

## The Pygmalion myth in Ovid's "Metamorphoses" and William Schwenk Gilbert's "Pygmalion and Galatea"

*Pavlo Shopin*

*Doctor of Philosophy,  
Assistant Professor in the Department of Applied Linguistics,  
Comparative Language Studies and Translation  
Mykhailo Drahomanov State University of Ukraine  
(8–14 Turhenivska Str. (5 th Floor, Room 5–12), Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine);  
email: pavloshopin@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8022-5327>*

This article examines the ambivalent nature of the Pygmalion myth in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and William Schwenk Gilbert's *Pygmalion and Galatea* (1870). The versions of the myth in Ovid and Gilbert are regarded as attempts at demythologization, which paradoxically introduce their own mythology. The author argues that the myth serves as both a reality and an illusion for the protagonists, blurring the lines between critical knowledge and mythological worldview. Drawing on conceptual metaphor theory, the author suggests that the Pygmalion myth can be regarded as an allegory within the cognitive paradigm of embodied realism, and the unconscious metaphor behind the myth presents the metamorphosis as rationally explainable yet resistant to critical thinking. The article delves into Pygmalion's mythical consciousness, highlighting his self-deception and the dialectic between animation and petrification. In Ovid, Pygmalion's mastery achieves a perfect delusion. He believes in the possibility of animating his statue because it is so life-like. The original story - as we know it from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* - treads the line between a miracle and self-delusion. After Ovid, its nature has remained ambivalent over the centuries. Gilbert demythologizes the myth by allowing it to become authentic reality. Pygmalion's dream is realized to reveal its paradoxical consequences, which change the phantasmagoria of animation into a waking nightmare. The dialectic of the myth is realized through legitimating the magical act of creation and challenging its ramifications. Animation is possible in its initial stage, but the education and socialization of Galatea seemingly fail. The only way out of this predicament appears to be the reverse act of petrification. Pygmalion's illusion has to come full circle in order to restore the balance. The article concludes that the understanding of the Pygmalion myth requires balancing between mythologizing and demythologizing, knowing and not-knowing.

**Key words:** metaphor, mythologization and demythologization, animation and petrification, Pygmalion and Galatea, Ovid, William Schwenk Gilbert.

**Introduction.** This article argues that the Pygmalion myth in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and in *Pygmalion and Galatea* (1870) by William Schwenk Gilbert is paradoxical: it is reality for the protagonists, and yet it also becomes an illusion and a miracle. Creativity, as well as the reader's ability to suspend judgement and experience the work in the mode of not-knowing [1; 4], achieves a controversial balance between critical knowledge and mythological worldview.

The Pygmalion myth can be regarded as an allegory within the cognitive paradigm of embodied realism. The theoretical premise of my exploration of the Pygmalion myth is consonant with George Lakoff and Mark Turner's contention that myth is an unconscious metaphor which makes human reasoning possible [13, p. 215]. The conceptual metaphor theory [12] will be used to ascertain what kind of mythology is created by Ovid and Gilbert in their interpretation of the Pygmalion myth. (Petro Denysko offers an incisive criticism of this theory in his 2021 monograph *Insight. Visual and Multimodal Metaphors in Painting, Sculpture, Cinema, and Other Visual Arts* [3].) It remains to be demonstrated that the unconscious metaphor behind the myth presents the metamorphosis as rationally

explainable, which gives rise to mythical consciousness, and – because reason itself is largely metaphorical – cannot be eliminated by critical thinking. Although the dialectical approach to the Pygmalion myth as both a real miracle – a myth in itself – and as a delusion and unconscious metaphor is distinct from Lakoff and Johnson's cognitive relativism [11], it resonates with the argument about the omnipresence of myths, their persistence in time, and the paradoxical nature of mythical consciousness.

