

Language as Ideology: A Study of Absurd Theatre

Sabah Wajid Ali

Prof., Ph, D, University of Karbala, Karbala, Iraq
Prof.sabahwajidali69@gmail.com

Muhammad Abdul Hassan Muhsin

Asst. L., Department of English, University of Karbala, Karbala, Iraq
Mohammedmohsen124000@gmail.com

Abstract

The study introduces absurdity to the reader and shows the emergence of Absurd Theatre. The research also gives definitions and explanations for the terms “Ideology”, “Linguistic Manipulation”, and “Power Dynamics”. This paper explores and reveals language ideology, cultural values, as well as power relations in Ionesco’s *The Lesson*. It provides references to the theoretical background of absurdity in pairing with linguistic manipulation. It epitomizes that the conspicuous aspects of the use of language to convey the power dynamics are anchored on absurdity which is the topic of Eugene Ionesco’s play *The Lesson*. It also gives evidence to the belief that examination of linguistic absurdity ideas is fully applicable to the Ionesco’s *The Lesson*.

Keywords: English Language, Ideology, Absurd Theatre.

1.1 Introduction

The study scrutinizes *The Lesson* by the pioneer figure of Absurd Theatre Ionesco. It illustrates the role of language in shaping ideology and conveying power dynamics. The aim of this research is to show that the use of language has double edges. Language is an indispensable instrument for communication; although, it can be used as a tool for dominance, manipulation and control those who are in a weak position.

The fall of genuine communication in *The Lesson* between the professor and the student due to the boundaries between them so that they do not seem understand each other. The professor conducts the same procedures with the fortieth students and cancels the disparity among them. He's unable to change the situation in spite of the repeated consequences.

The Maid confirms this is not the first crime committed by the professor but the pupil is depicted as one of repeated victims. The Maid assists the professor to hide the crime and then both welcome the newcomer therefore, the professor seems to use the same procedures with the new pupil in infinite cycle of repetition. The two find solace in predictable daily routine which create false consciousness of having authentic meaning. In a society devoid of morals, principles, and virtues, language cannot have any clear meanings, hence, Ionesco explores the limits of language as a tool for cognition and communication. He writes in a language devoid of meaning in order to adequately depict a static life. Ionesco portrays language as an ineffective means of expressing ideas or understanding the outside world. Ionesco's works often delve into the depths of existential despair and the limitations of communication, highlighting the futility of human attempts to find meaning in a chaotic and absurd world. By analyzing Ionesco's play "*The Lesson*" to explore the ways in which he employs language to evoke a sense of existential despair and challenge conventional notions of communication.

1.2 Significance of Language in Ideology:

Language fundamentally plays a pivotal role in maintenance of ideology. Language is a medium of communication and indispensable tool of understanding, expressing and interpreting people's interaction with each other. Language is a powerful tool either to reinforce or challenge prevailing ideology. It is a fundamental instrument to construct or deconstruct specific ideology, by which people perceive the world around. Via language, people frame their ideological concepts by reinforcing or

challenging social opinions and letting them articulate their viewpoint. According to ideology which is settled by the use of language, people determine what is truth or untruth or normal and abnormal behaviors within society.

Language shapes public perception and the value of interaction, therefore language has power to restrict specific view or reinforce ideological authority. Language gives extra power to justify public values and draws line between what is legal and illegal and intervene what to include and exclude in discourse in order to support one's perceptions. Ideologies are spread through the medium of language. Ideologies are instilling through repetition so that people get familiarize with repeated messages which later on prevail as a universal truth or accepted ideology. Language plays a crucial role in superiority or inferiority of specific values and the loyalty to an ideology. Language is depicted as inefficacy tool of conveying thought. The use of language has to give way to standardized, stereotypical, and pointless conversations.

The substance of the human experience is not fully captured by words, which just scratch the surface. Ionesco demonstrates language as unreliable tool of communication. Language is seen as inefficacy means of passing time. As a result, he views time as a destructive force in his writing. Time has to be filled, either verbally or nonverbally. The social function of language creates and organizes social reality, communicating mental content via acts like persuasion, disputing, threatening, and inviting. Language has a crucial role in revealing power, maintaining authority, and enhancing effectiveness, making it an important stylistic area.

1.3 The Emergence of Absurd Theatre:

The theatre of absurd firstly appeared in France after World War II and used by playwrights of Eugene Ionesco, Samuel Beckett and Harold Pinter which have shared the view that “the human condition is essentially absurd, and that this condition can be adequately represented only in works of literature that are themselves absurd”

(Abrams, 2018, p.1). The Theatre of Absurd is a term coined by the dramatist and critic Martin Esslin in his book *The Theatre of the Absurd* in 1961. Esslin (1960) defines the word Absurd as “out of harmony with reason of propriety; logical” (p. 23).

Absurd theatre has based its view on the philosophy of scholars such as Jean Paul Sartre and Albert Camus through which they believe that human existence is out of significance (Dinerstein, 2016). Absurd theatre has influenced by the horrid experience of World War II and the collapse of the validity of values and the arbitrariness of life. Absurdity has its root in the work of Franz Kafka's *Metamorphosis*. The disparity between man and his desire, the setting and the actor evokes the felling of absurdity (Esslin, 1960). The French dramatist Eugene Ionesco claims that the aim of absurd theatre is to “cut off from transcendental roots, man is lost; all his actions become senseless, absurd, useless. People drowning in meaninglessness can only be grotesque, their sufferings can only appear tragic by derision” (Ionesco & Pronko, 1963, p. 23).

The theatre of Absurd comes in contrast with the conventional theatre of Shakespeare in that the plot is illogical and the dialogue is incomprehensible. Plays in this style is called anti plays. Anti-plays mean that neither the time nor the place of the action are ever clearly stated. The characters hardly have any individuality and often even lack a name” (Esslin, 1960, p. 3). The action tends to be out of hands and characters are drowned in endless repetition. Ionesco claims that:

Yet another kind of theatre is possible. Of a greater strength and richness. Not a symbolist theatre, but a symbolic one; not allegorical, but mythical; having its source in our eternal anguish; a theatre where the invisible becomes visible, where ideas become concrete images, reality; where the problem becomes flesh; where anguish is there, a gigantic, living proof (Ionesco & Pronko, 1963, p. 4).

There is no purpose in the social life. And it's a particular kind of emptiness, where people are estranged from themselves as well as from one another. Communication is difficult or impossible, language is a trap, and death is certain. Language which is used in the world of communication is already consumed. Words are simply recognized and there is void, contradictions and nonsense in language (Innes, 2003). Language is attacked for being misleading instrument and full of repetition and cliches.

According to Esslin, Ionesco “is a leading writer in the Theater of the Absurd and his plays present on the stage the absurd in its purest form, truer to life if less realistic by the mere fact of its apparent gratuity” (Esslin, 1968, p. 33). Ionesco explores concerns about the purpose and veracity of life in *The Lesson*. According to him, “no society has been able to abolish human sadness, no political system can deliver us from the pain of living, from our fear of death, our thirst for the absolute; it is the human condition that directs the social condition, not vice versa” (Lamont, 1973, p. 44). His opinions and feelings demonstrate the relationship between the exterior and interior world.

