

The Archetypal Shadow of the Teacher in Ionesco's *The Lesson* and Mamet's *Oleanna*

Maysoon Taher Muhi (PhD)

College of Education for Women-English Dept. University of Baghdad

Marriam2013@gmail.com

doi: 10.23918/vesal2017.a24

ABSTRACT

The present paper is concerned with the concept of the teacher as an archetypal shadow in the dramatic plays by Eugene Ionesco's *The Lesson* (1951) and David Mamet's *Oleanna* (1992). The shadow represents the negative tendencies and the animal aspects that are rejected by the persona (the public image) and they are supposed to be permanently hidden and dominated by several factors like ethics and social standards. Losing the control over one's shadow will definitely lead to reveal and expose unaccepted behavioural features. This is obviously noticed in these selected plays. The mythical image of a teacher as being a philosopher, a prophet, or a priest has been totally demolished when the dark side of the teacher character has governed him, i.e. when his shadow finds a way to be out of the unconscious that leashes it. Needless to mention that literature is a significant vehicle for delivering social messages; so, it is a vital to understand the shadow side of teachers, and examines significantly the dramatists' portrayal of the teacher as well as the pedagogical and cultural messages that these plays might imply about teacher's social and moral relationship with their students. By utilizing the psychological approach of C G Jung and his concepts of the Shadow and the Archetype, this paper discerns that the teachers in these plays have failed to recognize their shadow and consequently their self-conscious is controlled by it, incorporating in losing their mental integrity and moral principles.

Keywords: Archetype, David Mamet, Eugene Ionesco, Jung theory, *The Lesson*, *Oleanna*, Shadow

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

There is no doubt that a teacher and teaching process play a vital role in the personality and the future of the students. The teacher is always looked at as a supreme model, a reformer, a priest, a protector, a person of motherly and fatherly concern. To build a strong and developed society, a special and significant value is supposed to be given to education, educational system and the character of teacher. However, the representation of teacher in the literature, films and popular culture of the twentieth century have lately received some attention. In his emphasis on the fact that culture has created idealistic expectations of "teaching as a divine vocation", [Carter \(2009, cited in Cummins, 2011\)](#) states that educational system needs "to expose and critique the saint-teacher metaphor" that mutually idealizes or despises teachers (p, 83). Dalton (2008), Burnaford (2007), and [Muzzillo \(2010\)](#) have also observed that the portrayal of teachers in films and fiction is unrealistic. Most of the fictional teachers who violate anticipations of adequate demeanor or belief are fired from their jobs or they just leave their schools at the end of the story, sometimes reluctantly. In his essay, "The teacher as an archetype of spirit" Clifford Mayes (2010) argues that

the images of teacher and teaching in literature obviously reflect Jung's archetypes, particularly, that of philosopher, prophet, Zen master, and priest, claiming that such view would provide a way to understand and appreciate teachers and their profession.

Nevertheless, the current paper presents a different view by looking at the teacher beyond his known mythical images. The paper critically examines teacher's complex and animal dark side that shapes him, depicting him as a human being with moments of weaknesses, and with internal and external conflicts that greatly impact him personally, as well as affect his relationship with his students. In the two plays under discussion, the mythical images of the teacher have been totally demolished when the dark side of the teacher has governed him, i.e. when his shadow finds a way to be out of the unconscious that leashes it. The teacher in these two plays by Ionesco and Mamet represents a negative portrait of the archetypal image of the teacher, consequently, reflecting an urgent call for reformation of teaching incompetency and re-evaluating teacher's image which might be a cause of the corruption in education, if we have taken into consideration his supposed leading role in society. Critically, the recent studies highlight the similarities between the two plays in their dramatization of the teacher-student relationships where Mamet's *Oleanna* is seen as a parallel with Eugene Ionesco's *The Lesson*. Verna Foster (1995) in her article entitled "Sex, Power, and Pedagogy in Mamet's *Oleanna* and Ionesco's *The Lesson*" argues that both plays can be considered as accusation of an educational culture in which "power-role and power-games played by both professors and students make teaching destructive and learning impossible.

