



Discourse Analysis in Religious Studies

The Case of Interreligious Worship in Friesland

Frans Wijsen

Abstract. – The aim of this article is to explore the use and usefulness of critical discourse analysis in religious and inter-religious studies. In order to achieve this aim, the author makes a critical discourse analysis of data generated in a study on “Interreligious Worship” services in Friesland by combining three analytic perspectives and three analytic methods. The analysis is complemented by theoretical and methodical considerations. The author’s contention is that by using critical discourse analysis the gap between explanation and interpretation in religious and interreligious studies can be bridged. [*The Netherlands, Friesland, interreligious studies, interreligious worship, discourse analysis*]

Frans Wijsen, professor of interreligious relations at Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands. He has been working as guest professor in Indonesia since 1994 and in Kenya since 2004. – He wrote extensively about Muslim–Christian relations in these countries. His publications include: “I am just a Sukuma”. Globalization and Identity Construction in North-west Tanzania” (with R. Tanner. Amsterdam 2002), “Seeds of Conflict in a Haven of Peace. From Religious Studies to Inter-religious Studies in Africa” (Amsterdam 2007), and “Religion, Civil Society, and Conflict in Indonesia” (coed. with C. Sterkens and M. Machasin. Berlin 2009). – See also References Cited.

Since some decades there has been dissatisfaction with objectivist definitions of religion and positivist methods of studying religion.¹ However, alternative theories and methods of religious studies so far lack clear conventions (Granholm 2005: 260). Among others this is because scholars of religion face a dilemma. On the one hand, they want to make their studies more scientific. On the other hand, the object of their studies seems to escape scientific enquiry. Some scholars go for social science methods, others opt for the humanities approaches. Expla-

nation competes with interpretation (Wiebe 2005; Fairclough et al. 2004).

It is my contention that critical discourse analysis (CDA) can bridge this gap. It combines micro- and macrosociological analysis with linguistic analysis.² Whereas critical discourse analysis has become a well respected approach in qualitative research (Denzin and Lincoln 2005), its use in religious studies is rare.³ Various scholars of religion speak about discourse as this word has become a fad in academia. But their studies remain quite theoretical and do not use discourse analysis in a methodical and technical way.⁴ A few exceptions

- 1 See among others Kippenberg (1993), McCutcheon (1997), Flood (1999), Hammer (2001), and von Stuckrad (2003). Flood’s observation “that religious studies has method but no theory” (1993: 16) does not apply to these alternative approaches. They have a lot of theory but little or no method.
- 2 CDA has not yet reached standardized methods (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 3). The CDA version that I present here is based on the “three-dimensional conception of discourse” of Fairclough (1992: 72, 85) who is keen on the combination of linguistics, interpretivist or micro sociology, and macro sociology.
- 3 See the journals *Discourse Studies*, *Discourse in Society*, *Discourse & Communication*. In these journals articles in the field of Religious Studies are rare.
- 4 Despite the “AAR Critical Theory and Discourses on Religion Unit,” the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* shows 1385 hits when searched on “discourse,” but only 14 when searched on “discourse analysis,” of which 6 are in book reviews (e-journal contents approached on 5 June, 2009). Peter Lang’s series on “Religions and Discourse” has only one title on discourse analysis.

(Heather 2000; Granholm 2005) confirm the rule. The aim of this article is to explore CDA and its use in the academic study of religions and interreligious relations.

In order to achieve our aim we will make a critical discourse analysis of data generated in a study on “Interreligious Worship” (IW) services in Friesland. In this province IW has been practised since 21 March, 1993.⁵ In 1992 and 1993, there were demonstrations of hostility against foreigners, and Muslims in particular, at mosques in Leeuwarden and Herenveen. Complaints were lodged with the “Antidiscrimination Office.” Various societal and religious organisations came together as “Workgroup Colourful Friesland” to discuss how they could combat discrimination and racism. How could they show the ideal of a tolerant and peaceful society? One of the initiatives taken by the religious organisations was an IW service on the International Day against Discrimination and Racism on 21 March, 1993. Since then there have been annual IW services on that day. IW has been extended to other occasions such as International Women’s Day (8 March) and National Liberation Day (5 May). The organisers purposely choose national and international feast days rather than religious ones, in order to show that they concern all Dutch citizens. They assume, moreover, that the prayer leaders accept equality with respect to religion and gender, and that they participate in IW as adherents of their specific religions but not on behalf of them.

The research population consists of 15 persons, with whom in-depth interviews were conducted. There are three Christians, two of them Roman Catholics and one Protestant; three are Muslims, all of them Sunni; three are Hindus, two of whom identify themselves with the Arya Samaj reform movement; three are Jews, two of them Orthodox and one liberal; and there are three Bahá’í. Five participants describe themselves as converts: two Protestants converted to Bahá’í, one Protestant converted to Judaism, one Catholic became a Bahá’í, and another Catholic became a Hindu, but she describes herself as “Catholic Hindu” or “Hindu Catholic.” Five interviewees are Dutch, two are of Turkish

descent, one is of Moroccan descent, three are Surinamese, and one comes from Aruba. As for gender, 8 are women and 7 are men. With respect to age, 4 interviewees are in their sixties, 5 of them are in their fifties, 5 in their forties, and 1 is in his thirties. Seven interviewees hold official positions in their religious institutions. One is a Roman Catholic pastor, one is a Protestant minister. There are two imams and two pandits, and one is a rabbi.

For the interviews a topic guide was used based on Raimundo Panikkar’s concept “The Intrareligious Dialogue” (1978) and translated into more discourse analytical terms such as polyphonic self, multiple identity, and dialogical self (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 108–116; Hermans and Kempen 1993). Some interviewees were interviewed more than once. Interviews lasted from one hour to a couple of hours. They were conducted in spring 2007 in the homes of the interviewees. The language used was Dutch, although some were not fluent in Dutch. This may have affected the material. However, the interviews were recorded, transcribed, enhanced, and then authorized by the interviewees. The interviewer, with whom the present author collaborated closely (Wijzen and Nicolay 2010) is a participant in IW. This influenced the production of the material. In this type of research the analyst must be self-critical.⁶ Reflexivity is a way of validating the generated data, as are dialogical research and coresearch (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 116–118).

First we will explain Norman Fairclough’s approach of CDA and how it could be applied in the study of religion and interreligious relations (1). Next we make an initial analysis of discourse as linguistic practice or “text” (2), discourse as the discursive practice or “interaction” (3), and discourse as social practice or “context” (4). The primary discourses under consideration are the interviews; the secondary discourse is IW. We will end by discussion and conclusions concerning the use and usefulness of CDA in religious and interreligious studies (5).

1 Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is a specific way of conducting empirical research. The central concern is to trace “explanatory connections” (Fairclough 1992: 72, 80, 95) between language use (discourse) and social reality

⁵ Friesland is one of the northern provinces of the Netherlands. Out of a total population of 624,500, 3.0% are non-Western immigrants; the average for The Netherlands is 8.9%. The provinces of North-Holland and South-Holland have 14.0% and 14.2% non-Western immigrants, respectively (Central Office for Statistics, 01.01.2000). Thus, Friesland is not particularly the heartland of the multicultural society in the Netherlands. But IW services in Friesland were among the first in this country.

