



A Postcolonial Reading of *Pygmalion*: A Play of 'Mimicry'

Samira Sasani

Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz University

Eram Sq. Shiraz, Iran

Postal code: 7194685115

E-mail: ssasani@shirazu.ac.ir

Received: 19-09-2014

Accepted: 17-11-2014

Published: 01-03-2015

doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.2p.238

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.2p.238>

Abstract

Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* portrays the mutually complex relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. *Pygmalion*, a mimicry play, shows how the mimicry strategy, proposed by Homi K. Bhabha, paradoxically functions as both resemblance and menace in the hands of the colonizer and the Other. Based on Homi K. Bhabha's theories, the Other employs the mimicry strategy either too perfectly or imperfectly as a sign of resistance to servitude; on the other hand, employing the colonial mimicry strategy, the colonizer desires a reformed recognizable Other as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite. This paper tries to show how Higgins, the colonizer, and Eliza, the colonized enter the Third Space in which no party has priority over the other; in which power relationships are reciprocal and their identities are mutually constructed. *Pygmalion* depicts an untenable situation in which both the colonizer and the colonized are entrapped.

Keywords: Identity construction, power relations, colonial mimicry strategy, Third Space

1. Introduction

Pygmalion is a play by George Bernard Shaw first published in 1912. *Pygmalion* mainly circles round three main characters: a flower girl named Eliza Doolittle and two bachelors, Mr. Higgins, Professor of Phonetics and Colonel Pickering. Mr. Higgins makes a bet that he can train the flower girl and that he can make a duchess out of her. The authoritative power Mr. Higgins imposes on the flower girl is very much reminiscent of the authoritative power the colonizer imposes upon the colonized. Amkpa (1999) argues: "*formal citizenship* or acknowledgement of our individuality and grouping offers the power of effective participation in mainstream society. Higgins, Pickering the aristocrats and their 'hangers on' are all acknowledged as full formal citizens of bourgeois society, whilst Eliza and Alfred Doolittle are informal citizens who can only be recognized when they have been assimilated into the dominant culture"" (297). In contrast to this white and black attitude towards the colonized and the colonizer, Bhabha's theory has wider implications and can be applied to the texts in which one party is treated as the Other, because of class distinction, nationality, race, or gender. The equation of power is so complex in these relationships that the very assumption of the straightforward exertion of power is not plausible as it is the case in this play in which the power structure is complex and the exertion of power from top to bottom, from Mr. Higgins to Eliza, or in other words, metaphorically, from the colonizer to the colonized, is not acceptable.

Homi K. Bhabha in his influential book, *The Location of Culture*, emphasizes the mutual power relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. In his view, the power scheme is not a straightforward exertion of power from top to bottom, from the colonizer to the colonized. He deconstructs the binary opposition, the rigid distinction between the colonizer/the colonized, the black/white, and superior/inferior. In other words, he deconstructs Edward Said's traditional notion of the way the colonizer straightforwardly treats the colonized as the Other, or the inferior.

Bhabha argues that the colonizer tries to internalize inferiority in the colonized and imposes "mimicry strategy"—he also calls it "sly civility"—onto it; while the colonizer, at the same time, is afraid of the reformed colonized. Bhabha highlights the anxiety of the colonizer and the agency of the colonized. The colonizer wants the colonized almost the same but not quite, Bhabha claims. Bhabha (1994) believes that "mimicry is at once resemblance and menace" (p. 123). Since becoming quite the same means that the colonizer's authentic identity is paradoxically imitable. Thus, the colonizer is troubled by the Other, the colonized, the colonizer's double.

On the other hand, the colonized exerts power on the colonizer and intimidates it. The colonized resists the colonizer with different resistance strategies. Ball (2003) maintains that Bhabha's ideas "show how colonial power relations inevitably generate resistance and inhibiting ambivalence as by-products of their discursive and administrative structures of control" (p.37). The colonized deliberately would not imitate the colonizer perfectly or imitates the colonizer too perfectly that it looks fake and artificial. The latter resistance strategy, exaggeration, as Huddart (2006) argues, means that "mimicry is repetition with difference, and so it is not evidence of the colonized's servitude" (p.39). Huddart (2006) argues: "Bhabha's close textual analysis finds the hidden gaps and anxieties present in the colonial situation. These points of textual anxiety mark moments in which the colonizer was less powerful than was apparent,

moments when the colonized were able to resist the dominance exercised over them. In short, Bhabha's work emphasizes the active *agency* of the colonized" (p.1). Likewise Gilbert and Tompkins (1996), in their well-known book: *Post-colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*, argue that some colonized subjects either abrogate the formal registers of the imposed language or some others employ words to a different purpose, this way they resist and try to "decenter the European hegemonic powers embedded in an imposed imperial language" (pp.165-166).

