The Use and Abuse of Power: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Arthur Miller's "The Crucible"

Lecturer
Ayad Abdul Razzaq Abood
Shatt Al Arab University College

Abstract

This study outlines Norman Fairclough's "Critical Discourse Analysis" and applies it to the scene in Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* where the black slave Tituba confesses to witchcraft. The researcher uses Teun A.van Dijk's framework of power to prove that Tituba is forced to confess. She seemingly confesses yet her confession has a number of attributes which render it void. Tituba's position as a slave means that she is powerless to deny her guilt, and indeed her confession enables her to escape execution.

إستخدام القوة وسوء إستخدامها: تحليل نقدي للخطاب في مسرحية آرثر ميلر "البوتقة"

المدرس

أياد عبد الرزاق عبود

كلية شط العرب الجامعة

مستخلص

توجز هذه الدراسة التحليل النقدي للخطاب لنورمان فيركلوف ومن ثم تطبقه على مشهد من مسرحية آرثر ميلر "البوتقة" حيث تعترف العبدة السوداء تيتوبا بممارستها للشعوذة. يستعمل الباحث إطار القوة لتيون أي. فاندايك لإثبات أن تيتوبا أُجبرت على الاعتراف. ظاهريا إنها اعترفت لكن مع هذا هناك في اعترافها جوانب تجعل الاعتراف لاغٍ. إن مكانة تيتوبا كعبدة يعني إنها فاقدة للقوة لإنكار ذنبها وبالفعل اعترافها بالجرم مكنها من الإفلات من عقوبة الإعدام.

1. Introduction

Much of the success of Critical Discourse Analysis can be traced to the pioneering works of analysts such as Norman Fairclough, Teun A. Van Dijk and Ruth Wodak. The emergence of the term 'Critical Discourse Analysis' is attributed to the works of Norman Fairclough. Wooffitt (2005: 137) points out that critical discourse analysis is associated with researchers such as Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and Teun A. Van Dijk who comprehend critical discourse analysis as it is concerned with analyzing how social and political inequalities are manifested in and reproduced through discourse.

Critical discourse analysis is an area of interdisciplinary research and analysis which began to develop as a distinct academic area around the1980s and now includes a number of different approaches. These approaches have something in common which is a concern to ensure more satisfactory attention in critical social research to 'discourse' as a facet of social life, and to its relation to other facets of social life, than they have received in the past. Critical analysts of 'discourse' approach language as one facet of social life which is closely interconnected with other facets of social life, and is therefore a significant aspect of all the major issues in social scientific research—economic systems, social relations, power and ideology, institutions, social change, social identity and so on (Fairclough, 2006: 8).

Fairclough's first definition of critical discourse analysis paves the way to many scholars who show interest in the field. This definition is still in use and most quoted by many scholars. Fairclough (1995) defines critical discourse analysis as:

By 'critical' discourse analysis I mean discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power;

and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (pp. 132-33)

Ruth Wodak does not go far away in her conception of the term. She seems in full agreement to that of Fairclough's. Wodak (2001: 2) states that critical discourse analysis is fundamentally concerned with the analysis of opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. It aims to critically examine social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use or in discourse. Van Dijk (2001:352) sees critical discourse analysis as a type of discourse analytical research that is primarily concerned with studying the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. In this way, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality. Scollon (2001: 141) defines critical discourse analysis as "a program of social analysis that critically analyses discourse - that is to say language in use - as a means of addressing social change". Richardson (2007:1) considers critical discourse analysis as a theory and method which analyzes the way individuals and institutions use language. Crystal (2008:123) looks at critical discourse analysis as "a perspective which studies the relationship between discourse events and sociopolitical and cultural factors, especially the way discourse is ideologically influenced by and can itself influence power relations in society." Huckin et.al (2012:108) expound that critical discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary approach to textual study whose aim is to explain abuses of power promoted by those texts through analyzing linguistic/semiotic details in light of the larger social and political contexts in which those texts circulate.

