

Sectarianism: Nature and Defining Criteria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v2i3.230>

| Fareed Hameed Al-Hindawi¹ | Basim Jubair Kadhim^{2,*} |

¹Islamic University, College of
Education, Dept. of English

²Al-Najaf Education
Directorate Ministry of
Education, Najaf, Iraq

*basimjubair1984@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the linguistic account of sectarianism in terms of definition, forms, defining criteria, types of sectarianism and all the strategies which may represent sectarianism within a certain society. To define the sectarian discourse, defining criteria as well as parameters to specify the discourse genre which is related to sectarianism are to be explored and discussed. This can set the blueprints of analysis of the sectarian discourse.

KEYWORDS

sectarianism; sect; linguistics criteria; ideology; religion

INTRODUCTION

Religious sectarianism – generally speaking – is an ideology which is constituted in a society by certain groups of people who belong to an upper source ideology. Each of these groups [sects] is concerned with general teachings from where they dissent and particular principles for which they belong and show hatred, prejudice, discrimination, affiliation towards other sects, no matter whether their sect is right or not (Oxford Dictionary: sectarianism).

Accordingly, sectarianism can be utilized as an umbrella strategy of discrimination in different societal establishments such as religion, politics, sports, culture, linguistics and so many other minor contexts. Sectarian discourse is best viewed through the CDA [following Fairclough, 1995, Wodak, 1997, Dijk, 1998] as an inappropriate representation which is negatively reproduced ideology in order to socially practice group's stance, a matter which is covered through the use of discourse strategies.

At the level of the discourse genre, the linguistic markers, strategies and standards are introduced and investigated though presenting certain illustrative examples from certain religious gatherings such as the act of preaching. The focus of this chapter is on the religious implications of sectarianism as it belongs to the core objectives in this study. Religious sectarianism is regarded by definition as the base concept by which other types of sectarian discourse are inspired.

The account of the sectarian discourse can give rise to the treatment of sectarianism as a socio-cultural phenomenon which is religiously based and politically as well as socially utilized (Ghazi, 1992:166). This necessitates to give the sociological approaches to sectarianism as a religious as well as social phenomenon, following (Willison, 1963-69; Steeman, 1975; Weber, 1978; James, 1985; Stark and Bainbridge, 1988).

After the defining criteria are set and discussed, the chapter sheds lights on discourse of sectarianism at the level of the pragmatic notions that are utilized in a relevant manner in the sectarian use of language as a matter of effectively and rhetorically conveying the ideology(ies) through sectarianism.

LITERATURE OF REVIEW

Defenition of Sectarianism

According to Mariam Webster dictionary, sectarianism is defined as “excessive attachment to a particular sect or party, especially in religion”. This indicates the existence of a sect to which one might be excessively connected to the ideology of that party. The focus on religion is critically used as religion is the core source where sectarianism comes from, i.e. it is only religion which can be argued that it is a highly debatable genre (Mariam Webster Dictionary, online: sectarianism).

Similarly, oxford dictionary introduces (online, sectarianism) a wide spectrum to the concept of sectarianism. It defines sectarianism as the support to both religious and /or political parties, shedding light on the final product of the sectarian process which is the potential violence as all the verbal and other types of communicating sectarian aspects have been staged.

Taking sectarianism from a panoramic view, it is defined as an act which is performed by various forms of prejudice, discrimination and hatred (Britannica, online: sectarianism). In other words, sectarianism can be individually viewed and group who show prejudice towards a sect and nothing is right or at least accepted in all other sects. Such individuals will use strategies of discrimination at all the levels found in the social structure; chief among them is the religious establishments. Having employed discrimination, hatred attitudes are revealed showing the objective and of such an ideology. Powerful individuals/groups are the ones who direct sectarianism, i.e., it is found in different contexts such as religion, politics, sports, culture and intra/international aspects. Such a legal legislation is characterized by what can determine whether the language is sectarian or not (Brewer, 1992:359).

It is defined by certain features which are stipulated by statesmen in Ireland as an offence or any act that could lead to circumstance and contexts such as the sports events. This was issued as a result to frequent events that shown threatening, abusive, insulting or any inappropriate words (Armando, 2000:214)

Sectarianism conveys hatred as a broad feature which could be used to provoke others by language. Most importantly, the religious stratifications are considered as the core aspect which leads to the social conflict. In other words, sectarianism is utilized as a strategy to discriminate in society, a matter which constitutes the social conflict among communities (Al-Khayoon, 2003:12).

Sectarianism can serve functions at the three levels which are of direct impact on society: it can serve the ideas of certain ideologies and beliefs, it can be exploited by the individual through certain actions to have individualistic power on the society, or it can serve the social status that the ones who practice sectarianism adopt, as attained by James (2003: 20).

Roberts (2017:19) argues that sectarianism, regardless of whether religious or political, is

“... the existence within a locality of two or more divided and actively competing communal identities, resulting in a strong sense of dualism which unremittingly transcends commonality, and is both culturally and manifest.”

According to this definition, there are certain contextual factors of sectarianism, meaning that to be sectarian is to have the community where sectarian division takes place in one social establishment such as a religion, political accord or sports. These divisions can represent the different contexts where sectarianism is practices with different kinds of conflict that can all lead to acts of violence (Fregonese, 2020:33)

As an ideology, sectarianism reveals two types of social actors: inferior and superior where social power and dominance play a crucial role here. Such practice could lead to the negative effect in society in term of economics, political unrest, instability and the like (ibid:34).

Sectarianism is best viewed according to Justin (2020:III) as a process which has stages of how to sectarianize others within certain contexts. It is composed of stages starting with making general grouping, denomination, confessionalism, till reaching the sect. within these stages, the final product represents a negative ideology(ies) behind sectarianism. This matter is greatly related to sociology of religion (international Encyclopedia of Social Science: online).

This explains the existence of such a phenomenon as a broad strategy to enhance one's own beliefs, and to exclude all other's at any expense. It does not matter whether one believes in the tenets or not. It is just a matter of self-identification [being an in-group member of certain sect].

