without lapsing into conjectural biography. But the result was a strange duality: occasionally the implied author seemed to absorb every thing in the text, and occasionally she dwindled to a textual double of the real writer.

Thus, the implied author was simultaneously the text's dominal system of values and an ideal literary, created version of the real man.

In *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Wilde indicates that the source of gothic strain in narratology lies in the charged relationship between the irreducibly individual physical body and the infinitely reproducible artistic persona, between the writer and the author. In *Body Work* peter Brooks describes how the body enters the text by being "signed". But equally, the text has to be signed by a body: authenticated by presumption of a specific, and individual authorship. The writer's body is positioned in a paradoxical relation to the text, both necessary and necessarily absent. On the one hand, this body is very ground of the text, whose uniqueness and coherence of the particular human beings responsible for its production. In s/z Barthes claims that the text's symbolical field "is occupied by a sole object, from which it derives its unity. . . . The object is the human body" (17). But on the other hand, the text as a linguistic construct, open to endless readings, interpretations, and appropriations, always points *away* from the body. Thus, in Brook's words, the "body appears alien to the very constructs derived from it" (17). This alienation generates uncanny plots, in which the materiality of the body is conveyed through its annihilation.

2.2 Barthes's and Foucault's idea of Author

Violent imagery that clusters around the process of writing acts as a knife, attempting to cut the discursive identity of the textual author from the physical body of the writer. Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* indicates that writing is always involved in an ambiguous attempt to escape the body while acknowledging its ineluctable presence. Discourse produces the phantom figure of the author, majestic an omnipotent, paring his fingernails behind the magic show of the text. But the possibility of generating

such an ideal self and identifying with it is precisely what sparks the writer's desire. In Foucault's concept the writer of any text wants to be the author to loose herself in the text by craving the permanence of a picture. The loss of corporeal identity in the process of writing may become temptation rather than fear. Foucault suggests as much in a personal aside

What, do you imagine that I would take much trouble and so much pleasure in writing, do you think I would keep so persistently to my task, if I were not preparing- with a rather shaky hand- a labyrinth into which I can move my discourse, opening up underground passages, forcing it to go far from itself, finding overhangs that reduce and deform its itinerary, in which I can lose myself and appear at last to eyes that I will never have to meet again. *I am no doubt not the only one who writes in order to have no face.* Do not ask me who I am and do not ask me to remain the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare us their morality when we write. (Archaeology 17)

The process of artistic creation as Foucault suggests, inevitably implicates the body. Even the choice of metaphors that narratology uses to figure 'The Death of the Author' cannot escape corporeality. Only a corporeal being can die: only a one –living person can become a ghost: only a violence can be forcibly divested of his body. Representing the author as the text's ideal self implies an alternative corporality, rather than no corporeality, since it is impossible to imagine a self with no material vehicle.

Here, Foucault's suggestion in the act of artistic creation is that the author's personality cannot be completely separated from the text. His view is that any work of art

has slight impression of its creator but in the classic statements of the postmodern theory of authorship by Barthes and Foucault himself, the choice of metaphors betrays the violence of these theorists' concepts of creativity. The work of art is its creator's murderer. "the work, which once had the duty of providing immortality, now possesses the right to kill, to be its author's murderer" (198), says Foucault in "*What is an Author?*" but since the work cannot be completely dissociated from the writer, there is a strange slippage between murder and suicide. For Foucault "The writing subject cancels out the signs of his particular individuality" (198).

Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author" describes the beginning of the writing as "the author enter(ing) into his own death" (168), thus representing the text as a perilous House of Usher, daring the visitor to confront her mortality. Thus for him a text is such a space which lets to come all sorts of writing from the readymade dictionary and ultimately inviting the death of its author itself.

. . . a text consists of multiple writings, proceeding from several cultures and entering into dialogue, into parody into contestation; but there is a site where this multiplicity is collected, and this site is not the author, as has hitherto been claimed, but the reader: the reader is the very space in which are inscribed, without any of them being lost, all the citations out of which a writing is made; the unity of a text is not in its origin but in its destination can no longer be personal: the reader is a man without history, without biography, without psychology; he is only that someone who holds collected into one and the same field all of the traces from which writing is constituted. . . . Classical criticism has never been concerned

with the reader; for that criticism, there is no other man in literature than one who writes. We are no longer so willing to be the dupes of such antiphrasis, by which a society proudly recriminates in favor of precisely what it discards, ignores, muffles, or destroys; we know that in order to restore writing to its future, we must reverse the myth: the birth of the reader must be required by the death of the Author. (1132-33)

On the one hand Barthes's idea of writing emphasizes the dissolution of identity in the text: "Writing is that neutral, composite oblique space where our subject ships away, the negative where all identity is lost starting with the very identity of the body writing" (168). But on the other hand, "the identity of the body writing" haunts the writing of the body with echoes of its violent elimination. In the house of the text, the body of the writer is not so much distilled into words as dismembered into chunks of rebellious flesh. "The Modern Scriptor" does not believe anymore that his hand obeys his thought: on the contrary, "the hand cut off from any voice ... traces a field without origin" (170). This shocking metaphor imports the gothic plot of a solitary hand, served but supernaturally alive, acting out the stubborn perversity of the flesh unsubdued by reason or intention. If in writing "all identity is lost," it is not lost without a material trace.