Pygmalion is an artist and an educator; but in both cases the analyses of the texts will first and foremost highlight his mythical consciousness, which enables subjective perception to realize the miracle of animation. As long as Pygmalion considers himself to be capable of rationally explaining the miracle and assuming the role of the dominant subject, he risks becoming a slave to mythology and instrumental reason. Here I follow Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer in arguing that the Pygmalion myth describes a subject–object relationship where “man's domination over himself, which grounds his selfhood, is almost always the destruction of the subject in whose service it is undertaken” [9, p. 54]. Pygmalion's attempts to produce a miracle are efforts to gain power over his creation. To reach his goal, Pygmalion is ready

to resort to mythology; but eventually he might realize that his domination and omnipotence are a mere illusion.

In Ovid, Pygmalion's mastery achieves a perfect delusion: "ars adeo latet arte sua" [16, p. 82]. He believes in the possibility of animating his statue because it is so life-like (the trope of the living statue has been extensively studied by Kenneth Gross in his monograph *The Dream of the Moving Statue* [7]). The original story – as we know it from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* – treads the line between a miracle and self-delusion. After Ovid, its nature has remained ambivalent over the centuries. One can even posit an assumption that it has always been controversial in its animating the inanimate.

For Adorno and Horkheimer, as well as for Lakoff and Turner, mythology is not historically superseded by rationality but constitutes human experience of reality and is common in everyday life. Hence it is reasonable to consider the modern versions of Pygmalion as variants of a myth [17; 18; 19], in spite of the fact that most comparative studies tend to view Pygmalion as a theme or a story [5; 10; 20].

This exploration of the Pygmalion myth is intended to show how mythology is problematized in literary works. By way of close reading of the modern versions of the Pygmalion myth, I will be looking for moments in the text which complicate its reception, finding instances of subject-object relationship, and recognizing the underlying metaphors of animation and Pygmalion's subjectivity. The choice of primary sources is motivated, above all, by the task of unravelling the dialectic of the Pygmalion myth. Ovid is a necessary introduction. Gilbert's *Pygmalion and Galatea* (1870) will help to elucidate the process of alienation of the object and Galatea's paradoxical petrification.

**The Pygmalion Myth in Ovid.** The origin of the Pygmalion myth in art is found in Ovid [16, pp. 81–85], and already this text presents the dialectic of myth and enlightenment. Ovid's version of Pygmalion is one of the myths sung by Orpheus, who is mourning the loss of his beloved Eurydice and renounces the love of women. The preceding story is about the Propoetides, who "dared to deny the divinity of Venus" [16, p. 81] by prostituting themselves outside the temple. They lost shame and the ability to blush, as "the blood of their faces hardened" [16, p. 81]. In punishment, they were turned into stone "with but small change" [16, p. 81]. Just like Orpheus, Pygmalion is a misogynist: he creates his statue as he sees the Propoetides and is "disgusted with the faults which in such full measure nature had given the female mind" [16, pp. 81–83]. It appears to be unreasonable and even counterproductive to make a statue when other women have become stone [15, p. 3]. However, Pygmalion's statue is snow-white, i.e. it metaphorically possesses the quality of purity and innocence in contrast to the shameless Propoetides.

The figure is carved out of ivory "with wondrous art" [16, p. 83], which gives the statue supernatural beauty "qua femina nasci / nulla potest" [16, p. 82], and Pygmalion falls in love with his own creation. The statue is Pygmalion's child, for he is its sole creator. Thus, his love for the figure is a transgression, an act full of autoeroticism and narcissism [15, p. 6]. The sexual motive is most salient in the story, and Pygmalion's incestuous passion has as its outcome the punishment in the form of breaking down Pygmalion's lineage and Venus's falling in love with mortal Adonis.

In the first part of the story, Pygmalion achieves a perfect deception. His art does not imitate nature but is a product of his imagination. Pygmalion's adoration of the statue brings it to life. We learn that the statue has the face of "a real maiden, whom you would think living and desirous of being moved" [16, p. 83]. The art so well conceals its art that Pygmalion believes his statue to be alive: "ars adeo latet arte sua" [16, p. 82]. He is either "a great craftsman" [14, p. 206] or a deceived deceiver. His work has to be absolutely perfect to make Pygmalion desire his creation. At first, the reader views the scene from the perspective of Pygmalion, who ardently gives himself in to the illusion of the statue's animation; and the text unfolds the process of self-deception.