The colonizer tries to make the colonized aware of its difference from the colonizer. However, the benefit of this awareness is twofold; both the colonizer and the colonized understand themselves with the help of "Otherness". Iser (2007) stipulates: "Otherness turns into a mirror for self-observation, and such a relationship sets the process of self-understanding in motion, because the alien that is to be grasped realizes itself to the extent to which one's own dispositions come under scrutiny. The knowledge thus obtained is twofold: by getting to know what is different, one begins to know oneself" (p.36). M. A. R. Habib (2008) also notes that Hegel believes difference to be indispensable to the notion of identity (p.387). Hegel believes that, "identity has its nature beyond itself, in difference . . . identity and difference are inseparable" (Habib 2008, p.388). Based on Homi Bhabha's theory, the formation of the identities of the colonizer and the colonized is happened in the Third Space. Bhabha perceives: "the encounter of two social groups with different cultural traditions and potentials of power as a special kind of negotiation or translation", which "takes place in a Third Space of enunciation" (Ikas & Wagner 2009, p. 2).

2. Discussion

Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* beautifully shows these mutual and complex power relations between the colonizer and the colonized. *Pygmalion* starts while poor Eliza is sheltering from the rain. As the stage direction says, she is not a romantic figure; she is "eighteen, perhaps twenty, hardly older." (Shaw 1964, p. 8) Eliza is a poor girl, in shabby clothes: "she wears a shoddy black coat that reaches nearly to her knees and is shaped to her waist. . . . Her boots are much the worse for wear" (Shaw 1964, p.9). From the very beginning of the play, Eliza is considered as the "Other" because of her gender, appearance, weird accent, poverty and her social class.

While begging people to buy a flower from her, Eliza encounters The Note Taker, Higgins, and The Gentleman, Colonel Pickering. Being the phonetician, the Note Taker is able to distinguish where different people come from. Because of Eliza's weird accent he belittles her. Humiliated and treated as the "Other" by the Note Taker and the strangers, Eliza repeatedly says that she is a good and respectable girl. Preoccupied with her wounded feelings and humiliated by Higgins, Eliza contends that "he's [Higgins has] no right to take away my character. My character is the same to me as any lady's" (Shaw 1964, p. 14). Eliza wants to be treated like other ladies; she does not want to be treated as the "Other".

The Note Taker, Higgins, belittles Eliza for her weird accent, her social class, and her poverty and explicitly treats her as a servant. Higgins explicitly asks Eliza to leave the place they are standing, since her accent is depressing and disgusting; very overtly he tells her that with this accent, she has "no right to live" (Shaw 1964, p.16). Higgins boasts of his nation, of the canons and the great authors of his country, of Shakespeare, and Milton. The play's contexts and themes have connections with Bhabha's work. Little by little, as the relationship between these two characters grows, the complex "mimicry strategy" proposed by Bhabha, manipulates the relationship. Higgins, who is an adroit phonetician, employs the colonizer's strategy of "colonial mimicry desire". He bets that he can train Eliza and make a duchess out of her. Amkpa (1999) discusses: "From the outset Shaw provides a map of the relations of domination and subordination with Higgins and Pickering as the ideologues and technocrats of the dominant culture, and Eliza's body and mind as that whose subjectivity has to be dominated and objectified" (p. 294).

Higgins ostensibly wants to protect the colonized girl, Eliza and to improve her situation and to rescue her from her shabby life of living in the gutter. Wedeen (2013) sarcastically states that in "colonial and modernization discourses people have to move up the evolutionary ladder and become more 'civilized' before they can be free" (p.869). Higgins, very similarly, tells Eliza: "Yes, you squashed cabbage leaf, you disgrace to the noble architecture of these columns, you incarnate insult to the English language: I could pass you off as the Queen of Sheba" (Shaw 1964, p. 16).

As Edward Said believes, Higgins, as a colonizer, depreciates Eliza and addresses her as a liar who is essentially mean and in need of training. In contrast to Eliza, who is the colonized, Higgins is depicted, as the stage direction says, as "energetic, scientific type, heartily, even violently interested in everything that can be studied as a scientific subject" (Shaw 1964, p.21). Eliza, who becomes aware of her difference and her Otherness, who feels inferior because of her dreadful accent, decides to go to Higgins's house and asks him to teach her how to speak correctly with an elegant accent; in other words to teach her how to become like him. Higgins treated her disrespectfully and addresses her as "a baggage" (23). She is the Other in Higgins's eyes because of her odd accent, her poverty and her gender.

Higgins wants to project his own desires and fears onto the Other. What Eliza wants is totally different from what Higgins desires to project onto her. Eliza wants to be a lady in a flower shop instead of selling at the corner of Tottenham Court Road; for becoming such a lady, she understands that she should talk more genteel; otherwise as the Other, she cannot reach her goal. She wants to be almost the same, and because of her resistance she does not want to be quite the same, as Bhabha suggests. The colonizer, Bhabha declares, wants the colonized to be very much like him but not quite the same. In Bhabha's view, "colonial discourse wants the colonized to be extremely like the colonizer, but by no means identical" (Huddart 2006, p.40). Thus as Huddart (2006) says: "the play between equivalence and excess makes the colonized both reassuringly similar and also terrifying" (p.41).

