Abstract: Sunni – Shia polemic becomes issues depict the debate in Islamic discourse. Even though it starts from political issue, while in its progress meddling in theology area to justify the truth of each other. In this context, verbal violence often occurs to attack, hurt, insult, or weaken the opponent. This paper will discuss verbal violence in the Sunni – Shia polemic as has been written in Al-Munażarāt baina Fuqahā’i al-Sy‘āh wa Fuqahā’i al-Sunnah book. The paper focuses on discussing the form and the factor behind these violations. The study is conducted using qualitative descriptive analysis method. The research result shows that the verbal violence found in the text quite varied, which are verbal violence in the form of satire, accuse or defame, mock, intimidate, curse, and threaten. Factors that cause violence also vary. However, the main factor of verbal violence is when the speaker is carried away by the critical situation of the debate. Other influencing factor is the speaker feels proud of himself or group, disappointed, hatred, and power relation. This article concludes that verbal violence can be found in debate on Islamic religious discourse.
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A. Introduction

Among many sects, Shia is one of the streams that much discussed by religious figures and academics. Shia relation with some Islamic sects is still being debated in the discourse of Islamic study. Since its appearance, Shia has become spotlight, in fact, it seemed regarded as ‘monster’ in Islam. The sect that recognizes themselves as ahl al-bait lovers reaped many criticisms, better that Sunni group. Heresy and heathen appendages are increasingly attached. The phenomenon occurs is not without reason. The sects outside Shia presumes that this sect had disbelieved some of Prophet Companions, include the three companions, except Ali who was included in the rank of Khulafa’ al-Rasyidin.

Like any other conflicts, friction between Shia and Sunni Islam is also mediated by third party, this is shown by King of Malik Syah’s effort, the local government as well as the leader of Bani Saljuq, when encountered some of his citizens were debating in group of Sunni and Shia. Malik Syah arranges the two sects meeting in a dialogue forum in the form of debate. The debate is perpetuated in a book entitled with Al-Munazarât
Verbal Violence in Sunni-Shia Debate

*Baina Fuqahā’i al-Syi’ah wa Fuqahā’ al-Sunnah* Book Study.

The debate between both sects in the book took place on the 5th H century, precisely on Daulah Saljuqiyah which was conducted based on direct instruction from King Malik Syah. In the debate, he was accompanied by minister called Nizam Malik as the executive board. The person who acted as note-taker was Muqatil bin Attiyah.¹

Debate as activity in expressing argumentation has characteristics on language dynamics. ‘Bicker’ or pros-cons toward argumentation among debate participants are unavoidable. As in martial arts, violence phenomenon performed by the players is indisputable, likewise in bickering. Verbal violence in the form of harsh utterance is widely created between two sects; in the end it will only cause hatred and trigger of ongoing conflict.

This paper is based on the phenomenon of symbol or violence language used in Sunni-Shia debate which is resulted in social collision. Not only that, the impact of verbal violence also could escalade both conflicting side due to the participant in the debate commonly followed by academics from each sect. Study on the debate, as an object, becomes interesting because the description of debate situation is full of critical emotional outburst, thus, verbal violence is inevitable. Therefore, based on the problem mentioned, the paper tries to answer some problems regarded to verbal violence phenomenon in the debate of both sects by referring to research question, how the verbal violence occurs in the Sunni-Shiah debate and why the verbal violence occurs in the debate.

Theoretically, the research in this paper uses theoretical framework from Pierre Bourdieu in his book, *Language and symbolic power*, and Jean Jaques Licerce in his book, *The Violence of Language, which had also been translated into Arabic language entitled 'Unf al-Lughah* (verbal violence). The main idea of Pierre Bourdieu is “habitus”, “principal”, “domain” or “arena”, and “symbolic violence”. Habitus is some sort of *mind* and habit, custom, and behavior which shapes episteme either collectively or individually. The habitus (mentally) can create social production in the society. It could exist as the light in the society forming collectivity of certain group. This diversity of habitus will make the society shape the performance of distinguishing characteristics in a community.

Therefore, every individual or social group thinks, behaves, and acts that pushed by their each habitus. In other word, the habitus has become their *Worldview*. Similarly, religious group such as Sunni, Shia, and any other groups which every ideas, thought, action, and their attitude are influenced by their habitus, and of course every group in its penetration to rule others also must be supported by the strong principal, whether religious knowledge principal, social principal, capital, or economic principal.