Critical discourse analysis sees discourse, written and spoken language, as a form of social practice. Considering discourse as such implies that language affects and at the same time is affected by other social dimensions. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: vii) point out that

critical discourse analysis starts from the perception of discourse as an element of social practices which forms other elements as well as being shaped by them. For instance, the question of power in social class, gender and race relations is partly a question of discourse. Fairclough (2000: 158-59) asserts that the aim of critical discourse analysis is to see how language is articulated together with other elements. This approach is particularly concerned with social change as it affects discourse, and with how it is connected with social relations of power and domination. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002: 61) argue that critical discourse analysis aims to shed light on the linguistic discursive dimension of social and cultural phenomena and processes of change in late modernity. Critical discourse analysts consider discourse as a form of social practice which both constitutes the social world and is constituted by other social practices. "As social practice, discourse is in a dialectical relationship with other social dimensions. It does not just contribute to the shaping and reshaping of social structures but also reflects them." Fairclough (2003:205) explains the dialectical relationships between discourse and other elements of social practices. The main concern of critical discourse analysis is with the essential changes that are taking place in contemporary social life, with how discourse figures within processes of change, and with shifts in the relationship between discourse and other social elements within networks of practices. On the other hand, Weiss and Wodak (2003: 13) endorse that "describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them." That is, discourse is both socially constitutive and socially conditioned. It constitutes situations and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially substantial, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects, that is, they can help

produce and reproduce unequal relations of power between, for instance, social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:258).

Critical discourse analysts concentrate on the relationship between text, social dimensions, and cultural practices. Text not only affects social and cultural disparities but is also affected by them and at the same time helps to generate them. Fairclough (1989:26) explains the actual nature of discourse and text analysis. In his view, there are three levels of discourse. Firstly, social conditions of production and interpretation, i.e. the social factors, which contribute to or lead to the origination of a text, and, at the same time, how the same factors affect interpretation. Secondly, the process of production and interpretation, i.e. in what way the text is produced and how this affects interpretation. Thirdly, the text which is the product of the first two levels commented on above. Fairclough subsequently gives three stages of critical discourse analysis which are compatible with the three abovementioned levels of discourse:

● Description is the stage which is concerned with the formal properties of the text.
● Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction – with seeing the text as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation.
● Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context – with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their social effects.

Fairclough (1995:9) proposes a three-dimensional framework for critical discourse analysis (text, discourse practice, sociocultural practice). In this respect, a particular attention should be paid to processes of text production, distribution and consumption. This feature of the framework encapsulates "that analysis of texts should not be artificially isolated from analysis of institutional and discoursal

practices within which texts are embedded." Further, he (Ibid: 23) adds that I have called this framework 'critical discourse analysis' where critical discourse analysis is viewed as integrating "(a) analysis of text, (b) analysis of processes of text production, consumption and distribution, and (c) sociocultural analysis of the discursive event (be it an interview, a scientific paper, or a conversation) as a whole."

Bhatia et.al (2008:13) confirm that critical discourse analysis attempts to combine discourse analysis with social analysis, with insinuations to understand socio-cultural practices. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002:60) demonstrate that critical discourse analysis offers theories and methods for the practical study of the relations between discourse, social and cultural developments in various social realms. For Van Leeuwen (2006:169), critical discourse analysis is built on the idea that "text and talk play a key role in maintaining and legitimating inequality, injustice, and oppression in society. It employs discourse analysis to show how this is done, and it seeks to spread awareness of this aspect of language use in society, and to argue explicitly for change on the basis of its findings." According to Mayr (2008:9), critical discourse analysis addresses broader social matters and attends to external issues, including ideology, power, inequality, etc. and draws on social theory to analyze and interpret written and spoken texts.

2. Discourse Analysis and Power

The aforementioned definitions of critical discourse analysis show that there is a close relationship between discourse and power. Critical discourse analysts feel that it is their role to study, investigate, and explain this relationship. Van Leeuwen (1993:193) states that "Critical discourse analysis is, or should be, concerned with discourse as the instrument of power and control as well as with discourse as the instrument of the social construction of reality." Van Dijk (1993:252-255) holds the same view in that critical discourse analysis should deal primarily with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it. It is specifically interested in power abuse such as breaches of laws, rules and principles of

democracy, equality and justice by those who wield power. Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard (1996:xi) regard discourse as a major instrument of power and control and suggest that critical discourse analysts feel that it is certainly part of their professional job "to investigate, reveal and clarify how power and discriminatory value are inscribed in and mediated through the linguistic system."As a critical discourse analyst, Corson (2000:95) writes that his aim is to "explore hidden power relations between a piece of discourse and wider social and cultural formations" and has an interest in "uncovering inequality, power relationships, injustices, discrimination, bias, etc." Wooffitt (2005:138) divulges that although critical discourse analysts differ in their research styles, they all try to explore the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power relations within social structures. Particularly, they focus on the ways in which discourse sustains and legitimizes social inequalities. Wodak (2001:11) asserts that one of the defining features of critical discourse analysis is its concern with power as a central condition in social life, and its attempts to develop a theory of language which incorporates this as a major premise. Further she (2001) adds that:

Power is about relations of difference, and particularly about the effects of differences in social structures. The constant unity of language and other social matters ensures that language is entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power. Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long term. Language provides a finely articulated means for differences in power in social hierarchical structures. (p.11)

The term 'critical' in critical discourse analysis is often associated with the study of power relations. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002: 63-64) advocate that "critical discourse analysis is 'critical' in the sense that it aims to reveal the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of the

social world, including those social relations that involve unequal relations of power."Power relations are always relations of struggle. The struggle may have one of several forms. Social struggle occurs between groups of various sorts such as women and men, black and white, dominating and dominated groups in different social institutions. According to Van Dijk (2005:87-88), critical discourse analysis is particularly concerned with the study of the discursive reproduction of power abuse, with forms of domination and social inequality. In such case, critical discourse analysis tries to make explicit the way socially shared beliefs are discursively reproduced and how such beliefs are abused in the maintenance and legitimating of domination. Fairclough (1995:1) maintains that power is conceptualized both in terms of inequalities between participants in discourse events, and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and expended in particular sociocultural contexts. Meyer (2001:15) discusses the role played by scholars who endeavor to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance. According to Locke (2004:38), "critical discourse analysis is concerned with the ways in which the power relations produced by discourse are maintained and/or challenged through texts and the practices which affect their production, reception and dissemination."

Critical discourse scholars have examined language and power across a variety of institutional settings, showing how institutions are shaped by discourse and how they in turn have the capacity to create and impose discourses. Critical discourse analysts regard discourse as an essential component of the constitution of society and culture and is viewed as a major form of social action. By studying discourse and society, critical discourse analysts aim to challenge inequality, injustice, and unfairness in society by investigating social practices through a critical analysis of discourses and social actions. Scollon and Scollon (2005:101) avow that they take critical discourse analysis to bring the study of language into an engagement with the powers of social action

in the real world in which we live .Chilton (2004:45) affirms that power can be exercised through controlling others' use of language, that is, through various kinds and degrees of censorship and access control. Wodak and Meyer (2009:9) consider power a concept which is central for critical discourse analysis as it often analyzes the language use of those in power who are responsible for the existence of inequalities. Usually, critical discourse analysis researchers are interested in the way discourse (re)produces social domination, that is, the power abuse of one group over others, and how dominated groups may discursively resist such abuse. A good example is provided by Van Dijk (1989:33), that is, white group power may be exercised through verbal abuse and derogation of minority group members.

Some scholars have conducted studies of critical discourse analysis in relation to highly institutionalized settings such as political speeches, education, court trials, etc. Widdowson (2004:158) insists that critical discourse analysis is an approach whose purpose is ideological. It is committed to the cause of social justice and its aim is to uncover exploitation and the abuse of power. Kress (1996:15) indicates that critical discourse analysis has from the beginning had a political scheme that seeks to alter imbalanced distributions of economic, cultural and political goods in contemporary societies. The purpose has been to bring a system of extreme disparities of power into crisis by uncovering its workings and its effects through the analysis of potent cultural objects-texts and thereby to help in achieving a more equitable social order. For Bhatia et.al (2008:11), critical discourse analysis concentrates on socio-political domination, which comprises issues of social change, power abuse, ideological imposition, and social injustice by critically analyzing language as social action. It is thus based upon the assumption that the analysis of discourse provides insightful information on such social issues as they are largely constituted in language. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012:14) hold that power can be and often is itself a reason for action. Indeed those who hold power use their power to dominate the process of political decision making and to take action on the basis of their interests. Nonetheless, their decisions

are still based upon judgements which they arrive at on the basis of practical reasoning. In her books 'An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education' (2004, 1st edition and 2011, 2nd Edition), Rebecca Rogers has exerted much efforts in studying critical discourse analysis and its application in education. She has collected, in both volumes, various articles of scholars who have pedagogical orientation. In the preface of her book, she declares that the focus of this book is on the relationship between processes of learning in communicative interactions and critical discourse analysis. The book tries to conceptualize the relationship between language form and function in educational settings and to combine critical discourse analysis with theories of learning. The book is an attempt to explore the contextual relationships of teacher-research groups, students in a classroom, adult literacy education, etc. (Rogers, 2004: ix and 2011: xv). On the other hand, Van Dijk (1996b:89) has formulated a schema for the analysis of court trials. He has examined the power of social groups or professions, such as judges, by analyzing their range and patterns of access finding that they control most properties of the court trial.