Pygmalion's senses deceive the artist. He feels the statue with his hands (Melissa Haynes, in her recent article, offers an insightful analysis of the relational nature of this haptic aesthetic [8]) and does not "confess it to be ivory" [16, p. 83]. He kisses the statue and imagines that his kisses are returned. The sensuous, erotic side of the story is played out as reality in his imagination. While the statue is still ivory, Pygmalion speaks to it and "addresses it with fond words of love" [16, p. 83]. He touches her and fears to leave bruises on her skin. Pygmalion "brings it gifts pleasing to girls" [16, p. 83], dresses the statue in robes and adorns it with rings and a necklace. The climax of demythologizing the myth is reached when the narrator (Orpheus) tells us that Pygmalion lays the statue in his bed and "calls it the consort of his couch" [16, p. 83]. Pygmalion speaks to the statue, and his voice envelops it in the amorous fabric of mythical consciousness. However, the statue is mute, and Pygmalion's actions seem to be comic to an outsider. From the point of view of Pygmalion, these are the happiest moments of self-indulgent imagination. The power of deception can be ruined by the subject's doubt, but Pygmalion suspends disbelief and ventures to realize his dream. The reader is unable to see why Pygmalion deceives himself, just as he is unable not to empathize with Pygmalion and inevitably imagines the statue come to life. This paradox cannot be resolved but should be experienced as the true beauty of the story: its balance between knowing and not-knowing, myth and critical thought.

The realization of Pygmalion's illusion comes through a sacrifice. Pygmalion offers a sacrifice to Venus and prays to the gods to give him a maiden like the ivory figure. He does not dare articulate his dream. Muteness of the myth – its opposition to voice – reserves imagination as its true realm. In later stories,

the sacrifice will be internalized, but in Ovid it presents itself without the fear of being criticized, as the myth justifies the sacrifice and bestows the powers on the goddess who eventually animates the statue in the literal sense.

In the second part of the story, the statue comes to life while Pygmalion cannot believe his senses, and his adoration turns into petrification of his self. First, he touches the statue, and she only seems to be warm. Then the ivory becomes soft, and its hardness disappears: “the ivory grew soft to his touch and, its hardness vanishing, gave and yielded beneath his fingers” [16, p. 85]. Surprisingly, human flesh is once again reified through its comparison with wax, which is “easily shaped to many forms and becomes usable through use itself” [16, p. 85]. Disbelief and doubt infest Pygmalion’s imagination. Warmth and softness are not reliable for Pygmalion, although they are constitutive of our experience of human body, i.e. they can metonymically stand for the animate nature of the statue. For a brief moment, he does not trust his senses once again: “The lover stands amazed, rejoices still in doubt, fears he is mistaken, and tries his hopes again and yet again with his hand” [16, p. 85]. The lover is petrified by amazement, and his making the figure usable by the use itself alludes to onanistic repetition of a narcissist. At last he again gives in to the reality of the image of animation and believes his senses. Remember how the Propoetides could not blush and hence were not even perceived as alive. For mythical consciousness in the Pygmalion story, blush is not only shame, but also life. Thus, when the statue comes to life, she blushes. Her blush is the human nature which Pygmalion recognizes. This time the reader also believes in the transformation and consciously empathizes with Pygmalion. Both Pygmalion and the reader see a miracle, a myth reinstalled and simultaneously doubted. Pygmalion’s voluntary self-deception in the first part of the story and his disbelief in the miracle in the second contrast starkly and appear to be an illusion. Paradoxically, the reality of the true transformation is less real for Pygmalion than his initial self-deception.