While Bourdieu proposed Habitus theory, principal and arena were to explain symbolic violence, so, J.J licerce more emphasized on linguistic analysis related to language usage. According to him, structural theory proposed by Ferdinand De Saussure saw language in structural aspect had not explained the idea, meaning, and concept in language yet. It could not totally represent its speaker. As well as transformative-generative theory initiated by Noam Chomsky who saw the meaning of language more on the representation of reason or thought. In his opinion, language had two structurized layers: surface structure and deep structure. Licerce proposed question: Who is speaking? The Language, or the speaker? He *saw that a speaker in language usage was hampered by social reality and psychologically in quite specific. Barriers to social and psychological reality eventually created language violence or verbal violence.*

Afterward, the paper aims to describe forms of verbal violence in Sunni-Shia debate and explains some factors behind the verbal violence. However, the research describes verbal violence phenomenon in linguistic point of view, and also conveys spoken culture of violence-nuanced in Arabic language.

The paper becomes very interesting because of two main reasons. First, Not Much – to say that there is no - work or book particularly discusses verbal violence, even more in Indonesian language. Even though lately, it appears some essays and scientific works whether in articles or essays generally themed symbolic violence and several other themed language violence or verbal violence. Among those writings, just mention for example Anari Wahyu Utami’s article entitles *verbal and non-verbal violence by the teacher toward students on SMAN in Surabaya,* she concludes that verbal violence commonly occurs caused by authority factor, especially teacher’s authority toward student.2 Other research is

---

Muhammad Hamam’s article entitles *al-‘Unf al-Lughawi fī al-Khithāb as-Siyasi al-Maghraby.* In the paper, Hamam focuses on verbal language study from politc point of view. Hamam reports that the language violence has changed its function which is initially as media to deliver information from the speaker (ruler) to the listener (society), it becomes media to influence and force society to take action, stance, belief, and certain behavior that corresponds with language forms used by the ruler. In other word, the paper gives conclusion that actually communication process does not merely transfer concept and information, but has transformed into illocutionary force.

Secondly, Sunni-Shia debate is an interesting dialectics; particularly to Islam believers and generally to Islam observers, debate constellation in both of them is still steady and continues until present time. However, all this time, researches related to Sunni-Shia struggle is more dominated on theology. While the research on Sunni-Shia debate related to verbal violence between both of them has not existed yet, at least until the research in this paper is conducted.

In order to create expected finding, the paper limits domain of the research on the book of *al-Munafarat Baina Fuqaha’ as-Sunnah wa Fuqaha asy-syi’ah* in the text of *al-mumzjarat al-‘ula,* because only in this session can be found nuanced-dialogue with debate style. The issues will be discussed is on how the form of verbal violence in Sunni-Shia debate and why verbal violence occurs. These two issues will be studied using agih approach that is, the method by which the instrument is part of relevant language. In this step, researcher observes verbal violence phenomenon in the debate which is analyzed by dividing lingual data unit into several elements that will be classified in the next step. In addition to agih method, the research also uses contextual method which the researcher try to understand speaker’s intention by classifying utterance type, based on language act in coveys meaning or speaker intention elaborated based on

---


context and speaker’s interlocutor reaction. Utterance becomes data that analyzed based on context which is interpreted by verbal violence theory. Technically, in collecting data, it was used heed method that was called observation method in social research, namely observing the use of language. At a later stage, note taking technique is used. It is conducted by filtering data then takes notes. After the data sorting process is carried out, qualifications are made against the data considered relevant to research based on verbal violence.

B. Debate and Verbal Violence Practise

There are not many works or books which specifically discuss verbal violence even more in Indonesian Language. Lately, some essays and scientific works were emerging commonly themed symbolic violence and others themed language violence or verbal violence. Over both theme, the theoretical reference refers to the work from Pierre Bourdieu’s entitled Language and symbolic power translated from France language, and also has been translated into Arabic language entitled Al-Ramzu wa al-Sultah (symbol and violence), and the book The Violence of Language by Jean Jaques Licercle translated into Arabic language entitled ‘Urf al Lughah.