One the most interesting areas to use sectarianism is politics, especially where countries have multiple social structures which are interconnected with religious establishments. Such structures are represented by most of the Muslim areas where society is divided into such sects as Shiite, Sunni , Alawai...etc, following Almoslim.net (2020). Politics here, originates a sense of hostilities through sectarianism which in turn gives the right to the ones [politicians] who adopt this strategy as a way to discriminate races aspect that can define sectarianism.

As a narrow-minded belief, sectarianism is introduced as belonging to a denomination through which sectarian individual practices, prejudice, bigotry, discrimination and ill-will towards the members or the assumed members of the other denomination. The term "denomination" is defined in Collins Dictionary as a group of people who have certain commonalities at the level of faith and certain relevant aspects. It is related to the term 'sect' which focuses on showing intended discrimination for instigation and bigotry against other sects.

As a process, sectarianism is treated as a religious movement which contains such concepts as church, sect, denomination, cult and confessionalism. These concepts are approached and classifies differently and variously by sociologists as concluded by Tinaz (2005:105). In the same stream, Bisharah (2018:8) adopts these concept and introduces sectarianism as an act of bigotry in general, a matter which could be to a group, a religion, a set, a doctrine or any form of grouping which has common objectives and goals. This kind of showing belongingness to the group and exclusion of those who are outgroups is called sectarianism. The phenomenon in question is established in societies whose structures accept more divisions and support radical thinking.

Hoffman (2019:3) remarks that sectarianism is viewed from a political point of view, though it is basically a religious concept which is composed in society. Different parties try to politicize the religious affiliation of naïve individuals and drag them into sectarian grouping for the of political

In Al-Jazeera interview, sectarian is defined as being religiously exploited term to serve religious and politics as a weapon that can serve both in achieving their own goals. It can be founded where different interpretations to one social establishment i.e. religion; individuals can follow those whom they can find their interpretation as interesting as their tendencies desire (Aljazeera, 2015).

Dealing with different approaches to the religious organizations and movement, Jokiranta (2010: 200-231) argues that sectarianism is a system, meaning that it is an organization containing different elements such as actions, attitudes, structures and beliefs.

Sources of Sectarianism

Sectarianism comes from different sources that embody various tendencies, ideologies and strategies which are utilized by the individuals belonging to colorful social establishments. The following areas are the sources where sectarianism is practiced:

Religious

Taking the theoretical contemplations of the religious texts and interpreting them to practice a religion, different interpretations emerge, resulting – through certain stages – into sects which in turn constitute sectarianism. The following represents the religious sources (Al-Khayoon, 2003:17):

- a. Superficial treatment of religious, enlightening instructions.
- b. Preachers have a great role of in terms of agitation, instigation and the like, especially when lecturing the religion ideologically.
- c. Muslim folklore [religious] is about the Muslim differences throughout the Islamic history and the divisions that had been taken place for social and political purposes.
- d. Religious reclusion is regarded by sociologists [based on Willison, 1992] as the main source of sectarianism as the practioners of a religion find themselves as the ones on the right path among other fellow religion individuals, however the former cannot have the power to persuade the latter to their belief. They start to seclude within circles which then enlarge at a great scale till they have a sect. This sect is staged – as mentioned in the definition of composing a sect – till they have different ideology from the generalized religion. It can be argued that a sect is a particularized religion where practitioners can exercise their peculiar religious rituals that differentiate them from their sects.
- e. Preachers' individualism is a strategy used by most preachers, following James (1985) to appeal to the audience's emotions [see chapter three: preaching] in order to educate, agitate, aggravate and provoke the emotions of the addressees. Religious leaders can misrepresent or misinterpret the religious tenets, a matter which causes them to indoctrinate the preachers who follow these leaders' line of thought. The normal situation is that preachers are sponsored by a particular sect which must be represented through their discourse. Such representation can surely lead to certain kind of discrimination.

Political [devide and rule]

The second most common source for sectarianism is politics, viewing it as a strategy to politicize and divide society, as attained by Bisharah (2013:12). Such a source can be emerged from the following sub-sources:

- a. Foreign interference such as colonialism
- b. The existence of active minorities, attempting to confront each other.
- c. Colonial [political] tendencies are concerned with the colonial states that attempt to invade other states in terms of intellect and other resources such as social, economic, religious and so on.
- d. Political individuals are regarded as the producers and consumers of sectarianism (Lauret: 2017:241-251); they produce sectarianism in order to use it as a strategy to win political ends, following the principle of “divide and rule” such as what the Western countries do to the countries which are divided according to sectarian population. As a rejected strategy by most of the societal members, sectarianism is still utilized by politicians under pragmatic hidden strategies aiming [see chapter two: Critical Pragmatics] to discriminate, showing hostility, revealing one's own

policy towards other parties and the like. Politicians also base their used of sectarianism on the religious one as in addition to other types to certain levels (ibid).

Social

Based on the societal structure which is constituted from individuals belonging to various cultures, sectarianism is emerged. Henley (2016:11) focuses on the society as the cornerstone of sectarianism through the following:

- a. Ancient hatred [social]: this represents the indicators of hatred which stems from social inequalities and powerful individuals to discriminate low status ones.
- b. Social raising-up which is represented by the way how individuals are raised within social classes leads to sectarianism as a way of discrimination.
- c. Ignorance and fanatics are among the social diseases which facilitate sectarianism in that they rapidly respond to whatever brings fanatics and bigotry.
- d. Poverty – as a social disease – which leads to fanaticisms and bigotry.
- e. One of the significantly effective strategies among the aforementioned ones is the use of agitation; agitating the audience for discrimination through the use of certain levels of discourse. In this source, preachers convey their own ideological tendencies and sectarian affiliation, not to mention their representativeness to particularized sects. Hence, sectarianism is evident in the preachers' sermons given to the audience that accepts such ideological practice.
- f. Powerful figures [authoritarian] represent a social class that have the tendency to rule even without any power. They try to identify themselves as central, powerful members in the social structure in order attract other individuals to their party as a way of strong government. This source can take from both religious and political sectarianism.
- g. An operational definition to sectarianism can be as follows: sectarianism is an ideologically staged social act which is based on religious differences and which is characterized by prejudice, discrimination, intolerance, hatred and bigotry. Such criteria are all manifested through different levels of discourse [pragma-linguistics, pragmatics and critical pragmatics], following the core objective of the present study.