Discourse and power was the central theme of scholars, where a distinction was drawn between 'power in discourse', 'power behind discourse', 'power to' and 'power over'. According to Fairclough (1989:43), 'power in discourse' is a matter of some people exercising 'power over' others in discourse. This can take various forms. It includes powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of less powerful participants and can sometimes amount to a form of coercion. An example would be the power of producers of newspaper articles or television programmes to determine what is included and what is excluded, how events are represented, and thus potentially affect how audiences see aspects of the world and act accordingly. The idea of 'power behind discourse' is that orders of discourse, the semiotic aspect of social practices, emerge and are sustained or changed within particular asymmetrical relations of power and through the application of power. 'Power to' is a general human

capacity to bring about change, to act in ways that bring about changes in reality. Both individuals and collectivities (e.g. governments) have this capacity, and it is important to see it as a capacity and not reduce it to its exercise. The capacity exists whether or not it is exercised and whatever means of power (wealth, military force, etc.) may be used in exercising it. 'Power over' is an asymmetrical relation between people, and having power over others means being able to get them to do what you want them to do, to get them to do things which they otherwise would not do (Lukes 2005: 69-74). 'Power over', Lukes (2005: 85) defines as, "the ability to constrain the choices of others, coercing them or securing their compliance, by impeding them from living as their own nature and judgement dictate."A common way to exercise power, according to Searle (2010: 146-147), is "to give people reasons for actions that they would not otherwise have." There are various possibilities here and one is to exercise power by getting the subject to want something that he would not have wanted, for instance by presenting a limited range of options as the only ones available so that the subject is not aware of alternatives.

3. Van Dijk's Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis and Power

Van Dijk (2008b: vii) points out that critical discourse analysis is fundamentally interested in the social conditions of discourse and specifically in questions of power and power abuse. Since power is not shown just in some of the aspects of powerful speech, he calls for the need to study the whole complex context in order to know how power is related to text and talk, and more generally how discourse reproduces social structure. He (2009:111) contends that "critical discourse analysis is problem-oriented. It does not primarily focus on discourse and its properties, but on social issues and problems, such as racism and sexism or other forms of domination and power abuse, and then examines whether and how text and talk are involved in its reproduction."

Van Dijk (1996b: 84-85) postulates that accounting for the relationships between discourse and social power is one of the most important tasks of critical discourse analysis. The analysis should involve how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimized by the text and talk of dominant groups or institutions and that, Van Dijk (1996a: 64),critical discourse analysis is only effective when it generates reproduction of power and inequality. Van Dijk presupposes a conceptual framework for the study and properties of power. The present study is based on Van Dijk's (1996b:84-85, 2008a:19-21) framework which summarizes different properties of power in social interaction. Relevant to the present study are:

1- Power is a property of relations between social groups, institutions or organizations.
2- Social power is defined in terms of the control exercised by one group or organization (or its members) over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies.
3- Power of a specific group or institution may be distributed, and may be restricted to a specific social domain or scope, such as that of politics, the media, law and order, education or corporate business, thus resulting in different centres of power and elite groups that control such centres.
4- At an elementary but fundamental level of analysis, social power relationships are characteristically manifested in interaction. Thus we say that group A (or its members) has power over group B (or its members) when the real or potential actions of A exercise social control over B. Since the notion of action itself involves the notion of (cognitive) control by agents, the social control over B by the actions of A induces a limitation of the self-control of B. In other words, the exercise of power by A results in the limitation of B's social freedom of action.
5- Except in the case of bodily force, power of A over B's actual or possible actions presupposes that A must have control over the

cognitive conditions of actions of B, such as desires, wishes, plans, and beliefs. For whatever reasons, B may accept or agree to do as A wishes, or to follow the law, rules, or consensus to act in agreement with (the interests of) A.

