

Critical Discourse Analysis of Self and Other in Najaf and Al-Kufa Communities

Assist Lecturer Fatima N. Al-Karawi

Department of English language ,faculty of education ,Imam Ja'afar Al-Sadiq University

Abstract: The references between Al-Najaf and Al-kufa people are very controversial. For too many people, the references between these groups of people are problematic and argumentative. Despite this fact, no one has really investigated how these communities are presented. For this reason, this work attempts primarily to bridge this gap of research by investigating how Al-Najaf and Al-kufa communities are presented nowadays, how they are referring to each other, is there a hatred between these groups, and is the hatred still in the same degree or it just in its way to be disappeared.

This work is a critical discourse analysis of two representations one of them is positive-self representation and the other one is negative-other representation. This work aims to find the ideologies of these two representations : positive-self representation ,Al-Najaf community, and negative-other representation, Al-kufa community. It is dedicated to answer how Al-Najaf and Al-Kufa communities are represented. The framework of this study is critical discourse analysis and the methods of this research is qualitative. The data for this analysis are gathered through interviews and questionnaire and analyzed by using one of the approach in critical discourse analysis which is: discourse-historical approach of Wodak(2001)and Wodak and Reisigl (2017). The findings show that Al-kufa community is represented negatively by Al-Najaf community. Many people from Al-Najaf ,even from other communities, represent them, Al-Kufa communities as “people of treachery” ,“stingy” , “Marsh Arabs” or " Modan” , originally refers to the one who lived or raised up in Al-Ahwar region in southern Iraq but nowadays people use it whenever they want to underestimate others or devalues others ,and “ They killed Hussein”. It also shows that not only Al-kufa community but other communities like Al- Anbar, Al-Basra, Al- Nasiriyah are represented negatively in Najaf city, by Najaf community, especially in holy places in Al-Najaf city like the Shrine of Al- Imam Ali Ibn Abi Talib. The findings of this study is very helpful because it suggests a further study to be investigated on the above-mentioned topic.

Key words: DHA, AL-Najaf community, Al-Kufa community, positive-self representation , negative-self representation.

I. Introduction

Al-Najaf and Al-kufa people are two groups of Muslims. So, being a Muslims means to love and obey God and the Messenger of God ,his prophet Mohammed. And because prophet Mohammed in too many occasions states that “Hussain {prophet Mohammed’s grandson} is from me[prophet Mohammed], and I { prophet Mohammed} am from Hussain – God loves those who love Hussain...” These words of Prophet Muhammad declares that if you loves me ,then you should love my grandson ,Imam Hessian, and those who loves Imam Hessian are loved by God. In other words, Prophet Muhammad distinctly linked those loved by God to those who love Hussain. According to this ,the group who has a relation or agree or do nothing to stop the killing Imam Hussain must be hated and distanced by the other group. Here, too many people, include Al-Najaf people, believe that Kufans, from that time, are in way or another are responsible or involved in some way in the killing and their grandchildren ,nowadays, have inherited traits of treachery. This is the core of the problem which makes people from Al-Najaf refer to those who are in Al-Kufa with negative references like “people of treachery” and “People who killed Al-Hussein”. For this reason and because the references between Al-Najaf and Al-kufa people are very controversial, problematic and

argumentative, and because a few researches ,if none, have investigated how these communities are represented. This research is dedicated to fill the research gap by answering the following questions:

1. How Al-Najaf and Al-kufa communities are represented and refer to linguistically?
2. How these communities are referring to each other nowadays?
3. Does the hatred between these groups are still exist in the same degree or it just in its way to be disappeared?

II. Review of Literature:

This study draws from some various strands of literature .First of all, there are a number of theoretical articles which examine a critical discourse analysis in politics such as critical discourse analysis of speeches of two Iraqi presidents like Nasih.R and Abboud.Z(2020), critical discourse analysis and identity like Regan.J and Zotzmann.K.(2016), critical discourse analysis and media like Sari.D.(200), critical discourse analysis and immigration like Flayih.R and Taifoor.R(2016), and critical discourse analysis in presidential election debates like Muhammed.M and Flaifel.M(2012). Secondly, many other researchers use discourse historical framework of wodak(2001)as a theoretical framework for the analysis . These researchers are Farukh.A, Ismail.M, Ahmad.M(2019), who investigated the Positive-Self representation and Negative-Other Representation that is found in the English Language Textbooks. Adlpour.R and Eslamieh.R (n.d),who investigated Positive and negative representations in the Translation of Hard Choices, in Farsi translation. Alemi.M, Tajeddin.Z , and Kondlaji.A(2017) had investigated the discourse historical approach of speeches of two Iranian Presidents. Sugiharti.S(2018),who provided discourse historical analysis of a book named “Ronggeng Duku Paruk”. So, despite of the fact that many researches are conducted on the representations of two groups, no one have really investigated how Al-Najaf and Al-Kufa communities are represented nowadays and how they are referring to each other linguistically. Thus, this research is dedicated to fill the research gap by answering how these two communities are represented and referring to each other nowadays, using DHA of Wodak(2001) as theoretical framework of the analysis.