For Foucault, writing becomes martyrdom. Moreover, the writer does not only court death but in some sense must already be dead before embarking on her carrier the writer "must assume the role of the dead man in the game of writing " (198). The uncanny nature of the "author-function" derives from it's hostility to the writer, a hostility predicated on their incomplete dissociation.

In the conclusion point, though Unamuno, Oscar Wilde or even Foucault supports the slight presence of author in the text, it is Barthes who rejects this opinion completely. For him the "death of author," turns out at a closer look, to mean the death of the writer, the eclipse of the corporeal subject by her textual double generated by the dynamics of discourse. This dynamics becomes the subject of a particular cultural interpretation in any given period. Aestheticism focused on the perversity of writing and both the dangers and the seduction of art for art's sake. Modernism glorified authorial "impersonality," while postmodernism has assimilated the death of the author to the more general death of the subject.

III. Death of the Author in Pygmalion: A Textual Analysis

The story of Pygmalion is based upon the Greek legend. According to this legend, Pygmalion is an sculptor who, later on falls in love with the same statue made by himself. With his devotional prayer to the Goddess of love, i.e. Aphrodite, the statue changes into a beautiful living woman called Galatea and Pygmalion marries her. But in G.B Shaw's version of Pygmalion, he discards the original Greek myth of love affairs. The whole story in G.B Show's play moves around two major characters: Henry Higgins and Eliza Doolittle. At a glance, Higgins is the professor of phonetics. But a deep study of the play further helps to conclude all the readers that he is not only a phonetician. As the story of the play moves towards the final episode, much light is thrown on the character of Higgins. By this, all the readers are convinced that Higgins is the real creator of Miss Eliza Doolittle. On the other hand, Eliza Doolittle, who can be taken as the real heroine of the play, is a poor and uneducated girl selling flowers on the street. It is only through Higgins that Eliza becomes an educated girl after a few months and is also able to face the most cultured and aristocratic people without anyone suspecting that she really belongs to a lower social class.

One powerful quality of this myth is that it can wear many hats and change as the time changes. This quality makes a myth capable of maintaining its validity throughout time. Shaw's version of the Pygmalion story offers two basic revisions of Ovid's story: the change from supernatural agency to natural explanations and the replacement of physical creation by linguistic transformation. The relationship between the natural and supernatural is in Shaw's beginning of the play when the scene opens in a storm with thunder and lightning to accompany the meeting of Eliza and Freedy. Errol Durbach in

his *Pygmalion: Myth and Anti-Myth in the plays of Ibsen and Shaw* notes that the play itself does not sustain this mythically auspicious beginning: "(Shaw) empties the process of all its' mystery and insists upon the common place nature of the transfiguration" (23). Durbach sees this emptying as reason enough to ignore the classical roots and search elsewhere for influence. Irrespective of influence Shaw's revision of the story allows him to collapse the distinctions between the creator-god and the creator-artist, between the supernatural and the natural.

In the play Shaw raises the issues of morality and ethics by replacing Ovid's Pygmalion-Venus due with Higgins. In the Pygmalion story as recounted by Ovid, Pygmalion is described as having a radical aversion to the female sex, an aversion that emerges from the shameful and disgusting behavior of the women of Amathus. This is his moral desire for a woman beyond the imperfection of those women that inspires Pygmalion to create Galatea. So, in both cases of Ovid and Shaw, the ulterior motive of the artist can be seen in the relationship of resistance and dominance of art and science to reform their societies.

Shaw in this play has attempted to replace the original tale in a frame of reference familiar to his audience. So, he has shifted the focus from that of physical creation, since physical creation is impossible to effect on a natural level. His focus in this play becomes language rather than stone. The original Greek myth of the play has provided Galatea human life. In a similar way, the modern verse of the play by Shaw gives Eliza social life by the means of linguistics. Here, Shaw is in the correct line in comparison to earlier novelists. In this regard, Tony Crowley in his *Language Science* (1997) notes that in late nineteenth century novels "the bitterness and dangers which surround 'standard English'

are insistently portrayed" (18) Shaw uses this nineteenth-century notion of language as in Crowley's words, "Crucial to the making of self" (19) to explore the questions of selfhood.