In addition, as Bhabha stipulates, Eliza, as the Other, resists the authority of Higgins and tries to make him respect her and sees her from the equal stance, not higher. In the beginning, she feels half rebellious, half bewildered as a girl treated as the Other. However, Eliza from the very beginning is not completely submissive. She opposes Higgins not to be silly and not to treat her meanly and when Mrs. Pearce admonishes her not to talk to Higgins like that, she condemns Higgins in return and contends why he does not speak sensibly to her. She opposes Higgins why he behaves her as a father with a feeling of superiority. Higgins behaves her as if he is the authoritative power, the one who has the Eliza's future in his hands. Higgins treats her as his property. He cannot tolerate Eliza as she is. He articulates: "it's almost irresistible. She's so deliciously low—so horribly dirty—" (Shaw 1964, p.26). He fancies how he can make a duchess out of Eliza, a "draggletailed guttersnipe", as he calls her (Shaw 1964, p.26).

To make a duchess out of Eliza, Higgins asks Mrs. Pearce to burn her clothes which metaphorically and tacitly refers to his desire to change the other almost completely. Higgins not only works on her accent, language, and behavior, but he also works on her appearance to make a new character out of her; a new character which is assimilated with the mannerism of his own social class. Dasht Peyma (2009) maintains that colonizers usually impose their language onto the colonized, "coercing colonized people to speak the colonizers' tongue" (p.47). Eliza is made to simulate a duchess or as Bhabha proposes, to "mime" a duchess. Higgins justifies his purpose of training the girl: "I never had the slightest intention of walking over anyone. All I propose is that we should be kind to this poor girl. We must help her to prepare and fit herself for her new station in life" (Shaw 1964, p.26). The way he vindicates his purpose is very much like the way the colonizers justify their treatments towards the colonized, or generally speaking, towards the Others.

However, Mrs. Pearce, the essentialist colonizer, believes that it is impossible to change the characteristics of the Other. In other words, she assumes that Eliza has a fixed and established subaltern identity. She discourages Higgins from training and teaching Eliza, claiming that she is unchangeable and that she does not learn and understand anything, because she is the Other: "the matter is, sir, that you can't take a girl up like that as if you were picking up a pebble on the beach" (Shaw 1964, p.28).

Higgins intimidates Eliza; he puts her in a dilemma of choosing between being under the surveillance of the authoritative power and living in a good condition or living in a dilapidated condition; very much the same intimidating strategy employed by the colonizers to rule the colonized. She has no other choice than being thrown out or being treated as the subaltern; though both of them are the same. In other words, Higgins puts her in an untenable position; Eliza should choose between two undesirable conditions, in either of them she is treated as the Other and is the subaltern. Being entrapped in this situation, Eliza repeatedly articulates that she is a good girl to reduce the disparaging influences she got from Higgins, the so-called colonizer.

Higgins shrewdly tries to exploit the Other, Eliza, for the sake of his benefits. He does his best to change her totally to a duchess who speaks with pompous language and then after exploiting her, he spits her off. Gilbert and Topkins (1996) believe that "language is one of the most basic markers of colonial authority" (p.164). The only thing he is thinking about is himself at the cost of destroying the Other's life. He tries to assimilate Eliza's social class to his own social class by imposing the mimicry strategy on her. When he becomes successful to make Eliza internalize inferiority, Eliza, from then on, automatically mimes the language, manner, the costume and behavior of the colonizer to become like it. But this mimicry, as Bhabha believes, is not only a colonizing strategy imposed upon the colonized but also it can be considered as a threat for the colonizer and destroys the idea of his inaccessibly original identity. So simulation would be a threat to the colonizer and consequently the power relation between Higgins and Eliza is not as simple as Higgins conceives.

Higgins—in response to Mrs. Pearce's question about Eliza's future—says: "well, when I've done with her, we can throw her back into the gutter; and then it will be her own business again" (Shaw 1964, p. 30). But what he thinks is totally far from what happens in reality. Training the Other, and making her become like the colonizer, Higgins cannot treat Eliza like before; and this is exactly what the colonizer is intimidated from. Pickering also admonishes Higgins of what he is doing and its consequences:

Pickering: Excuse me, Higgins; but I really must interfere. Mrs. Pearce is quite right. If this girl is to put herself in your hands for six months for an experiment in teaching, she must understand thoroughly what she's doing.

Higgins: How can she? She's incapable of understanding anything. Besides, do any of us understand what we are doing? If we did, *would we ever do it?* (my emphasis, Shaw 1964, p. 31)

But Higgins heedlessly starts training the girl. He tempts the girl to accept his authority and her inferiority:

At the end of six months you shall go to Buckingham Palace in a carriage, beautifully dressed. If the King finds out yours not a lady, you will be taken by the police to the Tower of London, where your head will be cut off as a warning to other presumptuous flower girls. If you are not found out, you shall have a present of seven-and-sixpence to start life with as a lady in a shop. If you refuse this offer you will be a most *ungrateful wicked girl!*; and the angles will weep for you. (my emphasis, Shaw 1964, p. 32)

When Eliza is guided to her new room in Higgins' house, she cannot believe it; actually she thinks that she does not deserve it. Thus inferiority is so deeply internalized in her that she does not dare to touch anything in the room. She exclaims: "I couldn't sleep here, missus. It's too good for the likes of me. I should be afraid to touch anything. I aint a duchess yet, you know" (Shaw 1964, p. 33). This idea of inferiority has repeatedly dictated to her verbally and

practically by different people in the society; therefore the natural outcome of this treatment will be a girl who is emptied from within and thus is ready to be filled with whatever stuff the colonizer wills. Mrs. Pears, as part of the colonizing society of England, tells Eliza: "you can't be a nice girl inside if you're a dirty slut outside" (Shaw 1964, p. 33).