1.2 THE NOTIONS OF ARCHETYPAL AND SHADOW PART OF THE SELF

The word "archetype" originates from a Greek word "archetupon". Archetype is of the two parts where 'arche' stands for "root" and "origin" while 'typos' "pattern" or "model". The archetype is originally discussed by Plato who tackled archetype in the sense of imperfect copy of the ideal world of Idea. However, the major influence on mythological and archetypal criticism is attributed to Carl Jung's theory of archetype. Moreover, Jung expanded Freud's theories of the 'personal unconscious,' emphasizing that this 'personal unconscious' is watered by a primal 'collective unconscious' that contains archetypes which connected modern man with his primitive roots. Jung signifies that the mythologies are the means by which archetypes, essentially unconscious forms, become obvious to the conscious mind, and they appear in the individuals' dreams. Jung notices that what constitutes modern man's search for his identity and soul is his sense of possessing a primeval image, and having archetypal patterns that allow the artist to transfer experiences of the "inner world" to the "outer world". Accordingly, Jung said that it is only logical that the artist "will resort to mythology in order to give his experience its most fitting expression" (Jung, 1933, p164).

However, the idea of archetypes is considered as a C. G. Jung's most important discovery in the early decades of the 20th century. A great deal of books and studies have placed a high value on Jung's concept of 'archetype'. In this regard, Anthony Stevens (1995, p.130) asserted the significance of Jung's theory of archetype, saying

What Jung was proposing was no less than a fundamental concept on which the whole science of psychology could be built. Potentially, it is of comparable importance of quantum theory in physics. Just as the physicist investigates particles and waves, and the biologist genes, so Jung held it to be the business of

the psychologist to investigate the collective unconscious and the functional unites of which it is composed-the archetypes, as eventually called them.

Jung's archetypal images are related to the part of the human mind that contains all of the knowledge, experiences, and images of the entire human race. According to Jung, people from different cultures share certain myths or stories, not because everyone knows the same story but because deep inside their "collective unconscious" lies the past of human memory. In its simplest sense, an archetype is an original model or pattern from which copies can be made. "In literary criticism", M.H. Abrams and Geoffrey Harpham (2015, p.18) say, "the term archetype denotes recurrent narrative designs, patterns of action, character-types, themes and images which are identifiable in a wide variety of works of literature, as well as in myths, dreams, and even social rituals". Thus, in literary criticism, the archetype is captured with the recurrences of certain characters, narrative patterns, themes, images and motifs which are "identifiable in a wide variety of works of literature, as well as in myths, dreams and even social rituals" (Jung, 1996, p115). Hence, the power and significance of the literary works are explicated.

1.3 THE SHADOW

Jung calls the dark unconscious that is ruled by primal desires as the shadow. The Shadow is an archetype; so, typically everyone has a Shadow. Though difficult, understanding and integrating with the Shadow is crucial for self-awareness. In this regard, Jung states his belief that "everyone carries a shadow, and the less it is embodied in the individual's conscious life, the blacker and denser it is. At all counts, it forms an unconscious snag, thwarting our most well-meant intentions." The Shadow is an essential part of the human psyche that most people try to turn away from or deny; yet, it is showing itself up directly or indirectly. As part of the human unconscious mind, the Shadow is in an indefinite and often distasteful, but also intimate. The Shadow may represent the core of the original self that has been kept hidden, since child's early growth period, underneath the rationality and sociality of the accepted conscious mind. It is regarded as the storage mental mechanism that contains all repressed personal memories of individual's self, as well as those parts of a nation or groups that when brought to consciousness, an individual finds troubling, contradictory to his own values and sort of encounter to his intentionality.

Characteristically, the Shadow functions on a rather unconscious and irrational level not only on the troubling aspects of individual's personality, but also, in the 'collective unconscious' level. In general, The Shadow has been well developed in almost every mythology around the world. It is worth to notice that the 'collective unconscious' divulges itself in entirely different ways in different cultures. The Shadow indicates the darkness or hidden evil, suggesting that a character (Hero) is not only in an encounter with the evil outside; rather, his shadow might take the shape of an inner conflict or struggle with temptation and with his own weaknesses.