Shaw has rightly challenged through this drama that the contemporary belief of every human has a fixed position in his/her society and so cannot cross the barrier to get the higher rank. He has made Eliza able to cross that social barrier and get the upper position through the medium of linguistics. In this, Jean Reynolds in his *Pygmalion's Wordplay: The Postmodern Shaw* rightly points out that Shaw "attacked.... the popular belief that every human possesses a stable and unchanging essence or self "(29). Such a social constructive issue allowed Shaw to span the gap between the Victorian concern with social issues and the objective world of which a character was a part.

Eliza's story, in the play, examines not only the changes that come in her after learning the Standard English. This story, on the other hand, also demonstrates Eliza's new identity in her society which, later on, goes beyond her creator Higgins's control. For instance, her own observation of how Pickering 's treatment of people differs from that of Higgin's provide her with more insight into quality social interactions than do Higgin's directives on behavior. She, by her own inner feelings, knows that Higgins has taken the process of teaching phonetics as mere professional experiment. Not only this, she further uses her insight to differentiate the right and wrong person as her suitor in the society and applies this in her life in the proper time.

In essence, Shaw's revisions of Ovid come down to a shift from ontology (Galatea's physical creation) to epistemology (a consideration of how Eliza's identity was formed), a movement that anticipates differences in the handling of identity between

nineteenth-century and twentieth-century narratives. The juxtaposition of Ovid's Pygmalion and Shaw's Higgins makes of both debauchery and improper speech images of social ugliness that contain equal societal detriment. In Shaw's *Pygmalion*, we can see Higgin's process of how he undertakes the work of teaching Eliza to speak like a lady. This seems to be a challenging and playful work for him in the beginning which springs from a free and disinterested mind:

Higgins: You see this creature with kerbstone English: the English that will keep her in the gutter to the end of her days. Well, sir, 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. (16)

Here, the fact that how hard Higgins has tried for the well being of Eliza becomes more evident when Higgins refuses to compromise his aesthetic endeavor by marrying Eliza, he gives priority to the aesthetic value of art than to his own desire. This same impulse of his pushes Eliza away from him and goes to face the real world alone after she gets the perfect design from her creator. It happens so not because of Eliza's personal right but because of Higgins's resistance to individualization that preserves his art-work against the lures of decadence:

Higgins. Oh, it's a fine life, the life of the gutter. It's real: it's warm it's violent: you can feel it through the thickest skin: you can taste it and smell it without any training or any work. Not like science and literature and classical music and philosophy and art. You find me cold, unfeeling, selfish, don't you very well: be off with you to the sort of people you like.

Marry some sentimental hog or other with lots of money, and a thick pair of lips to kiss you with and a thick pair of boots to kick you with. If you can't appreciate what you've got, you'd better get what you can appreciate. (102)

The moral message of healing social gaps through speech is never actually stated by Shaw. Working on the literal level of language, we can see Higgins as a free, uninhibited artist who is interested in generalities and principles. His code is the cold superhuman deal to change the world. Higgins, in this play, is one of the prototype of 'reflective' creator to whom human material is raw material only: " I care for life, for humanity, and you are a part of it that has come my way and been built into my house " (99). If we look *Pygmalion* from the view point of the class structure of the 19th century English society, the aesthetic quality of this play would become more and more prominent. In this society, Eliza the heroine of the play occupies the lowest nauseating grade. Actually, one of the most visible and distinguishable marks in the 19th century, as the plot reveals, was speech and accent. Their impact was so immense that it could influence their definition of human beings. In this play, we see how Shaw depicts the inferiority of the lower classes in the eyes of the upper in the dialogue between Pickering and Higgins. This inferiority Eliza will transcend after she receives her education:

Pickering [*in good humoured remonstrance*] does it occur to you that the girl has some feelings?

Higgins [*Looking critically at her*] oh, no I don't think so. Not any feeling that we need bother about. (51)

The underlying ideas of Shaw's Fabianism and his dream of a classless society could thus be felt here. In this play, he regards phonetics and the proper use of pronunciation of the English language as an instrument of social changes and as a hope for achieving the aesthetic state. For him, the main difference between a flower girl and a duchess was a matter of education and accent, a mere issue of form reflected on the degrees of verbal aestheticization. So, the whole narrative of the play symbolizes a scathing scorn of the unscientific assumption that the upper classes in the society were superior by virtue of their birth. But this is equally satirized when Eliza does not go through the path that is shown by Higgins. It is, in short, a revolt against the creator of the creation.

Eliza in the play plays a vital part to maintain the English social structure. For this purpose too, she disregards her creator and chooses Freddy as her real suitor as he is from her same social class. Members of her class are important only in that they perform distasteful but essential services for the rich. It is this contrast between ugly and beautiful that creates the dramatic tension in the play. But the fact that a street-girl like Eliza is capable of 'beautiful' speech would thus make the actual class barrier that Eliza surmounts look obsolete and meaningless. In the play, this is reflected by Higgins when he says:

The great secret, Eliza, is not having bad manners or good manners or any other particular sort of manners, but having the same manner for all human souls: in short, behaving as if you were in Heaven, where there are no third-class carriages, and one soul is as good as another. (98)

Thus, for all the readers of *Pygmalion*, it becomes apparent that this play deals not the possible marriage between Eliza and her creator. The play rather clearly transcends the

sentimental individual level of a personal relationship to a higher level of linguistic aestheticization.