⁶ With Bourdieu (1990) we advocate a shift from participant observation to participatory objectification and reflexive research.

(structure).⁷ Fairclough starts from the following assumptions. First, discourse is a practice just as any other practice. Secondly, there is a dialectic relation (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 78) between discourse (the discursive) and reality (the non-discursive). Thirdly, the relation between discourse and reality is mediated through discursive practice. In this introductory section I first explain three analytic perspectives, thereafter I explain three analytic methods, and last but not least I design a model for analysis.

1.1 Perspectives of Analysis

With other qualitative approaches (e.g., content analysis, conversation analysis) critical discourse analysts are interested in participants' perspectives (Fairclough 1989: 6–14). But unlike these other qualitative approaches, critical discourse analysts are not interested in participants' perspectives as such. They are interested in how participants' perspectives are related to the social positions of the participants and more particularly, to their interests to reproduce or to transform the societal order (Fairclough 1992: 65; Wetherell 2001: 383–387).

Consequently, critical discourse analysts distinguish different dimensions of one and the same practice and they look at them from different perspectives: the individual dimension or micro perspective, the institutional dimension or mesoperspective, and the societal dimension or macro perspective (Fairclough 1992: 69). For example, the interactions between teachers and pupils, doctors and patients, or parents and children are not only related to views of what specific institutions such as school, hospital, and family are, but also to processes in the wider society such as democratisation or commercialization (Fairclough 1992: 65 f., 202–224). These examples show that the ideational and interpersonal (i.e., social identity and social relation) dimensions go together. The same applies to interactions between husband and wife, employers and employees, shop attendants and customers, politicians and electorate, civil servants and citizens.

Whereas radical post-structuralists tend to assume that discourse positions the speakers, and discursive psychologists tend to assume that speakers position themselves through discourse, Fairclough

(1992: 65) and other critical discourse analysts assume that it is both. Speakers position themselves but they are also positioned by the discourse. It is assumed that the relation between the discursive and the non-discursive is a dialectical one.⁸ This is an important analytic insight that will come back in the discussion and conclusion.

Translated into religious discourse we can distinguish the dimensions of the individual believers, their identification with the religion or the religious institution, and the societal context in which religious institutions operate.⁹ Thus one can discriminate when participants speak for themselves as individual believers, when they speak as representatives of a religion and as citizens of a country. It is assumed that what believers think and say is related (in a positive or negative way) to texts of the religious institutions that they belong to or (fully or partially) identify with, and to wider societal contexts in which they operate, e.g., processes of democratization or commercialization.

1.2 Methods of Analysis

Critical discourse analysts use various methods of analysis. These methods are given different names. Fairclough speaks about the analysis of linguistic practice, the analysis of discursive practice, and the analysis of social practice. Alternative names are the analysis of text, of interaction, and of context; or simply description, interpretation, and explanation (Fairclough 1989: 26; 1992: 199).

As was said above, according to critical discourse analysts, discourse is a practice as any other practice. Put in terms of the pragmatic turn, language use is not only a way of saying things (informative); it is a way of doing things (performative), or exercising power (Bourdieu 1991). The only difference with other practices is its linguistic form

⁷ Fairclough and CDA in general draw from various theoretical traditions. Basic are the linguistic turn and social constructivism (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 4 f.; Granholm 2005: 244–248).

⁸ Most discourse analysts take Foucault as their starting point (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 12–14). Whereas radical post-structuralist discourse analysts use Foucault in a strict way, critical discourse analysts criticize Foucault (Fairclough 1992: 56–61). According to them the relation between the discursive and the non-discursive is not deterministic but dialectic (Fairclough 1992: 66). Gramsci's concept of hegemony is superior to Foucault's concept of power (Fairclough 1992: 58).

⁹ One may ask if this approach can be used for the study of institutionalized religions only. In my view this is not the case. One can use CDA to analyze how text and talk constitute and are constituted by social reality. Even noninstitutionalized religion does not escape habitualization (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 70). And the institutional dimension is there to the extent that noninstitutionalized religion constitutes itself as a critique on institutionalized religion.

(Fairclough 1992: 71). Thus the first method is the analysis of discourse as linguistic practice.

Critical discourse analysts furthermore assume that there is a dialectic relation between language use and social structures, assuming that what participants say is shaped by and shapes social structures, either by reproducing them or transforming them (Fairclough 1992: 72). Put in other words, critical discourse analysts are interested in the sociocognitive effects of language use, i.e., the ideational and interpersonal effects. This is the second method, the analysis of discourse as social practice.

According to critical discourse analysts, linguistic practice and social practice are mediated through discursive practice. Consequently, the third method is the analysis of the discursive practice, i.e., the analysis of the production, distribution, and consumption of texts (Fairclough 1992: 71, 86). The discursive practice (i.e., interaction) is crucial as the dialectic relation between linguistic practice (i.e., text) and social practice (i.e., context) is based on it.

1.3 A Multiperspective and Polymethodical Model

Fairclough develops CDA as a multiperspective and polymethodical approach. But the distinction between analytic perspectives and methods is not a sharp one. There are overlaps (Fairclough 1992: 73, 231). Moreover, the distinction between perspectives and methods of analysis does not reflect a one-to-one situation. All methods are used for analyzing all dimensions of practice, although one method may be more fruitful for analysing a specific dimension of practice than another. Critical discourse analysts use linguistic methods, but they do not need to have training in linguistics. They are interested in linking linguistic analysis with social analysis.

The model can be represented in a matrix of three columns (individual, institutional, and societal perspective) and three rows (linguistic, discursive, and social practice). Fairclough does not give a matrix such as this. But we can use it to represent his analyses, for example, of medical interviews (Fairclough 1992: 138–149). Analysing linguistic practice we note that the doctor says that he “knows” the cause of the disease, that the hospital administration does not allow him to give a specific treatment and that “we all feel cost-cutting in our wallets.” Analysing discursive practice we see him referring to a scientific article in a medical journal about the disease, to the strategic plan of the hospital, and to the policy of the health insurance

company and the ministry of health. Analysing the social practice we see him positioning himself as a real “specialist” in the medical field, reproducing a hierarchical relation to the patient, and serving the interests of the pharmaceutical industry.

We could link the standard medical interview with its subject positions and social relations to the societal processes of technologization and commercialization (Fairclough 1992: 200–224). On the contrary, we could link the alternative medical interview to the process of democratization with more egalitarian doctor–patient interactions. The comparison between the two would show the power struggle between standard and alternative medical practices with their respective knowledge claims. Scholars of religion could easily translate this to communication between professors and students in a university setting, and to the communication between ordained priests and ordinary faithful in a religious setting. As is well-known, Bourdieu (2000: 122) saw the religious field as exemplary for any other field.

