



Verbal Violence in Sunni-Shia Debate: *Al-Munazarāt Baina Fuqahā'i al-Syī'ah wa Fuqahā' al-Sunnah Book Study*

Zamzam Afandi

Islamic State University of Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta
zamzam@uinsuka.ac.id

Habib

Islamic State University of Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta
habib@uinsuka.ac.id

Moh. Ali Qorror Al Khasy

Islamic Science Institute of Annuqayah, Guluk-Guluk, Sumenep
ali.alkhasy@gmail.com

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-Munzarāt baina Fuqahā' i al-Syī'ah wa Fuqahā' i al-Sunnah book. The paper focuses on discussing the form and the factor behind these violences. 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.*

Keywords : *Syī'ah, Sunni, Verbal Violece,*

Abstrak : Polemik Sunni - Syiah menjadi isu yang mendasar dalam perdebatan dalam wacana Islam. Meskipun dimulai dari masalah politik, sementara dalam perkembangannya campur tangan dalam bidang teologi untuk membenarkan kebenaran satu sama lain. Dalam konteks ini, kekerasan verbal sering terjadi untuk menyerang, melukai, menghina, atau melemahkan lawan. Tulisan ini akan membahas kekerasan verbal dalam polemik Sunni - Syiah seperti yang telah ditulis dalam *al-Munzārāt baina Fuqahā 'al-Sunnah wa Fuqahā' al-Syi'ah*. Makalah ini berfokus pada membahas bentuk dan faktor di balik kekerasan ini. Penelitian dilakukan dengan menggunakan metode analisis deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kekerasan verbal yang ditemukan dalam teks cukup bervariasi, yaitu kekerasan verbal dalam bentuk sindiran, tuduhan atau pencemaran nama baik, ejekan, intimidasi, kutukan, dan ancaman. Faktor-faktor yang menyebabkan kekerasan juga beragam. Namun, faktor utama kekerasan verbal adalah ketika pembicara terbawa oleh situasi kritis perdebatan. Faktor lain yang mempengaruhi adalah pembicara merasa bangga dengan dirinya sendiri atau kelompok, kecewa, kebencian, dan hubungan kekuasaan. Artikel ini menyimpulkan bahwa kekerasan verbal dapat ditemukan dalam debat tentang wacana agama Islam

Kata Kunci : Sunni, Syi'ah, Kekerasan Verbal.

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 than 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-Munazarāt*

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 Saljuqiyyah 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 escalate 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 Licerle 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.

¹ Muqātil bin 'Atiyyah, *Al-Munazarāt Baina Fuqahā'i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahā'i asy-syi'ah*, ed. oleh Shalih Wardani (Beirut: Al-Gadīr li ad-Dirāsāt wa an-Nasyr, 1995): 11.

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 Licerle more emphasized on linguistic analysis related to language usage. According to him, structural theory proposed by Ferdiand 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. Licerle 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

² Anari Wahyu Utami, "Study on Verbal and Nonverbal violence Toward State High School Student in Surabaya 2014/2015 Academic Year," *Sociality: Social Education Scientific Journal* Vol. 5, no. 2 (2015).

Muhammad Hamam's article entitles *al-'Unf al-Lughawi fi al-Khithab as-Siyasi al-Maghraby*.³ In the paper, Hamam focuses on verbal language study from politic 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.⁴

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.⁵ 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

³ Muhammad Hamma, "Al-'Unf al-Lughawī fi al-Khithāb al-Siyāsī al-Maghraby: Dirasāt fi Aidiyulūjī al- Syatam al-Siyāsī min Naẓariyati Afal al-Kalam," *Tabayun li ad-Dirasat al-Fikriyah wa al-Tsaqafiyah* Vol. 15 (2016): 93–108.

⁴ Utami, "Study on Verbal and Nonverbal violence..."; Muhammad Hamma, "Al-'Unf al-Lughawī fi al-Khithāb al-Siyāsī al-Maghraby...".

⁵ Sudaryanto, *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik* (Yogyakarta: Universitas Duta Wacana, 1993): 15.

context and speaker's interlocutor reaction.⁶ 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,⁷ 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 evenmore 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*⁸ translated from France language, and also has been translated into Arabic language entitled *Al-Ramzu wa al-Sulthah* (symbol and violence), and the book *The Violence of Language* by Jean Jaques Licerle⁹ translated into Arabic language entitled '*Urf al Lughah*.