Shaw's *Pygmalion* is a play on the society, where both main characters Eliza and Higgins are symbols of two unequal social classes, whose gap could only be bridged through the beauty of language. But questions like why both Higgins and Eliza want to be away from each other after Eliza's completion of teaching phonetics may arise. In this context, some critics have pointed out that to think of the play in the sentimental terms of the possible growth of love between teacher and pupil, or creator and his creation, is to misconceive its aesthetic value. This is also rightly understood by the playwright in proper time and so twists the story toward another direction. In short, we can say that this is the tackle of Shaw's mind that Eliza goes away from her creator's hand and marries with another right person namely Freddy. According to Mohammad R. Salama, a prominent critic of English literature, this act of separation between the creator and his creation helps to save the aesthetic value of the play.

Eliza, the heroine of the play, acquires independence and freedom through the aesthetics of language, through the beauty of her new linguistic identity. Her example is a social promise for those who speak the 'Lisson Grove Lingo', and for all the 'draggletailed gutter' Eliza's of the nauseating low classes; it is a promise to defy their existing social position and to transcend their ugly decadent condition through linguistic education. This implies a beautification of the ugly and nauseating, recuperating them for the aesthetic.

Here, in this play, Eliza's aesthetic efforts to improve herself through language have not been based merely on a desire to master the world by mastering the word. At the end of the play, Eliza remains a choice, a thing, an object, but not herself a subject.

Hence, there, is impossibility of a personal relationship between her and Higgins. Like the Galatea figure in the myth, Eliza is a possibility, a creation, an artwork, and a result of her master's aesthetic mind.

Eliza's plight for her freedom and her own identity in the society highlights Shaw's joining of the two fictions. Ovid's version of Pygmalion deals largely with identity as physical self. Shaw and the other writers of the twentieth century have refocused toward other conceptions of selfhood. For them, beyond the physical self there exists other ways of thinking about identity or personhood. People have psychological selves, sociological selves, philosophical selves, and linguistic selves. Higgins has changed Eliza's linguistic selves and even physical selves by providing her with proper training, clothes and the customs and traditions of the society so that she passes as a duchess. But Eliza is capable of changing her psychological and philosophical selves through interactions with others in the society such as Mrs. Higgins and Colonel Pickering. More than this, she has also realized her status in the society that she is not the any possessive property of her creator rather she has her own identity in the society. This realization of her selfhood and identity has been shown in the dialogue between herself and her creator:

Higgins. Then get out of my way; for I wont stop for you. You talk about me as if I were a motor bus.

Liza. So you are a motor bus: all bounce and go, and no consideration for anyone. But I can do without you: don't think I cant.

Higgins. I know you can. I told you you could

Liza [*wounded, getting away from him to the other side of the ottoman with her face to the hearth*] I know you did, you brute. You wanted to get rid of me.

Higgins. Liar.

Liza. Thank you. [*She sits down with dignity*]

Higgins. You never asked yourself, I suppose, whether I could do without you.

Liza [*earnestly*] Dont you try to get round me. Youll have to do without me.

Higgins [*arrogant*] I can do without anybody. I have my own soul: my own spark of divine fire. But [*with sudden humility*] I shell miss you,

Eliza [*He sits down near her on the ottoman*] I have learnt something from your idiotic notions: I confess that humbly and gratefully. And I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather.

Liza. Well, you have both of them on your gramophone and in your book of photographs. When you feel lonely without me, you can turn the machine on. It's got no feelings to hurt.

Higgins. I cant turn your soul on. Leave me these feelings; and you can take away the voice and the face. They are not you. (98-99)

Shaw's works, if we make a close look at them, take the concern with the external sociological self. And this selfhood is common to all nineteenth century literature. This sociological selfhood merges with other elements of selfhood and with the interior selves that concerned modernists and the multiple selves emphasized in postmodern views.

Shaw's handling of selfhood in this play thus offers an ideal framework with which to analyze later narratives filled with "fictive" as well as "real" selves.

The central core of Shaw's *Pygmalion* project is this tension between the fiction of reality and the fictive of the picture. As far as Higgins is concerned, Eliza's reality for him is only her voice initially "guttersnipe" eventually "duchess." Yet Shaw ensures that readers see the error of this view point by having the socially accomplished Eliza revert to guttersnipe speech in moments of stress or excitement. As Lisa S. Starks in her *Educating Eliza: fashioning the model woman in the "Pygmalion film"* asserts, "Eliza learns how to perform the 'feminine masquerade' (45). The duchess "self" is thus only one of the assorted collections of stories that individuals, such as Eliza, can tell about themselves.