Alfred Doolittle, the so-called father of Eliza, tells Higgins: "the girl belongs to me. You got her" (Shaw 1964, p.40). He, very much like her daughter, assumes that he is the Other and has no voice and power to resist Higgins' infringement to take her daughter back, on one hand, and on the other hand, he is busy with mean and nasty activities which he presumes he deserves as the Other better than any other honorable job; thus he decides to get little money from Higgins for his abject expenditures at the cost of losing her daughter and selling her and his honor to the interloper. Bullying him, Higgins pretends that it is Alfred Doolittle who purposefully planned to blackmail him by sending his daughter to him. Alfred Doolittle, with a remarkably expressive voice which is the result of "a habit of giving vent to his feelings without reserve", as the stage direction says (Shaw 1964, p.39), stands with wounded honor and stern resolution in front of Higgins, the colonizer.

Doolittle with his melancholy tone tries to tell Higgins why he comes to Higgins' house but intimidated by Higgins, he cannot say the reason of his coming: "I will tell you, Governor, if you'll only let me get a word in. I'm willing to tell you. I'm wanting to tell you. I'm waiting to tell you" (40). Observing Doolittle's inability to articulate himself, Higgins, the colonizer, labels him a "sentimental rhetoric"; he belittles him and accuses him of dishonesty: "this chap has a certain natural gift of rhetoric. Observe the rhythm of his native woodnotes wild. . . . that's the Welsh strain in him. It also accounts for his mendacity and dishonesty" (Shaw 1964, p. 40).

Doolittle, very much like her daughter, undermines his identity while he is talking with snobbish Higgins. As the stage direction says, he has an expressive voice but when he confronts Higgins he demeans his dignity. Though he is introduced as a man who has voice and who articulates his discomfort and anxiety of the unfair moral standards of the middle and higher class of the society, when he confronts Higgins, and is treated as the Other, his voice is smothered and somehow he succumbs to his imitable authority. Higgins' identity is imitable as he himself also tacitly confirms it by persuading the Others, Eliza and his father, to imitate the upper social class standards. Thus, paradoxically he boasts of his superior identity distinguishing him from the Other and at the same time, he approves that it is achievable by imitation.

Though Doolittle understands Higgins and Pickering's deceitful game against him, he surrenders to their imitable power and concedes his own undeserving identity. Though he knows that he is a thinking man, he finds himself in a situation in which he has no other choice than succumbing to the authoritative power and ostensibly loses the game of power in which he is overtly treated as the Other: "I want a bit of amusement, cause I'm a thinking man. I want cheerfulness and a song and a band when I feel low. Well, they charge me just the same for everything as they charge the deserving. What is middle class morality? Just an excuse for never giving me anything. Therefore, I ask you, as two gentlemen, not to play that game on me. I'm playing straight with you. I ain't pretending to be deserving. I'm undeserving; and I mean to go on being undeserving. I like it; and that's the truth" (Shaw 1964, p. 44).

Higgins addresses Pickering and derides Doolittle: "if we were to take this man in hand for three months, he could choose between a seat in the Cabinet and a popular pulpit in Wales" (Shaw 1964, p. 44). The identity of the Other is shaped by the colonizer, on one hand, and on the other hand, the identity of the colonizer is shaped by the presence of the Other. Fanon (2008) asserts that: "Man is human only to the extent to which he tries to impose his existence on another man in order to be recognized by him. As long as he has not been effectively recognized by the other, that other will remain the theme of his actions. It is on that other being, on recognition by that other being, that his own human worth and reality depend. It is that other being in whom the meaning of his life is condensed" (pp.168-169).

The Other is not something outside or beyond the self, as the traditional Cartesian perspective would have it; rather, it is deeply implicated in and with the self (Türkkan 2011, p.369). *Pygmalion*, very well, depicts the colonized and the colonizer and the complex relationship between them. This play is not just the story of the power the colonizer exerted on the colonized and the way the colonized is shaped by the colonizer; this is half of the story and another half is related to the fears, desires, anxieties and uncertainties of the colonizer in his confrontation with the Other. Culler believes: "even the idea of personal identity emerges through the discourse of a culture: the "I" is not something given but comes to exist as that which is addressed by and related to others" (qtd. in Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin *Concepts* 2007, p.206). In other words, this play portrays the way the colonizer projects his fears and desires onto the Other and constructs its identity and the way the Other, mutually, shapes the colonizer'. Thus, it is not the subject that precedes desire. This is the desire that makes identification.