Pierre Bourdieu's main idea was "habitus", "principal", "domain" or "arena", and "symbolic violence".¹⁰ 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

⁶ Tri Mastoyo Jati Kesuma, *Pengantar (Metode) Penelitian Bahasa* (Yogyakarta: Carasvatibooks, 2007): 47.

⁷ Sudaryanto, *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik* (Yogyakarta: Universitas Duta Wacana, 1993): 133.

⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (UK: Polity Press, 1991).

⁹ Jean-Jacques Lecercle, *The Violence of Language* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

¹⁰ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*.

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 Licerle more emphasized on linguistic analysis related to language usage. According to him, structural theory proposed by Ferdiand 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 Licerle 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 formulized, but must be acknowledged in its existence. The remaining theory emphasizes more on *violence* in language. Licerle 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 misued or language abused is quite strong magnet causes violence utterance. Wherefore, language function basicaly 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 Lecerle, *The Violence of Language*.

¹² *Ibid*.

¹³ Stepanus Djawanai, “Bahasa dan Kekerasan,” dalam *Manusia dan Dinamika Budaya: Dari Kekerasan Sampai Baratayuda*, ed. oleh Sumijati Atmosudiro (Yogyakarta: Fakultas Sastra UGM bekerjasama dengan BIGRAF Publishing, 2001): 51.

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.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.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.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.¹⁷

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

¹⁴ I. Wayan Simpen, "Fungsi Bahasa dan Kekerasan Verbal dalam Masyarakat" (Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar, Denpasar, Universitas Udayana, 2011): 454.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ni Nyoman Ayu Suciartini dan Ni Luh Putu Unix Sumartini, "Verbal Bullying Dalam Media Sosial," *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia* 6, no. 2 (3 Januari 2019): 152–71, <https://doi.org/10.30659/j.6.2.152-171>; Onong Uchjana Efendy, *Communication Dictionary* (Bandung: PT. Mandar Maju, 1989): 381.

¹⁷ Agnes Adhani dan Yovina Putri Pamungkas, "Verbal Violence toward Women," dalam *Mengungkap Kebenaran Melalui Linguistik Forensik* (Seminar Masyarakat Ilmiah (SEMAI), Kudus: Universitas Muria Kudus, 2018): 24.

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 divided 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

¹⁸ Kunjana Rahardi, *Sosiopragmatik* (Jakarta: Erlangga, 2009): 15.

¹⁹ I. Wayan Simpen, "Fungsi Bahasa dan Kekerasan Verbal in Masyarakat" (Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar, Denpasar, Universitas Udayana, 2011): 465-471.

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:

Speaker	Definition	Speech data (Page)	Violence Form	Factor
Shia	The speech was related to Shia's answer toward Sunni's question about the chalifates of Prophet companions: Abu Bakar, Umar, and Ustman.	العباسي: أيها الملك قل لهذا العلوي إذا لم يكن الخلفاء مؤمنين فكيف اتخذهم المسلمون خلفاء، واقتدوا بهم؟ <u>العلوي</u> : أولا: لم يتخذهم كل المسلمين خلفاء وإنما أهل السنة فقط. ثانيا: إن هؤلاء الذين يعتقدون بخلافتهم ينقسمون إلى قسمين: جاهل ومعاندا (42)	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.	Responds to interlocutor's question (Sunni) that seems obtrude.
Shia	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.	<u>العباسي</u> : لكن علي بن أبي طالب لم يكن أهلا للخلافة، حيث أنه كان صغير العمر بينما كان أبو بكر كبير العمر... <u>العلوي</u> : أسمعت أيها الملك إن العباسي يقول: إن الناس أعلم من الله ورسوله في تعيين الأصلاح، لأنه لا يأخذ بكلام الله ورسوله في تعيين علي بن أبي طالب، ويأخذ بكلام بعض الناس في أصلحية أبي بكر، كأن الله العليم الحكيم لا يعرف الأصلاح والأفضل حتى يأتي بعض الناس الجهال فيختاروا الأصلاح (43)	Shia speaker says that Sunni human know more than God and His prophet. This bitter speech indicates a statement that Sunni is knowledgeable in deciding the better thing.	The anger of Shia's speaker toward Sunni's statement that Ali did not have enough expertise to be the caliph at that time.

