



AL-LISAN: JURNAL BAHASA

Publisher: LPPM IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo

ISSN: 2442-8965 E-ISSN: 2442-8973

Volume 10, No. 2 August 2025

Journal Homepage: <https://journal.iaingorontalo.ac.id/index.php/al>

Sacred Symbols and Hate Speech: A Forensic-Pragmatic Study of Panji Gumilang's Discourse

¹Okta Diana Anggrayni (*Corresponding Author*)

24020835014@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Master of Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

²Ina Ika Pratita

inapratita@unesa.ac.id

Master of Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

³Riki Nasrullah

rikinasrullah@unesa.ac.id

Master of Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Background: Hate speech targeting religious symbols in digital media has sparked complex legal and social debates. Public figures often disseminate ideological views that may violate religious norms and legal provisions.

Aims: This study aims to identify the linguistic forms and pragmatic functions of directive and representative speech acts in Pandji Gumilang's statements on the Zaytun Official YouTube channel, which were used as evidence in a finalised criminal case.

Methods: A descriptive qualitative method was employed using a forensic pragmatic framework based on Searle's speech act theory. Data were drawn from the Indramayu District Court Verdict No. 365/Pid.Sus/2023/PN.Idm using purposive sampling. The analysis focused on speech forms, communicative functions, and violations of Leech's politeness maxims, specifically tact, agreement, modesty, and approbation.

Results: The study found 12 speeches containing hate speech against religious symbols, consisting of four directive speeches and eight representative speeches. All data violates the principles of politeness, especially the maxims of wisdom, agreement, humility, and decency. Statements such as "Indonesia is a sacred land", "not the *kalam* of Allah", and "strange *nasab* descendants of the Prophet Saw. show the manipulation of language that functions as an ideological means and has a legal impact.

Implications: Findings reveal that directive and representative speech acts serve as ideological tools undermining Islamic symbols and provoking legal action. This research highlights the utility of forensic pragmatics in examining how language functions as symbolic power and a medium for religion-based offences.

Keywords: *Forensic pragmatics; hate speech; Pandji Gumilang's discourse; religious symbols*

Article Info:

Received: 23 May 2025

Accepted: 21 July 2025

Published: 27 August 2025

How to cite:

Anggrayni, O. D., Pratita, I. I., & Nasrullah, R. (2025). Sacred symbols and hate speech: A forensic-pragmatic study of Panji Gumilang's discourse. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (e-Journal)*, 10(2), 191-204. <https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v10i2.6392>

1. INTRODUCTION

Social media platforms such as YouTube have become powerful tools for disseminating religious expressions across diverse sociocultural boundaries. This circulation can significantly influence belief systems and, at times, trigger ideological tensions. Empirical studies confirm that religious discourse disseminated digitally, particularly by authoritative figures, can provoke symbolic conflicts and threaten social cohesion, especially when it involves sensitive content or sacred symbols (Hartini et al., 2020; Peña et al., 2022; Lavitski, 2023). For example, Vidhiasi et al. (2023) found that expressions containing evaluative and polarising language in digital platforms, such as Twitter, could incite intergroup hostility and lead to legal implications, including defamation and hate speech. These findings illustrate the need for a scientific and methodological approach to examining such expressions, as descriptive observation alone is insufficient. Forensic pragmatics, therefore, offers a relevant framework to analyse the linguistic intent, structure, and legal consequences of utterances categorised as religious defamation or symbolic insult.

Legal controversies surrounding freedom of expression in digital media frequently emerge when speech targets religious symbols or doctrines. These controversies often involve allegations of blasphemy, violations of human rights, or breaches of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) in Indonesia (Syahid et al., 2022; Elyamany et al., 2025). Judicial responses to such speech acts depend on the classification of the case under national legal frameworks. One crucial aspect involves the legal status of *inkrah*. This term refers to a final and binding court decision that carries permanent legal force due to the absence of further appeals or the rejection of such efforts by a higher court (Sousa-Silva, 2022; Taufek et al., 2024; Assem & Alansary, 2022). The term remains relevant in legal and academic discourse in Indonesia. A prominent example is the case of Panji Gumilang, leader of the Al-Zaytun Islamic Boarding School, who delivered a series of controversial statements through the Al-Zaytun Official YouTube channel. The content in question was used as evidence in a criminal case involving charges of hate speech and religious defamation, culminating in a verdict with *inkrah* status.