Pierre Bourdieu’s main idea was “habitus”, “principal”, “domain” or “arena”, and “symbolic violence”. Habitus was some kind of mind and habit, custom and behavior that shapes episteme either collectively or individually. Habitus (mentally) could create social production in society. It could quickly present as a light in society formed collectivity of certain group. This diversity will make the community shape distinguish performance and identifier in a society. Therefore, every individual or social group, thinks, behaves, and acts encouraged by their each habitus. In other word, habitus had become their Worldview. Thus, religious group

---
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such as Sunni and Shia, with all their opinions, thoughts, actions, and behaviors are really influenced by their habitus. Surely, it is needed a strong principal by each group in its penetration to rule the other, whether religious knowledge principal, social principal, capital, or economic principal.

While Bourdieu proposed Habitus theory, principal and arena were to explain symbolic violence, so, J.J Licercle more emphasized on linguistic analysis related to language usage. According to him, structural theory proposed by Ferdiani De Saussure saw language in structural aspect had not explained the idea, meaning and concept in language yet. It could not totally represent its speaker. As well as transformative-generative theory initiated by Noam Chomsky who saw the meaning of language more on the representation of reason or thought. In his opinion, language had two structurized layers: surface structure and deep structure.\(^{11}\)

J.J Licercle proposed theory that he called as “remaining” theory (reminder, al-mutabaqqi). According to him, every language theory builds its object by separated “the relevant” from “the irrelevant” phenomenon and take out the latter (irrelevant). Consequently, all of the language theory abandons the rest. This rest is thought as very creative, dynamic unstable and difficult to be formulated, but must be acknowledged in its existence. The remaining theory emphasizes more on violence in language. Licercle proposed question: Who is speaking? The Language, or the speaker? He saw that a speaker in language usage was hampered by social reality and psychologically in quite specific. Barriers to social and psychological reality eventually created language violence or verbal violence.\(^{12}\)

Verbal violence is an act of language abuse. Language misused or language abused is quite strong magnet causes violence utterance. Wherefore, language function basically became cooperative tool and united social relation has been ‘misconducted’ in reverse side. Therefore, language has two paradox functions. The first function is language as social hospitality, and the second is as anti-social.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Licercle, *The Violence of Language.*


Sudaryanto in Simpen mentioned that there are three utterance forms categorized as language misused, which are: narcissistic, mansurbative, psitasistic utterance. The narcissistic utterance is a language phenomenon using utterance to praise themselves without regarding the interlocutor. Including this category is the usage of high language without regarding interlocutor understanding level. The mansurbative utterance is a language act based on emotional outburst of the speaker. In this case, the speaker does not have psychological burden in speech. Output of these speech are: cursing and dirty speech. Psitasistic speech is a form of speech that is an imitation of what is said by other speech partners. Therefore, this type of speech is considered as the sound of a Parrot.\(^\text{14}\) The imitation speech is to underestimate and consider not serious. This can be indicated with the different speech tone of the imitator or by negative expression of the copycat.

Simpen also stated that verbal violence is a language act causes someone uncomfortably, worry, anxiety, depressed, and threatened.\(^\text{15}\) In the mainstream, verbal language is bad expression that contains scorn, mock, curse, and insult element. In other term, verbal violence is also called as verbal bullying, which expression by cursing, making fun, and insulting either in personal or racial.\(^\text{16}\) Related its forms, verbal violence is a ‘subtle’ violence using harsh words or other language symbols. Verbal violence also includes threat, banish, coercion, and humiliation. Even though verbal violence includes in subtle violence, but the effect is painful as well as physical violence. In other words, this type of violence called as psychological violence by making emotion as its object and words as an intermediary, also emotional condition that disrupts the soul.\(^\text{17}\)

Another important point in understanding verbal violence is contextualization of speech. This results in consequences that not all the


\(^{15}\) Ibid.


harsh speech forms verbal violence. There are some supporting factors of speech that can affect difference forms and speech functions, such as social distance factor among speakers, also social environment and circumstances behind the speech. It means that verbal violence is not merely on diction, but also supported by contextual bound. In this study, social environment factor will not be considered deeply, considering this study starts from pragmatic frame, not sociolinguistic. Context in pragmatic frame covers partial and temporal dimension.\(^{18}\) Simpen devided verbal violence as follows:

1. **Satirize**, is the act of language which the primary purpose is expressed indirectly, but it could be received by the receiver. Satire usually conducts by comparing the main objectives with other objects, *it is better to ride our own motorcycle than a ride a credit car.*

2. **Accuse or Slander**, is an act of language that is not based on truth or reality, and cannot be accounted. This is done because of jealousy, hatred, or just looking for sensation.

3. **Mock**, is the act of verbal violence because of character destruction: making fun until causes self-unconfidence. Moreover, mocking also includes harass and disgrace someone.