2. Accusing or Slandering

Speaker	Definition	Speech data (Page)	Violence Form	Factor
Sunni	The initial statement in talking about discussion topic with accusing tone.	العباسي : من بدعكم أنتم الشيعة أنكم لا تعترفون بالقرآن (ص. 19)	Shiah group is accused for not acknowledge Al-Qur'an.	Motivation to strike down the interlocutor.
Shia	The initial statement in delivering discussion topic with accusing tone	العلوي : من انحرفاتكم وأباطيلكم حول الله سبحانه أنكم تقولون :إن الله يجبر العباد على المعاصي والمجرمات ثم يعاقبهم عليها (ص. 26)	Sunni's doctrine is considered diverging in the term of Allah's will.	Motivation to strike down the interlocutor.

3. Mocking

Speaker	Definition	Speech data (Page)	Violence Form	Factor
Shia	In aside dialogue, the speakers are involved in communication which quite warm; discussion of Muslim's Leader at that time.	العباسي : إني أعرف إمام زمانني! العلوي : فمن هو؟ العباسي: الملك! أما اعلم : العلوي ولا يكذب، أنه الملك لك تملقا إلا ذلك يقول ص. (64)	The speaker said that Sunni was lying and trying to look good.	Speaker's irritation toward Sunni's statement and hypocrisy
Shia	This dialogue is as Shia's response toward clarification from Sunni that they did not intend to generalize the disbelief of Prophet's companios.	العباسي : إني قصدت بكل الصحابة أبا بكر وعمر وعثمان وأتباعهم العلوي : نقضت نفسك بنفسك، ألم يقرر أهل المنطق أن (الموجبة الجزئية نقيض السالبة الكلية) فإنك تقول مرة إن الشيعة يكفرون كل الصحابة و تقول مرة إن الشيعة يكفرون بعض	Sunni are considered not consistent with their statement.	The fact that Sunni were in mistake over the speech.

Shia	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	<p>الصحابة (ص. 17)</p> <p>العباسي: كلا إني لم أقل أن الناس أعلم من الله ورسوله</p> <p><u>العلوي</u>: إذن لا معنى لكلامك، فإن كان الله والرسول قد عينا إنسانا واحدا للخلافة والإمامة، فاللازم أن تقتدي به، سواء رضي به الناس أم لا! (ص. 44)</p>	Shia's speaker stated that Sunni's statement is meaningless, it was just an excuse.	The speaker was annoyed toward the interlocutor speech that underestimated Ali bin Abi Thalib
Shia	The debate in this case had reached into Sunni's explanation related to Umar's badness and his impudence in leading.	<p>قال الملك - موجها الكلام إلى العباسي -: ما جوابك على كلام العلوي؟</p> <p>قال العباسي: إني لم أسمع بمثل هذا الكلام من ذي قبل!</p> <p><u>العلوي</u>: الآن وحيث سمعت هذا الكلام، وتجلى لك الحق فاترك خلفك، واتبع خليفة رسول الله الشرعي (علي ابن أبي طالب عليه السلام) (ص. 51)</p>	The speaker wanted to say that Sunni's belief is wrong.	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	<p>الملك : فلماذا سكت في أول الأمر؟</p> <p>الوزير : لأنني أكره أن أظعن في أصحاب رسول الله ص!</p> <p><u>العلوي</u> : عجيب! أنت تكره ذلك والله ورسوله لم يكرها ذلك حيث أنه</p>	Using "عجيب" expression to expressed his bitterness as well as rebuted the interlocutor's statement.	The speaker was not satisfied by the silence of the Minister.

his unwilling act
to curse the
Prophet's
companions.

تعالى عرف بعض
الصحابة بالمنافقين وأمر
رسوله بجهادهم كما
يجاهد الكفار، والرسول
بنفسه لعن بعض
أصحابه!

4. Intimidating

Speaker	Definition	Speech data (Page)	Violence Form	Factor
Shia	The respond to Shia's statement that Sunni's leader is the person who firstly conducted heresy (bid'ah) in Islam, which was Umar.	الملك :إذن كيف نتبع نحن إنسانا أبداع في الدين؟ <u>العلوي</u> :ولهذا يحرم اتباع هكذا إنسان، لأن رسول الله ص. قال: كل بدعة ضلالة وكل ضلالة في النار. فالذين يتبعون عمر في بدعه - وهم عالمون بالأمر - فهم من أهل النار قطعاً (ص. 62)	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.	Effort to respond Sunni's statement that Shia is heresy followers.
Shia	The aside speech was spoken by Shia in the third day debate. The speech was raised because of fanaticism.	العلوي :أيها الملك، إني أشهد أن العباسي من أهل النار، إذا مات على هذه الحالة (ص. 63)	The Sunni group will enter the Hell if they die in Sunni, which its fanaticism regarded to the fourth Imam.	The speaker's desires to the interlocutor following the intention of the speaker.