In discourse analysis it is important to select a corpus of (natural or generated) discourse samples for closer inspection (Fairclough 1992: 226–228) and to enhance this with supplementary data through interviews and panels, but also websites and other media. In this article we only make use of transcriptions of interviews. As noted before, critical discourse analysts are not interested in participants’ views as such. They are interested in how participants’ views are related to their social positions, and to their interests to maintain or transform the status quo. Whereas the emphasis will be on text analysis, we will also look for indications in the text about interactions outside the interview setting (discursive practice) and their relations to structures of the society (social practice).

The analysis will follow the “stages” that are distinguished above. The “stages” are distinguished for analytic purpose only. They do not imply a chronological order. Data generation and (various stages of) data analysis refer to an iterative process. In each stage we will distinguish where participants speak for themselves, as individual believers; where they speak “as Christians,” or “as Muslims,” thus as representatives of a religion, officially or unofficially; and where they speak as Dutch, Frisians, or as Dutch or Frisians of Turkish or Surinamese descent, thus as citizens of the Netherlands. Specific techniques of CDA will be discussed while doing the analysis.

2 Description

The first method is description, i.e., the analysis of the linguistic features of the text (Fairclough 1992: 76f., 185–194). For this stage, Fairclough (1992: 73–78, 234–237) suggests various analytic tools. Here we focus on vocabulary and metaphor.¹⁰ Analytic questions are: How do participants speak about IW? What words do they use? How do they describe what they are doing in IW?¹¹

2.1 Individual Dimension

Making an abstraction of the institutional and societal context, some participants describe IW primarily as a “spiritual journey” for themselves as individual believers, “a common search and being on the way to the Ineffable.” As a Roman Catholic pastor says, “God is more important than tradition and, therefore, I want to discover how others experience him/her . . . how his/her name is sanctified, and goes beyond institutions. Traveling together on the way to him/her is more important than local and religious differences of experience.”

Another participant puts it thus: “It is like climbing a mountain and looking from that height at what happens down there.” It is “just like Moses glimpsing the Promised Land, how it could be if people lived together . . . what a colorful society could look like.” From this quotation it is evident that it is not always possible to separate the individual dimension from the other dimensions of practice. We will notice this in other practical dimensions as well. Some say that “God is more important than tradition . . . We pray to God, not to an institution.” A Turkish imam said that it is good that IW services “are held in a church or a mosque” because “just like a mosque, a church is a house of God . . . not a house of Christians.”

Whereas some say that IW services represent prayer to God, others say that they do not. One Jew emphasizes that for him IW services are “just services of worship . . . not prayer to God” because “you can only pray in the synagogue.” Another Jew says that for her “it is an encounter, but not a service.” Other participants also prefer the word “en-

counter.” Thus what we see here is various wordings of what is going on.

Some participants are a bit suspicious about IW, as they fear Christian monopoly and a hidden agenda. “For me the word ‘service of worship’ is pretty much a Christian word. I don’t like this word,” says a Jew, adding, “I would feel happier with the word ‘thanksgiving’.” This is confirmed by a Bahá’í woman, who says, “In fact, the word ‘service of worship’ comes from the Christian tradition. I experience it as contemplation. Meditation is a nicer word. It is more open.” She continues, “Through IW we contribute to the spiritual development of the divine . . . For me personally, this is not prayer to God.”

At least one Jew and one Muslim express some hesitation about Christian and Hindu worship. As the Muslim says, “I believe that you cannot make living things, people, and animals, God. Therefore, I find it difficult to accept that Christians make Jesus a God” and that “Hindus see cows as holy, as a God . . . God is God and you cannot make people God.” And a Jew says, “I believe that we cannot comprehend God . . . Therefore, I find Hindu belief strange. They have so many statues and they kneel before them.” He adds, “By the way, this also applies to the Catholic Church.”

Whereas some participants see IW as an “experience of unity” because “we all come from a common Source,” and because all believers are “children of the same father,” other participants see IW as a celebration of diversity. According to one participant, “the receivers of the prayers are different divinities, Godheads . . . we cannot make them one, because the differences are too big.” This is what Colorful Friesland is all about:¹² showing the different colors, not harmonizing them: “Show the diversity of colors and show that they are allowed to be there. That makes us cheerful!”

2.2 Institutional Dimension

Some participants clearly indicate when they are speaking for themselves as individual believers and when they are speaking as representatives of a reli-

10 “One focus for analysis is upon alternative wordings and their political and ideological significance”, says Fairclough (1992: 77). Thus we look at wording, overwording, rewording and alternative wording.

11 Fairclough (1992: 185f.) says, “it is sometimes useful for analytic purposes to focus upon a single word” or “key-words.” Overwording may indicate ideological language use (Fairclough 1992: 193).

12 In 1994, the “Workgroup Colorful Friesland” changed its name to “Platform of Life Philosophies in Colorful Friesland,” usually abbreviated as “Colorful Friesland.” The aim is to contribute to the building up of a multicultural society. In the beginning their services were called “Interreligious Prayer” but in 1995 they changed the name to “Interreligious Worship” in order to avoid being accused of praying with each other. According to the initiators they pray side by side, each prayer leader in his or her own tradition.

gion (my own faith and our Christian church). They distinguish between when they speak “as a person and as a pandit”; “me and the Jewish community”; “the rules of the church and my own experience of faith,” etc. One interviewee says that he participates in IW “as a Muslim and an imam,” another says that she participates “as a representative of the Bahá’í faith, as a woman, and as a faithful believer,” distinguishing carefully between various subject positions and social identities.

Although the individual and the institutional dimension cannot always be separated clearly, for analytical purposes we focus on the institutional dimension of practice when participants speak “from my Bahá’í faith,” “as a Christian,” or even “as a Protestant minister” or “as an imam.”

Here again our first method is analysis of linguistic practice. One participant describes IW explicitly as “something that happens between religions and worldviews.” Another participant says that he was asked to participate in IW by the Council of Churches. “My answer was immediately yes, but only from within the Roman Catholic Church,” adding that he speaks “as a pastor in the Roman Catholic Church.”

Most participants describe IW as praying “alongside each other,” each participant “in his or her own tradition.” Two or three interviewees stress the common ground between the religions. They worship “together with each other.” For one Bahá’í interviewee this is their daily experience, this is what they always do. The same applies to the interviewee who describes herself as a Catholic Hindu. One Bahá’í woman, who is married to a Lebanese Muslim, says that in their marriage they experience unity in their belief in one God but they remain Bahá’í and Muslim.

Another Bahá’í explicitly expresses her “dream to reach a common belief and religion” and she sees this dream partly realized in IW when “rabbi and imam label each other brothers in faith.” She speaks about common sources and all manifestations of God being empowered by the same source. Other interviewees also see unity realized as far as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are concerned. “Jews, Christians, and Muslims are children of the same ancestor, Abraham.” One Muslim says, “With Jews we must become one [in this world]. I mean that we see each other as brothers, because our sacred books are so close.” Others stress that “the key terms of Islam and Judaism have the same root, shalom and salaam.” However, “Hinduism and Bahá’ism are different.”