4. **Intimidate**, is the act of verbal violence that creates anxiety. This is generally done in order the interlocutor follows the speaker’s intention. It causes uncomfortable feeling and worried to the speaker.

5. **Curse**, is a language misused that basically raise dignity, but has the contrary function. Curse is spoken with harsh language, disgusting, taboo, and indicates hatred. This type of verbal violence depends on certain social culture. For instance, something that is taboo in particular region, does not mean taboo in the other region.

6. **Threaten**, is an act of frightens excessively. Threaten is an act that is more than just frighten. The example of this type is “If you are still late, next week you are prohibited to enter the class, so does for the weeks to come?”\(^{19}\)

---


Language contains violence element can make uncomfortable feeling to the ‘violence victim’ because it uses a quite harsh language symbol, of course by considering context as explained before. This case describes that verbal violence can not be separated from the speaker’s perception in the interaction. Each of the speakers has their own perception. Talk about perception, speech recipient is the main party in determining verbal violence. For the reason, in some cases, the listener feels uncomfortable with the speaker’s speech, even though the speaker does not meant to do, or the speaker intents to make the interlocutors feel uncomfortable, but they do not feel that way. Perception is influenced by self-emotion.

Verbal violence phenomenon can not be separated from its source. The phenomena caused by the speaker’s interest in venting his emotions encouraged by various sources. The main source that results verbal violence, according to Simpen, is Power that spread in Caste category (social stratification), gender, age, wealth, and intelligence. Power is quite significant in encouraging verbal violence act. The power also considered in temporal cases, for instance in the certain context of the speaker A needs B, which phenomenon is not least found.

C. Exposing Verbal Violence in Sectarian Debate

These are several findings related to verbal violence found in Sunni-Shia debate refer to problem limitation as mentioned before. In this step, the writer describes each verbal violence form as well as its background factor. To simplify, the writer presents the analysis result in the table. The data mentioned is as follows;

1. Satirize

These are several findings related to verbal violence found in Sunni-Shia debate refer to problem limitation as mentioned before. In this step, the writer describes each verbal violence form as well as its background factor. To simplify, the writer presents the analysis result in the table. The data mentioned is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speech data (Page)</th>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>The speech was related to Shia’s answer toward Sunni’s question about the chalifates of Prophet companions: Abu Bakar, Umar, and Ustman.</td>
<td>العباسي: أيا الملك قبل هذا العلو؟ إذا لم يكن الخلفاء المؤمنين فكيف اخترهم المسلمون خلفاء، واقتدوا بهم؟</td>
<td>It’s a fool-stubborn statement for those who consider Abu Bakar, Umar, and Usman as Chalifate. In other words, the speaker says that Sunni is a fool and stubborn group.</td>
<td>Responds to interlocutor’s question (Sunni) that seems obtrude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>Appointment of Abu Bakar as Chalifate. The dialogue was started by Shia’s question that Sunni group had ignored the Prophet’s mandate by appointed Abu Bakar as Chalifate instead of Ali.</td>
<td>العباسي: لكن علي بن أبي طالب لم يكن أهلا للخلافة، حيث أنه كان صغير العمر بينما كان أبو بكر كبير العمر...</td>
<td>Shia speaker says that Sunni considers human know more than God and His prophet. This bitter speech indicates a statement that Sunni is knowledgeably in deciding the better thing.</td>
<td>The anger of Shia’s speaker toward Sunni’s statement that Ali did not have enough expertise to be the caliph at that time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Accusing or Slanderng