Discussing the features of the Shadow, the psychologist Von Franz (1980, p.123) pinpoints that the shadow which "consists largely of laziness, greed, envy, jealous, and the desire for prestige, aggressiveness and similar "tormenting spirits" ", has a connection with our self-esteem and our social images. Inevitably, any quality that does not fit that image is shoved into the deep darkness of the unconscious. One of the most important points Jung has dealt with is his belief that the Shadow underlines a moral problem that poisons the individual's personal life along with as his communal life and relationships to other people. For Jung, sexuality is one of an infinite number of "the primordial images of the collective unconscious" that incarnate all what an individual rebuffs to admit about himself, saying that the "woman always stands just where the man's shadow

falls, so that he is only too liable to confuse the two” (Jung, 1978, p.109). Accordingly, woman and shadow might be seen as two faces for the same coin. They might be regarded as entirely obscured from consciousness as they tend to consist mostly of the primitive, taboo, socially or religiously disparaged human incompatible tendencies, emotions and whims like sexual lust, power strivings, inferior traits, self-interest, gluttony, jealousy, anger or rage. As will be analyzed, the murder of a student by a professor in Eugene Ionesco’s *The Lesson* (1951) and the sexual lust and harassment of a professor with his student in David Mamet’s *Oleanna* (1992), illuminate the perennial shadowy problem of human evil, the irrational and hostile inner forces and the destructive power of extreme unconsciousness.

2.1 TEACHER AS A VAMPIRE IN EUGENE IONESCO’S *THE LESSON*

Eugene Ionesco (1909-1994) was one of the famous playwrights of the Absurd Theatre. His play *The Lesson*, written in 1951, is a one-act play with three characters, the Professor, Pupil, and the Professor’s maid. From the very beginning of the play, Ionesco presents an ‘archetypal triangle’ of one male and two female characters: the Professor is a male in his fifties; his maid, a woman between forties and fifties, who plays a role of double- function as a mother and wife; and an eager female Pupil who is a “well-brought-up girl, polite, but lively, gay dynamic [with] a fresh smile.” (p.45)

When the Professor starts teaching Pupil Arithmetic, the maid shows a kind of bothersome expression, and urges him to “remain calm”, warning him of the bad consequences of teaching arithmetic exercises, as they are “tiring, exhausting” (p.51) which Professor defensively replies in a way as if she is questioning his potency, saying to his maid “I will not stand for your insinuations. I know perfectly well how to comport myself. I am old enough for that.” (p.51) Apparently, this intercession, on one hand, reveals a secret involvement between the dominant male marauder and the maid as a mother-figure who takes care not of the possible victim’s safety, but of the aggressive-teacher’s interests. On the other hand, the Professor’s answer obviously reflects his unawareness of the other dimension of his shadow self that grips his personality as powerful as that of the public self.

As the play unfolds, we see a deteriorated educational world where lust and murder are rising up in its wrecks. The Professor, who is portrayed as a caricature of an academic and a poignant representation of male sex desire, shows an excessive timidity and nervous entrance; yet, he displays an irritating body language by a continuous and nervous rubbing of his hands and “occasionally a lewd gleam comes into his eyes and quickly repressed” (p.46). With the course of the drama, the Professor becomes “more and more sure of himself, more and more nervous, aggressive, dominating, until he is able to do as he pleases with the Pupil, who has become, in his hands, a pitiful creature” (p.56). Such manifestations and changes in his behaviour might set the first steps of the seduction towards his Pupil. Moreover, his exaggerated complimentary remarks about her intelligence and good memory, accompanied by the numerous subconscious messages set up the sexual implications between the Professor and Pupil.