Pygmalion endows the statue with his own power but does not see the other in it. He loves the statue, and she becomes his lover. There is almost no subjectivity in the animated statue. She is neither identical with, nor independent from Pygmalion because she is his creation. Even animated, she is mute, nameless, and her position in relation to Pygmalion is inferior: when she comes to life, she sees “the sky and her lover at the same time” [16, p. 85]. The spatial orientation of the animated figure is highly meaningful. She is looking up at Pygmalion who is *above* her and hence assumes the role of the dominant subject. Otherness of the statue and its total appropriation by Pygmalion create the tension which will be explored in later works. Pygmalion’s act of animation can be seen as an act of sublimation in the first part of the

story, but the true animation comes as authentic reality, i.e. the myth as it is. The reader and Pygmalion change places at the second stage of animation: Pygmalion cannot believe the reality of the myth, whereas the reader knows that his wish has been granted by the goddess. Finally, Pygmalion is persuaded in the reality of the myth, and the reader recognizes the mythical nature of the metamorphosis.

The fact that the reader perceives the story from the point of view of Pygmalion is crucial for the animation of the statue. If the myth is treated as a metaphor for creative process, the animation of the work of art rests on the ability to imagine things, to empathize with Pygmalion’s delusion and truly see the bright and picturesque reality of the myth. In itself, the myth is absolutely impenetrable to analytic thought and relies on our ability to relive it together with Pygmalion. Consequently, a blush is literally a feeling of shame and life, and softness is not a symbol or a sign of life, but life itself. Such direct experience is possible only due to mythical consciousness. Nonetheless, this absolute mythology has already been rendered impossible by Ovid himself. The text does not allow one to give in to the illusion of animation. Conversely, even the reader who analytically demythologizes the story and scrutinizes every unconscious metaphor to separate the tenor and vehicle cannot escape animating the statue in his imagination. The dialectic between mythologizing and demythologizing, knowing and not-knowing, animation and petrification is present already in Ovid, and the ambiguous and narcissistic subject in his text dominates over the object and simultaneously enslaves his own self in the act of self-deception.

**The Curse of Animation in Gilbert.** William Schwenck Gilbert’s *Pygmalion and Galatea* (1870) combines Victorian comedy with the personal tragedy of Galatea, which can be discerned only if the spectator views the play through the eyes of the animated statue. Its message for the Victorian audience could have been the necessity of the lie courteous [10, p. 105], but I am interested in the dynamic of the animation process and in Galatea’s experience of being normalized by education and society. Galatea’s education stands for her animation; as a trope it provides meaning and coherence to the process of animation. The question of educating the statue moves the focus toward the consequences of animation and changes the concept of the human being. To become one, Galatea needs to learn the culture and be integrated into the society. The implicit criticism of the social order can be found in Galatea’s interaction with other dramatis personae. Gilbert juxtaposes Victorian values with the alleged innocence of Galatea, where innocence is actually a myth and a different kind of culture. Galatea’s innocence is also used for the comic effect where her words acquire a second meaning, impenetrable for the heroine. While Galatea appears on the stage as a “controlled, trapped, rescued, idealized, defined and owned by men” [10, p. xxi] personage, she unconsciously acts as a mirror that reflects male domination and makes the subjugation of women recognizable to the modern spectator. The process

of education is aimed at commodifying Galatea and turning her into an object for adoration; hence Victorian morals do not allow for a free and independent woman in the society, and therefore Galatea has no other alternative but to literally turn into stone again.

The motive of blindness at the end of the play alludes to Pygmalion's infatuation as a delusion. When Pygmalion is blinded, he repents and clearly sees that he was wrong, and he still loves his wife. Galatea is cast away once Pygmalion is blinded. His blindness can also be interpreted as blind allegiance to Victorian morals. Galatea disappears from Pygmalion's eyes; there is no place for her as a living being on the stage. Over a period of twenty-four hours, Galatea experiences the most incredible set of metamorphoses and is plunged into the alien world with her own idiosyncratic preconceptions and values, which the spectator is asked to regard as innocence. Everybody in the play appears to be influenced by Galatea's animation, and she is being gradually alienated after each new encounter with other dramatis personae. Ironically, it is the animated statue who possesses "warmth, kindness and pity" [14, p. 211], whereas other personages are the exact opposite in their treatment of Galatea. As she learns what bitterness and misunderstanding are, her sorrow contrasts starkly with the petty family drama of Pygmalion and his wife.