Absurdity Challenges the basic values in culture and life and asks about the meaning of existence in front of catastrophic effect of wars (Vannier & Pronko, 1963). The Theater of the Absurd makes a conscious effort to revitalize the language of drama and highlight the lifelessness of traditional expression (Vasconcelos, 2014). The most important feature of the Theatre of Absurd is that they believe the lack of genuine communication via language which is seen as a meaningless exchange. Language can't express deep communication so that it cannot reflect authentic communication. Words fail to express the essence of human existence. Communication breaks down and becomes irrational and illogical speech (Wellwarth, 1962).

The hidden meaning of words is assumed to be the primary object of absurd theatre. Freund's notion of subconsciousness leaves its impact on Absurd Theatre in opening new aspects of perceiving human nature. Absurd Theatre values surrealism, expressionism, and symbolism and rejects Naturalism and realism of Ibsen in order to express spots that languages cannot convey (Modreanu, 2011). Plays do, in fact, present their audience with a perplexing experience—a genuine onslaught of absurdly bizarre, often illogical happenings that appear to defy all known conventions of theater. Ionesco believes that “Absurd is that which has no purpose, or goal, or objective” (Ionesco & Pronko, 1963, p. 4).

Ionesco is renowned as one of the originators of the Theatre of the Absurd. He’s a prominent dramatist of 20th century. Ionesco’s plays mixes between rationality and irrationality, subjectivity and objectivity, seriousness and triviality of the western culture after World War 11. Ionesco aims to “express the difficulty of being, the separation between man and his transcendental roots. I wanted to express the unusualness of our existence” (Ionesco & Pronko, 1963, p. 6). He’s considered as an exponent of the Theatre of the Absurd that has become a trend in literature in 1940s and 1950s. This kind of plays evoke feelings of alienation and man’s sense of despair and discomfort. Ionesco consistently conveys the sense of pointlessness and futility of human endeavor as well as the inability of human connection (Cornwell, 2016).

Absurd theatre is depressing, tinged with a sense of futility brought on by disenchantment and persistent despondency. It conveys the same profound sense of loneliness and the irreversible nature of human existence. Absurd Theatre paves the way of rebellious against social order, ridiculous reality and political tyranny (Vassilopoulou, 2008). Ionesco asserts that:

As our knowledge becomes increasingly divorced from real life, our culture no longer contains ourselves (or only contains an insignificant part of ourselves) and forms a

“social” context in which we are not integrated. It becomes necessary to break up our language so that it may become possible to put it together again (Jacquart & Ionesco, 1973, p. 45)

The world is shown in the Theatre of the Absurd as being incomprehensible. The audience witnesses the actions on stage only from the outside, never really grasping the significance of these bizarre patterns of occurrences. The audience cannot relate to the ambitions because they are confronted with individuals and events that they do not fully understand (Pronko, 1970). The absurd aspect of their life is made apparent to the spectators. The absurdity of the human situation and the delusion of its seemingly logical structure are exposed by Theatre of the Absurd. Plays are full of repetitive, mechanical stereotypes. People in Absurd plays are reduced to the status of marionettes, powerless puppets with no free agency who are passively subject to meaningless situations and blind expressions (Newberry, 1975). Ionesco believes that the new dramatist is “one who tries to link up with what is most ancient: new language and subject matter in a dramatic structure which aims at being clearer, more stripped of inessentials and more purely theatrical; the rejection of traditionalism to rediscover tradition” (Ionesco & Pronko, 1963, p. 6).

Not everything we say has the intended meaning. grammar and language have a deceptive quality; since language is the basis of all of our mental processes and it follows arbitrary conventions, we must work to uncover the true meaning of language that lies underneath these conventions and norms. Thus, it's important to go past linguistic clichés in this situation as well and use language fragmentation to uncover reality (Bermel, 1975). The awareness of human being is incomprehensible. Human beings inhabit the universe, although they possess little comprehension of both the world itself and their own purpose. He is an extraterrestrial that has been forced to leave his original location of residence and is now in a seemingly confusing and empty space (Sagi, 2002). Human beings cope with the harshness of the environment by numbing themselves to the truth via the adoption of deceptive

artificial ideas. They find solace in a predictable daily routine, which creates the false perception of having a meaningful existence (Polzler, 2018).

Ionesco employs the technique of nonsensical speech to illustrate a particular facet of the irrationality of daily existence by deconstructing the meaning of words. Everyday life relies on the coherence of our language patterns. If the ways we speak are absurd, then everyday life becomes absurd for us. While an individual may not perceive the world as absurd, their inability to communicate with others using meaningful speech patterns renders their perspective practically non-existent. Despite the apparent order and coherence of the universe, Ionesco argues that it is fundamentally ludicrous due to the limitations of communication, which confine each individual inside their own isolated existence (Couvalis, 1988).

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The innovation of this study occurs in its wide application of Absurdity, ideology and linguistic manipulation in examining Ionesco's *The Lesson*. One of the key features of this research is to elucidate Absurdity in relation to ideology, illuminating interplay language and control and the impact of language on ideology. In the end, language as a device in Ionesco's *The Lesson* opens up social spaces and new ways of making meaning. Absurd theatre is a prevailing device of interpretation, as revealed by its application in the works of Eugene Ionesco.

The study's major emphasis illustrates how the play *The Lesson* defies traditional norms and standards and how language becomes as a reflection of social norms. It shows Ionesco's effort to criticize superiority-inferiority relationship and to elevate weak individuals to the subject position. In Ionesco's *The Lesson* the weak chain, the pupil's voice is dominated by the professor who manipulated student's choice according to his preferences through shifting the girl's desire from total doctorate to partial doctorate and from mathematics to philology and she is powerless.

The speaking subject must first get access to the creative ability to generate meaning, which is a behavior full of importance and significance. The aim is to achieve active participation in the discourses that control, define, and characterize life. The research argues that language is used as a device in order to convey power dynamics so that language is seen as a reflection of societal norms. Examination linguistic absurdity such as repetition formulates a close alliance between ideology and power dynamics.

According to Terry Eagleton's philosophy ideology is the process by which meanings, signals, and values are created in social interactions and a collection of concepts unique to a certain social class or group and concepts that support a prevailing political power's legitimacy. The false beliefs that support the legitimacy of a powerful political entity and communication that is consistently cruel. The purpose of choosing the play *The Lesson* is to bridge a gap of knowledge in Ionesco's work which no well-knit study has explored. The study target is to answer the following questions: What is the role of language in shaping ideology? What is the consequence of using language to convey power dynamics?

2. Language as a Device in Ionesco's the Lesson

2.1 The Role of Language in Shaping Ideology:

The term "ideology" comes from the French word "idéologie" which is a mixture of the Greek words idéo- (idea, notion, pattern) and -logie (logia, the study of) to stand for "the science of ideas" was first used by Antoine Destutt de Tracy in 1796 (Seliger, 1977). An ideology can be simply a "complex of ideas" and "the political and social semiotic process of instilling ideas about society in the minds of members of that society" and its diffusion strives to create hegemony for that ideology (Blommaert, 1999, p. 33).

Language Ideology stands for the beliefs that people have about language and its usage and how language is perceived by its speakers (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994).

It combines linguistic signs and cultural system and their interactions with each other (Kroskrity, 2000). It encompasses language ideas that perpetuate social realm (Fairclough, 1989). It also refers to attitude and discourses that includes mental awareness and cultural system through which give individuals the ability to interpret linguistic signs (Silverstein, 1979). It concentrates on how language usage determines societal issues (Hodge & Kress, 1993). Language Ideology is the belief that how language is used in its social world. It's the conceptualizations of three entities of language, speaker and discursive practices. It's influenced by politics and how words convey meaning in cultural setting and moral interests (Irvine, 2012).