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speech data (Page)</th>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>The initial statement in talking about discussion topic with accusing tone.</td>
<td>باس: من يدعكم أنتم الشيعة أنكم لا تعرفون بالقرآن (ص. 19).</td>
<td>Shi’ah group is accused for not acknowledge Al-Qur’an.</td>
<td>Motivation to strike down the interlocutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>The initial statement in delivering discussion topic with accusing tone</td>
<td>العلوي: من انحرافاتكم وأباطيلكم حول الله سبحانه أنكم تقولون إن الله يجير العباد على المعاصل والحمرات ثم يعاقبهم عليها (ص. 26).</td>
<td>Sunni’s doctrine is considered diverging in the term of Allah’s will.</td>
<td>Motivation to strike down the interlocutor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Mocking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speech data (Page)</th>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>In aside dialogue, the speakers are involved in communication which quite warm; discussion of Muslim’s Leader at that time.</td>
<td>الباس: إن أعرف إمام زماني! العلوي: فمن هو؟ العلوي: الملك! أيا علم: العلوي ولا يكتب أن الملك تلك تتماذا إلا ذلك يقول ص. (64).</td>
<td>The speaker said that Sunni was lying and trying to look good.</td>
<td>Speaker’s irritation toward Sunni’s statement and hypocrisy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>This dialogue is as Shia’s response toward clarification from Sunni that they did not intend to generalize the disbelief of Prophet’s companions.</td>
<td>الباس: إن قصدت بكل الصحابة أبا بكر عمر وعثمان وأتباعهم العلوي: نقضت نفسك بنفسك. ألم بقر أهل المنطق أن (الموجبة الجزئية نقيض السالبة الكلية) فإنك تقول مرة إن الشيعة يكفران كل الصحابة وقول مرة إن الشيعة يكفرن بعض</td>
<td>Sunni are considered not consistent with their statement.</td>
<td>The fact that Sunni were in mistake over the speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
الصحابة (ص. 17): العباسي: كلاً إن لم أقل أن الناس أعلم من الله ورسوله.

العلوي: إذن لا معنى لكلامك، فإن كان الله والرسول قد عيننا إنسانا واحده للخلافة والإمامة، فاللازم أن تقتدي به، سواء رضي به الناس أم لا! (ص. 44)

الملك - موجه الكلام إلى العباسي: ما جوابك على كلام العلوي؟

العباسي: إنني لم أسمع بمثل هذا الكلام من ذي قبل.

العلوي: الآن وحيث سمعت هذا الكلام، وتجلى لك الحق فاترك خلفاءك، واتبع خليفة رسول الله الشرعي (علي ابن أبي طالب عليه السلام) (ص. 51)

الملك: فلمادأ سكت في أول الأمر؟

الوزير: لأنني أكره أن أطعن في أصحاب رسول الله ص!

العلوي: عجيب أن تكره ذلك والله ورسوله لم يكره ذلك حيث أنه

شيعة

The speaker accused Sunni had stated that humans know more than God and His Prophet. The conclusion is derived from Sunni’s statement that considered Ali is not worthy yet to replace Muhammad.

Shia’s speaker stated that Sunni’s statement is meaningless, it was just an excuse.

Shia

The debate in this case had reached into Sunni’s explanation related to Umar’s badness and his impudence in leading.

The speaker wanted to say that Sunni’s belief is wrong.

Shia

Public opinion was annoyed toward the interlocutor speech that underestimate Ali bin Abi Thalib.

There is an opportunity to influence Sunni because of their nescience.

In other words, factor in verbal violence is the power of knowledge and information.

Shia

Respond to the minister’s gesture chose to be silent when Shia presented facts about several badness of Prophet companion’s.

The Minister chose to be silent because of "عجب" expression to expressed his bitterness as well as rebutted the interlocutor’s statement.

Shia

The speaker was not satisfied by the silencecy of the Minister.
4. Intimidating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speech data (Page)</th>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>The respond to Shia’s statement that Sunni’s leader is the person who firstly conducted heresy (bid’ah) in Islam, which was Umar.</td>
<td>الملك: إذن كيف تتبع نحن إنسانا أبدع في الدين؟</td>
<td>Warning and Judging of Shia’s speaker that every Umar’s followers, as the heresy, are hell fellow. In term of the speaker regarded Sunni as the hell fellow.</td>
<td>Effort to respond Sunni’s statement that Shia is heresy fellows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>The aside speech was spoken by Shia in the third day debate. The speech was raised because of fanaticism.</td>
<td>العلوي: إياكم الملك، إني أشهد أن العباسي من أهل النار، إذا مات على هذه الحالة (ص. 63)</td>
<td>The Sunni group will enter the Hell if they die in Sunni, which its fanaticism regarded to the fourth Imam.</td>
<td>The speaker’s desires to the interlocutor following the intention of the speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Cursing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speech data (Page)</th>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>Sunni’s statement in aside column was a response of the King’s question related to Sunni’s excuses from shiah’s statement.</td>
<td>الملك: أها الملك اسأل هذا العباسي هل يجب على العالم الحافظة على كتاب الله وأقوال رسول الله. أم يجب عليه المحافظة على عقيدة العوام المنحرفة عن كتاب الله وأقوال رسول الله. أم يجب عليه المحافظة على عقيدة العوام المنحرفة عن الكتاب والسنة؟</td>
<td>Heresy’s Labelling (ahl bid’ah) toward Shia group.</td>
<td>Emotion outburst of the speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>This speech was a response of King’s ‘wavering’ confidence after hearing Shia’s explanation about the disbelief of Abu Bakar, Umar, and Ustman.</td>
<td>الملك: عجب، عجب جدا أي كنت أعتبر عمر من السابقين إلى الإسلام، وأعتبر إيمانه مثاليًا، والآن ظهر لي أن في أصل إيمانه شك وشبهة! العباسي: ميلا أها الملك، ابق على عقيدتك، ولا يخدعك هذا العلوي الكذاب. (35)</td>
<td>The speaker called Shia as the liar.</td>
<td>Worries of the speaker about Shia’s hegemony toward the King, also their position were getting cornered in front of the King.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>The speech in the next column is the closing statement of the King in the kingdom.</td>
<td>الملك: أعظموا أيها الجماعة أي قد اطمنت ووثقت من هذه المجاورة (وقد كانت دامت ثلاثة)</td>
<td>Malik Syah stated that Sunni is a vanity and deviated group</td>
<td>Malik Syah’s disappointment toward Sunni and the awareness on the truth of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
debate which was expressed after realized, that all this time, the group he believed can not be trusted.