6- A's power needs a basis, that is, resources that socially enable the exercise of power. Power is a form of social control if its basis consists of socially relevant resources. Generally, power is intentionally or unwittingly exercised by A in order to maintain or enlarge this power basis of A, or to prevent B from acquiring it. In other words, the exercise of power by A is usually in A's interest.

7- Direct control of action is achieved through discourses that have directive pragmatic function (elocutionary force), such as commands, threats, promises, laws, regulations, instructions, and more indirectly by recommendations and advice. Speakers often have an institutional role, and their discourses are often backed by institutional power. Compliance in this case is often obtained by legal or other institutional sanctions.

8- Crucial in the exercise or the maintenance of power is the fact that for A to exert mental control over B, B must know about A's wishes, wants, preferences, or intentions. Apart from direct communication, for instance in speech acts such as commands, request, or threats, this knowledge may be inferred from cultural beliefs, norms, or values; through a shared (or contested) consensus within an ideological framework; or from the observation and interpretation of A's social actions.

The discussion above stresses an important element, that is, the relevance of the cognitive dimension of control. Power abuse not only involves the abuse of force and may result not merely in limiting the freedom of action of a specific group, but also and more significantly may affect the minds of people. That is, through special access to, and control over the means of public discourse and communication, dominant groups or institutions may affect the structures of text and talk in such a way that the knowledge, attitudes, norms, values and

ideologies of recipients are more or less indirectly affected in the interest of the dominant group.

4. Applying Van Dijk's Approach

Arthur Miller's "The Crucible" is based on the historical account of the Salem witch trials. Particularly, the story revolves around the discovery of several young girls and a slave dancing in the woods conjuring or attempting to conjure spirits.

The four white girls, Abigail, Betty, Mercy and Mary, and the black maid Tituba, have been caught dancing naked in the woods at night by Abigail's uncle, the Reverend Parris. The reader or member of the audience *knows* that the girls were not just dancing: a conversation among Abigail, Mercy and Mary reveals that previously Abigail had asked Parris's black female slave, Tituba, to give her a 'charm' to kill Elizabeth Proctor, the wife of John Proctor, Abigail's ex-lover.

As a self-defense, Abigail diverts the attention from herself and the other girls by claiming that Tituba made them take part in witchcraft, suggesting that they are the innocent victims of Tituba's power, and thereby deflecting blame from herself onto the slave. The accusation is thus transferred from Abigail to Tituba, whose fear and bewilderment, and her relatively powerless status in the village, cause her to produce incompetent conversational contributions which lead to her imprisonment.

In order to judge whether Tituba confesses or is forced to confess to witchcraft, it is necessary to examine some examples from the text. The extract below begins when Abigail deflects the accusation from herself onto Tituba, and ends with Tituba's confession.

[MRS PUTNAM *enters with* TITUBA, *and instantly* ABIGAIL *points at* TITUBA.]

(1) ABIGAIL: She made me do it! She made Betty do it!
(2) TITUBA: *[shocked and angry]* Abby!

(3) ABIGAIL: She makes me drink blood!

(4) PARRIS: Blood!!

(5) MRS PUTNAM: My baby's blood?

(6) TITUBA: No, no, chicken blood. I give she chicken blood!

(7) HALE: Woman, have you enlisted these children for the Devil?

(8) TITUBA: No, no sir, I don't truck with no Devil!

(9) HALE: Why can she not wake? Are you silencing this child?

(10) TITUBA: I love me Betty!

(11) HALE: You have sent your spirit out upon this child, have you not? Are you gathering souls for the Devil?

(12) ABIGAIL: She sends her spirit on me in church; she makes me laugh at prayer!

(13) PARRIS: She has often laughed at prayer!

(14) ABIGAIL: She comes to me every night to go and drink blood!

(15) TITUBA: You beg *me* to conjure! She beg *me* make charm—

(16) ABIGAIL: Don't lie! [*To* HALE:] She comes to me while I sleep; she's always making me dream corruptions!

(17) TITUBA: Why you say that, Abby?

(18) ABIGAIL: Sometimes I wake and find myself standing in the open door way and not a stitch on my body! I always hear her laughing in my sleep. I hear her singing her Barbados songs and tempting me with—

(19) TITUBA: Mister Reverend, I never—

(20) HALE: *[resolved now]* Tituba, I want you to wake this child.

(21) TITUBA: I have no power on this child, sir.

(22) HALE: You most certainly do, and you will free her from it now! When did you compact with the Devil?

(23) TITUBA: I don't compact with no Devil!