Although Pygmalion is a genius who has the "powers denied to other men" [6, p. 10], he cannot animate his statues. The cause of his discontent lies in his conceptualizing artistic creation as magic. Pygmalion considers himself to be a magician who is able to surpass the gods in their work. But his creativity has limits which can never be transcended: "there's my tether" [6, p. 11], bemoans Pygmalion his impotence. He acutely feels his inferiority to the gods. Right after the monologue where he bewails his powerlessness and appeals to the gods, Galatea comes to life and calls Pygmalion by his name from behind the curtain. The curtain reveals the phantasy. As the curtain opens, Pygmalion's imagination is given full reign. Galatea comes to life. She has a name and a voice, and her key traits are that she lives, speaks, and breathes [6, p. 11]. Galatea comes to life thanks to Pygmalion's prayer. From now on, she becomes the main personage in the play. The first thing Galatea does is speak. Afterwards, she takes Pygmalion's hand and feels its warmth: "Give me thy hand – both hands – how soft and warm!" [6, p. 11] Softness and warmth are Pygmalion's attributes; the roles are reversed here, as it is Galatea who perceives the otherness and animate nature of Pygmalion.

Galatea tells the audience about her experience of animation and the metaphor of self as a container [11, p. 275] is used to explain the process of her animation. The statue first developed self-consciousness within her marble body and then became aware of her surroundings. Galatea

understands that she was once "a cold, dull stone" [6, p. 12] and recollects her being a marble statue. The "first dull gleam of consciousness" [6, p. 12] developed in Galatea before the animation of her body. Her "cold immovable identity" and the consciousness of her "chilly self" [6, p. 12] were already present when Pygmalion was praying to the gods and lamenting his inability to animate Galatea. If Galatea had self-consciousness at that moment, Pygmalion must have achieved the animation without the help of the gods. At least, her self-consciousness must have been created by Pygmalion.

Galatea is animated by the invocation of her name, as she tells Pygmalion that hearing it "seemed to shake my marble to the core" [6, p. 12]. She recounts to Pygmalion and the audience her experience of language. What seemed to be obscure became clear to Galatea. At first, she did not distinguish the sounds; they were vague and meaningless, but later they "seemed to resolve themselves into a language" [6, p. 12]. As Galatea learned the language, her inanimate body was "pervaded with a glow that seemed to thaw my marble into flesh" [6, p. 12]. At last, Galatea's flesh was animated, her "cold hard substance" turned into "the ecstasy of new born life" [6, p. 12]. And upon creation, Galatea immediately feels love and gratitude towards her creator. His name is the word that expresses her love and gratitude.

Despite her alleged innocence, Galatea loves Pygmalion with all her heart, and Pygmalion loves her as "a sculptor loves his work" [6, p. 13]. While in Boureau-Deslandes Galatea claims independence from Pygmalion [19], Gilbert's Galatea recognizes that she is made by Pygmalion for Pygmalion. She has no will of her own and will be obedient to Pygmalion. In her consciousness, Galatea becomes a subservient being; she has "no thought, no hope, no enterprise, that does not own thee as its sovereign" [6, p. 13]. Pygmalion's wildest dreams appear to have come true: Galatea now lives for his sake and is fully committed to him. She expects from Pygmalion to be appropriated like an object, selflessly offering herself to Pygmalion and thinking of herself as one with him. Alas, this union is impossible, because he is a married man, and the conventional morality will dispel Galatea as an illusion, an affront to Victorian morals.