Language ideologies show the relationship between the speakers' linguistic ideas and the larger social and cultural systems to which they are affiliated, as well as how these systems give rise to these views. Language ideologies achieve this by connecting people's social experiences, political and economic goals, and implicit and explicit presumptions about language. Paul Kroskrity, a linguistic anthropologist, describes language ideology as a "cluster concept, consisting of a number of converging dimensions" with several "partially overlapping but analytically distinguishable layers of significance" (p. 496).

Michael Silverstein defines linguistic ideologies as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (1979, p. 248). As a result, speech patterns and linguistic structures are shaped and influenced by ideology. Silverstein's definition of language ideologies as "a set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (1979, p.193), with that of Irvine, who formulates language ideologies as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (1989, p. 225). The examination of "language structure and use" and "moral and political interests" may be facilitated by focusing

on language ideologies. Wortham views language ideologies as “models that link types of linguistic forms with the types of people who stereotypically use them” (2008: 43).

Language ideology is seen as moral and political representation of nature, structure, and use of languages in a social world (Irvine 1989). Language ideologies have an equal impact on perceived cultural and linguistic homogeneity. Basil Bernstein affirms that social structure exists between speech and language. Language does not reflect an abstract structural system but rather as actual communicative activities embedded in and generating social contexts of use by linguistic anthropology and kindred fields operating under the auspices of sociolinguistics and the ethnography of communication. Language is only one aspect of language ideology which creates connections between language and other social phenomena, such ethnic, gendered, racial, and ideas of personhood, appropriate human behavior, intelligence, aesthetics, and morality, and concepts like authenticity, truth, and universality. (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994)

Linguistic ideologies give their centrality to social institutions like schools and courts. Unquestioned presumptions about language become the hidden presumptions underlying assessments about a person's intellect, reliability, or fitness for a certain vocation. Studying language ideology involves dissecting the linguistic presumptions that underlie these kinds of social judgments in order to show how judgments about an individual's value may really be conclusions about the way they use language. Language ideologies reflexively modify the social and linguistic systems. Ideology does not reflect only passive transmitters of language forms from social structures or predicted superstructures. Language ideology as the more institutionalized and prescriptive evaluations of language “that attempt to guide collective sociopolitical beliefs and actions regarding language choices” (Heath 1989, p. 393).

Dell Hymes has highlighted the social dimensions of language. He looks at how language changes based on social variables including gender, race, and class. Hymes stressed how language usage should be socially acceptable in various situations. These investigations started to reveal the latent ideologies that underlie language usage and variation (Labov, 1972; Hymes, 1974). Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu investigated the connection between language and power. The notion of linguistic capital was first proposed by Bourdieu, who postulated that language is a kind of symbolic power that may be used to one's benefit in society (Bourdieu, 1991). The way that language serves as a tool for social control—shaping and limiting what may be said and thought in a society—was brought to light by Foucault's discourse studies. According to this viewpoint, linguistic ideologies uphold and legitimate social structures (Foucault, 1972).

Academics like Paul Kroskrity, Susan Gal, and Judith Irvine started to methodically investigate the ways in which linguistic ideologies influence and reflect social identities and power dynamics. Irvine and Gal explain how language traits may take on the symbolic meaning of social groupings and identities. The study of Kroskrity highlighted the fact that linguistic ideologies are varied, contentious, and a reflection of the social and political environments in which speakers find themselves. During this time, significant studies that used knowledge from sociology, linguistics, and anthropology to codify the study of language ideologies were published (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kroskrity, 2000).

Ideology is treated as false consciousness by Marx & Engels (1846). They interpret men's "conscious existence" as "their actual life-process" when they refer to consciousness. Marx and Engels affirm that "men have constantly made up for themselves false conceptions about themselves, about what they are and what they ought to be" (p. 2). They believe men must have a "critical attitude" towards this "existing reality" (p. 2). Working class are forced to have certain views that are

incorrect, misleading, warped, and misinformed by the political and social structures by dominant class (Van Dijk, 1998).

Marx and Engels perceive ideology as “pure illusion, an inverted or distorted image of what is 'real’”, Thompson, 1984, p. 5). Marx and Engels (1846) suggest a connection between people's ability to produce ideas and their actual language usage. They affirm “the production of ideas, of concepts, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men (...) language, like consciousness, only arises from the need, the necessity, of intercourse with other men” (p. 8). Marx and Engels' discussion of language's influence on ideology was mostly contained in the framework of their larger examination of society, class, and consciousness. Their materialist understanding of history and the function of ideas in society were entwined with their linguistic beliefs.

Language, according to Marx and Engels, is an outcome of social interaction. They contend that language emerges from the necessity for coordination and communication within a community, particularly in a culture where class relations play a major role. As a result, language is not only a neutral instrument of communication but is intricately linked to the power dynamics and social structures of a particular culture. Marx and Engels viewed ideology as a body of beliefs that represent and defend the interests of a certain class. In order to shape and spread these ideas, language is essential. They maintained that in addition to controlling the means of production that are material, the ruling class also controls the means of production that are mental, including language. The ruling class can preserve its supremacy and spread its ideas thanks to this control.

According to Marx and Engels, the working class is kept from realizing its own interests by intellectual systems, which is why they invented the idea of false consciousness. Thus, language may lead to false consciousness by distorting the

true nature of social connections and fostering a false perception of reality that benefits the ruling class. Marx and Engels describe in *The German Ideology* (1845-46) how the ruling class owns the means of production—both mental and material, including language and ideas.

2.2 Absurdity and Linguistic Manipulation:

Linguistic manipulation is the deliberate use of words to influence or control others, usually by misrepresenting or disguising the facts. This may be seen in propaganda, deception, politics, and even casual interactions. Euphemisms, ambiguity, and doublespeak are among the techniques used. Eugene Ionesco's *The Lesson* is a typical example, with the notion of “Absurdity and Linguistic Manipulation” “a language meant to restrict free thinking.

Absurdity may occur when language is distorted to the point that it loses its original meaning or becomes disconnected from reality. For example, in absurdist play of Ionesco's *The Lesson*, language is often repetitious, cyclical, and devoid of apparent meaning, emphasizing the absurdity of communication in a meaningless world. Language manipulation may result in ludicrous circumstances in which words no longer correlate to reality, causing confusion and disappointment.

Goodin (1980) has first defined the term manipulation as “a deceptive and covert influence adopted by a speaker (a manipulator) to intentionally and directly affect someone’s beliefs, desires, and/or emotions in ways typically not in his self-interest or, at least, not in his self-interest in the present context” (p.59). Ware (1981, p. 149), states that manipulation is a covert influence by a speaker on a person who is unaware of how the speaker influences their choices (ibid). This perspective allows scholars to view manipulation as a pragmatic process that achieves its goals without revealing guanine communication.

According to Tarasov (1990, p. 26), a speaker intentionally picks a statement that does not reveal their intended circumstance. This may be noticed when the listener is unable to understand the speaker's concealed intentions. Blass (2006), posits that manipulation is a kind of deceit when the manipulator uses the target's behavior or actions to accomplish their own purposes. As a result, manipulation takes the form of deception or persuasion.