(24) PARRIS: You will confess yourself or I will take you out and whip you to your death, Tituba!

(25) PUTNAM: This woman must be hanged! She must be taken and hanged!

(26) TITUBA: *[terrified, falls to her knees]* No, no, don't hang Tituba! I tell him I don't desire to work for him, sir.

(27) PARRIS: The Devil?

(28) HALE: Then you saw him! [TITUBA *weeps.*] Now Tituba, I know that when we bind ourselves to Hell it is very hard to break with it. We are going to help you tear yourself free—

(29) TITUBA: *[frightened by the coming process]* Mister Reverend, I do believe somebody else be witchin' these children.

(30) HALE: Who?

(31) TITUBA: I don't know, sir, but the Devil got him numerous witches.

(32) HALE: Does he! *[It is a clue.]* Tituba, look into my eyes. Come, look into me. *[She raises her eyes to his fearfully.]* You would be a good Christian woman, would you not, Tituba?

(33) TITUBA: Aye, sir, a good Christian woman.

(34) HALE: And you love these little children?

(35) TITUBA: Oh, yes, sir, I don't desire to hurt little children.

(36) HALE: And you love God, Tituba?

(37) TITUBA: I love God with all my bein'.

(38) HALE: Now in God's holy name—

(39) TITUBA: Bless him. Bless Him. *[She is rocking on her knees, sobbing in terror.]*

(40) HALE: And to His glory—

(41) TITUBA: Eternal glory. Bless Him—bless God…

(42) HALE: Open yourself, Tituba—open yourself and let God's holy light shine on you.

(43) TITUBA: Oh, bless the Lord.

(44) HALE: When the Devil comes to you does he ever come—with another person? *[She stares up into his face.]*Perhaps another person in the village? Someone you know.

(45) PARRIS: Who came with him?

(46) PUTNAM: Sarah Good? Did you ever see Sarah Good with him? Or Osburn?

(47) PARRIS: Was it man or woman came with him?

(48) TITUBA: Man or woman. Was—was woman.

(49) PARRIS: What woman? A woman, you said. What woman?

(50) TITUBA: It was black dark, and I—

(51) PARRIS: You could see him, why could you not see her?

(52) TITUBA: Well, they was always talking; they was always runnin' round and carryin' on—

(53) PARRIS: You mean out of Salem? Salem witches?

(54) TITUBA: I believe so, yes, sir. *[Now* HALE *takes her hand. She is surprised.]*

(55) HALE: Tituba. You must have no fear to tell us who they are, do you understand? We will protect you. The Devil can never overcome a minister. You know that, do you not?

(56) TITUBA: [*kisses* HALE's *hand*] Aye, sir, oh, I do.

(57) HALE: You have confessed yourself to witchcraft, and that speaks a wish to come to Heaven's side. And we will bless you, Tituba.

(58) TITUBA: *[deeply relieved]* Oh, God bless you, Mr. Hale.

(Miller 1986:45–8)

With the end of this conversation, Reverend Hale concludes that Tituba is guilty of practicing witchcraft **"You have confessed yourself to witchcraft"** (turn 57). But if we trace the whole conversation from the beginning, we will see that Tituba did not directly confess her involvement in the action.

According to van Dijk's framework adopted in this study, social power is defined in terms of the control exercised by one group or organization (or its members) over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies. In the excerpt outlined above, the exercise of power by Hale and Parris over Tituba is apparent. The analysis shows that Hale and Parris are more powerful if compared to Tituba; they are white, male and Hale is a reverend of the church and Parris is Tituba's master.

Hale questions Tituba in (turn7) **"Woman, have you enlisted these children for the Devil?"**, (turn 9) **"Why can she not wake? Are you silencing this child?"**,(turn 11) **"Are you gathering souls for the Devil?"** and (turn 22) **"When did you compact with the Devil?"**.

Although all these questions are met with denial by Tituba, Hale concludes that Tituba is guilty of witchcraft. This depicts how religious people in Salem affirm the existence of evil to cripple any person who disagrees with them religiously. Such people adopt a moral high ground so that anyone, who is in disagreement with them, is judged immoral and damned without hearing his/her defense. Hale employs his religious power to prevent any kind of disunity that might threaten the community by material or ideological enemies. In this respect, Hale really wants everyone to understand that he is in charge and that he knows what he is doing. So to speak, Hale is trying to have control over the whole situation and have everyone respect him and think he is correct. That is why Hale is pressing Tituba to confess that she works for the devil.