But most participants say that religions are not the same. One of them says, “None of the par-

ticipants want syncretism.” He continues: “There was a fear of weakening faith, loss of depth, the melting-pot idea. But people experience that it is exactly the other way round. Respectfully showing the huge diversity of colors, that makes us cheerful. It is the happiness of encounter.” Or, as a Hindu puts it, “The other need not become a Hindu. You may and must be yourself.” All religions are unique and enriching: “The more colorful, the better.” According to most participants IW is “neither syncretism” nor a “mixed service” and it does not strive to be a “super-religion.”

2.3 Societal Dimension

Several participants primarily describe IW “not as a religious ideal but as a societal reality.” They say that “IW and prayer are a sign that religions can contribute to a peaceful society,” or a “sign that through the common endeavor of people from different religions and worldviews the struggle against racism and discrimination is possible.” IW is an attempt “to demonstrate the ideal to society, to show that we do not accept racism and discrimination.” It is “an incentive to the world.” The aim of IW is “that religious leaders set a public example to their own community and to other people, and this empowers them.” Or as a Jew puts it, the aim of IW is “to fight against racism and discrimination, and to fight for a peaceful society.”

One Hindu pandita of Surinamese descent describes her negative experiences in Dutch society. “Few people in the Netherlands take Hindu belief seriously. They do not listen to me when I explain it [Hindu belief] to them. I have become aware that Western people in particular, but also Muslims, do not understand Hinduism and do not want to understand it because they stick to their own conviction, a conviction according to which they judge Hinduism to be idolatry.” But in IW “I feel and experience how we are equal and how we can be ourselves as religious leaders.”

Another pandita says that she wants “to show society that it is possible to live together in harmony,” and “to demonstrate to society who we are and that we want to live in peace with everybody.” She says, “One of our [Arya Samaj] principles is that nobody may be satisfied with personal well-being if this is not subordinated to the common good. And it is our duty to obey the rules that serve the common good. This also applies to living together here in the Netherlands.” A Protestant minister maintains that IW shows “that our roads cross. And it is at the crossroads that peace is sown and grows among

people.” And according to a Bahá’í, “interreligious cooperation is relevant to society.”

One interviewee describes IW as “an example for the new generation ... that church and mosque are both houses of God.” One Jew explicitly denies that IW is a religious activity. One of the imams also sees it primarily as a societal endeavor, “a common struggle against discrimination and racism.” He says, “It is good that we do it in our mosque. But according to me it is better to do it in a community hall.”

Various participants see IW not only as a struggle against discrimination towards believers of other faiths, but also as struggle against discrimination towards women and false perceptions of women in other religions. “As a woman I am in a religion where men often played a dominant role and often still play a dominant role. Then I feel that I am a faithful woman, a Muslima, who shows that Islam is essentially human-friendly, thus also woman-friendly ... After IW services people ask many questions. I wear a veil and I am a modern woman. That contradicts their view of Islam ... My colleagues ask me why I wear a veil. They think that I am forced to do so by my husband.” But she answers, “No, it is the opposite. My husband does not like me to wear a veil, but I do it because it is part of me.”

Talking about internal conflict, some Muslims describe a struggle not in themselves but within the Muslim community. On the one hand there are “fanatical Muslims who want to raise money for a big mosque for themselves and who put almost all their energy into this effort. They want to be the greatest and think of themselves as isolated from society.” On the other hand there are Muslims “who are open, open to other faiths and all people in society. They accept the need to have their own mosque. But for them it need not to be big and expensive. For them living together in harmony is more important.” They also speak about internal conflict in Dutch society. A Muslim says, “After 11 September and after the murder of Theo van Gogh this has become worse. It seems that people are really afraid of our faith, and I find that scary. Because how can I justify myself, and by the way, why should I justify myself? I find that difficult. People do not consider that many Muslims, and I also, are as afraid of fanatical Muslims and fundamentalists as they are.”¹³

13 In November 2004, a Muslim extremist murdered filmmaker Theo van Gogh because he produced “Submission,” a film of ex-Muslima Ayaan Hirsi Ali, a Dutch member of parliament of Somalian descent. In the film and in her public speeches

3 Interpretation

The second method is interpretation, i.e., the analysis of the production, distribution, and consumption of texts. Here again, Fairclough (1992: 78–86, 232–234) proposes various analytic tools. In this study we focus on intertextuality and interdiscursivity.¹⁴ Analytic questions are: How does this discourse relate to other discourses? Is there an order of discourse?

3.1 Individual Dimension

In talking about IW, participants refer to the inspiration they get from their own religion’s sacred scriptures or spiritual leaders, past and present. A Roman Catholic pastor, who stresses the importance of religious experience as opposed to institutions, justifies his view thus: “As Etty Hillesum says, let us safeguard God. In this case, [let us safeguard him from] the institutional power games of religions which fight each other in the name of God. This is unworthy of God.” He also refers to Hans Küng’s dictum, “No peace on earth without peace between religions.” A Hindu participant draws inspiration from Ghandi’s saying, “Take the best of all religions” because “all religions are good.” All Bahá’í informants quote Bahá’u’lláh’s saying that “all manifestations of God come from the same source,” “that God sends prophets to the people ... to ensure the peace and harmony of humanity,” and that “the world is one country and all people are its citizens.” One Bahá’í also quotes Socrates: “The aim of friendship is to become more mature.”

A Protestant minister says, “Christ teaches me to approach others openly. And I hope that the other – the humanist, the Muslim, the Jew, the Hindu, and people of other faiths – will recognize this. As Christians we must first trust the other and give them the benefit of the doubt. Only then the other has the possibility to show who he or she is. This open attitude is shown to me by Jesus in the stories about the Good Samaritan and the Samaritan woman.” One Hindu refers to Swami Dayanand, founder of the Arya Samaj reform movement in Hinduism, who “rejected images of God” and

Ayaan Hirsi Ali criticized Islam as an ignorant religion and prophet Muhammad as a paedophile and oppressor of women.

14 In harmony with Bakhtin, Fairclough (1992: 84) holds that people produce and consume texts by linking them to other texts. Earlier Fairclough (1989: 11, 24) spoke about “members’ resources” which people have in their heads and draw upon, when they produce or interpret texts.

“gave equal rights to men and women.” Another Hindu cites mother Teresa: “As a Christian she did good things to Hindus.”

The participants also refer to the sacred scriptures and traditions of their respective religions. One Turkish imam says, “According to the Koran I must always strive for peace” and “the Koran says that Muslims and Christians are people of the Book, who also believe in God.” A Hindu says, “I want to show to people from the Vedas what my faith says, namely that we can and must live peacefully with everybody.” To her, “the Vedas contain true knowledge.” Referring to his disappointment when faced with critical questions about his participation in IW in his own parish council, a Protestant minister says, “But as the Ecclesiast in the Bible says, everything has two sides.”

The primary consumer of the text is the interviewer, who is a Protestant minister and a participant in IW herself. Quite a number of interviewees refer to her as the person who inspired them. One Hindu says, “It felt good to see how you as a Christian dealt with others as equals.” The fact that the interviewer was a participant in IW herself may have motivated some interviewees to give socially desirable answers. On the other hand, there was mutual trust and some interviewees would say to her what they would not dare say to others. Critical discourse analysts advocate dialogical research (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 198–201) and reflexivity (Bourdieu 1990).