Shia group that he believes now.

Shia presumed the Sunni as blind followers, without critical mind.

The speaker’s pride toward his group as Ja’fary followers, and also as the respond to Sunni’s fanaticism toward the fourth Imam.

Disgracing the interlocutor by stating them that could not be trusted. Malik Syah claimed Sunni had lied.

Dejection and anger.

King

The speech was spoken after Malik Syah clarified the truth of hadith to the Minister about who should become the Imam of the muslim at that certain time. The speech was addressed to Sunni because they had denied the hadith.

The speech context in the aside dialogue discussed about several imam of fiqh madhhab

أيام) وعرفت وتيقنت أن الحق مع الشيعة في كل ما يقولون ويعتقدون. وأن أهل السنة بالطل عليهم منحرفة عقيدةهم (ص. 64)

الملك: ومن أين علمت أنه من أهل النار؟

العلوي: لأنه ورد عن رسول الله (قولة): من مات ولم يعرف أمام زمانه مات ميتا جاهلية (فاسل أبا الملك من هو إمام زمان العباسي؟

العباسي: لم يرد هذا الحديث عن رسول الله.

الملك: وعلم ورد الحديث عن رسول الله؟

وزير: نعم ورد.

الملك: كنت أظن أنك أبا العباسي ثقة، والآن تبين لي كذبك!

الملك: ما جوابك يا عباسي؟

العباسي: تقليب أئمة المذاهب الأربعة عادة اتخذناها نحن السنة!

العلوي: بل أجبركم على ذلك بعض الأمراء، وأنتم اتبعتم أولئك متابعة عمياء لا حجة لكم فيها (ولا برهان (63)
The following speech is Malik Syah’s response after hearing Sunni’s group suggestion.

Malik Syah called Sunni sect as Idiot. Moreover, the speaker stated that Sunnis was stubborn.

Malik Syah’s furious toward Sunni over the judgement that Shia is a liar,

Meanwhile, Nizam Mulk justified what Shia said.

6. Cursing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Speech data (Page)</th>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shia</td>
<td>Discussion about the perspective of Imam in the each Sects. The issue in the aside dialogue is the Sunni’s denial toward Shia’s statement.</td>
<td>الملك: هل صحيح قول العلي أن عمر قال هكذا؟ الوزير: هكذا ذكر الرواة الملك: عجيب: عجيب جداً. أي كنت أعتبر عمر من السابقين إلى الإسلام. واعتبر إيمانه مثالية، والآن ظهري أن في أصل إيمانه شك وشبهة! العباس ي: ميلاً أياً الملك، ابق على عقيدتك، ولا يخدعك هذا العلي الذي الكاذب الملك: إن الوزير نظام الملك يقول: إن العلي صادق في كلامه، وأن قول عمر وارد في الكتاب وهذا المصدر يقول إنه كاذب. أليس هذا العناد بعينه؟ (ص.35)</td>
<td>The speaker gave ultimatum toward the interlocutor that they would get God’s curse.</td>
<td>The speaker is furious with Sunni’s statement related to their worries about common-people belief (aqidah) from Shia’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, it can be acknowledged that verbal violence found in the debate is various. Verbal volence often found in the form of scolding and ridicule. The speeches in both forms are often found in term of labeling speech toward the interlocutor, such as in heathen and heresy-fellow labeling. The speaker also attached negative characteristic to the interlocutor, such as misguided, assumed foolish, stubborn, and cursed.

