The quality of representation of discourse actors in Arash Kamangir's poetry based on Van Leeuwen's model (1996)

Mansour Rahimi[1], Sayyed Ahmad Parsa[2]

1. Introduction
The process of actor representation in narrative involves various aspects of discourse-based formulations. The narrator refers to the actors as subjects to either accept or reject them, encompassing different stances, including acceptance and rejection with their sub-categories. Siavash Kasraei's stance as a subject-narrator towards a character as a subject-situator requires the selection of a specific approach and the rejection of other procedures. The mention or omission of actors in Arash Kamangir's poetry is directly related to the poet's thinking and his evaluation and interpretation of that character. The poet describes and depicts the situation of the character through his own interpretations.

2. Materials and methods
The rewritten poem of Arash Kamangir, as a unique type of contemporary Persian literature, briefly narrates the story of Arash, a renowned Iranian warrior. To analyze the actors of the discourse and the actors involved in the discourse, Van Leeuwen's (1996) opinions regarding Reference Allocation and Exclusion of character names, de-anthropomorphization with the approaches of abstraction and objectification, anthropomorphization with the approaches of specification and anonymization, differentiation, naming, and categorization are discussed with their subsets. The primary question of this research is how the social relations and discourse positions of Arash's poet or the subject-narrator have influenced the representation of the narrative and character description. To answer this question, we have considered that the subject-narrator utilized two main approaches of reference allocation and exclusion in character representation, relying on Van Leeuwen's theories.

3. Results and discussion
The findings of the research demonstrate the effectiveness of Van Leeuwen's (1996) model in categorizing character representation approaches in Arash Kamangir's text,

[1] PHD student, Department of Persian Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran; mansourrahimi13@gmail.com
[2] Professor, Department of Persian Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran (corresponding author); a.parsa@uok.ac.ir.

and in providing a discourse and sociological-semantic reading of the text. Many studies based on Van Leeuwen's social actors' model have referred to it as his 2008 theory, despite its origination in 1996 and its repetition in his book Discourse and Action in 2008. Based on this model, agents, and actors of discourse in Arash Kamangir's poetry fall into two main categories: the agent and the patient. Arash, in the role of the heroic victim, serves as the active agent of the narrative, while the people of the city, who are passive and waiting, are represented in the role of accepting the action (patient).

Furthermore, Personalization and Impersonalization approaches, along with their branches, play a crucial role in representing social actors in Arash Kamangir's poetry. In the Impersonalization approach, the poet employs Abstraction approach to introduce attributes, characteristics, images, and descriptions that are the product of the mind. Here, the narrator does not refer to the character itself when describing the human character. In the Personalization approach, the poet highlights the opposition and conflict between Iranians - representing an insider culture - and Turanians – depicted as an alien and uncultured culture - through Nomination and Categorization. Consequently, unfavorable titles and honorifics are attributed to the Turanian army and its supporters, portraying them as the enemy and the abnormal other. In contrast, favorable attributes, titles, and images related to legends and heroes are attributed to the character of Arash through emotional discourse.

4. Conclusion

In Arash Kamangir's poem, the hero (Arash) as a representative of indigenous culture, creates a prominent conflict with the uncultured and "foreign other" to defend the order and stability within the indigenous culture and reject foreign and other cultures. The formulation of rejection and acceptance mentioned in the Nomination and Categorization approach - which is derived from Van Leeuwen's ideas about activists - is prominently represented. Additionally, Kasrai has omitted the character of the king in the narrative, considering the specific discourse and belief field to which he belongs.

Keywords: Van Leeuwen, social actors, Arash Kamangir, rejection and acceptance