Galatea's transmogrification is not questioned by Pygmalion, and the debate now unfolds around the question of the possibility to educate Galatea. The myth of Galatea is demythologized by Gilbert through allowing the metamorphosis to happen exactly as Pygmalion was dreaming about it. The fulfilment of his prayer has unforeseen repercussions. The apparently ideal metamorphosis becomes a nightmare for Galatea. The first blow comes from the creator himself: Pygmalion tells Galatea that he cannot return her love, and she cannot be his wife, because he already has one. If Galatea cannot love Pygmalion, then why did the gods animate her? Galatea begins to wonder about this first incongruity of her plight. Pygmalion does not know the answer but presumes that the gods may want to punish him for his folly [6, p. 13]. Galatea is reified,

as her whole life turns out to be the sculptor's punishment "for unreflecting and presumptuous prayer" [6, p. 14]. One more unexpected revelation comes to Galatea when she is about to fall asleep. In her innocence, she does not know what sleep is and experiences it as death. She is terrified by the seeming approach of death. This illusion is an instance of an inverted metaphor. Sleep is often seen as a metaphor for death and is used to explain it, but here death is a trope that gives meaning to the concept of sleep. At this moment, Galatea learns that humans are mortal, and thereby has one more disenchanting experience of life. Galatea learns disconcerting facts about her human existence: her love for Pygmalion is a sin; Pygmalion's love for her is adulterous; sleep is a death-like experience; and all humans are mortal [6, p. 19]. Galatea's paradoxical viewpoint introduces ambiguity to human experience. Her judgements may be humorous for the audience, but for Galatea they register a sequence of terrible facts she learns about life. Galatea's education becomes a torture of alienation for her.

Galatea provides a different perspective on human life and the social order. A brave soldier becomes "a paid assassin" [6, p. 20] and "one whose mission is to kill" [6, p. 21] in the eyes of the animated statue. She is appalled when she sees Leucippe, a soldier, bring a dead fawn. For her, the fawn is a living being, not radically different from her. She does not know what it is, but she understands that it was animate: "Thy form is strange to me; but thou hadst life" [6, p. 22]. Afterwards, Galatea's "misunderstanding" leads to a comedy of errors, where Myrine, Leucippe's lover, is persuaded by Galatea that Leucippe killed somebody. Myrine loses her happiness, and Leucippe may lose his love. This humorous situation has a sinister side if the spectator views the play with Galatea's eyes. When Myrine sees the fawn, she immediately understands the mistake, forgives Leucippe, and questions Galatea's sanity: "Why, girl—thou must be mad!" [6, p. 24]. Galatea's innocence – a quality which was to be cherished in the Victorian society – becomes her curse. She is ostracized for being mad. Even Pygmalion sees in Galatea "unwarrantable foolishness" [6, p. 25]. One can see how her innocence serves the double purpose of comedy and ironic criticism. Paradoxically, she is regarded as a lewd woman, a "marble minx" [6, p. 36] due to her innocence and naïveté. When Pygmalion is punished by blindness for his infidelity, Galatea has to disappear, because she causes too much grief and confusion. Pygmalion's creation becomes his punishment, and his talent is seen as "the fearful gift of bringing stone to life" [6, p. 33]. Now Pygmalion's gift is cognized as perverse and transgressive. Pygmalion is ashamed of himself for this misdeed. In his blindness, he sees his fault, and Galatea has to face a much sterner punishment.

In the Victorian society, Galatea becomes a scandal. She is a public nuisance, as Daphne's exasperation bears witness to it: "But can't you stop her? Shut the creature up? Dispose of her, or break her? Won't she chip?" [6, p. 33]. When the blind Pygmalion – thinking that he is talking to his wife – confides to Galatea that he never loved her, Galatea understands the horror of her situation. Pygmalion loved Galatea only "in mad amazement at the miracle" [6, p. 38], and now her presence inflicts pain to him. She sees that she is not "fit to live upon this world!" [6, p. 39] She mounts the pedestal, bids farewell to Pygmalion, and becomes stone again. In Gilbert's play, the process of animation is undermined by introducing Galatea as a foreign element in the society. The social and educational aspects of animation problematize the initial act of creation and make it not only inane, but also detrimental to the society. On the other hand, Galatea epitomizes the modern subject for whom there is no place and who is an unwanted child of his creator.