Language manipulation is defined as “the conscious use of language in a devious way to control the others,” (Reboul, 2017) is based, practically speaking, on the use of indirect speech acts that emphasize the perlocutionary effects of what is said. Manipulation is persuading individuals to act or accept particular beliefs without using evident force. Manipulation, like cooperation, collaboration, generosity, exploitation, and free -riding, is a social concept. In language communication, manipulation is the process by which the speaker gains an advantage by persuading the hearer to do or think something that they otherwise wouldn't have.

The influence of language on public awareness may be shown in both overt and covert ways. Over the last several decades, hidden kinds of effect have become more significant and valuable (Mikhalskaya 2001). Linguistic manipulation is a widely used as an effective method of subtly influencing public perception. Along with informational, educational, and promotional purposes, Danilova (2009) believes that manipulative influence is one of the most significant roles played in social life. Danilova considers language manipulation to be “hidden linguistic impact on the recipient, intentionally misinforming it in relation to the idea or content of the speech, performed at three levels: individual, group and mass” (2009, p.12). When creating a text, manipulative discourse authors typically select the most neutral word in the semantic field; however, even a neutral word in a particular context can have an impact because, in contrast to a word with an expressive negative connotation, it transfers a positive estimation of this issue in a covert form,

reflecting the position of the entire ideological system. In the opposite situation, emotional words with a negative connotation are selected when describing events that are criticized by this system.

In linguistic manipulation, the speaker and the listener communicate with the intention of achieving a certain outcome by using words to modify the listener's behavior at the speaker's discretion. Language has the power to have on a person's or a group's consciousness; more specifically, in a restricted sense, it's the creation of a statement with the power to alter the recipient's mindset and behavior pattern.

According to N. A. Ostroushko, “linguistic manipulation” is understood as manipulation carried out through the conscious and purposeful use of the features of the structure and the use of language (P. 86). Language manipulation pervades all aspects of social life. The manipulator's ego silently enforces their ideals in all aspects of life, since it is impossible to do so openly. In the social sphere, social ideas are manipulated.

Six categories of manipulation were created by Hopper and Bell (1984) that are: “fictions,” “playing,” “lies,” “crimes,” “masks,” and “unlies”). The factors “falsehood acts”, “deceit strategies,” and “play strategies”) was developed by Buller (1986). In their study, Turner, Edgley, and Olmstead (1975) identified multiple forms of control information (such as “lies,” “exaggerations,” “half-truths,” “secrets,” and “diversionary responses”), while Metts and Chronis (1986) proposed four main types of manipulation (“falsification,” “half-truth,” “concealment,” and “escape”). The observable variation in deceptive message design, according to Metts (1989), reflects a “continuum of covert to overt misrepresentation of information,” in which “omission of all relevant information serves as one anchor and explicit contradiction of truthful information as the other” (p. 160).

McCornack (1992) affirms that people concurrently manipulate information along several different dimensions while verbally misleading another, leading to a potentially endless diversity of distinct message forms. The many ways that information may be manipulated to carry out deception are described by McCornack's information manipulation theory. According to McCornack's theory, people keep an eye on the information they reveal in casual interactions along four main dimensions: quantity, accuracy, relevance, and clarity. People have the ability to control the information they provide in terms of these four dimensions when they want to deceive others.

According to the theory of information manipulation (McCornack, 1992), conversational participants have a set of reasonable presumptions about information transmission that serve to direct the course of the discussion. Among these presumptions are those about the "quantity" of information that should be offered, the "quality" of information presented, the relevance of information within conversational contributions, and the clarity of information provided inside messages. Information manipulation theory defines manipulation as the practice of speakers taking advantage of their audience's expectations. For disclosure, via subtly changing the amount, quality, relevance, and/or clarity of the information revealed. In order to address the observable diversity in misleading message design, information manipulation theory offers a powerful conceptual framework. The realization that, despite the seemingly endless variety of misleading communication formats, the contained information differs in predictable and systematic ways is perhaps the most important contribution to information manipulation theory.

2.3 The Use of Language to Convey Power Dynamics:

Language is an innate system of accepted meanings that has been conventionalized by humans. By means of it, people carry out a variety of social tasks and convey and express their own emotions and ideas. The social functions include directing

others what to do or not do, engaging in social interactions including talking, disputing, and cheating, and co-constructing social reality among persons. Linguistic strength comes from the combination of its adaptability and vast variety of functions. Nevertheless, this is just a portion of the dynamic interaction between language and power that exists in reality.

The power behind language is a speaker's possession of a weapon, money, high social status, or other attractive personal qualities—by revealing them in convincing language, the speaker influences the hearer. The abilities of language stem from its wide variety of cognitive, communicative, social, and identity roles in meaning-making, social interaction, and language policy, as well as from a language's communicative adaptability. The ability of language to perpetuate the supremacy of legal, sexist, racist, and ageist discourses that prioritize some language user groups over others is one of these language powers.

Van Dijk (1995, p. 21) believes that ideology is “a specific basic framework of social cognition with specific social structures and specific and social functions”. It appears via language and speech during communication. Van Dijk (1996, p.7) states, “ideologies also establish links between discourse and society. In a sense, ideologies are the cognitive counterpart of power”. This indicates that ideologies connect the social circumstances of individuals and groups with the cognitive representation of action and discourse creation.

Wodak (2007, p. 209) contends that ideology is considered as “an important means of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations. Power takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions”. According to Fairclough (1992), the primary purpose of ideology is to write and generate texts that “impose assumptions” on other people—hearers and writers—on a continuous and cumulative basis—usually without being aware of them.

According to Van Dijk (1995), the ultimate goal of power is to manipulate, alter, and steer the thoughts and convictions of others in order to serve the interests of those in positions of dominance. Accordingly, he believes that the cognitive interface of various mental information, ideologies, and attitudes shapes and is modified by speech as well as social interaction (van Dijk, 2009, p. 64). Since critical discourse analysis focuses on people, groups, organizations, and institutions and is more interested in questions of power, dominance, and social inequality, it must take into account the different types of social cognition that these social collectivities share (van Dijk, 2001, p. 113). According to van Dijk (1995, p. 22), influential people have the capacity to influence at least some portions of the receivers' thoughts for their own benefit. This skill is based on several mental models of actors who “embody social knowledge and attitudes” and have a direct or indirect impact on other people's behavior (1995, p. 22).

Language is a verbal expression tool that may be used to assert expertise, question authority, and exercise power. This is a byproduct of discourse expression and is evident in the texts or language constructs chosen by social actors. Language and power are connected, according to Foucault (1982), who also comes to the conclusion that language may aid a power structure in achieving its goals. He understands that speech power has more power than physical force. According to him, power is exercised and transferred from one location to another and is associated with social networks. He finds that instead of power being permanently vested in one dominating figure, the discourse of social actors allows power to shift from one agent to the next. He opposes the notion of absolute power in a favor of the relational power that social actors promote via their language. Power may go from the bottom part of the power pyramid to the center figure, from the lower to the upper.

Fairclough (2001, p. 19) views language, whether it be spoken or written, “As a form of social practice,” According to his assertions, language and society have an inherent and dialectical relationship: “Language is a part of society; linguistic phenomena are social phenomena of a special sort, and social phenomena are (in part) linguistic phenomena” (Fairclough, 2001). Fairclough also contends that language is never value-free and are always the product of ideological construction. Language thus has a significant impact on people's thoughts, attitudes, values, conventions, and ideologies. They could influence social interactions and behavior in “causal effects” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 9). Sayer (2002) asserts that language shapes the social reality.