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis is defined from a variety of viewpoints. First of all, Janks.H defines critical discourse analysis as “research tool” that captures a social problem(Janks, 2004:14).Secondly, according to Van Dijk(1988), Critical Discourse Analysis is a one type of analytical research of discourse. It deals ,primarily, with social power ,abuse, inequality ,and dominance and the way they are, reproduced and enacted by either text or talk in any social or political context. CDA has an explicit position and aims at understanding and exposing the social inequality. CDA takes also offers a wide variety of perspectives of analysis, theorizing, and ,importantly, application over the whole field.

Van Dijk(1988) states that critical research on discourse should meet some requirements as a way to effectively achieve and realize its aims. Firstly, CDA has to be better than other works or researches in order to be accepted. It, primarily, emphasizes and centralizes on social and political issues and problems. Secondly, the relative critical analysis of any social or political problems is always multidisciplinary. Thirdly, CDA does not aim to describing a certain structures but it aims to explain the structures in terms of certain concepts and properties of social interaction and specifically the social structures.CDA emphasizes one how any discourse structures are enacted legitimated and reproduced and how the relations of power and dominance are challenged certain in society ,sometimes community. (p.67-68).

van Dijk (1993) also states something about the nature of critical discourse analysis. He states that critical discourse analysis is not a unified analytical framework. It is not a homogenous model , paradigm, or a school. But, CDA is a shared perspective when doing discourse analysis or semiotics (ibid: 131).

Fowler (1991) states that Critical Linguistics, in the late 1970s, was developed by a group of linguists at the University of Anglia, whose approach is depended on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (p.71). The practitioners of Critical Linguistics ,like Trew , dedicated to isolating the ideology in the discourse and how ideological processes are displayed as systems of linguistic processes and characteristics (Trew, 1979:155).Consequently, practitioners aim to develop the analytical tools of critical linguistics that is based on a SFL, systematic functional linguistics. Therefore, practitioners of critical linguistics view language , following Halliday, in use as performing, in the same time, three main functions: ideational, textual and interpersonal functions.

As Kress (1990) states, van Dijk ,among CDA practitioners, is the most referenced and even quoted in critical researches of media discourse, include the studies that have no fitness within the perspective of CDA(p.6).

Wodak (2001) states that CDA deals with nottransparent structural relations, particularly, of power, control, and judgment which are manifested in the language. Thus, CDA concerns with the relations between language and power and how language is viewed as a form of social construction that is manipulated by different beneficinries or politicians for the purpose of implying certain ideological intentions and even a political purposes. Interestingly, there is a similarities between Wodak's model and Fairclough's and van Dijk's because CDA deals mainly with spreading the enlightenment to make people aware of the form of power and dominance so they can free themselves through self-reflection.

2.2 DHA as Located Field Within CDS

According to Wodak(2001),DHA, Discourse-Historical Approach, is part of the largely defined field of CDA and it considered to be the a distinguished critical approaches to discourse study.

Wodak and Resigl (2009) both consider discourse as ,firstly, a cluster of dependent context of semiotic practices. Secondly, they consider it as something socially constitutive and socially constituted. Thirdly, they consider it to be something related to a macro-topic. Finally, they consider it to be linked in way or another to the argumentation, a validity claims. As a result, both of them conclude that argumentatively, pluri-perspectivity ,and macro-topic-relatedness are all constitutive components or elements of a discourse.

According to Van Dijk (2003) and Wodak et al (2006), discourse is constantly historical and connected diachronically and synchronically with other communicative events that happen almost at the same time or have happened before (p.21). consequently, discourse-historical approach, DHA, aims to integrate considerable quantity of knowledge that is available about the historical sources or even the background of the political and social fields where discursive events are embedded. Doing CDA, in other words, means an integration of past, present, and future experience or events in order to make a total and extensive analysis (Wodak, 2009: 11).