Types of Sectarianism

Sectarianism is originated with a religious sphere in that sects are grouped from certain individuals with the criteria of discrimination, hatred, bigotry and showing negative attitudes towards others. These and other criteria facilitate the way to set sectarianism under typologies which use it for different purposes than the religious ones. The following are the types of sectarianism:

Cultural Sectarianism

According to this context [culture], sectarianism means the discrimination, bigotry and hatred which are based on cultural considerations. This does not mean that religion is not concerned; rather it deals with sects [religious sects] according to the cultural norms where religion is practices. The acts of sectarizing culture are for the sake of cultural discrimination. Showing (Ghazi, 1992:167)

It is argued in the electronic website (democratice.de.com), discriminating society according to its status such as high, middle and low is to show negative attitudes by and towards each other, a matter which is regarded as the cultural sectarianism.

Political Sectarianism

Based on degrading, showing the negative attitudes towards other political parties, politicians politicize the sects and sectarian discourse as strategies to attract and bring people towards the politician's own side and ideologies (Jinnah, 1989:182). Such use is to be highly represented by politicians, a matter which is regarded as one of the defining properties of political discourse, following the religio-political systems (Chalcraft, 2007: ed:15).

Political sectarianism indicates the division which is practiced by politicians into other communities which are based on religious, ethnic or social affiliations (Bshkin, 2010).

Sectarianism is the religious embodiment of politics in that it reflects the religious side of political processes, representing the political expressing for fanatic society; which lacks the cultural exchange.

Ayub (2013) finds political sectarianism as a deliberate promotion of allegiance which is based on socio-political structure within communities.

According to Bisharah (2018:13), religious sectarianism is of different types of sectarianism that are based on religious differences among sects, focusing on precisely defining sectarianism from religious perspectives. The religious sectarianism is a mode/school/movement that shows tendencies at the level of interpreting religions.

It is seen as a weapon used by western colonial countries to the eastern colonized countries such as the Arab states. This can be related to the post-modernism movement which significantly shows the features of political sectarianism (Hashemi, 2019:1).

When it comes to practicing sectarianism by politicians in general, it is the process of sectarianization; a dynamic process by which the sectarian conflict is fueled (Fregonese, 2020: 33). They use the religious tendencies and affiliations to reshape the socio-political scenes. Politicians could utilize sectarianism to divide, to enhance one's ideology, rule people according to sects; destroy social norms which are considered somewhat as positive (ibid).

In such a context, religion is viewed as more negative than positive; it is aimed at using the similar social structure to serve common interest that should humanize the subjects. On the contrary, politicians in such a sense use sectarianism to achieve individual ideological ends such as elections and other political purposes. This cannot go hand in hand with religion as it has manipulative devices that deviate the true goal of religions in general.

According to Justin (2020:III-VI) Sectarianism is more political than religious, serving the social needs of political parties. Sectarian discourse is evidently manifested in the speeches, political accords, and reaching through with the hidden utterances and terms.

In this type, bigotry comes before religiosity as the supporters are after doctrine more than the faith itself, trying to practice the doctrine with various sectarian reproductions within a society. Accordingly, it is treated mostly as a religio-social or religio-political phenomenon. This can reveal the ideological identities that leave no choice for individuals; it takes all that away already (ibid)

Linguistic Sectarianism [Linguicism]

It is referred to in the Oxford English Dictionary (online: linguicism) that it is the tendency to use one language rather than the other is a kind of discrimination which is the result from certain social, political and even economical circumstances. "*Advocacy of, or predilection for other language*". This-in principle-can reflect sectarian attitudes towards different parties such as the diverse language communities.

Alvi (1988:86) discusses the way how social subjects [individuals] do their best to compete among each other at the level of the social status which relies on the use of certain

varieties of a given language. The inequalities which are reached out through using language are concluded as a basic strategy for sectarianism and discrimination among communities.

To sectarianize through language is to use the linguistic diversity to indoctrinate subjects of society. This happens in multi-national or multi-cultural contexts where certain preferences of the use of language take place as others (Agrin & Hornsby, 2012:161). According to this argument, language is the key element on which discrimination is based and the individual's identity is evaluated.

Religious Sectarianism

The origins from where ideological contest have appeared is religion; religious reclusion and unsatisfaction leads to intolerance of certain groups belonging to main group. New groupings have diverged and tuned into sects [sometimes known as church, denomination, or cult; with slight difference among each other] representing the same ideological tenets and are unified under similar ritual ceremonies, such as the Shiite and Sunni follower, protestant and Catholic and so on (Willison, 1963:49).

Weber (1978:54) argues that such a means of sectarianization becomes the source of all other evident conflict which are sect based ones. Interestingly, the concept is found with the social environment, though it was not practiced and termed in this modern way. This brings to the conclusion that the way how one discusses (following Willison 1969:361) process of sectarianisation is to be conducted within stages that could starting with positively acceptable but with the passage of time and the reproduction such a social activity, individuals' stances turn the sectarian positively attitudes into negative ideological indoctrination, depending on the social actors, a matter that van Leeuwen (1993a:31) focuses on in CDA.

Religious sectarianism is the act of discrimination resulting from ideological differences in terms of interpreting religious texts. Such a type of conflict is referred to as religious sectarianism. This leads to intolerance and then ends with either peaceful coexistence or violence, as mentioned by Maqdisi (2000: X) in the stages leading to the act of sectarianism.

Sometimes mistrust is found between sects of the same religion, a matter that brings restrictions and acts of discrimination, leading to the sectarian conflict (ibid). This comes as a result of viewing the religion as a sociological factor that designates the differences and discrimination between different parties within a community (Naek, 2001:29).