As Mrs. Higgins warns Henry Higgins of spoiling Eliza that she were becoming less fond of Colonel Pickering, Mr. Higgins informs for the first time in the play that she is going to marry Freddy. Shaw has not presented the rest of the story in action. It means that, the resolution of the play is clear to all the conscious readers that Eliza surely marries with Freddy. Some of the other dialogues uttered by both Eliza and Higgins also helps to reach this conclusion for the readers. This action of Eliza that she marries Freddy instead of marrying her creator is common enough to record the social transfiguration of the heroine through the means of linguistics. So, the readers have also their own interpretation or decision about Eliza that some analyze her as a brave girl who gives a great blow to her creator. In the same way the readers have same decision or interpretation about the text that is available in the market. It concludes that the readers are free to analyze and grab the meaning as their wish.

Eliza's decision of not accepting the marriage proposal if she were asked by Higgins was not coquetting. Rather it was a good decision made by her in right time. There is possibility that either she can adapt her creator as her life partner or leave him alone. She has choices in her life because she is the art created by the artist which can be placed where it suits. But Higgins, because he is an artist, has no choices in his life. This shows that any art is always itself free from its creator.

The dialogues uttered by Higgins from time to time in different contexts, shows his domination over Eliza. From the very beginning of the play, it also seems that as if Higgins has no interest in marriage. He only dominates in the name of teaching phonetics to Eliza. This further forces Eliza to think if she will really become happy in her life if she marries Higgins. Certainly, Eliza's decision will depend on her age, interest and income. If she is at her late youth and has no security in her life, it becomes better for her to marry him because she must marry one who is capable of providing her all such necessities. But, she is not in that age to feel such pressure and also has mind enough to choose a right thing in right time. Because of such all qualities, she is guided by her own impulses to choose her life partner.

As the process of teaching phonetics to Eliza Doolittle starts, she together with this starts to develop her own instinct. Because of this, she is capable of making her own decision. So, she decides not to marry with Higgins. On the other hand, this same instinct does not allow her to abandon Higgins totally. For Higgins too, if there is something else that interests him much in the world is Eliza and the linguistic she uses which was developed to that extent by himself. Because of such dual interests to each other of Eliza and Higgins, there ensues a kind of love relation. But this relation ends before it reaches

its final point because of Eliza. Knowing her creator's domineering superiority, she has developed such an instinct herself that it has good grounds for warning her not to marry her *Pygmalion*. And it also happens so because Eliza in her inner soul knows that she is the art created by an artist and is always free herself.

After her determination not to marry her master/creator, for he was a predestinate old bachelor and she was certainly not a predestinate old maid, Eliza at the same time mentions the name of Mr. Freddy as her real suitor and solves the query that with whom she is going to marry. Freddy is practically twenty years younger than Higgins who is daily pouring his love through the post. For her, he is a gentleman in the society. Moreover, he is nicely dressed, loves her unaffectedly, and is not her master. In real sense, he even does not make any domination over her. This is the enough evidence for Eliza to choose Freddy instead of choosing Higgins. It shows that the artist has no more right to control his art when it goes on the hands of the public. This is also shown in the dialogue between Eliza and Freddy.

Liza. Don't you call me Miss Doolittle, do you hear? Liza's good enough for me [*She breaks down and grabs him by the shoulder*] Freddy. You don't think I'm a heartless guttersnipe, do you?

Freddy. Oh no, no, darling: how can you imagine such a thing? You are the loveliest, dearest -

[*He loses all self control and smothers her with kisses. She hungry for comfort responds. They stand there in one another's arms.*]

By analyzing the situation of both characters, we can say that both Eliza and Freddy are matched in their social classes. At a glance, Freddy seems to be a poor person having no

money and occupation. On the other hand, Eliza has learned the standard phonetics and there is possibility of improving her social class. But a close reading of the play reveals that Eliza's father, Mr. Doolittle, though formally a dustman, now fantastically declassed from the society. Moreover, when she leaves Higgins, there also seems no possibility of getting any job in the society that suits her. These evidences are also helpful to show that they both are matched because of their social class. In this sense too, Eliza chooses Freedy instead of choosing Higgins.

It is clear that Eliza herself is not only fully responsible for the final outcome of the play. The different dialogues uttered by Higgins in the different contexts shows his dislikness towards womanhood. From the very beginning, he shows this dislikness and as the story runs to its middle, it becomes more violent. Towards the middle of act two this is reflected by Higgins when he says,

I find that the moment of let a woman make friends with me, she becomes jealous, exacting, suspicious, and a damned nuisance. I find that the moment I let myself make friends with a woman, I become selfish and tyrannical. Women upset every thing. When you let them into your life, you find that the women is driving at one thing and yours driving at another. (35)

Because of this misogynist impulse, he is still a confirmed old bachelor and wants to remain so afterwards. In one of the suggestion of Pickering that to care and be responsible for the Pupil, Higgins's thought is that unless pupil were sacred, the teaching processes becomes impossible. He has applied this theory to reshape Eliza's life and have

even become successful. He also proves that there lies a process by which identities are formed.