Another idea that is clarified by Fairclough (1995) introduces the term hegemony, holding that “hegemony is leadership as well as domination across the economic, political, cultural, and ideological domains of society,” concentrating on the connection between speech, power, and ideology (p.76). Language, a natural human system, may be used to wield power via conventionalized and non-linguistic indications. The social function of language creates and organizes social reality, communicating mental content via acts like persuasion, disputing, threatening, and inviting. Language has a crucial role in revealing power, maintaining authority, and enhancing effectiveness, making it an important stylistic area. In this regard, it was confirmed by Erickson that speech style, whether strong or weak, influences the addresser's attractiveness and credibility and also raises questions about the veracity of the addresser's information on a specific speech event. Additionally, he has shown that respondents find forceful speaking styles more appealing and trustworthy, independent of the identity of the addresser (Erickson et al. 1978, P. 276).

The strong and weak language styles were compared by O'Barr (1982, 96) in order to demonstrate the degree to which the powerful style is more convincing and

successful. He claims that the addresser with low social standing reflects their powerlessness via the use of powerless language characteristics, while the addresser with high social status strives to minimize and eliminate weak linguistic qualities. Sparks and Areni (2002, P. 518–20) further emphasized that the speaker is more compelling when they use strong (high-quality linguistic style) language choices as opposed to weak (poor-quality linguistic style) ones. The relationship between presenting style and language choices' substance results in the wide-ranging impacts on persuasion.

Simultaneously, Turner (2005, P. 6) divides “power” into two categories: control (involuntary) and influence (voluntary), meaning that individuals are either unwilling or convinced and interested. The power that persuades people to act in accordance with the wishes of the addresser by “persuading them that the desired judgement, decision, belief, or action is correct, right, moral, appropriate” is what makes “power as influence”. Van Dijk (2006, P. 359–61) notes that there are two aspects: “persuasion” and “manipulation.” As a reciprocal and communicative linguistic convention, manipulation is an illegitimate control mechanism that permits social deviation. It involves an individual manipulating another person, usually against their will or in opposition to their best interests, by attaching a more detached role—a negative outcome of manipulation. This behavior includes “abuse of power” as a result of it.

3. Analysis Ionesco’s the Lesson

3.1 Examination of Linguistic Absurdity:

Eugene Ionesco, a renowned playwright, employs language to convey themes of absurdity and the inherent meaninglessness of linguistic expression. Ionesco's works often delve into the depths of existential despair and the limitations of communication, highlighting the futility of human attempts to find meaning in a chaotic and absurd world. By analyzing Ionesco's play “The Lesson” to explore the

ways in which he employs language to evoke a sense of existential despair and challenge conventional notions of communication.

Absurdity is often defined as events or words that are unreasonable, illogical, or devoid of significance. In literature, absurdity is often employed to investigate the human condition, particularly in situations when life seems chaotic or meaningless. Albert Camus explored the “absurd” in his philosophy and show the conflict between humans' yearning for meaning and the universe's meaninglessness.

Ionesco's portrayal of absurdity and meaninglessness in language is rooted in his belief that human existence is fundamentally absurd and devoid of inherent meaning. He presents characters trapped in cyclical and monotonous routines, engaging in repetitive dialogues that often lack coherence. Through the use of fragmented syntax, disjointed dialogue, and nonsensical wordplay, Ionesco disrupts traditional linguistic structures, emphasizing the limitations of language as a tool for communication and understanding. In Ionesco's works, language becomes a vehicle for expressing the human condition's inherent absurdity and the existential angst that arises from the inability to find meaning.

One of the most essential characteristics of absurd theater is a lack of trust in language as a means of communication. Language is viewed as a channel for traditionalized exchanges and stereotypical meanings. The professor utilizes words without making the pupil understands what he is saying, and he uses language to pass the time and avoid reality. Ionesco's goal, according to Richard Coe, is to illustrate “the failure of communication and to provoke the spectator... discover his real existence” (Coe, 1970, p. 16).

The characters engage in seemingly meaningless conversations, filled with empty rhetoric and circular arguments, epitomizing the breakdown of meaningful communication. Through these linguistic experiments, Ionesco challenges the conventional idea that language is a reliable means of conveying truth and

understanding, forcing readers and audiences to confront the limitations of linguistic expression. Moreover, Ionesco's use of repetition and silence further reinforces the themes of absurdity and meaninglessness in language. Repetitive dialogue serves to highlight the characters' futile attempts to communicate and their inability to break free from their existential predicament.

The Maid affirms that this is not a sole victim but an endless circle. “Maid: And today makes it the fortieth time! And every day it’s the same thing! Every day!” This incident indicates the absurdity use of power. The professor uses language as a weapon to control her. After killing the student, the professor waits the arrival of a new student in an endless circle of futility. These endless events confirm the absurdity of societal system. Communication collapses in irrational world. The professor uses language not for the case of teaching but as a tool of domination and confusion. The professor uses the word knife repeatedly as a metaphor for power. Characters have become helpless, confused, disillusioned, estranged, disoriented, and aimless. Man lives in sorrow and that the universe is illogical and chaotic. Language is a deceit tool; however, it is used as an empty system. It combines ambiguity, intricacy, conversational fragmentation, and dark humor.

The professor implies incomprehensible language to reinforce his authoritative position. He evokes inadequate feeling of alienation so that his monological style grows senseless. The rapid shifting of subjects such as mathematics, comparative Philology, and the neo-Spanish linguistics emphasis anxious educational environment. The student tries to keep up with the new tasks but she is confronted by the professor’s dominant manner. Under pressure, student loses her critical thinking and the ability to defend herself. Language is perceived as hollow, deceptive, and confusion instead of being an adequate medium to convey meaning. Cliches, empty phrases, platitude values, futility and endless miscommunication signifies the failure of language to convey human experiences. The professor

deliberately uses complicated linguistic tactics in order to move the student's interaction to his supposed expertise. The professor undermines student's sense of confidence therefore she becomes bewildered.

Silence, on the other hand, becomes a powerful tool for conveying the unspeakable aspects of human experience, as well as the limitations of language in capturing the complexity of existence. By exploring Ionesco's writings through the lens of absurdity and meaninglessness in language, he challenges traditional notions of communication and exposes the inherent limitations of linguistic expression. Ionesco's linguistic experimentation serves as a means to evoke a sense of existential despair, inviting readers and audiences to confront the human condition's intrinsic absurdity and the search for meaning in a chaotic and inherently meaningless world.

The contact between instructor and student, as well as the challenge of conventional language use, establish a strong connection between language and power. While the student deteriorates from a self-assured young woman into a bundle of physical pain and devastation, her professor is transformed from a timid and overly apologetic man into a verbal and physical aggressor. The act culminates with the professor's assault and murder of his pupil. The maid helps the professor dispose of the body, and, reassuring him about what he has done, she places a swastika - or any other comparable insignia - on the professor's arm. Addressing the audience directly, she announces that this is a routine event: the professor has disposed of forty pupils that day, and the forty-first pupil arrives as the play's opening dialogue begins again.

The professor changes from a shy and excessively contrite person into a verbally and physically abusive, while the pupil deteriorates from a confident young lady into a bundle of physical suffering and destruction. The act's climax, which is rife with subtle and suggestive sexual overtones, has the professor assaulting and killing his student. While assisting the professor in disposing of the dead, the maid

reassures him about his actions by placing a swastika, or any other similar mark, on his arm. She immediately addresses the audience by stating that this is a regular occurrence: the professor had dismissed forty students that day, and the play's opening dialogue resumes with the arrival of the forty-first student.