Eliza resists more than his father to the mimicry strategy imposed on her by Higgins. Doolittle believes that Eliza will soon pick up Higgins' "free-and-easy ways", but Eliza repudiates his father's sayings and tries not to succumb easily to Higgins' free-and-easy ways of living. She insists: "I'm a good girl, I am; and I won't pick up no free-and-easy ways" (Shaw 1964, p. 47). The difference between Eliza and her father, Doolittle, is that Doolittle is only familiar with the dilapidated colonizing strategies, while Eliza is one level a head and knows that Higgins is using a new stratagem playing with the Other's thoughts and feelings to internalize Otherness in it. To treat Eliza, Doolittle advises Higgins: "Governor, you do it yourself with a strap" (Shaw 1964, p. 47); in contrast with her father's licentious servitude, Eliza resists Higgins's colonial strategy and makes him call her Miss Doolittle. Eliza does not want to see Doolittle again; she assumes that he is a disgrace to her. Based on Bhabha's theory, the result of her resistance to Higgins' mimicry strategy, at the beginning of her training, is her imperfect simulation of Higgins' accent:

Higgins: . . . Say A, B, C, D.

Liza: [*almost in tears*] But I'm saying it. Ahyee, Bøyee, Cə-yee

Higgins: Stop. Say a cup of tea.

Liza: A cappətə-ee. (Shaw 1964, p.50)

Working on Eliza's accent and language for a long time, Higgins ultimately shows Eliza to his mother and introduces Eliza to her as a common flower girl whom he picked from a gutter. What Higgins, the colonizer, cannot cope with is his paradoxical feelings towards the Other, Eliza. "Colonial discourse at once demands both similarity and difference in the figures of the colonized", Huddart (2006) states (p.44). Higgins considers her as the Other and different from himself and his social class, and on the other hand, he has tried to assimilate her; he cannot cope with this paradoxical situation which is the source of his intimidation. Higgins always sees Eliza different; this is what colonial mimicry desires for: " a reformed recognizable Other, as a *subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite*" (original italics, Huddart 2006, p.40).

Higgins' desire for a reformed recognizable Other is one part of the story, and the other part is Eliza's resistance. She does not become quite the same as the domineering power. Because of her resistance her pronunciation is either too good to be believed—and also to some extent seems ridiculous—or still with some differences from the authentic language she is assimilated. Huddart (2006) maintains: "this mimicry is also a form of mockery, and Bhabha's post-colonial theory is a comic approach to colonial discourse" (p.39). On the other hand, Eliza, as the Other, is willing to learn the authentic language and tries to assimilate quickly. This is the complex relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, Bhabha refers to. Higgins as a colonizer is not satisfied; though he has won the bet and this is the paradoxical situation the colonizer encounters, very much like the paradoxical situations the colonized encounters in its mutual relationship with the colonizer. Eliza desires to be like her master and paradoxically she resists:

Higgins: . . . I shall win my bet. She has a quick ear, and she's been easier to teach than my middle-class pupils because she's had to learn a complete new language. She talks English almost as you talk French.

Mrs. Higgins: That's satisfactory, at all events.

Higgins: Well, it is and it isn't.

Mrs. Higgins: What does that mean?

Higgins: You see, I've got her pronunciation all right; but you have to consider not only how a girl pronounces, but what she pronounces. (Shaw 1964, p. 53)

The reformed recognizable Other, Eliza, enters the room where Mrs. Higgins and other people are gathering. She behaves in a way that she is remarkably different. As the stage direction shows "Eliza, who is exquisitely dressed, produces an impression of such remarkable distinction and beauty as she enters that they all rise, quite fluttered. . . . she comes to Mrs. Higgins with studied grace" (Shaw 1964, p. 57). She speaks with pedantic correctness of pronunciation and great beauty of tone which makes her almost the same, but not quite. Her too much artificial care and consideration in her language and behavior make her different from others. Therefore, as Bhabha emphasizes, too much assimilation is the emblem of her difference from others. She has gone so much to extreme in her appearance, language, and accent that she looks different, fake, and somehow ridiculous as the reformed Other.

Though Eliza has changed a lot, Higgins treats her as the Other, as the subject of difference who is almost the same but not quite. Mrs. Higgins wonders on what terms Eliza should still live with Higgins and Pickering if she has got all the required lessons by Higgins. For Higgins, teaching Eliza is one facet of the many-sided prism of his colonizing project. He looks at Eliza, the Other, as a doll in his hands. Higgins' mother admonishes him of his indecent attitude towards the girl, but for Higgins, Eliza is like an object he manipulates. Higgins is only thinking about his benefits at the cost of exploiting the Other. He responds his mother's reprehension: "I've had to work at the girl every day for months to get her to her present pitch. Besides, she's *useful*. She knows where my things are, and remembers my appointments and so forth" (my emphasis, Shaw 1964, p.63).