In the light of van Dijk's framework, direct control of action is achieved through discourses that have directive pragmatic function (elocutionary force), such as commands, threats, promises, laws, regulations, instructions, and more indirectly by recommendations and advice. Hale tells **"Tituba, I want you to wake this child"** (turn20) and **"you will free her from it now!"**(turn 22). This indicates that he presumes that Tituba is able to wake Betty. Actually Tituba does not have any kind of power to wake Betty because she is not truly bewitched but is only pretending to be sleeping. As indicated earlier, Hale has an institutional role in the city and his discourse is thus backed by institutional power (religious power). However, Tituba's sustained endeavors to deny her guilt, **"No, no sir, I don't truck with no Devil!"** (turn 8),**"I have no power on this child, sir"** (turn 21), **"I don't compact with no Devil!"** (turn 23), appear to be irrelevant to Hale who is determined to interpret her utterances as a confession. On the other hand, Parris's following directive **"You will confess yourself or I will take you out and whip you to your death, Tituba!"** (turn 24) is an explicit threat which leads to a series of vague utterances from Tituba that may imply her guilt but do not constitute a confession. Both parties, Tituba, on the one hand, and Hale and Parris, on the other, have dissimilar and mismatched conversational goals. They want

Tituba to confess to an accusation which she wants to deny. However, the more powerful status of her white male accusers renders Tituba's attempted denials useless. Tituba's status as a slave shows that she is powerless to deny her fault. The menace of being hanged for rejecting to confess is evidence of the duress to which Tituba is subjected and is sufficient to explain why she admits her involvement in witchcraft. In this case she prefers imprisonment to being hanged.

The exercise of power by Hale and Parris results in the limitation of Tituba's social freedom of action. Thus, the social control over Tituba by the actions of Hale and Parris induces a limitation of the self-control of Tituba. Tituba's powerless status in the village makes her unable to refute her guilt since she is considered as if she had already confessed. This idea is strengthened by her use of non-standard English. This helps her interrogators to interpret her utterances in the way they prefer. For instance, as Tituba says **"I tell him I don't desire to work for him, sir"** (turn 26), Parris presumes that Tituba is confessing her involvement with the devil, while actually Tituba means something else, and Hale remarks **"Then you saw him"** (turn 28). This supposition is not confirmed by Tituba whose next utterance **"I do believe somebody else be witchin' these children"** (turn 29) is seen as confirming her guilt rather than supporting her denial.

The power of Hale and Parris over Tituba's actual or possible actions presupposes that they have control over the cognitive conditions of actions of Tituba such as desires, wishes, and beliefs. For whatever reasons, Tituba may accept or agree to do as her accusers wish, or to follow the rules, directions, or consensus to act in agreement with them. Hale not only threatens Tituba, but also advices and promises her salvation and protection if she complies: **"We are going to help you tear yourself free—"** (turn 28), **"Open yourself and let God's holy light shine on you"** (turn 42), **"We will protect you. The Devil can never overcome a minister"** (turn 55). Here, Hale and Parris are intending to persuade Tituba to confess. A common way to exercise power is by getting the person to want something that he would not

have wanted, for instance by presenting a limited range of options as the only ones available so that he is not aware of alternatives. The alternatives, damnation and abandonment to evil, are assumed to be more frightening than the imprisonment which results from confession.

Crucial in the exercise or the maintenance of power is the fact that for Hale and Parris to exert mental control over Tituba, Tituba must know about their wishes, wants, preferences, or intentions. This knowledge may be inferred from cultural beliefs, norms, or values; through a shared (or contested) consensus within an ideological framework; or from the observation and interpretation of Hale and Parris's social actions. In order to save her own life, she takes cues from her interrogators and tells them what they want to hear and thereby avoids execution. When they ask Tituba: **"When the Devil comes to you does he ever come—with another person? Perhaps another person in the village? Someone you know."** (turn 44), **"Who came with him"** (turn 45), **"Sarah Good? Did you ever see Sarah Good with him? Or Osburn?"** (turn 46), **"Was it man or woman came with him?"** (turn 47), Tituba replies **"Man or woman. Was—was woman."** (turn 48).

5. Conclusions

Teun A.van Dijk's approach of power provides a useful framework for the analysis of Arthur Miller's "The Crucible" due to the differences in power between the interactants under study. The analysis , undoubtedly, uncovers how power is used and abused by those people who wield power.