5. Cursing

Speaker	Definition	Speech data (Page)	Violence Form	Factor
Sunni	Sunni's statement in aside coloumn was a response of the King's question related to Sunni's excuses from shiah's statement.	العلوي :أيها الملك اسأل هذا العباسي هل يجب على العالم المحافظة 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؟ <u>العباسي</u> : إني أحافظ على عقيدة العوام حتى لا تميل قلوبهم إلى الشيعة لأن الشيعة أهل البدعة! (ص. 61)	Heresy's Labelling (<i>ahl bid'ah</i>) toward Shia group.	Emotion outburst of the speaker.
Sunni	This speech was a response of King's 'wavering' confidence after hearing Shia's explanation about the disbelief of Abu Bakar, Umar, and Ustman.	الملك : عجيب, عجيب جدا أني كنت أعتبر عمر من السابقين إلى الإسلام، واعتبر إيمانه مثاليا، والآن ظهر لي أن في أصل إيمانه شك وشبهة! <u>العباسي</u> : مهلا أيها الملك، ابق على عقيدتك، ولا يخذعك هذا العلوي الكذاب. (35)	The speaker called Shia was the liar.	Worries of the speaker about Shia's hegemony toward the King, also their position were getting cornered in front of the King.
King	The speech in the next coloumn is the closing statement of the King in the	<u>الملك</u> : اعلموا أيها الجماعة أني قد اطمأننت ووثقت من هذه المحاوره (وقد كانت دامت ثلاثة	Malik Syah stated that Sunni is a vanity and deviated group	Malik Syah's disappointme nt toward Sunni and the awareness on the truth of

	debate which was expressed after realized, that all this time, the group he believed can not be trusted.	أيام) وعرفت وتيقنت أن الحق مع الشيعة في كل ما يقولون ويعتقدون. وأن أهل السنة باطل مذهبهم منحرفة عقيدتهم (ص). (64)		Shiah group that he believes now.
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.	الملك: ومن أين علمت أنه من أهل النار؟ العلوي: لأنه ورد عن رسول الله (قوله): من مات ولم يعرف إمام زمانه مات ميتة جاهلية (فاسأل أمها الملك: من هو إمام زمان العباسي؟ العباسي: لم يرد هذا الحديث عن رسول الله. الملك للوزير: هل ورد هذا الحديث عن رسول الله؟ الوزير: نعم ورد <u>الملك</u> : كنت أظن أنك أمها العباسي ثقة، والآن تبين لي كذبك!	Disgracing the interlocutor by stating them that could not be trusted. Malik Syah claimed Sunni had lied.	Dejection and anger.
Shia	The speech context in the aside dialogue discussed about several imam of fiqh madhhab	الملك: ما جوابك يا عباسي؟ العباسي: تقليد أئمة المذاهب الأربعة عادة اتخذناها نحن السنة! <u>العلوي</u> : بل أجبركم على ذلك بعض الأمراء، وأنتم اتبعتم أولئك متابعه عمياء لا حجة لكم فيها ولا برهان (63)	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.

King	The following speech is Malik Syah's respons after hearing Sunni's group suggestion.	<p>المملك: هل صحيح قول العلوي أن عمر قال هكذا؟</p> <p>الوزير: هكذا ذكر الرواة المملك :عجيب: عجيب جدا ..أني كنت أعتبر عمر من السابقين إلى الإسلام، واعتبر إيمانه مثاليا، والآن ظهر لي أن في أصل إيمانه شك وشبهة!</p> <p>العباسي : مهلا أيها المملك، ابق على عقيدتك، ولا يخذعك هذا العلوي الكذاب</p> <p><u>المملك</u> : إن الوزير نظام المملك يقول: إن العلوي صادق في كلامه، وأن قول عمر وارد في الكتب <u>وهذا الأئله</u> يقول إنه كاذب، أليس هذا العناد بعينه؟ (ص.35)</p>	<p>Malik Syah called Sunni sect as Idiot. Moreover, the speaker stated that Sunnis was stubborn.</p>	<p>Malik Syah's furious toward Sunni over the judgement that Shia is a liar, Meanwhile, Nizam Mulk justified what Shia said.</p>
------	--	--	--	--