Higgins has entered a "third space", very much like Eliza. He does not merely look at Eliza from a domineering position, top to bottom, and does not merely project all his fears, and desires onto Eliza, the Other. On the other hand, the Other becomes very much like him and threatens his foundations of authority. Based on "The Third Space" theory of Bhabha, "minority groups in the metropolises—marginals within the center—adumbrate a third rhetorical space that disrupts and destabilizes centralized authority" (Huggan 2001, p.21). Higgins is looked at from the Other's point of view who is now standing beside him abreast. "The colonized returns the colonizer's gaze", Huddart (2006) maintains (p.45). The Other is equally able to project her own fears and desires onto the colonizer whose authenticity is accessible and imitable.

In addition, this paradoxical situation also happens to the Other and she enters the Third Space in which she has wished to reach; it was the Other's wish to become like the colonizer who is presumably better than the Other. The Other very well imitates, because of her strong motivation. Accordingly, Higgins suggests Pickering to take Eliza to the Shakespeare exhibition at Earls Court since "She'll mimic all the people for us when we get home", Higgins advises (Shaw 1964, p.66). But as the Other, she resists the domineering power of the colonizer by not completely copying his accent or by going ridiculously to extreme which is the emblem of her imperfect acceptance of those standards imposed

on her in the form of colonial mimicry desire. Or as Bhabha (1994) argues, in *The Location of Culture*, "the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference" (p.122).

Higgins believes that he has invented new Eliza, by teaching Eliza, dressing Eliza; "she regularly fills our lives up", Higgins states (Shaw 1964, p.64). Higgins' argument with his mother reinforces the colonial mimicry desire proposed by Bhabha: "but you have no idea how *frightfully interesting* it is to take a human being and change her into a quite different human being by creating a new speech for her. It's filling up the deepest gulf that separates class from class and soul from soul" (my emphasis, Shaw 1964, p. 64). Higgins invents a new Eliza but he is frightened to accept that she is the same, with the same power. If he accepts her as quite the same, he will destroy his own identity. In other words if he accepts her as equal, he tacitly approves that his identity is not authentic but imitable. Thus he projects his fears onto the Other, Eliza, by still treating her as the Other.

On the due date, Eliza goes to the garden party along with Pickering and Higgins. If she could behave appropriately, she passes as a princess. Pickering and Higgins are nervous but Eliza ensures them that she can overcome the restless situation and pass the trial. Paradoxically the reformed recognizable Other spuriously and exaggeratedly behaves as a duchess. Eliza is truly the fruit of colonial mimicry desire; she is almost the same as the dominant agency, but not quite. In other words, new identity is not internalized in her; she may forget it. In the party she tells Pickering: "I am in a dream now. Promise me not to let Professor Higgins wake me; for if he does I shall forget everything and talk as I used to in Drury Lane" (Shaw 1964, p. 68).

As the stage direction shows, she speaks English and behaves too perfectly to be believed: "she is so intent on her ordeal that she walks like a somnambulist in a desert instead of a debutante in a fashionable crowd" (Shaw 1964, p. 69). However, Higgins' pupil's recognition of her fraudulent identity, which is because of Eliza's too impeccable performance, reinforces the idea of the Other's resistance and reluctance to imitate the colonizer entirely. Eliza, who is entering the Third Space, says: "I dont think I can bear much more. The people all stare so at me. And old lady has just told me that I speak exactly like Queen Victoria. I am sorry if I have lost your bet. I have done my best; but *nothing can make me the same as these people*" (my emphasis, Shaw 1964, p. 71). Nepommuck, Higgins' formerly pupil, truly understands that she is a fraud:

Hostess: . . . She speaks English perfectly.

Nepommuck: *Too perfectly*. Can you shew me any English woman who speaks English as it should be spoken? *Only foreigners who have been taught to speak it speak it well*.

Hostess: Certainly she terrified me by the way she said How d'ye do. I had a school mistress who talked like that; and I was mortally afraid of her. (my emphasis, Shaw 1964, p.70)

Higgins, who treats Eliza as the Other even to the end of the play, confirms Pickering's sayings about Eliza's learning ability. Higgins practically demonstrates that he believes in the congenital inferiority of the Other, though he verbally affirms Pickering's saying. Pickering acclaims Eliza's performance at the garden party: "Eliza was doing it so well. You see, lots of the real people cant do it at all: theyre such fools that they think style comes by nature to people in their position; and so they never learn" (Shaw 1964, p.74). Higgins cannot forget Eliza's Otherness; when the garden party finishes and he wins the bet, everything finishes for him. Eliza is nothing, just a doll in his hands; an object which he has shrewdly exploited.

Getting to this point and understanding her true identity in the eyes of the colonizer, Eliza furiously flings herself on the floor and protests to Higgins' brutal treatment towards her. It is for the first time that Higgins sees her real rage and fury. "*looking at her in cool wonder*", Higgins astonishingly says: "the creature is nervous after all" (original italics, Shaw 1964, p. 75). Eliza contends that she is nothing to him, "not so much as them slippers" (Shaw 1964, p. 75). Both Eliza, the Other, and Higgins, the colonizer, are in the Third Space. No one has the absolute power. None of them are satisfied with the situation; the relationship is not desirable for any of these two parties. As the stage direction says: "Eliza hopeless and crushed. Higgins a little uneasy" (Shaw 1964, p.75). Accordingly, Huddart (2006) claims: "when the relationship between self and other seems to be one of domination, the fact that there is a relationship at all suggest that domination is not total" (p.46).