It is clear from the very beginning that the Professor tries to get Pupil’s approval indirectly by alluding to her sexual maturity, saying “Ah, you’re so far advanced, even perhaps too advanced for your age.” (p.48) And later the Professor says: “Excuse me, Miss, I was just going to say so...but as you will learn, one must be ready for anything”, (p.48) where Pupil replies, “Yes,

Professor, I am at your disposal” (p.50). With a provocative shimmer into his eyes and with erotic suggestions, he says “Oh, Miss, it is I who am at your disposal. I am only your humble servant” (p.50). The stage directions signify that the Pupil looks “lively, gay, dynamic; a fresh smile is on her lips” (p.45). But as the play progresses, the Pupil's general bearing and movements “gradually lose their animation” and she slowly changes “from being happy and cheerful to being downcast and morose”, becoming “more and more tired and sleepy”, in “a state of nervous depression”, until at the end “she is nothing more than an object, limp and inert, lifeless... in the hands of the Professor” (p.47)

This buzzard power structure, where the male asserts his subjugation will dramatically disclose a drastic change in the rest of the play when this “humble servant” becomes a pitiless marauder. With a knife, the Professor kills his female Pupil who falls, “flopping in an immodest position onto a chair which, as though by chance, is near the window ” (p.75). Then, he appears waiting for another Pupil -victim, suggesting that this vampire tendency and the brutal sexual behaviour are unstoppable as declared later by his maid, saying that this Pupil is number 40. Thus, as Martin Esslin (1988) so aptly argues, the central proposition of *The Lesson* “hinges on the sexual nature of all power and the relationship between language and power as the basis of all human ties”(p.147)

From a Jungian perspective, the shadow overwhelms the Professor’s actions, making him forget the real function of the teacher; his conscious mind is confused and paralyzed by the fact that he is possessed by his own shadow that makes him fall into a level contrary to social standards and ideals and below the assumed role as an archetypal image of the teacher. The maid, who warns him not repeating the atrocities that he used to do, symbolizes what Jung refers to as “anima” which is the feminine features inside man that arouses panic. Jung always refers to ‘anima’ as ‘she’ that appears to man either as a real woman or as an imagined women in dream. (Wehr, 1987).

Moreover, the maid, portrayed as ‘anima’, primarily, in Jungian concept, seems to be an entirely detach personality, presuming an unintegrated connection between his conscious and unconscious. Accordingly, the Professor’s shadow is possessed by his ‘anima,’ which “is always afraid [he] shall tire [himself]. She's worried about his health” (p.51). Similarly, the Pupil observes that the maid\ the Professor’s anima looks a “very devoted. She loves you very much.” (p.51) However, the image of the teacher as a vampire, who intensifies his strength by diminishing the power of his female Pupils, shows aspects of the shadow archetype by which the Pupil is gradually being conquered by the Professor while her toothache increases.

The Pupil: Oh, Sir, I've got toothache.

PROFESSOR: Don't interrupt! And don't make me angry! For "if I lose control of myself... As I was saying, then (...) I repeat: if you prefer, for I notice that you are no longer paying attention...

PUPIL: I've got the toothache. (p.62)

The Professor totally strips his Pupil from strength symbolically by a sudden suffering from unbearable toothache and by chocking her with his dominated language and physical power that hides his animal instincts. The Professor forces the Pupil to repeat the word ‘knife’ several times until he finally thrusts her to fatality in “an act of orgasmic violence” (Walker, 1997,July):

PROFESSOR: Ah! (...) It will be enough if you will pronounce the word "knife" in all the languages, while looking at the object, very closely, fixedly, and imagining that it is in the language that you are speaking.(p.73)

Pupil's powerlessness to comprehend subtractions designates her subconscious and innate effort to self-preservation, and her denial of disintegration that the Professor philosophically proclaimed: "It's not enough to integrate, you must also disintegrate. That's the way life is. That's philosophy. That's science. That's progress, civilization" (p.55). The Professor takes hold an imaginary knife from the drawer as a collective symbol of all forms of dictatorship and of "the spirit of domination [that] always present in teacher-pupil relationships, and that the professor kills the girl because her toothache enables her to escape from having to listen to his instruction" (Esslin, 1988, p.147):

PROFESSOR: Seven and one?

PUPIL: Eight again.

PROFESSOR: Excellent. Perfect.