6. Cursing

Speaker	Definition	Speech data (Page)	Violence Form	Factor
Shiah	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.	<p>المملك: فلماذا أنت تنكر الحقائق الواردة عندنا نحن السنة؟</p> <p>العباسي: خوفا على عقيدة العوام أن تتزلزل، وتميل قلوبهم نحو الشيعة!</p> <p><u>العلوي</u> :إذن أنت أيها</p>	The speaker gave ultimatum toward the interlocutor that they would get God's curse.	The speaker is furious with Sunni's statement related to their worries about common-people belief (aqidah) from Shia's

العباسي مصداق لقوله تعالى *: إن الذين يكتمون ما أنزلنا من البينات والهدى من بعد ما بيناه للناس في الكتاب أولئك يلعنهم الله ويلعنهم اللاعنون * فشملتك اللعنة من الله تعالى (ص).	influence.
---	------------

(61)

From the table above, it can be acknowledged that verbal violence found in the debate is various. Verbal violence 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:

“Gentlemen, 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

²⁰ ‘Atiyyah, *Al-Munazarât Baina Fuqahâ’i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahâ’i asy-syî’ah...*, p. 64-65.

The same thing also announced by Nizam Mulk in his statement below:

“I also know that Shiah is the right madhhab. During my learning journey, truth only possessed by Shia, therefore, I announced my Shia-belief.”²¹

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 عباسي؟
 العباسي : تقليد أئمة المذاهب الأربعة عادة اتخذناها نحن السنة!
 العلوي : بل أجبرأم على ذلك بعض الأمراء، وأنتم اتبعتم أولئك متابعة
 عمياء لا حجة لكم فيها ولا برهان.²²

The dialog above occured in the third day. Debate participant was in the middle of discussion about some imam madhhabs (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. Madhhab of Iman Jakfar Shadiq was considered as Prophet Muhammad’s madhhab 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 devoted scholars compared with other. Hearing the statement, Shia group said:

العلوي: بل أجبركم على ذلك بعض الأمراء، وأنتم اتبعتم أولئك متابعة
 عمياء لا حجة لكم فيها ولا برهان.²³

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

²² ‘Aṭṭiyah, *Al-Munazarât Baina Fuqahâ’i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahâ’i asy-syî’ah*, ... p. 63.

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.²⁴ It is called narcissitic 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:

قال الملك - موجهها الكلام إلى العباسي - : ما جوابك على آلام العلوي - قال الملك
قال العباسي : إني لم أسمع بمثل هذا الكلام من ذي قبل
العلوي : الآن وحيث سمعت هذا الكلام، وتجلي لك الحق فاترك خلفائك، واتبع
خليفة رسول الله (شربي) 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

²⁴ I. Wayan Simpen, "Fungsi Bahasa dan Kekerasan Verbal dalam Masyarakat" (Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar, Denpasar, Universitas Udayana, 2011): 454.

²⁵ 'Atiyah, *Al-Munazarât Baina Fuqahâ'i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahâ'i asy-sy'ah*, ..., p. 51.

Chalifate Umar's badness.²⁶ 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,²⁷ 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.²⁸

If it is noticed, the usage of Sunnis language :

العباسي: إني لم أسمع بمثل هذا الكلام من ذي قبل²⁹.

so, the speech indicates how weak their position. It is proved with the nescience of the speaker in the speech. In relation to power, the above speech is on dominated position if it is compared with the following Shia's statement:

العلوي: الآن وحيث سمعت هذا الكلام، وتجلى لك الحق فاترك خلفاءك، واتبع خليف رسول الله الشرعي (علي ابن أبي طالب عليه السلام)³⁰

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

²⁶ Some Umar's vanity mentioned are (1) Umar had done 'ghasab' the chalifate chair and occupied Apostle position without Prophet Muhammad's permission, (2) Umar striked a region as an effort of Islam expansion with war and sword, thus, many people hated Islam as religion of peace and security, unlike in Prophet Muhammad era that made Islam as religion of peace and security. Muqāṭil bin 'Aṭīyyah, *Al-Munazarāt Baina Fuqahā'i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahā'i asy-Syī'ah*, ed. oleh Shalih Wardani (Beirut: Al-Gadīr li ad-Dirāsāt wa an-Nasyr, 1995): 49-50.

²⁷ Nur Sofyan, "Bahasa Sebagai Simbolisasi Mempertahankan Kekuasaan," *Interaksi: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi* 3, no. 1 (2 Januari 2014): 75-84, <https://doi.org/10.14710/interaksi.3.1.75-84>.