This type of sectarianism starts as the tendencies and inner motives of individuals who aim to achieve different purposes that can be either religious or political or sometimes both. Historically speaking, it starts after the departure of one primary source of a given sociological, religious and cultural founder, godfather, or an apostle. The companions and the followers start interpreting all the acts and texts that he used to do or use in life in such a different way (Islamonline.com). The different interpretations and contemplations are highly related to one's ideological tendencies such as what had happened after Jesus disappeared and the prophet Muhammad demised.

The following are the stages of achieving religious sectarianism, based on (almoslim.net) and Brooke (2017:848-50):

1. Within the sociological studies, religious affiliation is regarded as the most significant element of group identity of an individual.
2. Certain religious scholars try to bring new findings in religion through revealing different interpretations where they rely on subjective [sometimes unauthenticated] references.

3. The interpretation of religious texts is based on certain references that are elected in a way which meets certain ideological tendencies.
4. Individuals who are in charge for preaching reproduce and re-interpret the religious texts to be used as convincing as possible.
5. Having the different interpretations which are seen by different individuals as wrongly interpreted, some of them feel intolerant towards others that they seek change in the religious sect/church.
6. They start new campaigns against the ones who are dissident from them to discriminate all the tenets of the same religion.
7. The discrimination in such a way brings about the hatred by the followers of each disputed sect towards others on a large scale.
8. The other side of hatred is bigotry in term of dealing with one's own sect as to the other'.
9. The sectarian conflict is stemmed afterwards to be started as verbal and then turned into physical violence as remarked by Aytenkin, (2016:2).
10. The solutions are to be looked at peaceful ends or violence which is exploited by other parties such as the political rivals and the colonial invaders (Bisharah, 2018:3).

Approaches to Sectarianism

The concept of sectarianism is approached from both the sociological as well as the psychological perspectives. The focus is on the sociological side as it deals with the ideals, beliefs and the social norms where the sectarian discourse is manifest. The psychological perspective, on the other hand, is also accounted for as it tackles the cognitive representations of sectarianism as both a genre of discourse and as an attitude containing the speaker's ideological tendencies (Jokiranta, 2010:201).

Although the term "sect" from which sectarianism is coined is provided with many definitions based on various points of view, five most significant approaches are presented here. These approaches are related to the social practices and structure, a matter which is related to the core objectives of this study.

Weber's Ideal Type Approach

Weber (1978:55) focuses on the use of the sect as the group of individuals who share certain commonalities; and when showing negative attitudes towards those who do not share such commonalities, those processes of sectarianism start. The final product at the same time is the phenomenon of sectarianism. Hence, Weber (ibid) discusses the multiplicity of the types of sects such as the religious, political, aesthetic and even scientific

According to Weber, sectarianism describes the concepts where certain features that are related to the ideal type which refers to the typical concepts. This is what makes sects, church and denomination represent certain culturally distinct features (Bruun, 2001:155).

The types of sectarianism – as manifested by Weber- can be revealed through the typical values of the society when it is practiced, such as political, religious, cultural or other aspects within the social structure of a given society (ibid:157).

As far as the way how to start sectarianize individuals to be members of a certain sect, depending on the merits that these individuals have common tendencies towards special religious, political or social values. In return, the sect is after certain qualifications that are required from the members or assumed members of a sect. the entire matter is that they are represented by strategies used to attract individuals one's sect (Weber, 2002a:4).

Such an approach discusses how sects can be extended for the individuals' ideals to the societal ideologies to be just like the stances of every member or presumed of that sect very little is mentioned about how this process is achieved.

Troeltsch's Socio-cultural Approach

In this approach, the relationship between the sect and society is discussed and introduced in a way where sectarianism is the final result from such relations. Troeltsch (1981: 348) introduces the sect as a different concept from the church which was the old main religious organization, justifying the need to the social structure that sects need to be flourished. As a religious organization, the church sets the goal of dominance through the power it has from the reflections of the divine sources. On the other hand, sects are originated within society the groups show indifference, hostility, hatred, and bigotry towards other sects.

Accordingly, Troeltsch (1991:372) modifies the old version adding that sects replace the church with the sect as the latter is concerned with the socio-cultural contexts, though other terms are given such as cult religious organization and denomination, following in this McGuire (1997). Hence, the differences among the socio-cultural settings have led sectarianize one another, i.e., showing negative attitudes towards each other through the use of both religion and other cultural considerations (Bainbridge, 1997:38-40).

Wilson's Religious Subtypes Approach

Based on Troeltsch and attempting to bridge the gaps in the socio-cultural approach, Wilson (1963-2004) criticizes the concept of sectarianism that results from the socio-cultural contexts as not necessarily having similar factors in different cultures at the levels of organization, doctrine and origins of a given sect.

Wilson (1990:46-7) argues the subtypes of responding to the evil through the process of sectarianism, introducing seven subtypes of response as follows:

- a. Introversionists are those who are after purifying the communities.
- b. Conversionists are those who try to transform the self from one state into another [from one ideology into another].
- c. Manipulationists are the one who deceive others through evil acts.
- d. Thaumaturgists are those individuals who are concerned with miraculous deeds and dispensation.
- e. Reformists represent the reformation and change toward better situation of human being.
- f. Revolutionists attempt to change the entire world by divine powers through certain individuals.
- g. Utopians are those humans who believe that only humans can change the world towards better through the use of the best sect, a matter which is significantly disputable.

Stark & Bainbridge's Movement Approach

According to this approach, sect is viewed as a religious movement originated by individuals as a reaction to the social and rational/irrational choices to be compensators for their beliefs (Stark & Bainbridge, 1985:24). Such assumptions have been expanded to be an approach through which sectarianism is analyzed. Following the 'sect movement', a group of individuals within a religiously social contexts are deemed to set a deviant religious movement whose tenant are taken from the base organization [religion] and the socio-cultural norms [though sometimes deviant]. Along with the sect, novel tenets that are

related to the sect can be introduced through certain ways of interpreting particular divine sources. Such a movement is referred to as a 'cult' (Bainbridge, 1997: 24).

Once such religious movements indoctrinate their own ideologies through either causing or preventing change to society, sectarian strategies of sectarianism are adopted and institutionalized to cover the planned ideology under the concerned sect (ibid).