The whole conversation in the selected extract of this study goes alongside with the interests of Hale and Parris. They want to restore social equilibrium in Salem and establish their status as they represent the elite groups in the city. For good purposes or even beneficial purposes, the powerful groups of Salem develop a theocracy, a combine of state and religious power whose function is to keep the community together, and to prevent any kind of disunity that might open it to

destruction by material or ideological enemies. Hale and Parris are unwilling to put their position of power in jeopardy.

Racial difference and Tituba's powerless status in the community make her the target for the disruptions. The idea that women, and not men, are accused in Salem demonstrates that male privilege offers some protection from persecution. Gender, race, and class, make them vulnerable to social mistreatment.

The analysis also proves that Tituba's confession to witchcraft is void since her confession is done under pressure by her accusers. Unsurprisingly, Tituba confesses to witchcraft when the accusers threaten her with physical violence. She is a black female slave, an individual without any power. She does not have the least chance to defend herself against Abigail's accusations. Tituba's admitting of her involvement in witchcraft is a direct result of the Salem belief system and her lack of status in the community. The asymmetrical power relationships which exist in Salem are responsible for the misinterpretation of what she says by her accusers, and render Tituba unable to deny the charge.

Bibliography

- Bhatia, Vijay K., John Flowerdew and Rodney H. Jones (2008)."Approaches to Discourse Analysis."In Vijay K. Bhatia, John Flowerdew and Rodney H. Jones (2008) (Eds.). *Advances in Discourse Studies*. New York: Routledge. pp. 1-17.
- Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa and Malcolm Coulthard (1996) (Eds.).*Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, Paul (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie and Norman Fairclough (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Corson, D. (2000). "Emancipatory leadership." *International journal of Leadership in Education, 3(2),* 93-120.
- Crystal, David (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Fairclough, Isabela and Norman Fairclough (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman (2006). *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak (1997)."Critical Discourse Analysis."In T. van Dijk (1997) (Ed.).*Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage. Vol. 2. pp. 258–84.

- Huckin, Thomas, Jennifer Andrus, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon (2012)."Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric and Composition." *College Composition and Communication,* 64(1), 107-129.
- Jorgensen, Marianne and Louise Phillips (2002).*Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kress, Gunther (1996). "Representational resources and the production of subjectivity: Questions for the theoretical development of Critical Discourse Analysis in a multicultural society."In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (1996) (Eds.).*Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. pp. 15- 31.
- Locke, Terry (2004). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mayr, Andrea (2008). *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Meyer, Michael (2001). "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA."In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (2001) (Eds.).*Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 14- 31.
- Miller, A. (1986) *The Crucible*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Richardson, J. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rogers, Rebecca (2004) (Ed.).*An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education (1st Edition)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Rogers, Rebecca (2011) (Ed.).*An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education (2nd Edition)*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Longman.

- Scollon, Ron and Suzie Wong Scollon (2005)."Lighting the Stove: Why Habitus isn't Enough for Critical Discourse Analysis."In Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton (2005) (Eds.).*A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 101- 117.
- Searle, J. R. (2010). *Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). "Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power."*Communication yearbook12*, pp. 18-59.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis."*Discourse & society*, vol. *4*(2), 249-283.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996a). "Against Reductionism: A Rejoinder."In Christina Schaffner and Helen Kelly-Holmes (1996) (Eds.).*Discourse and Ideologies*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd. pp. 60- 64.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996b). "Discourse, Power and Access."In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (1996) (Eds.).*Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. pp.84- 104.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). "Critical Discourse Analysis." In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (2001) (Eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. pp. 352- 371.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). "Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production: A CDA Perspective."In Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton (Eds.) (2005).*A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 71-100.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008a).*Discourse and Power*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008b). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Van Leeuwen, T. (1993) "Genre and field in Critical Discourse Analysis: a Synopsis."*Discourse & society*, vol. *4*(2), 193-225.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2006)."Critical Discourse Analysis."In Jacob L. Mey. (Ed.) (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Ltd. pp. 166- 169.
- Weiss, Gilbert and Ruth Wodak (2003). "Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis."In Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak (Eds.) (2003).*Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. pp.1- 32.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wodak, Ruth (2001). "What CDA is About - A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments."In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (2001) (Eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 1- 13.
- Wooffitt, Robin (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.