But the story of the play, on the other hand, reveals that Higgins is only a misogynist in the case of other women but not for Eliza. Otherwise, it was not his compulsion to take the task of teaching phonetics to Eliza at the first hand. His command to Mrs. Pearce to provide her necessary care, and also clothes is notable here. He also offers a bet to Colonel Pickering that he would pass that cockney flower girl, dirty shabby, speaking a horrible and almost incomprehensible vernacular into a duchess. It is his most challenging job in his life and takes this responsibility for the sake of Eliza. He actually wages, with his friend Pickering, an armature student of phonetics, that in six months; he can pass the flower girl off as a duchess at a fashionable garden party without suspecting anyone that Eliza is from lower social class. All these tasks done by him for the sake of Eliza show that there is another Higgins inside the rough one who is kind enough to deserve the well being of Eliza as well as of the whole humanity. These actions are also enough to confirm us all that he only doesn't hate Eliza but there is also the seeds of love for her which is continuously springing inside his heart.

Higgins assessment of Eliza provides an excellent example. Social identity, class, education, manners, socioeconomic background, accent these are the fields by which a Higgins can 'know' an Eliza in the society. Identity is merely an understanding of the self that suffers from an inability to resolve paradox. For instance, what should be done with an Eliza Doolittle whose new accent contradicts her economic status and her parentage? In such case, it becomes easier to ignore the duality than to readdress it. Eliza also does the same when she sees the duality in her identity. These all are the things in the play

which were taught to Eliza by her creator, Mr. Higgins. These things too, on the other side show the mutual relationship growing between Higgins and Eliza. But for the aesthetic value of his work of art i.e. Eliza, he repudiates the suggestion that the Higgins-Eliza relation was a marriageable one as indelicate and stupid. So, he leaves his artistic creation (Eliza) free and independent at the end of the play.

Pygmalion highlights the thoughtful, creative and Philosophical Eliza who has power to revolt against her creator. She has developed her sharp spirit to neglect her creator who is going to touch her moral character. She is conscious who speaks to gentleman without fear. The flower girl exhibits the same when she says: "I am not done anything wrong by speaking to the gentlemen. I have right to sell flowers if I keep off the keep. I'm a respectable girl, so help me. I never spoke to him except to ask to buy a flower off me" (10).

This dialogue uttered by Eliza shows that she is always conscious about her right in her society. The same consciousness leads her to marry Freddy instead of marrying her creator. And this consciousness of Eliza also leads to prove my assertion that the art is always free from its creator.

Thoughtfully, Eliza is very much sensitive to her character and morality. She goes to the home of Higgins to learn proper phonetics even she does not have enough money. She fearlessly speaks about her purpose with Higgins. She has taken Higgins as a good teacher with whom she has freedom to learn anything. She has taken him as a guardian. But, she finds the opposition. He never encourages her to learn anything but scolds rudely. This on the other hand helps Eliza to become more determined and search her selfhood in the society. This behavior of Higgins only helps to plant the seeds of anger in

Eliza's mind which is shown in the dialogue between these characters in the final act of the play.

Liza [*Snatching up the slippers, and hurling them at him one after the other with all the force*] There are your slippers. And there. Take your slippers; and may you never have a day's luck with them!

Higgins [*astounded*] What on earth-! [*He comes to her*]. Get up. [*He pulls her up*]. Anything wrong?

Liza [*breathless*] Nothing wrong- with you. I've won your bet for you, havnt I? That's enough for you. I don't matter, I suppose.

Higgins. You won my bet! You! Presumptuous insect! I won it. What did you throw these slippers at me for?

Liza. Because I wanted to smash your face. I'd like to kill you, you selfish brute. Why didn't you leave me where you picked me out of – in the gutter? You thank God it's all over, and that now you can throw me back again there, do you? [*She crimps her fingers frantically*].

Higgins [*looking at her in cool wonder*] the creature is nervous, after all.

Liza [*gives a suffocated scream of fury, and instinctively darts her nails at his face*]!!

Higgins [*Catching her wrists*] Ah! Would you? Claws in, you cat. How dare you show your temper to me? Sit down and be quiet. [*He throws her roughly into the easy- chair*]

Liza [*crushed by superior strength and weight*] Whats to become of me ?
Whats to become of me?

Higgins. How the devil do I know what's to become of you? What does it matter what becomes of you?