Gilbert demythologizes the myth by allowing it to become authentic reality. Pygmalion's dream is realized to reveal its paradoxical consequences, which change the phantasmagoria of animation into a waking nightmare. The dialectic of the myth is realized through legitimating the magical act of creation and challenging its ramifications. Animation is possible in its initial stage, but the education and socialization of Galatea seemingly fail. The only way out of this predicament appears to be the reverse act of petrification. Pygmalion's illusion has to come full circle in order to restore the balance.

**Conclusion.** The discussion above gives support to my main thesis that the effort to unveil the myth ends in developing a new metaphor to explain the metamorphosis of Galatea, which leads to reintroduction of mythical consciousness into the story. The modern authors, such as Gilbert, worked along these lines, trying to demythologize the Pygmalion myth and present creation as "eine vollkommene Täuschung" [2, p. 22], a perfect deception. The dialectical approach towards the myth and its interpretation allowed me to look at the moments when the fabric of the text is rent by the incongruity between the myth and its criticism.

Pygmalion is an artist or an educator, and his art conceals itself so well that he gives in to self-delusion only to question it later. Galatea comes to life, but her status is ambivalent. The myth problematizes the story, and the reader has to balance between understanding and not-understanding the myth. The understanding of the myth demands either uncovering the underlying metaphor and exploring the complexity of its conceptual design or experiencing the myth as authentic reality and animating Galatea through empathy. Conversely, not-understanding the myth involves either withholding judgement and experiencing the myth in its absolute reality or critical analysis and dismantling the fabric of the myth. Consequently, the literary interpretations of the Pygmalion myth strive to achieve

a balance between mythologizing and demythologizing, understanding and not-understanding, animation and petrification. Ultimately, the Pygmalion myth makes one aware of

the subject–object relationship, where Galatea’s agency is acknowledged by Pygmalion and her otherness disrupts his ability to dominate the animated and socialized person.

## References

1. Assmann, A. (1997). Belebte Bilder: Der Pygmalion-Mythos zwischen Religion und Kunst. In *Pygmalion: die Geschichte des Mythos in der abendländischen Kultur* (pp. 63–87). Eds. M. Mayer, G. Neumann. Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach.
2. Blühm, A. (1988). *Pygmalion. Die Ikonographie eines Künstlermythos zwischen 1500 und 1900*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
3. Denysko, P. (2021). *Insait. Vizualni y multymodalni metafory v zhyvopysi, skulpturi, kino ta inshykh vizualnykh mystetstvakh* [Insight: Visual and Multimodal Metaphors in Painting, Sculpture, Cinema, and Other Visual Arts]. Poltava: FOP Hovorov S.V.
4. Didi-Huberman, G. (2005). *Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art*. Trans. J. Goodman. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
5. Dörrie, H. (1974). *Pygmalion. Ein Impuls Ovids und seine Wirkungen bis in die Gegenwart*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
6. Gilbert, W. S. (1870). *Pygmalion and Galatea. An entirely original mythological comedy*. New York: T.H. French. <http://archive.org/details/pygmaliongalatea00gilb> (accessed 17 July 2023).
7. Gross, K. (2019). *The Dream of the Moving Statue*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
8. Haynes, M. (2023). The Skin of a Statue: Rethinking Ovid’s Pygmalion. *The Sculpture Journal*, 32(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3828/sj.2023.32.2.03>
9. Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T. W. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Trans. J. Cumming. New York: Herder & Herder.
10. Joshua, E. (2001). *Pygmalion and Galatea: The History of a Narrative in English Literature*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
11. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Philosophy*. New York: Basic Books.
12. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
13. Lakoff, G., Turner, M. (1989). *More Than Cool Reason: A Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
14. Miller, J. M. (1988). Some Versions of Pygmalion. In *Ovid Renewed. Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (pp. 205–214). Ed. C. Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Miller, J. H. (1990). *Versions of Pygmalion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
16. Ovid. (1958). *Metamorphoses*. Ed. and trans. F. J. Miller. Vol. 2 (pp. 81–85). London: Heinemann. <http://archive.org/details/metamorphoseswit02oviduoft> (accessed 17 July 2023).
17. Shopin, P. (2013). The Myth of Language in G. B. Shaw’s Pygmalion. *Mova i kultura*, 16(2), 282–286. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Mik\\_2013\\_16\\_2\\_50](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Mik_2013_16_2_50) (accessed 17 July 2023).
18. Shopin, P. (2014). Postmodern Pygmalionism. *Visnyk Luhanskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Filolohichni nauky*, 6(2), 77–86. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vluf\\_2014\\_6%282%29\\_14](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vluf_2014_6%282%29_14) (accessed 17 July 2023).
19. Shopin, P., Bentia, I. (2023). The Myth of Materialism and the Subject of Modernity: Pygmalion in the Works of André-François Boureau-Deslandes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *Artistic Culture. Topical Issues*, 19(1), 192–199. [https://doi.org/10.31500/1992-5514.19\(1\).2023.283357](https://doi.org/10.31500/1992-5514.19(1).2023.283357)
20. Weiser, C. (1998). *Pygmalion: vom Künstler und Erzieher zum pathologischen Fall; eine stoffgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