Thus, Stark & Bainbridge (1985:46-67) argue that sectarianism as a process can be characterized with three main aspects:

- a. Difference represents the levels at which members of a sect are different or differentiated from other sects, along with the linguistic strategies utilized in making the members distinct.
- b. Antagonism is the way in which members of given sect deny or illegitimate the rights of all other religious sects, and finally rejecting all what other sect have, reaching to the point of conflict.
- c. Separation conveys the reclusion of the members and the restriction of their contacts to their fellow members of the same group. In other words, the members' communication is only accepted with their in-group members.
- d. These three aspects seems to be overlapped when it comes to the conflict which could be socially, verbally or physically triggered through one or more of these aforementioned aspects, as illustrated by Rambo (1993:106) in that sectarian conflict does not start physically, there should be stages and triggers.

Presumed Sectarianism Approach

According to Bisharah's approach (2018:11) to sectarianism, it is the presumed [imagined, not real sects], it is defined way where individuals are gathered based on bigotry, discrimination and hatred toward other sect, without which it is not regarded as sectarianism. On the other hand, denomination [school of thought] is the groupings of people which is based on the sect that designates the social identity for an individual, and to expect certain naturalized acts and utterances to be done by such an individual as a member of a denomination (ibid:13).

Based on the sociological definitions of sect (Weber, 1978:53), denomination and church from the Arabic point of view, Bisharah (ibid:59) argues that the sect followers who are grouped around the ideology of a religion are sectarianized after the process of politicization of their own religious sect. This agrees with the concept of religio-political sectarianism as the presumed negative ideological movements, as it is found in the Christian church.

The presumed sectarianism is originated by certain stages and movements such as protesting against religious decisions through the use of political speech, justifying it as letting down the true tenets of religion and for that very reason a new sect is originated with a political stance. This stance starts with defining religion but after then reveals its hidden tenets and ideologies which are nearer to politics than religion (ibid:65).

Defining Criteria of Sectarianism

In order to recognize sectarianism, sectarian discourse is the key element to the speaker who is sectarian. James (1985:77) argues that ideologies are best manifested through the use of special linguistic devices through which the audience [listener] can reveal the sectarian attitude. On the same stream, Van Dijk (1997a:3) attains that to define the ideological discourse is to find out the linguistic as well as paralinguistic properties utilized in the sectarian discourse.

In this section, the defining properties are discussed in three types which are overlapped among each other: linguistic, paralinguistic and ideological properties.

The first two types are the opening gate to the ideological manifestations of sectarianism as asserted by Mumtaz (1998:101) various strategies and/or criteria to convey sectarianism.

Linguistic Criteria

a. Lexical signaling

These represent one of the core linguistic features that characterize sectarianism. It means the use of lexical items to refer to what the speaker tries to convey; meaning that the speaker's attitude and tendencies, one can reach out through the lexical signaling. As example, being sectarian, the speaker could use such lexical signaling as the ones that show negativeness of the other side. The terms that degrade, agitate or show – in one way or another – hatred and bigotry towards the other parties [sects]. This is based on mentioning the names of sects, names referring to sects by all means, attributes indicating the sects and the like (Zelin & Smyth, 2014:1-4)

b. Lexical terms [terminologies]

According to Kashi (2014:51-62), using certain terms and expressions can lead to the speaker's status, power, and tendencies. In regards to sectarianism, one might be sectarian when one uses such terms as the ones that negatively implicate certain negative attitudes toward other groups. The use of words such as “‘rafidhi [rejecter], Shiite, Sunni, Kawarij [outlaws], Nasibi [hating and showing grudge against other sects],” can refer to sectarian act simply as the denote through their lexical meaning, an issue which is focused on by Zelin & Smyth (2014:2).

c. Lexical pragmatic terms

These are the lexical terms and expressions that are contextualized for the sake of pragmatic use. Such terms are best exemplified in the use of the terms which are used in contexts where the speaker is required to be as polite as possible (Murphy 1997:237-39). In the presence of the individuals from the opposite sect, one cannot directly use the terms and expressions that can threaten or damage the listener's face. Pragmatic use of expressions can be of use here, such as using the words “the other side, our brothers, different sects, other doctrines... etc”.

d. Decontextualization

Here, according to special use of ideological tendencies, individuals take utterances out of context in a way that such utterance would be interpreted completely different (Britannica.com). This process is referred to as decontextualization where utterances are decontextualized so that a sectarianist uses them under stark attack of the other sect (Lauret, 2017:244). One might use the utterance: “Imam Ali ordered to tear the holy Quran which is in the hands of his opponent Muawya as this Quran is not a real Quran”. The sectarianist tries to mention all the historical contextual factors leading to such an event. Rather, only what best serves the speaker's attitude is taken out of context and interpreted differently. Here, the sectarian utterance would be” Imam Ali ordered to tear the holy Quran”, a matter which is hugely from and the true utterance and context.

e. Phonological intonation is the level of tone used by the speaker to serve different discourse as well as pragmatic functions (Beckman and Pierrehumbert, 1986:256-309). Changing the intonation indicates a change in the topic, start new topic, deviate from a topic or the like. In case of sectarianism, any change of the intonation, along with certain paralinguistic moves would lead to the interpretation that the speaker is

sectarian (Al-Helu: interview). It does matter the level of intonation as much as the change itself which takes place. For instance, the speaker changes his tone when talking about the sectarianism as a way of instigating the audience and emphasizes his ideological tendencies within inappropriate use of language.

f. Implicature

One of the pragmatic main notions is that of implicature as introduced by Grice (1975) as additional information reached out through the contextual factors in a situation. This happens when one of the cooperative principles is violated for the sake of pragmatic meaning, a matter that occurs at a large scale when it comes to the ideological discourse such as sectarian discourse, following Lauret (2017:249). Sectarianists employ this pragmatic concept when they try to be more polite or politically correct in order not to be accused of being sectarian. A good illustrative example can be taken from the Islamic Shiite –Sunni sectarian discourse is that he each of these two parties can speak of the other under pragmatic generalized and/or particularized implicature such as the naming of one party as ‘the other doctrine’, ‘the specialized’, ‘sons of the public’ Ithnaasharia [twelvers] and so on.