In *The Lesson*, the student shows up dressed in full student regalia, with her bag tucked under her arm and a subdued final look at her assignments. Her instructor, who has a beard, dresses in traditional academic attire and is quite courteous. The dramatist exposes the authoritarian nature of the professor-pupil interaction. During the lecture, the instructor offers his student a quick pretest of her knowledge, stating that it is his responsibility to assess her and implying via encouragement that it is her responsibility to deliver thoughtful responses. As the session goes on and the student loses her cool under the professor's aggressive behavior, he emphasizes that her job is to listen, recite his words out, and answer his questions.

Through allusions to parental expectations, exams, and professional requirements, the power connection is connected to both society and family authority. The professor in *The Lesson* encourages the student to pursue the “total doctorate,” a goal she feels strongly about. When she struggles with his complicated explanations of subtraction, he forewarns her of the grave consequences for her future. The relationship among the three characters is a component of a greater socioeconomic hierarchy, as shown by references to external authority. The maid exudes a sense of knowing authority due to her superior knowledge of the circumstances and her mother demeanor toward her master. She places a familiar insignia on his arm, giving his actions an ideological tone and an air of external legitimacy. As a witness to the murders who assists the professor in getting rid of the bodies, she suggests implicit societal support for his crimes. “Wait,” she says, putting on the armband, “if you're afraid, wear this, then you won't have anything more to be afraid of... that's good political” (Ionesco, 1982, p. 78).

The power of pedagogy is not only a kind of linguistic and mental control, but it also poses a serious danger to the pupil. The play's dramatic space is organized by a similar absurdist framework, centered on a repeating human interaction of dominance and obedience. Despite occasional references to French geography, Ionesco's play conveys a feeling of disconnection from details of time and location, implying that such references are inherently arbitrary. The professor's bombastic observations about the weather, for example, lack real substance. The trajectory of the play in *The Lesson* is straightforward and unstoppable. From the first scene between the self-assured student and her terrified professor, is quite evident which course they will go, as the professor becomes the opponent and the young lady his victim.

The absurdist method is typified by a concern with the boundaries of language as a means of communication and as a linguistic device. Ionesco's work is described as the tragedy of language. In *The Lesson*, language is a major topic as it is an essential and mandated component of the curriculum. The professor's lesson, which includes a prepared presentation on the neo-Spanish languages, is centered upon linguistics and comparative philology.

The professor comes to the conclusion that all languages are essentially the same and that any linguistic differences are artificial; he says that it is amazing that humans can comprehend one another. Although language plays a significant role in *The Lesson*, regular communication is not directly related to its potency. Its importance in *The Lesson* goes beyond its function in communication. One of the main sources of power for a professor is the ability to manage language, especially the structures and conventions of pedagogical discourse. In *The Lesson*, alterations in the professor's and his student's speech patterns and relative command of language are indicators of their respective growth: "philology leads to calamity"

(Ionesco, 1982, p. 46) the maid predicts. And the student gradually loses her ability to speak until she is completely submissive to her adversary

The girl appears “almost a mute and inert object” (Ionesco, 1982, p. 46). The professor undergoes a parallel change as his halting and reedy voice becomes “powerful, ringing and sonorous” (Ionesco, 1982, p. 46). It is the professor, furthermore, who gradually silences his student: “Don't parade your knowledge,” he orders, “you'd do better to listen” (Ionesco, 1982, p. 62).

Professors abuse language's potential as a tool for reasoned communication and prioritize content above semantics. A large portion of the professor's real remarks throughout the session are illogical, such as his brief discussion of the weather or his thesis on neo-Spanish languages. The lecturer tells his student that language becomes meaningless and loses its ability to communicate, becoming “purely irrational assemblages of sounds, denuded of all sense” (Ionesco, 1982, p. 62). As he explains speech to his pupil, the professor starts to emphasize the material aspects of his words by using suggestive metaphors and significantly elaborating on his points. He “delicately, caressingly, over the vocal cords, which, like harps or leaves in the wind, will suddenly shake, agitate, vibrate, vibrate or uvulate, or fricate or jostle against each other” (Ionesco, 1982, pp. 63-64). When the professor starts repeating the word “knife” in a repetitive manner, his student complains that his piercing voice is hurting her. Eventually, the professor's words turn into a succession of forceful, staccato noises. He compromises the lesson's substance in order to make his points more impactful.

3.2 Interplay Between Language and Control:

Professors use language as a tool of control over the norms of classroom discourse and to take advantage of its tangible attributes. Words are weapons in both form and content. The use of language in the lesson is arbitrary and beyond the control of the students; it is a kind of repression. There's not the slightest indication that

she, or any subsequent victims, can change the lesson's routine that silences them. They have no authority over language, and they are unable to end the repression that comes with the academics' use of it.

The professor mimics, in a way that verges on parody, the verbal rhetoric of teaching: definitions of concepts to be retained, question-answer exchanges in which only specific answers are expected or accepted, and the constant reiteration of the rules that govern the lesson and the dissemination of knowledge. The meaningless vocabulary of conventional education is revealed. *The Lesson* play dramatizes repression and power dynamics via a well-known and relatable human interaction. Within the incoherent universes shown in both works, language ceases to be a useful tool for normal communication and reasonable debate, and instead becomes a weapon in the hands of those who control it, both ideologically and materially. The play challenges the validity of both the social reality it depicts and its own discourse norms.

Ionesco often criticizes ideological theater, which prioritizes social use. He dismisses this as nonsense citing the theater “tries to become the vehicle of ideologies, it can only become their popularizer. It simplifies them dangerously. . . . An ideological theatre is insufficiently philosophical.”⁵ Ionesco draws a line between ideas and ideology: “A work of art is not devoid of ideas. Since it is life or the expression of life, ideas are emanated from it: the work of art does not emanate from an ideology.” He distinguishes between concepts that are local and specialized and concepts that have universal characteristics.

The doorbell rings. A Maid welcomes a student to the home and informs them that the Professor will soon arrive to teach them. The Professor's arrival has unexpected consequences. The Professor is pleased when the Pupil expresses her desire to pursue a PhD after naming the four seasons with difficulty. The Professor praises the Pupil's expertise and encourages her to pursue a PhD when she correctly

responds that one and one equal two. A few seconds later, our PhD candidate struggles to subtract three from four.

The student is admitted by the maid for a lesson. When the professor shows in, they exchange pleasantries with the student. He disregards the Maid's advice to refrain from teaching math. He starts the session by attempting to ascertain the pupil's prior knowledge. He also offers her a quick exam, which she quickly passes. He then gives her a quick subtraction test, which she fails. Then, he makes an unsuccessful attempt to teach her subtraction. He tries again when he presents the topic of linguistics and comparative philology, against the Maid's counsel. At last, he kills the student.

When the maid enters, she finds out about the crime. He makes an unsuccessful attempt to murder her. She assists him in getting rid of the proof and getting ready for the next student, to whom he will probably do the same thing. An instructor strives to impart knowledge to a student. He is becoming more and more irritated with himself for not being able to. As he finds it more and more difficult to explain himself to her, his mistakes start to take the form of a nightmare. A lesson is basically an effort to transmit information from one person to another via the medium of communication which becomes unsuccessful.