3.2 Institutional Dimension

What participants say about IW is also related to debates within their own religious institutions. A Protestant minister reports a discussion about IW in his parish council. “I was disappointed that some members of the congregation started to raise questions in the church council, critical questions, in which there was rejection by some ... However, there were various opinions in the church council and they gave me the benefit of the doubt.”

Three Muslims say that they follow the “Sunni tradition” or “Islamic teaching” and that “Islam is peace.” They say that “IW and Islam go together perfectly because Islam calls all people to live peacefully together and to be open to all fellow human beings.” Another Muslim says, “In Islam it is important to live peacefully with others, however different we may be.”

Two Hindus, both panditas, say that they follow the “direction” or “the principles of Arya Samaj.” According to one of them this direction “focuses

more on the inner experience of faith.” According to the other “the main aim of Arya Samaj is to promote the well-being of the world, to promote the physical, spiritual, and social interests of everybody, not only of Hindus.” Thus, for him as a pandit, “it is fitting to participate in IW” because “it is good for the well-being of all people” and for “harmonious coexistence of all people.”

One Turkish imam had doubts about reading the Bible. He discussed it with the chairperson of the Turkish Religious Council, who answered, “‘If a Bible text appears literally in the Koran, you may use it.’ Since then I have felt so happy, because his answer confirmed what I felt inside.” A Hindu pandit feels strengthened to participate in IW because “the Council of Clerics supports me.”

One Roman Catholic pastor refers to the Second Vatican Council saying that “outside the RC Church there is salvation.” The same pastor narrates a debate in the Council of Churches in 2000 about an invitation from Colorful Friesland to participate in IW. “The council was reluctant and wanted to consult its member communities first ... Two years later the same invitation came. The Council of Churches had not yet consulted its member communities. The fear of syncretism that prevented them from participating in 2000 was not removed.” It was decided that it was not a service of the Council of Churches, but that they were invited to take part. “The parish council of the Roman Catholic Church could agree but had questions. The most important again concerned syncretism ... Ultimately the parish council agreed to have the service. The priests of both parishes (Burgum and Dokkum) had had positive experiences of IW services, for example, the ones in Assisi.”

Some participants refer to the interviewer as a Christian and pastor. “When you pray as a Christian I feel that you also pray for me,” says a Surinamese pandita. She continues, “Prayer goes beyond boundaries of culture and belief because we pray to God.” And a Muslim woman refers to her conversation with the interviewer after receiving an angry letter from a Christian, saying that she should not read the Koran and that she should not pray as a Muslim in church. “You and I talked about it. I was afraid to meet that man. You then acted as if you were that man. And I could explain perfectly well that Christians and Muslims are children of the prophet Abraham and that we all belong to God/Allah. Consequently my doubt and fear disappeared.”

3.3 Societal Dimension

What the participants say about IW relates to a general discourse about multicultural society in the Netherlands. They express anger at Dutch people's general neglect of cultures and religions other than their own, at the negative portrayal of Muslims in the Dutch media, and in reaction to this, growing fanaticism among youths in Muslim communities. But they also speak positively about their hope of a colorful society, and about various initiatives that are going on: the Day against Racism and Discrimination, International Women's Day, and National Liberation Day.

Some participants remember positive experiences in their countries of origin. The Surinamese pandita, who described her negative experience in Dutch society, says that "in Surinam people live nicely together and there is not that wrong way of looking at each other that is so common in the Netherlands." She says, "In Surinam we always shared everything as Christians, Muslims, and Hindus." She speaks about frequent home visiting and common festivals. "Hindus and Christians simply had to be present at the festival at the end of Ramadan. The same went for the Christians' Christmas and our Divali festival." A Turkish imam says that in Turkey information is given to promote an open attitude of Muslims. "That would be good for the Netherlands as well," he says. "It helps people to perceive each other in positive ways and not only as a threat."

Whereas some participants cite positive examples from their countries of origin, a Turkish imam speaks about his negative experience. "If we speak about Christians in Turkey, almost everything is negative." Another Muslim tells how he lost his son in Turkey. "Our son did not want to fast during Ramadan. He wanted to be a Muslim in his own way. He was kidnapped by a radical Muslim group and murdered by them."

Various participants refer to social or cultural organizations. A Roman Catholic pastor gets positive support from "Solidarity Friesland" and the "Catholic Social Activation Work." "This is a foundation with a lot of freedom to act and a particular responsibility." A Jew refers to "Maimon," "a foundation of Jewish and Muslim Moroccans who organize joint cultural occasions . . . By organizing joint cultural and also religious occasions they reach mutual understanding, knowledge, and tolerance so that a bridge is built to the neighbor." In this way "religion can help to prevent the escalation of tensions in society."

One interviewee describes how Muslims are

marginalized by the newspapers. "I see how Muslims are marginalized by the way newspapers write about us. I then think: they do not write about me, and about so many other Muslims in the Netherlands. This is complicated and causes mixed feelings. I want to trust and believe in living peacefully together, but at the same time I feel uneasy and concerned deep inside me. We are portrayed negatively so that people become scared of us and think all Muslims can become fanatical and violent."

Yet generally the role of local and national media is talked about in a positive way. "The media do a good job. IW is reported in a good way in newspapers and on television. The broader the better for us. By us I mean society, the whole colorful society."

In this dimension of practice, too, some interviewees refer to the interviewer as a participant. An imam tells how he spoke about his experience of IW with a Dutch woman married to a Turkish Muslim, who recently came from Turkey. The imam said to her, "I stood there as imam with a rabbi and three ladies, the pandita, the Bahá'í, and you [the interviewer]. The woman said, 'If you do that in Turkey you will be murdered.'" The imam continues, "I told her that I see you [the interviewer] and the pandita as Mother Mary, who is an important person in Islam. Mother Mary is the mother of the prophet Jesus. Mary is important for both Christian and Muslims. If I explain this, they appreciate it. The result of IW is important."

4 Explanation

The third method is explanation, i.e., the analysis of the sociocognitive effects of the texts. Also in this stage, Fairclough (1992: 86–96, 237f.) mentions a variety of analytic tools.¹⁵ Here we focus on ideology and hegemony.¹⁶ Analytic questions are: What is the relation between language use and social reality in terms of belief systems, social identities, and social relations? Are they simply reproduced or transformed by the way participants speak about them?

15 Among others, Fairclough (1992: 193) says that "it is useful to compare" alternative wordings and discourse samples.

16 This is an example of an overlap (Fairclough 1992: 73). In the first stage we focused on "alternative wordings and their political and ideological significance" (Fairclough 1992: 77). In the third stage we focus on how ideological language use works out. One can perceive CDA is a form of ideology critique (Fairclough 1992: 67; Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 176).