g. Presupposition

Presupposition [with all its triggers] can be regarded as a criterion to define sectarianism, especially when taking the sectarian purposes for granted through triggering presupposition. Presupposition is defined semantically and pragmatically (Levison, 1983:204-25). At the pragmatic level, it is the common ground between the speaker and the listener, where the speaker presuppose and the listener infers through the shared knowledge / common ground. In terms of sectarianism, Dashti (2015: 2) remarks that sectarianists adopt presuppositions that are known for both the speaker and listener such as the use of the Shiite-Sunni phrases and expressions (Sala Allahum alaihi wasalam [peace be upon him], Sala Allahum alaihi wa alalihi wasalam Alaihi alsalam [peace be upon him and his family], alaihi asalam [peace be upon his], Radhaia Allahu anhu [may Allah be pleased with him] ... etc.

h. Relevance

At the cognitive level, listeners cannot always process the sectarian utterances unless they are processed within the contextual factors of the situation where it is sectarian. Following Seperber and Willsion (2004:31), to link what the speaker says to what it should be meant is to process and retrieve the sectarian factors that the listener has already in mind. For instance, the speaker mentions certain historical events to instigate the audience against the other sect. The speaker would use pragmatic utterances to expect the listener to make the relevance in order to reach out the intended interpretation.

i. Reference

At the level of pragmatic reference, sectarianism can be regarded as one defining criteria in that speakers need insinuate themselves for sectarian attitudes, they refer [with the uses of language] to the opponent sect in terms of using pragmatic reference. An illustrative example is that the Shiite reference to the caliphs; they are referred to as the first, the second, the third, however, when it comes to the fourth one it is mentioned with glorification “Imam Ali (peace be upon him). Here, the speaker tries to agitate the audience against the ideology of the aforementioned caliphs.

j. Dixies are used at the micro-pragmatics which is classified by Mey (2001:53); they are language indicators using in the place, time, person, discourse and social indications. When it comes to sectarianism, person and social diexes are adopted

significantly. Sectarianists attempt to refer to their opponent through the use of different references such as the first, the second, third for the Caliphs after the prophet Muhammad.

All these can be tested against the appropriateness theory; utterances that are considered as sectarian to all types of listeners are – according to the appropriateness theory - are inappropriate [see chapter two: appropriateness theory]. Having tendencies for different ideologies blurs the line between the different sects and leave the listener in perplexity of whose sect is right and whose sect is wrong. It is highly difficult to decide at the level of the sectarian acts. However, sectarian utterances are taken as inappropriate ones as it refers to a negative ideology that the normal human being would condemn. Linguistically, adopting the appropriateness theory can be of use in this regard (ibid:56).

Paralinguistic Properties

Sectarianists do not only depend on linguistic devices to convey sectarian attitudes, they also utilize the body movement, the facial expressions and the psychological status to indicate whether the discourse is sectarian or not. This is of course after taking the contextual cues [as introduced by Gumperz 2003] in to account.

a. Body movement

One of the paralinguistic factors is body movement such as the movement of the hands, fingers, how they moved. These movements are culturally the key factor to help reach the meaning of many speech acts such as instigation, criticizing, rebuking ... and the like (Traunmüller, 2005:353). In the case, of sectarianism, this can be of use as it focuses on the speaker's attitude in interpreting the appropriateness of the speech act issued by the speaker.

b. Facial expressions

This is significantly considerable in demonstrating the speaker's attitude such as being happy, angry, sad, agitated or agitating... and so on. Being sectarian, speakers can indoctrinate their audience through the facial expressions that could be linked to the audience's emotional status, leading them to be provoked, as discussed by (Berkum, 2008:581).

c. Psychological status

Certain individuals have certain gaps to be filled and certain needs to be satisfied (McKay et al: 1995: 63) through different interest and practices; among which sectarian conflict is the practice that they find comfort in. so, sectarianists have special emotional needs and conflicts to characterize sectarianism.

Sectarian Discourse

Based on the aforementioned criteria as well as the stages of starting sectarian situations from the speech acts used till the sectarian conflict which leads to sectarianism as a negative social act. As far as discourse is concerned, it is regarded as the tool through which sectarianism is manifested. In other words, sectarian discourse is represented by a process that is achieved within particular stages. Each of these stages is manifested with a certain level of language [particular pragmatic strategies] and reveals the ideological implications.

Reasonably, ideological implications and pragma-linguistic device [pragmatic strategies] are married according to stages of sectarianism. Some of these stages are considered as speaker oriented as they are the speaker's concern. Others are viewed as the listener oriented in that they are related to the listener in the interpretation level.

Basically, sectarian discourse is revealed in three stages: issuance and intention stage, Inappropriate and Conflict Stage and interpretation and sectarianism stage. These are discussed below.

Issuance & Reproduction Stage

Following Willison (1992) account on sectarianism, sectarianists start using the speech acts that represent the ideological boundaries among sects as a matter of setting the special stance of their own sect. Hence, for the purpose of belittling or dehumanizing other sects, all the merits of a sect are neglected and degraded as a strategy of showing all the positive manifestations of a given sect.

Sectarianists use the discourse devices dealing with the 'us' and 'them' in order to differentiate their own sect and to show the difference aspects of other sects. This is argued by Dik's ideological square (1998), referring to how ideologies are practiced within social structures.

Sectarianists adopt multiple levels of pragma-linguistic levels [based on Chen, 2020] to reproduce the religious reflections of a given sect. Trying to set purifying rationales to impact individuals, sectarianists use such speech acts, implicature, presuppositions, references, dummies ...etc. in order to attain the positivity and secure a status for their set.

Inappropriate and Stance Stage

Taking a stance by proponents of a particular ideology [sect], it is highly significant to show the drawbacks of other sects, even if it takes to be implicitly stated. However, it is often the verbal attack is the obvious strategy utilized as to reveal the inner motivation for sectarianism. Thus, the different religious texts that are regarded as the heritage from which all different sects are attributed are interpreted differently. Contextual factors are violated and breached, i.e. leaving the situation inappropriate [see documentation criterion].