Liza. You don't care. I know you don't care. You wouldn't care if I was dead. I'm nothing to your- not so much as them slippers. (74-75)

In the same way, when a text goes to the market there lies no any sort of rights of the author to control over its meaning as Higgins is unable to control over his creation. The author has no responsibility either the text succeeds or fails in the market because the text when goes to the market has no relation with its Author. Like Barthes says that the text is produced and read so that the author distances himself from the text at every level, Eliza distances herself from her creator.

For Eliza, Knowledge and education are the private matter. In fact, the human beings are the tribute of nature. So, Shaw's concept is that human shouldn't impose unnecessary rules to human. As such, Eliza cannot endure the rough words of Higgins and she ignores him. When Higgins asks her about her marriage, she takes it as a private affair.

Shaw has presented Eliza with a thoughtful mind who does not like the sophisticated life. She takes Higgins as a child though he is matured. So, as the story of the play moves towards the resolution, she also criticizes Higgins as lacking manner in the society. This dislikeness of Higgins helps her to be very sensitive to every action.

Eliza doesn't like Higgins's scolding but wins the bet easily. It has earned the reputation of Higgins in the society. But he doesn't show any sign of encouragement or give prizes to her rather scolds her. Though inertly he likes Eliza, he doesn't show any sign and acts as if neglecting her. So, he has no manners and if we compare both of them,

Higgins doesn't suit with Eliza. Eliza though taken by her creator as a minor female is decorated with ideas and intellect.

Though, we can't see outwardly about the development of her ideas and intellect in her mind, it can be felt through her dialogue with Mrs. Higgins and her creator towards the end of the play.

Mrs. Higgins. The carriage is waiting is waiting, Eliza. Are you ready?

Liza. Quite. Is the professor coming?

Mrs Higgins. Certainly not. He cant behave himself in Church. He makes remarks out loud all the time on the Clergyman's pronunciation.

Liza. Than I shall not see you again, Professor. Goodbye. [*She goes to the door*]

Mrs Higgins [*coming to Higgins*] Goodbye, dear.

Higgins. Goodbye, mother. [*He is about to kiss her, when he recollects something*]. Oh, by the way, Eliza, order a ham and a stilten cheese, will you? And buy me a pair of reindeer gloves, number eights, and a tie to match that new suit of mine. You can choose the color. [*His cheerful, careless, vigorous, voice shows that he is incorrigible*]

Liza [*disdainfully*] Number eights are too small for you if you want them lived with lamb's wool. You have three new ties that you have forgotten in the drawer of your washstand. Colonel Pickering prefers double Gloucester to Stilton; and you don't notice the difference. I telephoned Mrs. Pearce this morning not to forget the ham. What you are to do without me I can't imagine. [*she sweeps out*]

In this dialogue Eliza becomes more determined and goes out by leaving her creator back. It may be also possible that Higgins might have earned fame and reputation by teaching Eliza in the society. But it was also his ultimate wish to possess his creation in his life which is not fulfilled.

In the Greek mythology, the play begins with a climatic moment in Pygmalion's life. Pygmalion has just finished an art work of absolute beauty that even arouses the wonder of the Gods themselves, Apollo and Venus who are omniscient voyeurs in the play.

The reference to Pygmalion in its original myth as possessing a godly gift is stressed over and over again throughout the play. Sometimes, he too, surpasses the Gods. At least Pygmalion is able to transcend his human confines and go beyond the prison-house of the body through art, whereas the Gods by virtue of their end-point divinity can not over-step their own transcends. Here both creator and created, artist and his work, enjoy each others company. Thus, art in the original Greek myth of this play is an uplifting of the human soul. This shows that the creator is able to maintain his possession over his creation throughout his life.

But in the Shavian Pygmalion, Henry Higgins, a professor of phonetics, who picks up a flower girl named Eliza Doolittle, teaches her fashionable language and manners and then successfully passes her off as a duchess. But she is a living being and cannot, therefore, be treated as a mere machine. At the same time, every girl has a right to be loved and Eliza loves and is loved by Freddy whom she marries. Professor Higgins remains an old bachelor.

As Barthes in his essay “The Death of the Author” says “. . . The modern scripiter is born at the same time as his text . . .” (1132), Higgins is also made popular by Eliza’s success in phonetics. But when Eliza left him alone, his existence also becomes futile and meaningless as he has no any sorts of right over Eliza’s life.

In the same way when a text is completed by the writer and it sleeps away from their hand, they also have affection with their creation i.e. the text. But in reality they have no right to control over their text and the readers are free to interpret and impart meaning as their wishes as Eliza is free to lead her life according to her will.