²⁸ Anang Santoso, *Studi Bahasa Kritis: Menguak Bahasa Membongkar Kuasa* (Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju, 2012): 126.

²⁹ Muqāṭil bin 'Aṭīyyah, *Al-Munazarāt Baina Fuqahā'i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahā'i asy-Syī'ah*, p. 51.

³⁰ Ibid.

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.³¹

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

المملك : اعلموا أيها الجماعة أني قد اطمأننت ووثقت من هذه المحاوراة (وقد كانت دامت ثلاثة أيام) وعرفت وتيقنت أن الحق مع الشيعة في آل ما يقولون ويعتقدون، وأن أهل السنة باطل مذهبهم، منحرفة عقيدتهم³²

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 essentially can be disrupted if one the interlocutor is in anger. Someone in furious condition can do destructive actions,³³ 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 respons 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: Menguk Bahasa Membongkar Kuasa*, 125.

³² Muqāṭil bin 'Aṭīyah, *Al-Munazarāt Baina Fuqahā'i as-Sunnah wa Fuqahā'i asy-Syī'ah*, p. 64.

³³ Mursia Ekawati, "Pseudo Politeness in Anger Expressive Speech Act in Indonesia Language," *Adabiyat: Language and Literary Journal* Vol. 1, no. 1 (2017.): 3.

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 violences 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 violences in form of satire, accuse or slander, mock, intimidate, curse, and threaten. These verbal violences 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, dissatisfaction, 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. [.]

References:

- Agnes Adhani, dan Yovina Putri Pamungkas. "Verbal Violence toward Women." Dalam *Mengungkap Kebenaran Melalui Linguistik Forensik*. Kudus: Universitas Muria Kudus, 2018.
- Anang Santoso. *Studi Bahasa Kritis: Mengungkap Bahasa Membongkar Kuasa*. Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju, 2012.
- Muqāṭil bin 'Aṭīyyah. *Al-Munazarāt Baina Fuqahā'ī as-Sunnah wa Fuqahā'ī asy-Syi'ah*. Disunting oleh Shalih Wardani. Beirut: Al-Gadīr li ad-Dirāsāt wa an-Nasyr, 1995.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. UK: Polity Press, 1991.

- I. Wayan Simpen. "Fungsi Bahasa dan Kekerasan Verbal dalam Masyarakat." Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar, Universitas Udayana, 2011.
- Kunjana Rahardi. *Sosiopragmatik*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 2009.
- Lecerle, Jeans-Jacques. *The Violence of Language*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Muhammad Hamma. "Al-'Unf al-Lughawī fi al-Khithāb al-Siyāsī al-Maghraby: Dirasāt fi Aidiyulūjī al- Syatam al-Siyāsī min Nazariyatī Afal al-Kalam." *Tabayun li ad-Dirasat al-Fikriyah wa al-Tsaqafiyah* Vol. 15 (2016): 93–108.
- Mursia Ekawati. "Pseudo Politeness in Anger Expressive Speech Act in Indonesia Language." *Adabiyat: Language and Literary Journal* Vol. 1, no. 1 (t.t.).
- Ni Nyoman Ayu Suciartini, dan Ni Luh Putu Unix Sumartini. "Verbal Bullying Dalam Media Sosial." *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia* 6, no. 2 (3 Januari 2019): 152–71. <https://doi.org/10.30659/j.6.2.152-171>.
- Onong Uchjana Efendy. *Communication Dictionary*. Bandung: PT. Mandar Maju, 1989.
- Sofyan, Nur. "Bahasa Sebagai Simbolisasi Mempertahankan Kekuasaan." *Interaksi: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi* 3, no. 1 (2 Januari 2014): 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.14710/interaksi.3.1.75-84>.
- Stepanus Djawanai. "Bahasa dan Kekerasan." Dalam *Manusia dan Dinamika Budaya: Dari Kekerasan Sampai Baratayuda*, disunting oleh Sumijati Atmosudiro. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Sastra UGM bekerjasama dengan BIGRAF Publishing, 2001.
- Sudaryanto. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Duta Wacana, 1993.
- Tri Mastoyo Jati Kesuma. *Pengantar (Metode) Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Carasvatibooks, 2007.
- Utami, Anari Wahyu. "Study on Verbal and Nonverbal violence Toward State High School Student in Surabaya 2014/2015 Academic Year." *Sociality: Social Education Scientific Journal* Vol. 5, no. 2 (2015).