Sectarianists adopt the strategy of decontextualizing, following Lauret (2017:244), the ideologically useful utterances from the situations to show sectarian attitudes. This matter turns the utterances inappropriate as the situation where they are used is not compatible with the utterances which are taken out of their context. To document from the religious sources is a questionable matter as sectarianists follow unreliable ways of interpreting and commenting, an issue which renders the situation inappropriate to be taken positively. Sectarianists [as cited by Bisharah, 2018] attempt to adapt the situation for their own interest, showing the intolerance, antagonism against all other sects, manipulating the references they rely on and revealing all the miraculous dispensation.

Interpretation and Sectarianism Stage

Having the contextual factors, common ground, shared knowledge and the presuppositions, sectarian utterance can be tested against the inappropriate norms which govern the society where sectarian discourse is practiced. Sectarianists use discriminatory speech acts, as attested by Brooke (2017:848), to reproduce discriminatory, prejudiced, intolerant acts for different purposes utilized by disseminators. However, no matter the purpose, the reproduction of the language within such a stance can only reflect the speaker's sectarian attitude (Hoffman, 2019:4).

Listeners – as they are concerned in this stage – can find different purposes claimed by sectarianists such as reformists who try to change the world for better through the use of discrimination and prejudiced language. Other sectarianists revolutionize against all other sects' interpretation for the religious texts, claiming that they have divine authority to

change the world in the way they find it useful, regardless of if it is only useful for a very limited individuals in a community.

Accordingly, listener can utilize the communicative principle of relevance as introduced by Sperber and Willison (1992) to connect the contextual factors and to appropriate the sectarian use of such discriminated, prejudiced and intolerant utterances. This kind of separation within society can be taken as an instigating, inciting and act of showing hatred and bigotry within the one society belonging to one religion at least (Bisharah, 2018:53). The final result is the sectarian conflict which can only be resolved through physical or verbal violence and rarely peaceful talks which remain in conflict but with the cautious use of language (Lauret, 2017:241-251).

The following is an illustrative example of the definging criteria manifesting sectarianism within its stages:

“A true Muslim is the one who follows the teachings of Quran and the authentic hadeeth of Bukhari and Muslim... if not, he is not a true Muslim.” Sunni -British Preacher

In this piece of discourse, there are three identifying criteria which make it sectarian. The first one is the use of the utterance ‘true Muslim’ and ‘authentic hadeeth’ represent the lexical signaling that the preacher uses to signal to the properties of the true Muslim and authentic hadeeth according to his doctrine. The lexical pragmatic term ‘authentic hadeeth of Bukhari’ has been used as a presupposition that it is only this hadeeth that can identify the true Muslim. Here, the presupposition indicates that the true Muslim is the one who follow Bukhari who belongs to one of the Muslim sects.

Other criteria can be revealed within other utterances showing sectarianism.

CONCLUSION

This study has come up with certain conclusions:

1. It introduces an operational definition of sectarianism as a social act which is staged and manifested through discourse, representing a negative ideology.
2. Different types of sectarianism are discussed such as the political, cultural, linguistic and religious sectarianism. These are all based on and originated from the religious sectarianism, having common forms of prejudice, discrimination, intolerance, and instigation and religious fanaticism.
3. Sectarianism emerges from different sources and used for various purposes. Among these sources and motives are the religious, political and social sources. Accordingly, the sociologists’ approaches of sectarianism are discussed. Weber’s Ideal Type is based on the socio-cultural approach to sectarianism which deals with the relationship between the sect [as an in-group member] and society as a final product of such kind of a relationship. Another approach is introduced by Willison which is based on religious elements that brings sectarianism for religious and spiritual purposes in order to change the society according to the divine ideologies. Sectarianism and sect are approached by Stark and Bainbridge as a social-ideological movement serving social as well as political needs. Finally and recently, Bisharah’s approach attains that there is no real sectarianism, it is a presumed concept which is in the imagination of promoters of sectarianism.
4. Certain criteria which are regarded as the defining criteria of sectarianism are discussed and explored under the linguistic, paralinguistic and ideological criteria, focusing on the discourse which manifests all the three types of criteria.



5. There are three discourse stages of sectarianism. It starts with the issuance and ideological reproduction stage, the inappropriate illocutionary and contextual factors discrimination stage and the interpretation and intolerance, hatred stage.