2.3 Discourse Historical Approach

As Wodak (1994), states that DHA ,discourse-historical approach, was developed and sophisticated within a series of manuscripts in Vienna. The main goal of this approach is that it connects as many discourses and genres on a particular issue. With this approach, there are three dimensions that are central to methods of the historical discourse: Firstly, the content of the data ,the employment of discursive strategies, and the linguistic realization of these strategies. In the discoursehistorical method, the researcher begins with the first dimension , content of the data which is mostly linguistic, and he begins with exploring the strategies that are employed throughout a specific period of time and by specific agents. The researcher's final aim is to identify and capture the linguistic forms that are related to those strategies. The word "discursive" which is used before the strategies related to the nature of the strategies which can be either flexible or fixed in various situations. In the discourse-historical method, the discursive acts is conceived in two main ways. The first way is the integration of the information that are available to the historical background as well as the original sources that are discursive "events" and are embedded. The second way is the investigation and the exploration of the ways in which particular types and genres of discourse are subject to diachronic change(Wodak et al., 1990).

According to Wodak(2006), DHA deals with three types of critiques : Discourse or Text immanent critique that attempts to explore discourse related structures, socio-diagnostic critique that attempts to unmask the persuasive or 'manipulative' nature of specific discursive practices, and prognostic critique that attempts to develop and improve the communication. Wodak also states that the best way for the analyst to avoid the bias in discourse analysis is by following the principle of triangulation.

2.4 Basic Principles of the DHA

As Wodak (2015) states, Discourse Historical Approach is characterized by different principles. These principles are summarizes as the following:

1. As Amoussou & Allagbe (2018)states, DHA is interdisciplinary approach of critical discourse analysis. Here, interdisciplinary means to composed of different methods, theory, and research practice.
2. DHA is problem-oriented. It studies different social problems such as racism, and any forms of social inequality.
3. According to Meyer (2001), DHA moves recursively between empirical data and theory. (p.18).
4. A huge number of genres, interdiscursive and intertextual relationships are investigated and studied. The context is taken intp consideration while interpreting the discourses. In this way, DHA provides a systematic and transparent analysis of the historical dimension of discursive practices through investigating various ways in which a specific genres of discourse are changeable or subject to change over a period in time and integrating different social theories in order to explain and study the context.

5. General social theories or Grand theories serve as a foundation and conceptualize, primarily, the relations between social action and social structure and, therefore, link macro and micro sociological phenomena. On the other hands, middle-range theories serve the theoretical basis and highlights certain social phenomena like a conflict or particular subsystems of society like economy and politics.
6. Results should be applied, available, and communicated to the public.

2.5 Basic Concepts of DHA

According to Wodak(2001), there are three fundamental constitutive concepts used by DHA. These are: critique, ideology and power(p.1).

Critique:

DHA is deviated to critical theory of socio-philosophical orientation. Critical, here, means, “not taking things for granted, opening up complexity, challenging reductionism, dogmatism and dichotomies, being selfreflexive in one’s research, and through these processes, making opaque structures of power relations and ideologies manifest” (p.12). In that perspective and as Wodak (2015) and Resigl (2017) states, DHA is after the concept of social critique which mixes three related aspects: discourse immanent critique, the socio-diagnostic critique and the prospective critique.

Ideology:

Fowler (1986) states that ideology indicates the systems of belief reside in any language. Simpson (1993) defines the ideology as assumptions or a beliefs that are shared, collectively, by social groups. Wodak (2015) argues that explicit type of ideology is of no interest to CDS but the one that is hidden and inherent in our everyday-beliefs that appear disguised in different ways as a conceptual metaphors or sometimes the analogies. For this reason CDA aims to unmask the hidden ideologies especially the one that is loaded with manipulative purposes.

Power:

Van Dijk (2003) notices that power can be exercised but not as an abusive acts of dominating a members of certain group but it can be enacted and even taken-for-granted as actions of everyday life. Weiss and Wodak(2003) states that language is a “entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power. Power does not derive. from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and the long term” (p. 15).

2.6 Analytical Tools of DHA

As Fairclough(1995) states, the DHA makes use of different analytical categories for the analysis of self and other representation or positive-self and negative-self representations. Here, representation means “how language is used in a text to assign meaning to people, social groups, objects or events”. The five-level of the analytical method of Wodak involves five discursive strategies that serve as a framework of the analysis. However, these strategies may vary as a result of the problem under the investigation. These analytical tools are :

1. Nomination: it is a discursive construction that make use of different nouns, metonymies ,deictics and metaphors.
2. Predication: it is a discursive characterization that make use of different adjectives, relative clauses ,prepositional phrases.
3. Argumentation: it is a persuading addressees that make use of fallacies and topoi.
4. Prospectivization: it is a positioning writer’s point of view that make use of direct and indirect speech or quotation marks, even prosody.
5. Mitigation and intensification: it is a modifying illocutionary force that make use of augmentatives or diminutive, tag questions, and indirect speech acts, and sometimes a vague expressions.