PROFESSOR: Magnificent. You are magnificent. You are exquisite. I congratulate you warmly, miss. There's scarcely any point in going on. At addition you are a past master. Now, let's look at subtraction. Tell me, if you are not exhausted, how many are four minus three?

PUPIL: Four minus three? . . . Four minus three?

PROFESSOR: Yes. I mean to say: subtract three from four.

PUPIL: That makes ... seven?

PROFESSOR: I am sorry but I'm obliged to contradict you. Four minus three does not make seven. You are confused: four plus three makes seven, four minus three does not make seven. This is not addition anymore; we must sub- tract now.

PUPIL [trying to understand]: Yes ... yes ...

PROFESSOR: Four minus three makes . . . How many? How many?

PUPIL: Four?

PROFESSOR: Oh, certainly not, miss. It's not a matter of guessing, you've got to think it out. Let's try to deduce it together. Would you like to count? (p.52)

Insensibly, the psychological evolution of the teacher and the student undergoes a reversal, in the sense that the shyness of the teacher is transformed into aggressiveness and despotism, while the temerity of the pupil is changed into submission. This reversal which occurs during the linguistic lesson triggers in the professor a sort of intoxication of the word that leads him into an unconscious state. He seeks to reduce the pupil to the state of object and malleable mechanism. His need to explain everything, an obsession of clarity due to the irrational refusal of his troubled, timid being, causes him to destroy all that is obscure in his pupil. He shows a great deal of domination over his female pupil; yet, he is ultimately dominated and enslaved by and his shadow. After killing the pupil, the Professor pleads innocence, declaring that he had not understood the Maid's warning. "Liar," she replies, "an intellectual like you is not going to make a mistake in the meanings of words" (p.77). His pleading for innocence recalls what Rollo May discusses about the relation between the shadow and evil, saying "our capacity for evil hinges on breaking through our pseudoinnocence. So long as we preserve our one-dimensional thinking, we can cover up deeds by pleading innocent" (Rollo, 1991, p. 175).

His pride has led him to disregard his shadow, and prevents him accept others. He seems to be the prey of uncontrollable hidden desires that pushes him to pour on his victim a frightening logorrhea. From a Jungian view, the Professor's vampire image could be understood as an expression of his "shadow," of those aspects of the self that contain suppressed wishes, anti-social desires, morally

suspicious motives, childish fantasies of an egoistic nature, and other traits that might be considered shameful ones.

3.1 THE PROJECTION OF THE SHADOW IN DAVID MAMET'S *OLEANNA*

Mamet's play *Oleanna* has received numerous scholarly studies where the main focus was on topics like, sexual harassment, gender difference, pedagogical environment, and power dynamics. Harry J. Elam (1997, p. 160) aptly observes that "Mamet's approach in *Oleanna*...is not one of balance. Rather, Mamet decidedly loads the conflict in favour of his male protagonist, John, the professor." On the same vein, Badenhause (1998) suggests that Mamet's play *Oleanna* comments ominously on "education in America and more particularly functions as a dire warning both to and about those doing the educating"

In *Oleanna*, the audience is confronted by only two characters; John, who is a forty-year-old university professor, father, husband, and breadwinner, and his twenty-year-old female student, Carol. The student comes to her teacher's office, asking his help understand some academic issues to improve her grade. He shows a tendency to devalue her mentality and that makes her believe that he accusing her of being a stupid student. Their conversation that is continuously interrupted by several phone calls leads to some disputes, especially when he involves his personal compartments to offer Carol an "A" in his class. Putting his hand on her shoulder, his order that she has to meet him privately in his office a few times during the semester to solve her problems and his psychical and bodily approach towards her are interpreted as a sexual harassment, rape and a manipulation of power. John declares that he is doing this because he "likes" Carol, thinking that they might be "similar." When she complains, John tells her to "[f]orget about the paper," for "[w]hat is The Class but you and me?" (Mamet 1993, p.21). Describing John's character, the critic, Caryn James considers him as "a bad teacher and an egotist, guilty of poor judgment. Yet by the end... a villain" (p. 22). John seems has no self-esteem that teacher is expected to abide. Throughout the play, he conveys many personal facts about himself as a person and as a teacher, stating that he was brought up to believe that he is stupid (Mamet, p. 15-16). As the conversation goes on, audience discovers more negative characteristics about Professor John. He reveals that when he was a student, he had difficult time understanding even "The simplest problem was beyond [him]" (p. 16). Right after this, John discloses another secret about his academic life. He describes himself as an "incompetent" teacher, saying that "I become, I feel 'unworthy,' and 'unprepared' . . ." (p. 17). Later in Act 1, John punctuates his lesson on theories of higher education with an inappropriate analogy, contending that education is 'hazing' and artificial. He also mentions his detestation of schools and teachers; "I came late to teaching. And I found it artificial . . . I told you. I hated school, I hated teachers . . . I knew I was going to fail. Because I was a fuck up. I was just not goddamned good. (p. 22). Strangely, He confesses to Carol that people think that he is a stupid:

Carol: People said that you were stupid...?

John: Yes.

Carol: When?

John: I'll tell you when.

Through my life. In my childhood; and, perhaps, they stopped. But I heard them continue.

Carol: And what did they say?

John: They said I was incompetent. Do you see? And when I'm tested the, the, the feelings of my youth about the very subject of learning come up. And I ... I become, I feel "unworthy", and "unprepared", (Act I, p. 17)

Furthermore, John believes that university tests "are designed . . . for idiots. By idiots" (p. 23). Hence, it is not surprising that Carol continues to acknowledge a lack of understanding for the subject that John teaches.

Archetypically speaking, John knows well that as a teacher, he is supposed to have a fatherly concern and he should talk to Carol as "[he is] talking to ... [his] son". Nevertheless, he could not achieve this harmonious relationship because he is not able to recognize his shadowy side. He is facing different opposites that are resulted from the tension between personal and the collective unconscious archetypes such as: teacher's fatherly concern and the sexual attraction, 'authority' and 'intellectual immaturity' and his past and his present:

Carol: I did what you told me. I did, I did everything that, I read your book, you told me buy your book and read it. Everything you say I... (She gestures to her notebook. The phone rings.) I do...Ev...

John:... Look:

Carol:... everything I'm told...

John: Look. Look. I'm not your father.

Carol: What?

John: I'm.

Carol: Did you say you were my father?

John: ... no...

Carol: why did you say that...?

John: I... (p.9-10)

Later, he declares to Carol that "I'm talking to you as I'd talk to my son. Because that's what I'd like him to have that I never had". This allusion to fatherhood is invested with a host of codes, which suggest the authority of John and the immaturity—in this case an intellectual immaturity—of his student. In Act 2 & 3, John appears metaphorically naked, losing his authority over his student, and losing his reputation as university professor after Carol's accusation of him as being molester and her intention to complain him to Tenure Committee. While talking about this tenure committee, John is sure that this committee "will find an index" of his "badness" (p. 24), begging her to drop the accusation. Yet, John interestingly does not defend or refute Carol's accusations. He does not that "deny that these things happened" (p. 48). When Carol makes her claim, John says, "Well, all right" and he moves to read the report passed to him by the tenure committee (p. 47).

Carol describes the struggle with her teacher as "pornographic". Carol also talks about the sexual attack again toward the end of Act 3, saying "You think I am frightened, repressed, confused, I don't know, abandoned young thing of some doubtful sexuality . . ." (p. 68). Later, she asserts; "[John] tried to rape [her]. [She] was leaving the office; [he] 'pressed' [himself] into [her]. [He] pressed [his] body into [her]" (p. 78). Thus, Professor John's sexuality and desire come to his

personality surface. Mamet's Professor John is condemned relentlessly by many critics who deal with John's negative professorship as a serious matter since this professor might reflect real professors who did harass their female student in reality. In her article, "The Politics of Gender, Language and Hierarchy in Mamet's *Oleanna*," Christine MacLeod (1995) visualizes her negative feelings towards both the student and the professor; as a student, she feels bad, inferior and repressed one, and she is no longer trust the image of professor in educational system. On the other hand, this theatrical negative professorship portrayed in this play is seen as an indication of the corruption in American education.