Eliza is dangling between two identities. Bhabha employs Lacan's psychoanalytic concept, "camouflage" referring to "blending in with something in the background that none the less is not entirely there itself" (Huddart 2006, p.46). Befuddled, Eliza addresses Higgins: "what am I fit for? What have you left me fit for? Where am I to go? What am I to do? Whats to become of me?" (Shaw 1964, p. 76). Or in another place she says: "I sold flowers. I didnt sell myself. Now you've made a lady of me I'm not fit to sell anything else. I wish youd left me where you found me." (Shaw 1964, p. 77); "you told me, you know, that when a child is brought to a foreign country, it picks up the language in a few weeks, and forgets its own. Well, I am a child in your country. I have forgotten my own language, and can speak nothing but yours", Eliza stipulates (Shaw 1964, p. 94).

Higgins' plan to change Eliza, or as he says to invent a new Eliza, leaves nothing for her; even her clothes are burnt which is symbolically telling of losing her previous identity. Eliza feels happy when Higgins acknowledges that it is she who has hit him and wounded him to the heart. Eliza—"thrilling with hidden joy", as the stage direction says—acknowledges: "I'm glad. Ive got a little of my own back, anyhow" (original italics, Shaw 1964, p. 79). Thus, it is not only Eliza, but also Higgins who is hurt in this mutual colonizer-colonized relationship.

Hurting Higgins and getting hurt by him, Eliza decides to elope with Freddy. She goes to Mrs. Higgins' house and tells her the whole story. Meanwhile, Doolittle, Eliza's father, who is now a wealthy man, comes to Mrs. Higgins' house to complain to her about her son, Higgins. Doolittle protests to Higgins who has ruined his happiness and who has tied him up and delivered him into the hands of middle class morality which he abhors. Higgins not only destroys Eliza by employing the colonial mimicry strategy but he has also ruined her father, Doolittle, with the same strategy. Writing a letter to a friend and introducing Doolittle as the most original moralist in England, Higgins has destroyed Doolittle by changing his previous identity and still keeping him as the Other, as the reformed recognizable Other, who is almost the same but not quite.

The same thing happens to Doolittle, the Other, by Higgins, the colonizer. Like other colonizers, he wants the Other to be almost the same but not quite and this is the cause of rage and anger in Eliza and her father, Doolittle. Both Eliza and her father are not the subservient characters totally manipulated by Higgins. They both oppose his mimicry strategy which holds them back from getting quite the same. On the other hand, imitating the domineering population is the desire of the Other, while based on the Other's resistance strategy, it does not desire to become quite the same; it exceeds and becomes too perfect or resorts to imperfect imitation. Doolittle who is innately articulate, as the stage direction says, retrieves his voice and very much like her daughter opposes Higgins' colonial mimicry desire: "who asks him [Higgins] to make a gentleman of me? I was happy. I was free. I touched pretty nigh everybody for money when I wanted, same as I touched you, Enry Iggins. Now I am worried; tied neck and heels; and everybody touches me for money. . . . I have to live for others and not for myself: thats middle class morality" (Shaw 1964, p. 87).

The cause of Doolittle's opposition to Higgins is his resistance to servitude as the Other. As the Other, Doolittle does not want to be quite the same. This is the desire of both the colonizer and the colonized. Huddart (2006) emphasizes that "the desire is not only the desire of the colonized but clearly also that of the colonizer" (p.44). Doolittle feels "intimidated: thats what I am. Broke. Bought up. Happier men than me will call for my dust, and touch me for their tip; and I'll look on helpless, and envy them. And thats what your son has brought me to" (Shaw 1964, p. 88). Very much like her father, Eliza, the Other has "attached" to Higgins (Shaw 1964, p. 89); and at the same time she opposes to him by throwing Higgins' slippers in his face.

She is the cause of change of Higgins, though temporarily; Higgins promises his mother to behave himself perfectly when he meets Eliza, though this is very hard for him to accept her assimilation: "I have created this *thing* out of the squashed cabbage leaves of Covent Garden; and now she *pretends* to play the fine lady with me" (Shaw 1964, p.92). In another place Higgins surprisingly asks Eliza: "you never asked yourself, I suppose, whether *I* could do without you" (Shaw 1964, p.98). Huddart's (2006) saying well supports Higgins' confession: "colonial authority is menaced by the colonized to the extent that it utterly depends on the colonized for its sense of itself" (p.61).