4.1 Individual Dimension

At the level of individual believers most interviewees state that IW did not change them or that their belief or behavior did not change. Some say that they already changed before participating in IW. Five interviewees converted from one religion to another, as mentioned above. The Hindu Catholic / Catholic Hindu says that she prays “both in the Catholic way and in the Hindu way. Both beliefs are in me and that feels good.” She continues: “I like to live and pray as a Hindu as well, because my father was a well respected pandit, both in Surinam and in the Netherlands. I am a rich person because in my life I can combine both beliefs very well.”

Most interviewees, who explicitly say that neither they themselves nor their belief or practice has changed, describe various changes later on in the interview. They say they acquired “more knowledge” or “better understanding” of the other; “better insight into,” “more respect for,” “more” or “better relations with others” because they got to know an imam or pandit personally through IW. They admit that they had little or no knowledge about others and their faiths, or even had negative prejudices against them. They also admit that they have become “more conscious” and “clearer” about their own faith. “IW did not weaken my faith but sharpened it in a positive way.”

One Jew explicitly says, “My faith did not change,” but later on she adds, “I am changed through IW” (note the passive form of the verb). The same woman says, “I stand firm in my belief.” And she continues, “I have become more conscious . . . that Muslims, Jews, and Christians have much in common.” A Bahá’í says, “Bahá’u’lláh says that we can faithfully be open to others. After 39 years of being a Bahá’í I am totally convinced that this is true.” The interviewee says, “As a Bahá’í I accept all prophets as prophets of God. I can go wherever I like and participate in all services. I can go to a mosque, synagogue, church, *mandir*, it makes no difference.”

Some interviewees explicitly refer to cognitive or ideational changes. One Protestant minister states, “For a long time I took it for granted that only followers of Jesus can be saved. But already during my theological studies I discovered that Jesus had Jewish roots and that he lived and died a Jewish man. When I prepared for IW there were doubts again . . . But since I stopped feeling under pressure to convert, I feel more relaxed. I am open to what others find important and try to understand that.” This Protestant minister bluntly says, “I call myself a Christian, no longer a Protestant.” It is

noteworthy that this interviewee first said that his faith has not changed, but later on in the interview he confesses to doubts.

Some interviewees say that their behavior changed, especially in relation to others. “I never thought of visiting a Divali festival before, but through IW I came to know the pandita personally, so it was easier for me to go,” a Jew says. Another Jew states that at first he was afraid to show that he was Jew. He was afraid of being recognized in the street as a Jew. He thought that he would be discriminated against, that people would laugh at him. But as a result of IW he is no longer afraid. “By participating in IW I get the feeling that I want to be recognized as a Jew. I don’t want to be afraid. I am a Jew and now wear my yarmulke . . . Through participation in IW I have become less afraid . . . My trust in a peaceful society has grown.”

Yet another interviewee says that IW did not change him: “After IW everything goes back to normal.” He tells how he visited a mosque with a group of youngsters after an IW service. Before the visit a member of Colorful Friesland told them something about Islam. “But the visit to the mosque was quite disappointing. We were not received well . . . The imam was quite strict and authoritarian.” He comments, “Both sides are possibly part of interreligious learning.” But the same interviewee also reports a transformation from fearing others to seeing them as equal partners.

Various interviewees describe a dilemma, indecision, internal conflict, or struggle. One says that IW does not cause any struggle in his own religious experience: “I already experienced it before, namely a conflict between the rules of the church and my own experience of the faith.” A Muslim, too, says that he did not experience any internal conflict. He narrated that he once had a group of homosexuals in his mosque who challenged him: “Homosexuality is forbidden in Islam, isn’t it?” He says, “I explained to them that at first I thought that homosexuals are people of Lot. But people of Lot did not look after women and they lost their faith. But you do care for women and they have faith. Thus you are not people of the blood.”¹⁷

One Jew says that IW confuses him. “It is good, although in the beginning I thought it was wrong.” He did experience internal conflict about prayers. “I asked myself if it [IW] was prayer . . . I talked about it to other Jews and now I know: it is not prayer,” because “as a Jew you only pray with

17 According to the Qur’an (11:78; 7:80) the people of Lot persevered in their wickedness of raping men, murder and robbery, and they refused to stay faithful to their wives.

other Jews.” A Protestant minister says that he felt doubts. “For me Jesus is the way to God ... Is it good what I do?” But after experiencing the warmth and depth of the other prayer leaders he knew: “I can be a faithful Christian, and at the same time open to others.” One Bahá’í woman, who is married to a Muslim, experiences internal conflict in their marriage between the desire to “be oneself” as believers and “be together” as husband and wife.

4.2 Institutional Dimension

At an institutional level several interviewees say that at first their respective organizations or communities did not want them to participate; they were reluctant, feared syncretism or a weakening and eventual loss of faith. The Protestant minister who reported that some congregants raised critical questions in the church council says later on in the interview, “I discover that more members of the congregation start to recognize what I do. And this is important for the growth of positive feelings towards our multicultural society.”

In the last quotation we see that the institutional and societal dimensions of practice can be distinguished but not separated. One Jew says, “IW means much to me and to the Jewish community.” He continues, “What I do is followed and influences the community. It is an influence that makes us more open to others, and stronger in the feeling that we may be proud of our Jewish identity.”

This participant says that “the Jewish community has always lived a very isolated life,” but through IW he has become “proud to be Jew” and the Jewish community “feels respected” and as a result “has come to be more open to others.”

Some interviewees change from the active to the passive form. The experienced change is not only that they themselves understand others better, but they feel that they are understood better by others as well.

Another informant says, “More members of the community are interested.” An imam says that he did not change, but that IW stimulated him positively to act as a “bridge-builder between Muslims and others.” A woman who describes herself as a “Frisian of Moroccan descent” likewise sees herself as a “bridge-builder between people of different cultures and religions.”

One Muslim interviewee is terrified by the growing fanaticism in his own community. He describes growing polarization between fanatics and “those who are open to other faiths.” He often speaks about

IW in the mosque. “I do not meet resistance, but also not much motivation to join.”

As far as the audience is concerned, some interviewees see their own religious communities as the primary consumers of their talk on IW, others focus primarily on Dutch society. One imam says, “I find it important to change people’s thoughts ... My first target group is my own community. My second target group is society.”

Some interviewees speak about compartmentalization of religions. “I find the spirit of compartmentalization, of people who stick to their own images and thoughts, difficult to accept,” a Christian comments. And a Bahá’í says, “People have imprisoned themselves in their own religion and thrown away the key.” As a Bahá’í he can go to different houses of prayer. He can read different sacred scriptures, believe in different prophets – but, he adds, [as a Bahá’í] “I cannot become member of the other faith community.”

4.3 Societal Dimension

Some participants say that IW has zero effect on society. One Bahá’í expresses his disappointment: “Is this all?” According to him, IW is “quite an investment” and he does not understand that other people “do not see that it [IW] is quite normal.” During actual IW services there is clearly an experience of common ground. “But if there is no follow-up, it fades away.” Another Bahá’í says, “Only meeting each other is not enough. The world needs more than that.” And a Roman Catholic pastor says, “After IW everything goes back to normal.”