Therefore, the play "ultimately explores the peril of inferior teaching and the subsequent misreading that necessarily follow in a pedagogical environment that tacitly reinforces hierarchical differences amongst its participants" (Badenhausen, 1998, p. 2). In act of extreme violence toward the very end of the play, John attacks his student, beating her severely and calling her with names a "bitch" and a "cunt". All these facts about John's character challenge his professorship. Therefore, academically speaking, Professor John's character has no even the least amount features of good professorship. Richard Hornby (1993, p.194) argues that the Professor's inadequacy in teaching and his inappropriateness for the "'tenure position' is so incompetent that we cannot really show any sympathy for him. I could only feel that anyone lacking in intellectual skills or moral fiber never deserves tenure in the first place".

Although, sexuality, desire, violence and related subjects grow to be prominent observable facts in all walks of life, it is rather not acceptable or admirable traits of a professor's character to consider this phenomenon as a prevalent or as a dominant side in this relationship with his student. However, with the traces of Jungian archetypal shadow in *Oleanna*, it is found that John's character is fragmented not integrated; so that causes some tensions and lack of self-realization from which he suffers. The interrupted phone calls throughout his conversation might reflect and increase the fragmented nature of his character. Accordingly, the Shadow of Professor John manifests itself and exposes its power over his relation with his student through different impulses that bring out throughout the play. These impulses include his slips of the tongue (when he destroyed his self-image), cynical remarks (accusing her as being a stupid student), and outbursts of anger and irritability (his sudden fits of rage and violence towards Carol), his, or negative behavior or attitudes toward others (his negative view to the academic institution and educational system).

Moreover, Professor John faces great difficulty in keeping his shadow hidden and repulsed inside because it abruptly intrudes and continuously sabotages his conscious life. Obviously, his hidden antagonism comes literally to the surface in his conception of his job and his relation with his student, Carol. In the following passage, he describes to Carol the nature of his professorship and the strategy he employs in higher education:

John: ...that's my *job*, don't you know.

Carol: What is?

John: To provoke you.

Carol: No.

John: Oh. Yes, though.

Carol: To provoke me?

JOHN: That's right.

CAROL: To make me mad?

JOHN: That's right. To force you...(p.32)

Confronting the shadow is an extremely big challenge because it is uneasy to admit or even discover that we embrace shortcomings or we nature dim side. Jung proposes that the Shadow is largely intended to be our connate tendency to move towards our demerits and our shortcomings. John's ultimate conflict is not the conflict of external evil but rather the evil that lies within and which can never be avoided. John's innate darkness manifests in an exterior form. Moreover, what makes the image worse is that if individual does not realize his own dark side, he projects this negative side on others, expressing his hatred and harshly blaming the innocents. Carol notices this, saying to Professor John

Why do you hate me? Because you think me wrong? No, Because I have, you think, power over you. Listen to me. Listen to me, Professor. [Pause] It is the power that you hate. So deeply that, that any atmosphere of free discussion is impossible. It's not "unlikely." It's impossible. Isn't it? ... Now. The thing which you find so cruel is the selfsame process of selection I, and my group, go through every day of our lives. In admittance to school. In our tests, in our class rankings (p.68-9)

Professor John's darker side of his unconscious self may denote an alienation from his moral principles, articulating the pervasiveness of the political *and moral issues* in diversified American society (). Holding beliefs, ideologies and values to look at others as morally inferior, John's most conflicts on moral issues appear in his violent action towards Carol at the close of the play when he attempts to kill or seriously hurt her "lowers the chair... moves to his desk and arranges the papers on it" (Act III, p.86); this action summons John's shadowy side of nature that is still unilluminated and unknown. Seemingly, he could not succeed to make balance between his inner and outer world. His lost of genuine teaching and personal ethics causes oddities in his psyche.