Verbal violence perpetrator is not just from one side, but it was done by all of the debate participants. Even though, the verbal violence was dominated by Shia sect, the utterances often dedicated to Sunni as their opponent team in the debate. Although this sect was verbal violence perpetrators the most, their arguments were able to influence Malik Syah, also toward Nizam Mulk, so that, this sect was considered as the winner in the debate. Malik Syah said:

“Gentlements, know that I am certain and believe based on this dialogue (which lasted for three days), I acknowledge and believe that Shia is the right based on what they said. And Sunni (Sunnah follower) is the vanity sect and the wrong creed. I am a figure that will acknowledge and obey the cleared truth. I don’t want to become destroyer in this earth and hell-fellow in afterlife. Therefore, I announce my Shia-belief in front of you all. For those who want to be with me, then join me into Shia, with Allah’s permission and blessing whilst saving ourselves from the evil of the darkness to the light of the thruth.”

20 Aṣiyyah, Al-Munażarát Baina Fuqahā’i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahā’i asy-sy’ah..., p. 64-65.
The same thing also announced by Nizam Mulk in his statement below:

“I also know that Shia is the right madhab. During my learning journey, truth only possessed by Shia, therefore, I announced my Shia-belief.”

Verbal violence phenomenon can not be separated form its supporting factors. In the Sunni-Shia debate, factors behind verbal violence are quite variative. The main factor in verbal violence is when the speaker is carried away in the critical circumstances of the debate. The intense of the debate scene can raise and burn emotion of the speakers, such as in responding the interlocutor statements.

One of the factors that quite influence the verbal violence was the speaker’s pride of himself and his sect. Notice the following dialogue:

الملك: ما جوابك يا عباس؟

العباسي: تقليد أئمة المذاهب الأربعة عادة اتخذناها نحن السنة!

العلوي: بل أجبره على ذلك بعض الأمراء، وأنتم اتبعتم أولئك متابعةعمياء لا حجة لكم فيها ولا برهان.

The dialog above occurred in the third day. Debate participant was in the middle of discussion about some imam madhhab (fiqh) such as: Abu Hanifah, Malik, Syafi’i, Ahmad bin Hambal, and Jakfar Shadiq. Over the five Imam mentioned, Shia proclaimed that they were following the latest imam. Madhab of Imam Jakfar Shadiq was considered as Prophet Muhammad’s madhab because Jakfar Shadiq was ahlul bait. The first-four Imam were followed by Sunni sect. One of the Sunni speaker said that Ahlusunnah followed those four imams because they were considered the most devout scholars compared with other. Hearing the statement, Shia group said:

العلوي: بل أجبركم على ذلك بعض الأمراء، وأنتم اتبعتم أولئك متابعةعمياء لا حجة لكم فيها ولا برهان.

---

21 I. Wayan Simpen, “Fungsi Bahasa dan Kekerasan Verbal dalam Masyarakat.”


23 Ibid.
On the speech above, Shia stated that the Sunnis is an uncritical follower. As the reason is their engagement toward the four Imams was a blind fanaticism (taqlid), it was not based on strong reason and evidence with real truth. So that, the Shia speaker described Sunni as blind follower, عمياء متابعة the Idiom negatively struck the interlocutor’s pride by disgracing them. The utterance indicates one-side advantage. In this phase, the Sunni was silenced again and chose to be silent without comment. The bitter speech was addressed to the Sunnis as if it was weaken their position. This case shows the naïve utterance of Sunnis in responding the Shia’s statement. This circumstances showed that they were indeed accepted the statement, or other possibility, they were really in a cornered position.

The speech above is the form of outsourcing language manifested in narcissistic speech, as one of the trigger in verbal violence. It is called narcissistic speech because implicitly the speakers wants to raise themselves and group by assuming their group is more critical than the rival, also the speaker tried to disgrace and disregard the interlocutor circumstances. The speaker believed that they were on the right and strong position. Therefore, the verbal violence is inevitable.