Although we cannot give hard evidence of the societal impact of IW as we did not analyze additional sources for this article, some interviewees are convinced that IW has an impact because “more and more community members and also other people start to appreciate it” and “this is important for the growth of positive attitudes towards multicultural society.”¹⁸ The Hindu interviewee who told

18 Societal relevance of IW in Friesland may be indicated by wide coverage in regional and national media, by a subsidy of the Province of Friesland to the “Platform of Life Philosophies in Colourful Friesland” between 2001 and 2004 to improve integration and participation of immigrants, and by the fact that the Platform is included in a wide network of immigrant pressure groups who raise their voices after incidents of racism and discrimination. In 2008, at the 15th anniversary of IW in Friesland, Imam Mustafa Önlü publicly said that IW should be exported to other provinces because they deserve wider following. The subsidy of the Province of Friesland was stopped in 2005. A new deputy provincial commissioner favoured strict separation of church and state

of her negative experiences in Dutch society said, "I think that IW helps. Because of positive experience that I have I am able to survive out there." Asked what she means by this she says, "We strive for the common good. That is important and that is why I participate. To live together in a good way is important for me. This is important to hand down to my children and my children's children."

Another interviewee speaks about the "societal impact of beliefs and worldviews." He says that through IW "there is a signal to the external world that works for years, and works as a stimulus to approach the other; it inspires people to do good and shows: this can be done, and by doing so it binds people together. We seek each other's company in the event of troubles such as after the 11 September events. I have a feeling that by doing so we could prevent escalation."

The same interviewee says that he has a feeling that through IW since 1993 they have been building a "new culture." When asked what he means by this, he says, "A culture of showing that differences may exist and are positive, that there is mutual respect and support. A culture that [accepts that] differences color our existence, that we may question each other and celebrate our differences. This multi-culture has developed by putting our differences side by side but also by showing that we want to live with each other in mutual trust and respect, and that we get the inspiration to do this from our faiths and worldviews."

One imam speaks about change in his Muslim community that stresses the urgency of IW, namely the increasing number of fanatical Muslims in the mosque. "In the papers you read a lot about fanatical Muslims and people might think that we are all like them." And because of this, "youngsters can shift to other ways of thinking, to fanatical thinking, and this is dangerous." Hence IW "must become broader. Good things like this must become broader. It helps to overcome our fear of each other, to be glad with each other. An IW service is important for good coexistence of all people."

5 Discussion and Conclusion

By using CDA we were able to see the contradictions and even struggles to define what is going on in IW and what IW is all about. These power struggles would not have appeared so clearly if we had

and was not susceptible to the argument that the subsidy was used to promote participation and integration of immigrants, not to promote a religion of any kind.

used content or conversation analysis. Thus, contrary to what some critics of CDA say (Wetherell 2001: 397), CDA is not just a model to order the material but a method to generate new insights. Whereas some participants say that they celebrate unity and commonness, others say that they celebrate diversity and colorfulness. In analytic terms, for most interviewees IW is a multi-religious practice, "praying side by side . . . each in his or her own tradition," and not specifically interreligious, praying "together with each other" in the sense that they celebrate a common ground or religious overlaps.

At least two or three interviewees defined IW as a Christian dominated practice (celebration is a Christian term), thus in monoreligious terms, and some expressed a fear for Christian hegemony, or a hidden agenda on the part of the Christians, at least in the beginning. Three interviewees see IW as an interreligious practice, something that they know already in their daily life, although they do not define themselves as interreligious believers, except one, who describes herself as Catholic Hindu or Hindu Catholic. But for the majority, IW is multi-religious, celebrating apart together, as explained above, and it is doubtful if the name "Interreligious Worship" covers what the practice is all about.

Most interviewees see IW primarily as a "societal reality," which is not so strange when we consider that IW started in order to combat racism and discrimination in Friesland, and is celebrated on societal occasions, such as Liberation Day and Women's Day. Others see it primarily as a religious or spiritual experience or encounter. Most interviewees describe their participation as a contribution to a multicultural and colorful society; others describe it primarily as their "struggle for recognition."

Moreover we were able to see transformations on ideational and interpersonal level, both in terms of subject positions or social identities (I call myself a Christian, no longer a Protestant) and social relations (I don't want to be afraid. I am a Jew and now wear my yarmulke). We were also able to see contradictions at individual level. Most interviewees said that they did not change. But later on they described various changes in the way they perceived their own faith and that of others, and the way they related to believers of other faiths. As far as societal impact is concerned, some say that IW services have little or no impact on the society and are disappointed, others see little changes in reducing escalation.

In response to the main question of this article, if CDA can be used and is useful in religious and interreligious studies, we answer in the affirmative.

But some controversial issues have to be explored further (Wetherell 2001: 383). One is that various methods and perspectives not only overlap (Fairclough 1992: 73, 231) but they are also confused. This is clear with respect to the term social practice, which sometimes refers to the macro dimension of practice and sometimes to the method of analysing sociocognitive effects. We tried to elaborate on this by distinguishing perspectives and methods more carefully, without denying that there are overlaps (Fairclough 1992: 73, 231).

But the main problem is to prove that language use has sociocognitive effects. Fairclough (1992: 238) is aware that it is difficult to “justify” or to “validate.” He nevertheless assumes that there is a dialectical relation between social reality and cognitive representation of reality (Fairclough 1992: 45, 60, 65). This is his critique on Foucault’s “determinism.” His central concern is to show “explanatory connections” (Fairclough 1992: 72, 80, 95) between text and context. But, how can the scholar prove evidence that this relation exists (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 89)? Fairclough (1992: 227f.) himself speaks about “panels” and “interviews” to enhance the corpus with “supplementary data.” But are these enough?

Van Dijk (2008: 119) claims that there is no immediate influence of text on context. Influence is mediated by mental models, i.e., the interpretation of the participants. Although van Dijk (2008: 23) says that a “definition of contexts in terms of mental models does not imply that we reduce social influences to mental ones,” he nevertheless holds that “there is no such thing as an *objective* situation, unless I define such objectivity” (van Dijk 2008: 119).¹⁹ Against such a position, Fairclough (1992: 65) argues, “This could easily lead to the idealist conclusion that realities of the social world ... merely emanate from people’s heads.” In opposition to the idealist position, Fairclough advocates the dialectic relation between social reality and its cognitive representation, and opts for critical realism (Fairclough 2003: 8f.; Fairclough et al. 2004: 25).²⁰ Also Fairclough (1992: 71, 86) says that there is no immediate relation between lin-

guistic practice (text) and social practice (context). But in his case, text and context are not mediated through mental models but through discursive practices (interactions). We agree with van Dijk (2008: 23) and Blommaert and Verschueren (1998: 39) that this relation is seldom made explicit. We nevertheless see it as a challenge to overcome theoretical and methodical “confusion” and lack of “clear rules and conventions” (Granholm 2005: 249, 260) in discourse analysis and to improve the instruments to show evidence that text and talk have socialcognitive effects.