CONCLUSION

When Jung's archetypal theory is applied to the dramatic character of teacher in Ionesco's *The lesson* and Mamet's *Oleanna*, it is found that both teachers have torn between their conscious and unconscious as there is an eternal struggle between good and evil. Ostensibly, because they are taken over by their shadow and are unable to recognize this dark side that consists of the most irritating and disgusted qualities, teachers are portrayed as having devilish personality (where the devil is a form of the shadow), losing their reason, their morals and his soul. In Jungian view, breaking down of the persona (the public image) has paved the way to their archetypal shadow to over control their conscious, and social behaviour. Moreover, these plays show that there are teachers who are more concerned about themselves and their own impulses than their pupils, and may be more imbued with knowledge than with pedagogy, more anxious to train learners in their scientific gibberish than to recognise the living person in face of them, which may include hurting the teeth or the head, committing a sexual harassment or even rape. Despite the physical evil, the pupil endures the unbearable language and behavior of his/her teacher, reflecting the idea that those in the teacher-student relationship might reflects the havoc and tensions that underline how "the culture as a whole, the pedagogical relationship [are] standing as a model of the exchange of cultural principles among individuals and social groups". However, the murder in *The Lesson* is taken a spiritual and symbolic form as the Pupil is exterminated by main means of ideology and

science,(i.e. language) that robs her of an autonomous life; whereas, the murder in *Oleanna* seems so real, calling the attention to the sever and critical level of deterioration in the academic life.

REFERENCES

[Abrams, M. H.](#) and Geoffrey Harpham. (2015). "Archetypal Criticism." *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 11th ed. Stamford, USA: Cengage Learning.

Anthony, Stevens. (1995). *Private myths: dreams and dreaming*. London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd.

Bressler, Charles E. (2007). *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. 4Eh ed. New Jersey: Pearson.

Cummins, Am. (2011). "Beyond a Good/Bad Binary: The Representation of Teachers in Contemporary YAL". [ALAN Review](#) (V.39, No.1). <https://doi.org/10.21061/alan.v39i1.a.5>

Elam, Harry, Jr. (1997). "'Only in America': Contemporary American Theater and the Power of Performance." *Voices of Power: Co-Operation and Conflict in English Language and Literatures*. Ed. Marc Maufort and Jean-Pierre van Noppen. Lie`ge: Belgian Association of Anglicists in Higher Education.

Foster, Verna. (1995). "Sex, Power, and Pedagogy in Mamet's *Oleanna* and Ionesco's *The Lesson*", *American Drama* 5.1 pp. 36–50

Hornby, R. (1993). *Dramatizing AIDS*. *The Hudson Review*, 46(1), 189-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3852315>

Ionesco, Eugene. (1958). *Four Plays: The Bald Soprano, The Lesson, Jack, or The Submission, The Chairs*. Trans. Donald M. Allen. New York: Grove.

Jung, C. G. (1978). *Psychological Reflections: A New Anthology of His Writings, 1905–1961*. Ed. Jolande Jacobi and R. F. C. Hull. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Jung, C.G. (1933). *Modern Man In Search Of A Soul*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Jung, C.G. (1996). *Psychology and Literature*. In *20th Century Literary Criticism*. Singapore: Longman et Singapore Publishers.

Mamet, David. (1992). *Oleanna*, New York: Vintage Books.

Martin, Esslin. (1988). *The Theatre of the Absurd*. New York: Penguin.

Mayes, Clifford. (2002). "The teacher as an archetype of spirit". *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34:6, 699-718

Rollo, May. (1991). "The Dangers of innocence". *Meeting the shadow, the hidden power of the dark side of human nature*. U.S.: A New Consciousness Reader.

Von, Franz, M. (1980). *Projection and re-collection in Jungian psychology: Reflections of the Soul*. London: Open Court.

Von, Franz, M. (1975). *C. G. Jung: His myth in our time*. New York: Putnam.

Walker, Craig Stewart. (1997). "Three Tutorial Plays: The Lesson, The Prince of Naples, and Oleanna", *Modern Drama* 40, pp. 149-162.

Wehr, Demaris S. (1987). *Jung and Feminism: Liberating Archetypes*. Boston: Beacon Press.