Ionesco's central idea is that individuals are unable to interact with one another in an efficient manner. The two fundamental components of communication—words and numbers—are what the professor seeks to impart to the student. But he's not able to. In the first part of the play, we see the instruction from the perspective of the communicator, the Professor, who perceives everything as rational and straightforward. His efforts to clarify subtraction are very evident to us; we are well aware of what he is discussing. However, by the time, he discusses linguistics and philology, the pupil's perspective is used to convey the lesson.

The professor's remarks are incomprehensible. He says that what differentiates Spanish from neo-Spanish is their striking likeness, making it difficult to discern between the two. These tongues are “diverse in spite of the fact that they present wholly identical characteristics.” Every attempt at communication that is unsuccessful leads to frustration, which fuels a rage that ends in murder. The failure to communicate manifests itself as a lack of communication, which leads to instructor dissatisfaction, student anguish (toothache), and ultimately murder—the climax of the agony and frustration. This time, it won't end either. This procedure will be repeated for every new student.

Every character serves a purpose that is directly tied to this topic. The primary goal of a professor is to impart knowledge and convey meaning, whereas the student's goal is to acquire knowledge and comprehend the professor's meaning. And the Maid is one of those spirits that only cares about her work and has no interest in meaning or communication. She cleans up her employer's mess and maintains order in the workplace.

3.3 Language as a Reflection of Societal Norms:

The professor forms student's psyche according to his supposed societal norms. The professor, at the beginning of the play repeatedly requests the student's permission but in fact the girl's choice is associated with professor's doctrine. Both the maid and the student are out of their free will and they're obliged to follow professor's instructions. “Maid: Professor. You will do better not to start the young lady on arithmetic. Arithmetic is tiring, exhausting. Professor: Not at my age. And anyhow, what business is it of yours? This is my concern. And I know what I'm doing. This is not your department”.

The professor asks the students” how much one and one” and this is a naive question for a girl in her eighteenth and have science diploma and arts diploma too. The professor aims to manipulate the girl in order to convince her that she's able to solve

mathematics summations. He aims her to come in alignment with his desire to choose this subject. Professor: You appear to me to be well along in your studies. You should easily achieve the total doctorate, miss. Pupil: I'm so glad. Specially to have someone like you tell me this. Professor: Let's push on: how much are two and one? Pupil: Three. Professor: Three and one? Pupil: Four. Professor: Four and one? Pupil: Five. Professor: Five and one? Professor: Six. Professor: Six and one? Pupil: Seven. Professor: Seven and one? Pupil: Eight. Professor: Seven and one? Pupil: Eight again. Professor: Very well answered. Seven and one? Pupil: Eight once more. Professor: Perfect. Excellent. Seven and one? Pupil: Eight again. And sometimes nine. Professor: Magnificent. You are magnificent. You are exquisite. I congratulate you warmly, miss. With these repetition questions, the professor stimulates the pupil to come in alignment with his chosen subject.

The professor uses abstract explanations such as imagined blackboard, chalk, deductive and inductive reasoning. He asks her to multiply 3,775,998,251 by 5,162,303,508. She gives him the result in a second. She memorizes the result. The professor praises her right answer who said "that's pretty good". The professor repeatedly asks such questions therefore, the young lady gets exhausted from this process. She loses her concentration. This incident affirms the huge gap between the professor and the learner. The pupil comes to the conclusion that she cannot rely on her reasoning method. She cannot understand the professor's abstract terms.

The professor losses patience and gives up from total doctorate to partial doctorate. He doesn't follow gradual development of the student. The professor rapidly moves from mathematics to polytechnical courses to comparative philology. "Professor: I hear that you will not be able to qualify for the total doctor's orals. Pupil: Yes, Professor, it's too bad!". He evokes feeling of uncertainty and she gradually lacks confidence. She said "I've got toothache, professor". But he surprisingly responses: "That's not important. We're not going to stop for anything so trivial". The student

suffers from toothache and she pleads for painkiller. She repeats the sentence “I’ve got to toothache” more than 35 times and the professor doesn’t pay attention to her pain.

The dialogical manner between the dominant figure and the subordinated character implies the devoid of mutual understanding. Language becomes as a means of miscommunication. The professor manipulates language to subjugate the student's agency. She becomes a passive participant of discourse. The characters seemingly grow sense of isolation since they're unable to communicate between each other. The student is aligned from the society so that she's unable to comprehend the word around. The girl seems polite, lively, dynamic, a fresh smile is on her lips then she progressively loses her courage and becomes withdrawn.

The professor uses language as a tool in order to enslave her. The professor with his oppressive authority keeps her under control. Language, instead of being a tool of communication, becomes a means of confusion and insufficient means of communication. Words loses the genuine meaning and utilized for conveying societal norms. As a result, his play is seen as a mirror reflecting the actual horror of human nature, exposing how the whole moral order devolves into the pointlessness and absurdity of existence. Living in a world out of meaning, principles, and objectives forces man to confront his miserable situation (Hobson, 1957, p. 13).

Social interactions have a significant impact on how people socially isolated. Therefore, that can lead to a sense of loneliness, which has detrimental effects on people's lives. The professor, the maid and the pupil are unable to progress any meaningful plot because they are confined to a life of repetition. They are used to tell the same tale and acting out the same roles every day. Ionesco validates his perception that language and communication are only illusions so that the pupil unable to make any progress. The professor’s use of disjointed, inconsistent, and

incomprehensible language is obviously intended to portray an odd and chaotic environment.

Language is only a barrier to social interaction for humans. Man cannot develop language to speak with others because of his terrible living conditions; as a result, he is unable to communicate. Humanity makes vain attempts to discover ways to communicate socially via language. This highlights Ionesco's contention that language and communication are two different things. Ionesco criticizes the hollowness and futility of contemporary life, as well as the hypocrisy of modern society, via the use of empty words.

Language is often used for communication. Although, the professor's language is difficult to grasp since it does not adequately convey their circumstances. The inability to communicate between the professor and the pupil leads to the absurdity of the human condition. Isolation results from a breakdown in communication. Therefore, emotional isolation or detachment from other people evokes a sense of alienation. Language is depicted as inefficacy tool of conveying thought. The characters contradict themselves for instance, the pupil later gives up and becomes hopeless. For the professor, language is reduced to an empty, sound. Words are only symbols with no representational substance, which makes them fundamentally unsuitable for thought and communication.

This shifting is out of harmony and logic. The professor, the pupil and the Maid don't have individuality and even lack names. The events are out of their hands and the characters are drawn in endless repetition. Language becomes a tool for misleading and full of repetition and cliches. Characters are powerless puppets with no free agency and articulate blend expressions. Characters are constrained by the norms. They expect themselves to optimize tradition.

4. Implication and Conclusion

4.1 Understanding the Impact of Language on Ideology:

This study critically examines social structures and organizations from the standpoint of their power-wielding effects on individuals; that is, they examine how powerful individuals and organizations use language to both establish and maintain their authority. Thus, language becomes necessary for the maintenance of power, and language's influence and strength ultimately rely on the strength of the individuals and institutions using it.

The aforementioned works function as intricate illustrations of the diverse impact of language, ranging from its ability to mold personal identities to its function as a catalyst for group transformation. The investigation highlights the critical role that language plays in influencing human behavior and fostering interpersonal bonds as it navigates linguistic mazes and philosophical conundrums. Readers are confronted with the subtle yet ubiquitous ways that language pervades our everyday lives, greatly influencing our views of and interactions with the world around us, as seen through the lenses of fiction and reality. This investigation ultimately challenges readers to acknowledge the tremendous role of language as a mirror and a catalyst for cultural progress.