Fairclough (1992: 193) mentions comparison as a way to prove sociocognitive effects of language use, but he does not elaborate on this systematically. Constant comparative analysis between various data sources and between these data sources and knowledge sources (Strauss and Corbin 1998) could be used more often in discourse analysis. Constant comparative analysis implies triangulation, i.e., combining different sources, such as participant observation, focus group discussion, ethnographic interviewing, collecting written and audiovisual materials, etc. E.g., using the notion of commodification (Fairclough 1992: 207–215) scholars of religion can compare churches which use business language with churches which do not use such language. One can hypothesize that the former correlate with commercialization of religion and prosperity gospel and the latter do not.

However, the reliability of representations is a complicated issue that has to do with the distinction between science and ideology, and between the discursive and nondiscursive (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 20; Wetherell 2001: 395–397). If discourse is considered to be constitutive, as radical poststructuralism does, there is nothing beyond discourse, this is to say, scholars cannot access reality outside discourse. In this case it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish between social reality and cognitive representation of social reality, good descriptions, and not so good descriptions of reality (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 196).

Yet, the purpose of any scientific research is to produce *representations of reality* that are as *reliable* as possible (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 182). How can CDA scholars reach these? First, there is dialogical research, i.e., the interaction between the researchers and the researched. This is what we tried to do by asking interviewees to validate the transcriptions of the interviews. Next, there is co-research or the teamwork of researchers in the same

model, van Dijk (2008: 118f.) goes for a mental model for explaining the correlation between text and context.

19 Van Dijk minimizes the objectification in the social construction of reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 70–85). A certain level of “reification” is unavoidable, and constructivism is never total. For this reason, Bourdieu (1990: 123) refers to his work as “constructivist structuralism,” linking the continuity of the habitus with the flexibility of the market.

20 The dilemma between realism and idealism (Fairclough 1992: 8f.) goes under various names. Bourdieu (1990: 124) speaks about “objectivism and subjectivism,” whereas Blommaert and Verschueren (1998: 26f.) favor a materialist

field.²¹ Third, there is experimental and transparent writing in reporting the data so that others can criticize the claims made. And through all this there is the reflexivity of the researchers (Bourdieu 1990).

However, validity as a term comes from a different language game, that of positivist epistemology and quantitative research, claiming that scientific statements are true if there is a correspondence between reality and representation of reality.²² But if we accept that there is a dialectic relation between social reality and cognitive representation of reality, our representations of reality are never mere reflections of reality. This brings us back to our contention that CDA can bridge the gap between interpretation and explanation. Maybe the gap cannot be closed completely,²³ but at least interpretation and explanation are no longer competitive but complementary (Fairclough et al. 2004: 26, 38). Fairclough (1992: 72f., 85f.) combines three analytic traditions: linguistics, micro- and macrosociology. He says, "I accept the interpretivist claim that we must try to understand how members of social communities produce their 'orderly' or 'accountable' worlds . . . I would argue, however, that in so producing their world, members' practices are shaped in ways of which they are usually unaware by social structures" (Fairclough 1992: 72). This is not to say that CDA solves all problems of theory and method in religious studies, but its prospect looks promising and deserves to be explored further.

A first draft of this article was presented at the Spring Conference of the Netherlands Association for the Science of Religions on 6 June, 2009, at Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

References Cited

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann

1966 *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Blommaert, Jan, and Jef Verschueren

1998 *Debating Diversity. Analysing the Discourse of Tolerance.* London: Routledge.

21 We tried to do this by collaborating with a researcher in the field (Wijzen and Nicolay 2010).

22 According to critical discourse analysts, the correspondence theory stands for naïve realism. Of course, epistemology, or better, the relation between ontology and epistemology, is the crux of the matter. According to Bourdieu (1990: 189) this is the old age dilemma between nominalism and realism.

23 Wiebe (2005: 70, 79f.) is more optimistic about closing this gap. He gets hope from experimental psychology and cognitive sciences for unifying religious studies.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1990 *In Other Words. Essays towards Reflexive Sociology.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

1991 *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

2000 *Das religiöse Feld. Texte zur Ökonomie des Heilsgeschehens.* Konstanz: UVK Universitätsverlag Konstanz. (Edition discours, 11)

Denzin, Norman, and Yvonna Lincoln (eds.)

2005 *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dijk, Teun A. van

2008 *Discourse and Context. A Sociocognitive Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, Norman

1989 *Language and Power.* London: Longman. (Language in Social Life Series, 1)

1992 *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

2003 *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman, Bob Jessop, and Andrew Sayer

2004 *Critical Realism and Semiosis.* In: J. Joseph and J. M. Roberts (eds.), *Realism, Discourse, and Deconstruction*; pp. 23–42. New York: Routledge. (Routledge Studies in Critical Realism, 10)

Flood, Gavin D.

1999 *Beyond Phenomenology. Rethinking the Study of Religion.* London: Cassell.

The Glorious Qur'an

1996 Istanbul: Cihan Matbaasi. [Bi-lingual Edition with English Translation by Marmaduke Pickthall].

Granhölm, Kennet

2005 *Embracing the Dark. The Magic Order of Dragon Rouge. Its Practice in Dark Magic and Meaning Making.* Åbo: Åbo Akademi Förlag.

Hammer, Olav

2001 *Claiming Knowledge. Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age.* Leiden: Brill. (Studies in the History of Religions, 90)

Heather, Noel

2000 *Religious Language and Critical Discourse Analysis. Ideology and Identity in Christian Discourse Today.* Oxford: Peter Lang. (Religions and Discourse, 5)

Hermans, Hubert J. M., and Harry J. G. Kempen

1993 *The Dialogical Self. Meaning as Movement.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Jørgensen, Marianne W., and Louise Phillips

2002 *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London: Sage.

Kippenberg, Hans G.

1993 *Diskursive Religionswissenschaft. Gedanken zu einer Religionswissenschaft, die weder auf einer allgemein gültigen Definition von Religion noch eine Überlegenheit von Wissenschaft basiert.* In: B. Gladigow und H. G. Kippenberg (Hrsg.), *Neue Ansätze in der Religionswissenschaft*; pp. 9–28. München: Kösel. (Forum Religionswissenschaft, 4)

McCutcheon, Russell T.

1997 *Manufacturing Religion. The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the Politics of Nostalgia*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Panikkar, Raimundo

1978 *The Intrareligious Dialogue*. New York: Paulist Press.

Strauss, Anselm L., and Juliet M. Corbin

1998 *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Von Stuckrad, Kocku

2003 *Discursive Study of Religion. From States of the Mind to Communication and Action*. *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 15: 255–271.

Wetherell, Margaret

2001 *Debates in Discourse Research. A Reader*. In: M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates (eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice*; pp. 380–399. London: Sage.

Wiebe, Donald

2005 *Beyond Thick Descriptions and Interpretive Sciences. Explaining Religious Meaning*. In: R. Gothóni (ed.), *How to Do Comparative Religion. Three Ways, Many Goals*; pp. 65–82. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (Religion and Reason, 44)

Wijsen, Frans, and C. Nicolay

2010 *Interreligious Worship in Friesland. A Discourse Analytical Approach*. *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue* 20: 58–78.