REFERENCES

- Aljazeera, (2015). *Featured Documentary - Enemy of Enemies: The Rise of ISIL (Part 1)*. [online] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xsHrULpYeFk>.
- Al-Khayoon, A. (2007). *Al-Adyan wal Mathahib Biliraq* [Religions and Sects in Iraq]. Al-Kamal Verlag, Germany.
- Al-Khayoon, A. (2011). *Dhidul Ta'fyah Iraq: Jadal mabad Nissan 2003* [Against Sectarianism, Iraq: Dispute of Post 2003]. Madarek Ibda: Lebanon.
- Almoslim.net.Politics: (2020).
- Al-Qarawee, H. (2014) *Iraq's Sectarian Crisis: A Legacy Of Exclusion* , Washington DC: *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.
- Alvi, H. (1988) "Pakistan and Islam: Ethnicity and Ideology", Fred Halliday, (ed.), *State and Ideology in the Middle East and Pakistan*, London: Macmillan Education Ltd.,86.
- Armando S. (2005). "The Euro-Islamic Roots of Secularity: A Difficult Equation. " *Asian Journal of Social Science*. 33, No. 3, 412-437.
- Aytekin, M. (2016). *What Are The Causes Of Sectarian Conflict In The Middle East And What Strategies Can Be Applied To End It?*. 10.13140/RG.2.1.3967.2721.
- Ayub, F. (ed.) (2013) 'The Gulf and Sectarianism', *Gulf Analysis* , (November).
- Bainbridge, W. (1997). *The Sociology of Religious Movements*. New York: Routledge.
- Bashkin, O. (2010) "Religious hatred shall disappear from the land" – Iraqi Jews as Ottoman Subjects, 1864-1913', *International Journal of Contemporary Iraq Studies* , 4(3),306.
- Bishara, A. (2013). Sect and Sectarianism Polysemy: Digging in the Historical Context of the Terms and Proposing a Sociological Analytical Concept "Omran". 23,6,7-25.
- _____. (2018). *Ta'ifah, Sect and Sectarianism: from the Word and Its Changing Implications to the Analytical Sociological Term*. Arab Center for Research & Policy Studies. 2, 53-67.
- Brewer, J. (1992), 'Sectarianism and racism, and their parallels and differences' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15 (3): 352-64.
- Britanica.net: linguicism
- Brooke, S. (2017). "Sectarianism and Social Conformity: Evidence from Egypt." *Political Research Quarterly* 70 (4): 848–860.
- Bruun, H. (2001). 'Weber on Rickert: From Value Relation to Ideal Type'. *Max Weber Studies* 1.2: 138–160.
- Bryan R. Wilson, (1963). "Typologie des sects dans une perspective dynamique et comparative", *Archives de Sociologie des Religions*, 16, 49-63.
- Chalcraft, J. (2007b). 'The Development of Weber's Sociology of Sects' in D. J. Chalcraft, ed., *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. London: Equinox, 26–51.
- Fregonese, S. (2020). Elements of contestation. Sectarianism as extractive violence and Lebanon's revolution. *Urban Spaces and Sectarian Contestation*. 3, 33-41.
- Ghazi, Mahmood A. (1992). *Studies in the Political & Constitutional Thought of Islam*, Lahore: National Book House.
- Henley, M. (2016). *Religious Authority and Sectarianism in Lebanon - Carnegie Endowment for International Place*.
- Hoffman, M. (2019) *Religion, Sectarianism, and Democracy: Theory and Evidence from Lebanon*. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11109-019-09538-9>



- Hurd, S. (2015). Politics of Sectarianism: Rethinking Religion and Politics in the Middle East “*Middle East Law and Governance*”. 7, 61-75.
- International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. (1968). Vol.14, America: The Macmillan Company & The Free Press.
- James A. Beckford, (1976) “New Wines in New Bottles: A Departure from Church-Sect Conceptual Tradition”, *Social Compass*, 23/3, 71-85.
- James A. Beckford. (1985). *Cult Controversies: The Societal Response to the New Religious Movements*. London & New York: Tavistock Publications.
- James D. Fearon and David D. (2003). ‘Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War’. *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 97. 1: 75–90.
- Jinnah Muhammad, (2000), *Jinnah: Speeches and Statements 1947-1948*, Karachi: Oxford University Press, 13.
- Johnson, B., & Wilson, B. (1962). Sects and Society. *Review of Religious Research*, 3(4), 176.
- Jokiranta, J. (2010). “Sectarianism” of the Qumran “Sect”: Sociological Notes’. *Rev Q* 78(20): 223–39.
- Justin, G. (2020) Sectarianism from the Top Down or Bottom Up? Explaining the Middle East’s Unlikely De-sectarianization after the Arab Spring. *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 18:1, 109-113.
- Lauret, M. (2017). Sectarian Discourse: Form of Perversion in Action in Our Modernity. In Caine D., Wright C. (eds). *Perversion Now!* The Palgrave Lacan Macmillan: Cham.
- Majid, R. (2016). Analysis of Arab Societies through Sectarianism Does not Grasp the Complex Dynamics of Identity Politics in the Region. Al-Jazera.net.
- Makdisi, U. (2000). *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History, and Violence in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Lebanon*. London: University of California Press.
- Mariam Webster Dictionary, online: *sectarianism*
- McGuire, B. (1997). *Religion in Social Context*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Mumtaz A. (1997), “Revivalism, Islamization, Sectarianism and Violence in Pakistan” in *Pakistan in Charles Kennedy and Craig Baxter*, Colorado: Westview Press. 1010-123.
- Murphy, M. (2002). Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 40. Leiden: Brill.
- Naek, L. (2001). ‘*Harsh Truth*’ Lahore: Hamid Shagufta.
- Oxford Dictionary online: *sectarianism*
- Rambo, L. (1993). *Understanding Religious Conversion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Roberts, D. (2017). *Liverpool Sectarianism: The Rise and Demise*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Rodney S. and William S. (1979), “Of Churches, Sects and Cults: Preliminary Concepts for a Theory of Religious Movements”, *JSSR*, 18/2 117-33.
- Theodore M. Steeman, (1975). “Church, Sect, Mysticism, Denomination: Periodological Aspects of Troeltsch’s Types”, *Sociological Analysis*, 36/3, 181-204.
- Troeltsch, E. (1981). *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Troeltsch, E. (1991). *Religion in History*. Essays translated by James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense with an introduction by James Luther Adams. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 1997 a. “Discourse as Interaction in Society” in van Dijk, T. (ed). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. 1-37. London: Sage.



- Van Leewen, T. (1993a). "Language and Representation" *The Recontextualization of Participation, Active and Reactions* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Sydney.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*, ed. G. Roth and C. Wittich (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- _____. (2002a). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New introduction and translation by Stephen Kalberg. London: Blackwell.
- Wilson B. (1992). *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism: Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society*. Oxford, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (ed.) *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements*. London: Heinemann, 1967.
- _____. (1963). «An Analysis of Sect Development.» *American Sociological Review*. no. 16
- _____. (1967) *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements* (ed.). London: Heinemann.
- _____. (1969). "A Typology of Sects", *Sociology of Religion*, ed. Roland Robertson London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- _____. (1990). *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism: Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ynaz, N. (2005). "A Social Analysis of Religious Organisations: The Cases of Church, Sect, Denomination, Cult and New Religious Movements (NRMs) and Their Typologies" *Ýslâm Araþtýrmalary Dergisi, Sayý*, 13. 63-108.
- Zelin, A. and Smyth, P. (2014) The Vocabulary of Sectarianism. *The Washington Institute for Near Eastern Policy*.