III. Research Method:

The research method used in writing this paper was classified into three parts:

3.1 Data Source

The data for analysis, in this work, are ten questionnaires from people of different areas like Al-Najaf, Al-Kufa, Baghdad, and Karbala and ten face-to-face interviews with groups of people of different social background. The questions of the interview are formed carefully to reveal how Al-Najaf and Al-kufa communities are represented and refereeing to linguistically and how they are referring to each other nowadays. The questions, used to collect the data for the analysis for both the questionnaires and the face-to-face interviews, are in appendix A.

3.2 Method and Technique of Collecting Data

Five questionnaires are given to people from Al-Najaf city of different place. Three of them live and grow up in the center of the city while the other two are lived and grow up in outskirts of Al-Najaf city. Three questionnaires are given to people who lived and grow up in Al-Kufa while the other two questionnaires are given to

people who born in Najaf but live later on in Al-kufa. The ten interviews ,on the other hands ,are made with people outside the communities under the study. These communities are Baghdad and Karbala.

3.3 Method and Technique of Analyzing Data

The data were analyzed qualitatively based on the theoretical model of Wodak(2001) and Reisigl (2017). So that, the collection of the data and their analysis were done under the supervision of two of the greatest experts in the field of the critical discourse analysis, Wodak(2001)and Reisigl (2017). The researcher is going to use a discourse-historical approach of Wodak(2001) and Reisigl(2017) in analyzing the data collected. In this work, the data for the analysis are examined according to Wodak's and Reisigl's procedures and discursive strategies of analyzing the data. Consequently, this work attempts to display how these communities: Al-Najaf and Al-kufa form positive-self representation,Al-Najaf,and negative-self representation,Al-kufa. This study makes use of discourse historical approach and the strategies of Wodak and Reisigl in order to investigate how these two controversially, at some extent, are represented and refer to linguistically. And how they refer to each other nowadays.

IV. Analysis

In this study, the target data is being analyzed according to Wodak(2001)and Reisigl(2017). In this section, the researcher will investigate how two communities :Al-Najaf and Al-Kufa for the in-group or the positive-self representation (Al-Najaf community) and the out-group or the negative-self representation (Al-kufa). The analysis unmask how the in-group or the positive-self representation (Al-Najaf community) discriminates the out-group or the negative-self representation(Al-Kufa community). The in-group, Al-Najaf community, makes use of classification of referential ,argumentation and prespectivization strategies. These strategies depicts the positive-self representation ,Al-Najaf community as superior to the negative-self representation or the out-group, Al-Kufa community, in being virtuous, educated, generous and open-handed. Consequently, out-group ,Al-kufa community, is represented as “people of treachery” ,“stingy” , “Marsh Arabs” or " Modan” , originally refers to the one who lived or raised up in Al-Ahwar region in southern Iraq but nowadays people use it whenever they want to underestimate others or devalues others ,and “ They killed Hussein”.

(1) “people of treachery” or “They killed Al-Hussein”.

Three people from Al-Najaf indicates that Al-kufa community are “people of treachery”, “they killed Al-Hussien”. One person who lived and grow up in Al-kufa supports this point of views. Two interviews with people from Karbala also indicates that Al-kufa community are people of treachery. All of them justify this reference by believing that the Shia of Al-Kufa who wrote hundreds of letters ,the number of letters that were written to Imam Hussien from the Kufans after the demise of Muawiyah to Imam Al-Hussien asking him to come to Al-Kufa and be their imam. However, Kufans who then firstly abandoned the Imam's emissary to Kufa , Muslim ibn Aqeel and then secondly, abandoned the Imam himself by not assisting him on the plains of Karbala and are responsible in way or another in ther murdering of Imam Al-Hussein.

Thus, this story of the treachery of Kufans who wrote letters to Imam Al-Hussien inviting him to come to Al-Kufa and in the end it was them that abandoned him , make Al-Najaf (the positive-self representation) very irritating . Consequentially, AL-Najaf people conclude that Kufans, from that time, are in way or another are responsible for the killing and nowadays, ironically, have inherited traits of treachery. This is the basis or the point from which the hatred and the separation between Al-Najaf community as a positive-self representation and Al-Kufa community as negative-self representation.