Eliza acclaims Pickering and calls him the cause of her imitation and her real education. It was because of him, that she decides to imitate the upper class people. Pickering has called her, Miss. Doolittle and this sparkles the idea of imitation in her mind; she tells Pickering: "the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how she is treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, . . . but I know I can be a lady to you, because you always treat me as a lady. And always will" (Shaw 1964, p.93-94). Notwithstanding Higgins' mimicry strategy, Higgins reaches the Third Space, he learns from Eliza, the Other. He humbly and gratefully confesses to Eliza: "I have learnt something from your idiotic notions. . . . And I have grown accustomed to your voice and appearance. I like them, rather" (Shaw 1964, p.98).

At this stage, becoming almost similar but not quite, and being still dependent on his father and Higgins, Eliza desolately cries out: "I'm a slave now, for all my fine clothes" (Shaw 1964, p. 100) and again she deliberately turns back to the earlier stages of learning language—when she had many grammatical mistakes—as a sign of resistance to servitude. Higgins wants to correct her but she does not accept him as her teacher anymore. She also prefers to marry Freddy who is poor and weak, since he can make her happier than her betters who bully her, she contends (Shaw 1964, p.101). She confesses: "I know I'm common ignorant girl, and you a book-learned gentleman" but she does not want to be dirt under Higgins' feet (Shaw 1964, p.102).

Higgins, the essentialist, disparages Eliza, the Other, who wants to be independent and not in the hands of the colonizer. As an essentialist colonizer, Higgins believes in the innate inferiority of the Other, whatever it would be. In reaction to Eliza's resistance, he belittles Eliza: "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 raining or any work" (Shaw 1964, p. 102). The relationship between Higgins, the essentialist colonizer and Eliza, the Other, is a mutually dependent relationship. Both of them paradoxically desire this dependency and both are afraid of it. Huddart (2006) articulates "colonialism is marked by a complex economy of identity in which colonized and colonizer depend on each other" (p.2). Higgins does not want the Other to be quite the same and if so, it intimidates the colonizer, as Bhabha proposes.

3. Conclusion

Eliza is a threat to Higgins—as his colonial double—when she reveals that she will be independent and will be a teacher of phonetics like Higgins and will be an assistant of Higgins' formerly pupil, Nepommuck. The Other intimidates the colonizer by reminding him that she is the same and that she has well assimilated: "what a fool I was not to think of it before! You cant take away the knowledge you gave me. You said I had a finer ear than you. And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can" (Shaw 1964, p. 103). Higgins is intimidated and he cannot tolerate it: "teach him my methods! My discoveries! You take one step in his direction and I'll wring your neck" (Shaw 1964, p. 103). Eliza

who is almost the same as Higgins, ultimately decides not to marry him; since she is as powerful as he is: "it is truth everywhere in evidence that strong people, masculine or feminine, not only do not marry stronger people, but do not shew any preference for them in selecting their friends." (Shaw 1964, p. 108)

Intimidated by Eliza's being quite the same, Higgins satirically talks to her from equal or lower standpoint: "five minutes ago you were like a millstone round my neck. Now you're a tower of strength: a consort battleship. You and I and Pickering will be three old bachelors together instead of only two men and a silly girl" (Shaw 1964, p. 104). *Pygmalion* truly satirizes the ambivalent colonial power relationships. *Pygmalion* satirically depicts how the identities of the colonizer and the colonized are blurred. *Pygmalion* is a play of mimicry' it is a satiric play. Satire, Rabb (2007) argues: "examine [s] national, historical, or ethnic identity. . . . [it] bring[s] objects of fear or danger into our midst by blurring the distinction between the broom and the dirt it sweeps, between us and them, or self and other" (p.582).

References

- Amkpa, A. (1999). Drama and Language of Postcolonial Desire: Bernard Shaw's 'Pygmalion'. *Irish University Review*. 29 (2), 294-304.
- Ashcroft, B., G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin. (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: Key Concepts*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ball, J. C. (2003). *Satire and the Postcolonial Novel*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Dasht Peyma, N. (2009). *Postcolonial Drama: A Comparative Study of Wole Soyinka, Derek Walcott and Girish Karnad*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
- Fanon, F. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks*. (C. L. Markmann, Trans.) London: Pluto Press (Original work published 1952).
- Gilbert, H., & J. Tompkins. (1996). *Post-colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Habib, M. A. R. (2008). *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory: Form Plato to Present*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Huddart, D. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha*. New York: Routledge.
- Huggan, G. (2001). *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. New York: Routledge.
- Ikas, K., and G. Wagner. (2009). Introduction. In K. Ikas & G. Wagner, (Eds.). *Communication in the Third Space*. (PP. 1-7). New York: Routledge.
- Iser, W. (2007). *How to Do to Theory*. Singapore: Blackwell.
- Rabb, M. A. (2007). The Secret Life of Satire. In R. Quintero (Ed.). *A Companion to Satire*. (pp. 568-584). Malden: Blackwell.
- Shaw, B. (1964). *Pygmalion*. Edinburgh: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd.
- Türkkän, S. (2011). Other/Alterity. In G. Castl. (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Literary and Cultural Theory*. Vol. I, (pp. 369-372). Malden, M.A: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wedeen, L. (2013). Ideology and Humor in Dark Times: Notes from Syria. *Critical Inquiry*. 39 (4), 841-873.