Надійшла до редакції 21 липня 2023 р.

Прийнята до друку 20 серпня 2023 р.

Submitted July 21, 2023.

Accepted August 20, 2023.

---

**Павло Шопін**, доктор філософії, доцент кафедри прикладної лінгвістики, порівняльного мовознавства та перекладу Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова (вул. Тургенівська, 8–14 (5 поверх, ауд. 5–12), м. Київ, 01601, Україна); e-mail: pavloshopin@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8022-5327>

**Міф про Пігмаліона в «Метаморфозах» Овідія та п'єсі Вільяма Швенка Гілберта «Пігмаліон і Галатя»**

У статті розглянуто амбівалентну природу міфу про Пігмаліона в «Метаморфозах» Овідія та п'єсі драматурга вікторіанської доби Вільяма Швенка Гілберта «Пігмаліон і Галатя» (1870). Овідієва та Гілбертова версії міфу постають як спроби деміфологізації, які парадоксальним чином запроваджують власну міфологію. Аналіз цих творів показує, що міф править водночас за реальність та ілюзію, розмиваючи межі між критичним знанням і міфологічним світоглядом. Спираючись на теорію концептуальної метафори, автор також припускає, що міф про Пігмаліона можна вважати за алегорію в рамках когнітивної парадигми втіленого реалізму, а несвідома метафора, що стоїть за міфом, представляє метаморфозу як раціонально пояснювану, але відпорну до критичного мислення. У статті досліджено міфічну свідомість Пігмаліона, висвітлено його самообман і діалектику між одухотворенням і скам'янінням. В Овідія Пігмаліон досягає майстерності досконалої омани. Він вірить у можливість оживити статую, адже вона дуже схожа на живу. Оригінальний сюжет «Метаморфоз» Овідія балансує на межі між дивом і самооманою. Після Овідія його природа залишалася амбівалентною протягом століть. Гілберт деміфологізує цей сюжет, дозволяючи йому стати справжньою реальністю. Мрія Пігмаліона перетворюється на дійсність, виявляючи свої парадоксальні наслідки - фантазмагорія одухотворення стає жахом наяву. Діалектика міфу реалізується через легітимізацію магічного акту творення і підваження його наслідків. Одухотворення принципово можливе, але виховання та соціалізація Галатей зазнають позірного фіаско. Єдиним виходом з цього становища видається зворотний акт скам'яніння. Ілюзія Пігмаліона має пройти повне коло, щоб відновити баланс. У висновках зазначено, що розуміння міфу про Пігмаліона вимагає балансування між міфологізацією і деміфологізацією, знанням і незнанням.

**Ключові слова:** метафора, міфологізація та деміфологізація, одухотворення і скам'яніння, Пігмаліон і Галатя, Овідій, Вільям Швенк Гілберт.

---