(2) “stingy”

The five people who lived and grow up in Al-Najaf refer to the people of Al-Kufa community as being “stingy”. Interestingly, two of people who born in Al-Najaf but later on live in Al-kufa asserts that Al-kufa community are very “stingy” people and many situations can reveal that kufan are stingy and accustomed to “stingy” trait. For this reason , the separation between Al-Najaf and Al-kufa communities are still existed and ,thus, forming two controversial communities in which Al-Najaf community ,the positive-self representation, are represented as generous and open-handed ,as the ten people from Baghdad and Karbala indicate and one of Al-Kufa community asserts this fact, while Al-kufa community, the negative-self representation are represented as “stingy”.

(3) Marsh Arabs” or " Modan”

Originally , “ Modan” or *Marsh Arabs*” mean and refer to the one who lived or raised up in Al-Ahwar region in southern Iraq but nowadays people use it whenever they want to underestimate others or devalues others. Al-kufa community represented negatively in Najaf city, by Najaf community, especially in holy places, ironically, in Al-Najaf city like the Shrine of Al- Imam Ali Ibn Abi Talib. The clear cut or the heterogeneous relation between the two communities: Al-Najaf as in-group and Al-Kufa as out-group is made in this section. Al-Kufa community are discriminated and refer to and treated as “Modan” even if they are educated and live a high standard life. This is

revealed and assured through :Firstly, the two people who born in Najaf but later on live in Al-kufa, the five people who live and grow up in Al-Najaf and , finally, the three people who born in Al-Najaf but later on live in Karbala.

V. Conclusion :

This work aims to investigate how Al-Najaf and Al-Kufa communities are represented and refer to linguistically and how Al-Kufa community, as forming the out-group or negative-self representation , is referred to nowadays. This work is a critical discourse analysis of two representations one of them is positive-self representation and the other one is negative-other representation. This work aims to find the ideologies of these two representations : positive-self representation ,Al-Najaf community, and negative-other representation, Al-kufa community. The framework of this study is critical discourse analysis and the methods of this research is qualitative. The data for this analysis are gathered through interviews and questionnaire and analyzed by using one of the approach in critical discourse analysis which is: discourse-historical approach of Wodak(2001)and Wodak and Reisigl (2017). The findings show that Al-kufa community is represented negatively by Al-Najaf community. Many people from Al-Najaf ,even from other communities, represent them, Al-Kufa communities as “people of treachery” or “They killed Al-Hussien”,“stingy” , “Marsh Arabs” or " Modan”. The findings of this study is very helpful because it suggests a further study to be investigated.

References

- [1]. Wodak, R. (2001). What Critical Discourse Analysis is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage
- [2]. Reisigl & Wodak (2008). *The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis Second Edition* (pp.87-121). India Pvt Ltd New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- [3]. Wodak, R. (2011). *Complex Texts: Analysing, Understanding, Explaining and Interpreting Meanings*. *Discourse Studies*, 13 (5), 623-633.
- [4]. Wodak, R. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach*. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1-14.
- [5]. Van, Dijk, T. A. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (ed), *The Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [6]. Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [7]. Van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). *Ideology and Discourse Analysis*. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11 (2), 115-140.
- [8]. Reisigl & Wodak (2008). *The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis Second Edition* (pp.87-121). India Pvt Ltd New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- [9]. Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [10]. Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism, First Edition*. UK: University Press.
- [11]. Amoussou, A. Allagbe A. A. (2018). *Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis*, *International Journal on Studies on English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 6, 11-18
- [12]. Reisigl, M. (2017). *The Discourse-Historical Approach*. In J. Flowerdew, & J. E. Richardson (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp.44- 59).Routledge. Access on July 25th , 2018 <http://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315739342.ch3>
- [13]. Mai, S. E. & Al-Shaymaa, M. M. A. (2015). *Coqueting Females versus Males of Manners: Critical Discourse Analysis of Egyptian Street Songs*. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6 (5), 190-196.
- [14]. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research*. In R. Wodak& M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.
- [15]. Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Appendix .A

- If you asked to refer to people of Al-kufa community what would you say about them?
- Do you think of Al-Kufa community negatively or positively? why?
- Do you know someone refer to Al-kufa community in negative way? If yes how they are referring to them?
- Do you think there is a hatred between Al-Najaf and Al-Kufa communities? Justify your answer.
- What do you think the source of the hatred between these communities?
- Do you think the hatred between these groups of people are operative nowadays or never exist? what would you say about someone from Al-Kufa community that pissed you off?
- what would you say about someone from Al-Najaf community that pissed you off?
- Would you marry someone from Al-Najaf community? why?
- Would you marry someone from al-kufa community? why?