The other factor that contributes in verbal violence is hatred. In the text of the debate, it is very apparent how hate groups both. Moreover, power factor of the speaker also play important role in verbal violence. The power in this case intended as discourse power in verbal interaction. This can be described as the following dialogue:

قالملك: موجه الكلام إلى العباسي: ما جوابك على آلام العلوي؟ قال الملك
قال العباسي: إنني لم أسمع بمثل هذا الكلام من ذي قبل
العلوي: الآن وحيد سمعت هذا الكلام، وتجلى لك الحق فاترك خلافتك، وتابع خليفة رسول الله الشرعي (علي ابن أبي طالب عليه السلام).25

The utterance above addressed because the interlocutor situation was weakened. How weak their position could be proven by Sunni’s statements that were never heard before. The statement meant was about

25 ‘Alīyyah, Al-Munāẓarāt Baina Fiqahā’i as-Sunnah wa Fiqahā’i as-Sy]i’ah..., p. 51.
Chalifate Umar’s badness. The weak Sunni position in that condition gave Shia’s opportunity to pressure the Sunnis for following and understanding the ideology of the Shia’s belief. In the verbal violence, the power-relation dynamic was quite obvious at the above speech. The power meant in this case was not governmental where the King ruled over the society, but it was more on the power of knowledge. In other words, the speaker tried to build symbolic power, which the speaker tried to construct facts built according to social condition, in this case is the validity of Shia’s argument. So that, someone who had power ruling them who had little knowledge. In the end, power relation is understood as the description of the ‘ruler’ dominating through the language in the speech.

If it is noticed, the usage of Sunnis language:

The usage of imperative language in the speech indicated and gave power in the utterances. So that, in term of power relation, the speech was on dominating position. Power is one of the influencing factors on the verbal
violence act.

Moreover, the speech delivered by Shia toward Sunni was ‘message enforce’, which is coercion speech in order the interlocutor followed and understood the discourse they built. The discourse in this case understood as form of act in interaction expressed consciously and controlled. Actions of the interaction in this meaning were constricted in verbal act, both written and spoken. The discourse built can be understood as speech with certain purpose, such as to persuade or influence other. Therefore, understanding the discourse is actually connected with context carried.  

In fact, dissapointment can also be the factor of verbal violence. This case is as consisted in the following speech:

The speaker’s statement, that stated the vanity and misappropriation of Sunni’s madhhab, was an act of verbal violence by making fun of the interlocutor with harsh language. The third party (Sunni) will feel ashamed and feel bad because of the utterances. The King’s statement that was cornering and hurting the Sunnis was caused by Malik Syah’s culminating disappointment. That was not only disappointment, unstoppable rage was further strengthen the bitterness utterances. It is true that the fineness of a communication essentialy can be disrupted if one the interlocutor is in anger. Someone in furious condition can do destructive actions, especially to the interlocutor. Emotionally, Malik Syah did not hesitate to call the audience following the group shined by the light of truth and abandoned the dark-vanity group.

Sunni’s respond toward the speech attacked their pride was by accepting the king’s statement without resistance from their speech, either by striking back or self defence. The accepting attitude did not mean that

31 Anang Santoso, Studi Bahasa Kritis: Menguak Bahasa Membongkar Kuasa, 125.

32 Muqāṭīl bin ’Aṭiyah, Al-Munāṣarāt Baina Fūqahā’i as-Sunnah wa Fūqahā’i asy-Syāḥ, p. 64.

they were surrender and affirmed the King’s speech, considered the context was at the end of the debate. In other words, the speech was the closing statement of Malik Syah.

D. Conclusion

The paper concludes that the verbal violence can be found in the discourse of religious debate (Sunni-Shiah), as written in the book of al-Munazarat baina Fuqaha’ as-Sunnah wa Fuqaha’ asy-Syi’ah. In the book, it was found a lot of verbal violations conducted by all debate participants, whether from Sunnis, Shias, until Malik Syah as the King and debate initiator. The form of verbal violence found in the debate was quite vary, which were verbal violations in form of satire, accuse or slander, mock, intimidate, curse, and threaten. These verbal violations are influenced by various factors. However, the dominant factor of verbal violence is the speaker involvement within critical circumstances of the debate. Another influencing factor is the pride of the speaker of himself and his group, disappointment, hatred, and power relation existed.

The research result in this paper implies that there are words or sentences indicate form of verbal violence in some religious texts. Therefore, this study opens opportunities for further typical studies. Especially on research with non-structural language that does not only study on formal element of the language, but also in the context and function of the spoken language. 
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