Higgins has taught Eliza phonetics and in return Eliza teaches the moral rules to Higgins. The intellectual female who has not negative conscience sees her teacher as a good guardian but not as her suitor. His mother too disregards Higgins as he is a female hater. If Eliza had loved the luxurious and sophisticated life, she could have adopted Higgins as her life partner. But she scolds both Higgins and Pickering and leaves for her freedom and independence. As Eliza is able to teach morality to her creator, in the same way the text is always giving some new ideas to its author. So they shouldn’t look for fame and popularity in return because they have no right over their text when the text goes in the market whatever is harvested by their labor, they should accept it happily.

In concluding point, every artist, writer or creator who sets out to fight ignorance is in a similar position with regards to his text, art or creation as Higgins was with regard to Eliza. He leads his creation towards a new way of life and is compelled to leave it at its threshold to go on by itself.

IV. Conclusion

In *Pygmalion*, Professor Higgins has completely transformed Eliza, she has become a refined Duchess of London. She is completely shattered when Higgins expresses his reality that he could not marry with her. In return she is also compelled to leave Higgins alone. She understands that she can live for higher things in her life. She can devote herself to learning and more creative purposes.

Higgins, on the other hand, refuses to make any compromise in his aesthetic achievements by marrying Eliza. He gives more priority to the aesthetic value of art than to his desire. This priority of aesthetic value of art helps to distance the line between Eliza and her creator Higgins. In consequence, Eliza goes away from her creator when she is complete and perfect. It happens so in the play because Higgins wants to preserve his art work from any decadence.

Eliza has her choices in her life. She can make a choice among Higgins, Pickering or Freddy as her suitor. But Higgins has no choices. It is so in the play because Eliza is the art or creation created by Higgins as an artist. So the art has choices when it is complete but the artist has no choices and he should face the reality that is to be separated from his own creation.

Higgins has taught not only the proper use of language to Eliza, but he is also able to rouse her social identity, education, manners, and socioeconomic background. She has been filled by her creator with the power to revolt against him. So, she leaves Higgins in the final episode of the play and marries Freddy.

At the end of the play, Eliza remains a choice, a thing, an object but she is not herself a subject. Her intention is not to master the world by mastering the word. Like in the myth, Eliza is a creation, an artwork and she is also the result of her master's aesthetic mind. So, there lies no possibility of personal relationship between her and her creator. And this act of separation between the creator and his creation helps to save the aesthetic value of the work of art.

Barthes and Foucault have rightly pointed out that the creation ultimately becomes free from its creator. There doesn't exist any kind of relationship between the creator and his creation. Both of their point is that the readers should not be bound by the writer or creator's background to impart the meaning.

So, Higgins is in the condition that is bound to leave his creation free. He shapes Eliza's personality and standard of phonetics to fight against ignorance and leads her to a new way of life. Though different critics have viewed this play wearing different spectacles, this act of leaving Eliza free and alone by Higgins helps to prove my contention that Higgins existence has become meaningless. Higgins just writes and romances through the inner text of phonetics and culture which is only transitory and is not able to maintain this romance with his creation till the end of the play.

Works Cited

- Barthes, Roland. "*The Death of the Author*", Image, Muric, Text. Trans. Stephen Heath.
New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- - -. S/Z. Trans. *Richard Miller*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.
- Berst, Charles A. *Bernard Shaw and The Art of Drama*, University of Illinois, Press
(Urbana) 1973.
- Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Crowley, Tony. "Uniform, Excellent, Common: Reflections on Standards in Language",
Language Sciences. 19.1 (1997).
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. 2nd Ed. Vol. V, New Delhi,
1998. (1106-11).
- Durbach, Errol. "Pygmalion: Myth & Anti-Myth in the Plays of Ibsen & Shaw", *English
Studies in African*. 21 (1978).
- Foucault, Michael. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New
York: Harper 1972.
- Gomel, Elana. "Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and the (UN) Death of the
Author", *Narrative*, Vol.12, No.1 (January 2004).
- Hinderson ,Archibold. *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century*. New York:
Appleton-Century – Corfts, Inc., 1956.
- Kennell, Vicki R. "*Pygmalion as Narrative Bridge Between the Centuries*", *The Annual
of Bernard Shaw Studies*, 2005, Vol. 25.
- MacCarthy, Desmond. *Pygmalion in Shaw*. London: Maegibbon and Kee, 1950.

Reynolds, Jean. *Pygmalion's Wordplay: The Postmodern Show*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1999), p.29.

Salama, Mohammad R. "*The Aesthetics of 'Pygmalion' in G.B. Shaw and Tawfis Al-Hakim: A Study of Transcendence and Decadence*", *Journal of Arabic Literature*, 2000, Vol.31, Issue 3, P. 222.

Starks, Lisa S. "*Educating Elisa: Fashioning the Model Woman in the 'Pygmalion Film'*", *Post Script* 16.2 (1997): 45.

Wyres, Frances. "*Unamuno and The Death of the Author*", *Hispanic Review*, Vol. 58, No.3 (summer, 1990), 325-346.