This study suggests a scholarly exploration of the ways in which language functions as a communication channel and a persuade instrument. This study may provide deep understandings of the ways in which language dynamics affect perception, organization, and social interaction. This section breaks out the study's objectives and potential problem statement. Addressing the underappreciated and usually ignored impact of language on human thought, social interaction, and the formation of societies is the primary objective of this research. Although communication via language is vital to human connection, language's nuances have the power to

liberate or enslave people and organizations in ways that are not always completely understood.

4.2 Concluding Remarks

The social function of language creates and organizes social reality, communicating mental content via acts like persuasion, disputing, threatening, and inviting. Language has a crucial role in revealing power, maintaining authority, and enhancing effectiveness, making it an important stylistic area. The addresser with low social standing reflects their powerlessness via the use of powerless language characteristics, while the addresser with high social status strives to minimize and eliminate weak linguistic qualities. The speaker is more compelling when they use strong (high-quality linguistic style) language choices as opposed to weak (poor-quality linguistic style) ones. The relationship between presenting style and language choices' substance results in the wide-ranging impacts on persuasion.

Ionesco's works often delve into the depths of existential despair and the limitations of communication, highlighting the futility of human attempts to find meaning in a chaotic and absurd world. By analyzing Ionesco's play "The Lesson" to explore the ways in which he employs language to evoke a sense of existential despair and challenge conventional notions of communication. Ionesco's portrayal of absurdity and meaninglessness in language is rooted in his belief that human existence is fundamentally absurd and devoid of inherent meaning. He presents characters trapped in cyclical and monotonous routines, engaging in repetitive dialogues that often lack coherence. Through the use of fragmented syntax, disjointed dialogue, and nonsensical wordplay, Ionesco disrupts traditional linguistic structures, emphasizing the limitations of language as a tool for communication and understanding. In Ionesco's works, language becomes a vehicle for expressing the human condition's inherent absurdity and the existential angst that arises from the inability to find meaning.

His characters engage in seemingly meaningless conversations, filled with empty rhetoric and circular arguments, epitomizing the breakdown of meaningful communication. Through these linguistic experiments, Ionesco challenges the conventional idea that language is a reliable means of conveying truth and understanding, forcing readers and audiences to confront the limitations of linguistic expression. Moreover, Ionesco's use of repetition and silence further reinforces the themes of absurdity and meaninglessness in language. Repetitive dialogue serves to highlight the characters' futile attempts to communicate and their inability to break free from their existential predicament. Language is a means of ideological construction. It has a significant impact on people's thoughts, attitudes, values, and ideologies. It can influence social interaction and behaviours so that language shapes social reality.

References

- Abrams, M. H. (2018). *A glossary of literary terms*. Cengage.
- Bermel, A. (1975). Ionesco: Anything but Absurd. *Twentieth Century Literature*, 21(4), 411–420.
- Cornwell, N. (2016). The absurd in literature. In *The absurd in literature*. Manchester University Press.
- Couvalis, S. G. (1988). *Feyerabend, Ionesco, and the Philosophy of the Drama*.
- Dinerstein, A. C. (2016). The radical subject and its critical theory: An introduction. *Social Sciences for an Other Politics: Women Theorizing without Parachutes*, 1–15.
- Esslin, M. (1960). The absurdity of the absurd. *The Kenyon Review*, 22(4), 670–673.
- Innes, C. (2003). *Avant Garde Theatre: 1892-1992*. Routledge.
- Ionesco, E., & Pronko, L. C. (1963). Notes on my theatre. *Tulane Drama Review*, 7(3), 126–159.
- Jacquart, E., & Ionesco, E. (1973). Interview: Eugene Ionesco. *Diacritics*, 45–48.

-
- Modreanu, S. (2011). A Different Approach to the Theater of the Absurd With Special Reference to Eugene Ionesco. *Cultura*, 8(1), 171–186.
 - Newberry, J. K. (1975). The Evolution of the Dramatic Technique of Eugene Ionesco. *Nottingham French Studies*, 14(1), 31–41.
 - P Izler, T. (2018). Camus. feeling of the absurd. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 52, 477–490.
 - Pronko, L. C. (1970). Fragments of a Journal by Eugne Ionesco. *Modern Drama*, 13(3), 341–342.
 - Sagi, A. (2002). *Albert Camus and the Philosophy of the Absurd* (Vol. 125). Rodopi.
 - Vannier, J., & Pronko, L. C. (1963). A Theatre of Language. *Tulane Drama Review*, 7(3), 180–186.
 - Vasconcelos, F. (2014). *Absurd Language in the Theatre and Arts in the 20th Century*.
 - Vassilopoulou, K. (2008). Possible Worlds in the Theatre of the Absurd. *Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference on Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 120–138.
 - Wellwarth, G. E. (1962). Eugene Ionesco: The absurd as warning. *Southern Journal of Communication*, 28(1), 6–16.
 - Irvine, J.T. & Gal, S. (2000). "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation." In P.V. Kroskity (ed). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 35-84.
 - Duranti, Alessandro, ed. (2004). A companion to linguistic anthropology ([Repr.] ed.). Malden, Mass. [u.a.]: Blackwell. pp. 496–517. ISBN 0-631-22352-5.
 - Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (eds.), *the Elements* (pp. 193–248). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
 - Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers, 1970.
 - Marx, Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1904.
-

-
- Seliger, M. (1977). *The Marxist conception of ideology: A critical essay*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998). *Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech as a Manifestation of Linguistic Ideology*. In *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 - Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
 - Fairclough, N., and Wodak, R. (1997). "Critical Discourse Analysis". In T. A.
 - Van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction: Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
 - Foucault, M. (1982). *The subject and power*. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795. Retrieved on January 24, 2013 http://www.unisa.edu.au/Global/EASS/HRI/foucault_-_the_subject_and_power.pdf
 - Reboul, A. (2017). *Communication and Cognition in the Evolution of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198747314.001.0001
 - Buller, D.B. (1986, May). *Selecting deceptive communication*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
 - Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
 - McCornack, S.A. (1988, November). *The logic of lying: A rational approach to the production of deceptive messages*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
 - McCornack, S.A. (1992). *Information manipulation theory*. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 1-16.
 - McCornack, S.A., & Levine, T.R. (1990). *When lies are uncovered: Emotional and relational outcomes of discovered deception*. *Communication Monographs*, 57, 119-15
 - Miller, G.R. (1983). *Telling it like it isn't and not telling it like it is: Research in deceptive communication*.
 - In J. Sisco (Ed.), *The Jensen lectures: Studies in contemporary communication* (pp. 91—116). Tampa, FL: University of Florida Press.
-



-
- Irvine, J.T. & Gal, S. (2000). "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation." In P.V. Kroskrity (ed). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 35-84.
 - Duranti, Alessandro, ed. (2004). *A companion to linguistic anthropology* ([Repr.] ed.). Malden, Mass. [u.a.]: Blackwell. pp. 496–517. ISBN 0-631-22352-5.
 - Silverstein, M. (1979). *Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology*. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (eds.), *the Elements* (pp. 193–248). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
 - Ionesco, E. (1982). *The Bald Soprano and other plays*. Grove Press.