One of the problematic utterances identified in the case is the phrase “strange *nasab* descendants of the Prophet Saw,” which represents a speech act that targets the genealogical sanctity of the Prophet’s lineage. This utterance carries a negative evaluative stance, implying deviation or impurity, and pragmatically functions as an act of symbolic degradation that violates the social norms of religious reverence. Other utterances involve direct criticism of core Islamic symbols, including the sanctity of the Qur’an and the Kaaba, as well as the practice of pilgrimage to Mecca. The speaker referred to Mecca as a distant land with no spiritual value, and claimed that the Qur’an was not the word of Allah, but rather the words of the Prophet Muhammad. These statements have been categorised as hate speech and religious defamation under Indonesian law. The case was reported to the Criminal Investigation Division of the National Police based on alleged violations of Article 28 Paragraph (2) in conjunction with Article 45A Paragraph (2) of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), which prohibits the dissemination of information aimed at inciting hatred based on religion or ethnicity. In addition, Articles 14 and 15 of Law Number 1 of 1946 forbids the spreading of false or misleading information that may cause public disorder. The court sentenced the defendant to one year of imprisonment. The verdict, which holds *inkrah* status (final and binding), serves as a valid legal and linguistic basis for scientific analysis in the field of forensic pragmatics (Susilowati et al., 2023; Salama & Fawzy, 2023; Sousa-Silva, 2022).

Forensic pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that analyses language in a legal context, focusing on the form, meaning, and purpose of speech in legal or criminal proceedings. One of the key aspects of forensic pragmatics is the violation of the conversation maxim according to Grice (1975), which includes the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. Violations of these principles can indicate hidden intentions, ideological deviations, or manipulations of meaning that affect public understanding. Speech that attacks religious symbols, especially when delivered by public figures through digital media, poses a high risk of misinterpretation and social provocation.

Forensic pragmatics provides a relevant theoretical framework for examining speech in the context of criminal cases. The focus of the study is directed at the relationship between the form of language, the social context, and the legal impact of speech. The speech theory developed by Searle (1979) became a framework for understanding the structure of speech meaning based on three levels: locution (literal meaning), illocution (the speaker's goal), and perlocution (the impact on the listener). Previous research has explored various dimensions of hate speech in digital and legal contexts. Parvaresh (2023) analysed covert hate speech in political discourse using a corpus-assisted pragmatic approach, but did not address religious figures or sacred symbols.

Taha et al. (2024) examined local expressions of hate speech in Sula Malay based on pragmatic features, focusing on ethnic rather than religious dimensions. Al-Ghazo (2024) discussed illocutionary force in general speech act theory without reference to criminal legal frameworks or religious controversies. Fadhilah and Arimi (2024) conducted a forensic pragmatic study on blasphemy-related hate speech, but focused on defamation involving a public figure in a non-religious context. These studies provide valuable insights into hate speech mechanisms, yet none have specifically addressed hate speech against religious symbols delivered by religious leaders in legally finalised criminal cases. This research aims to fill that gap by offering a forensic pragmatic analysis grounded in legal documentation and contextual interpretation. This study aims to analyse the lingual unit in Pandji Gumilang's speech, which is seen as hate speech against religious symbols, especially directive and representative speech, as well as its impact on social and legal aspects.

1.1 Research Gap and Novelty

This study addresses a research gap concerning hate speech targeting religious symbols articulated by religious authorities via digital platforms within adjudicated criminal contexts. Existing literature has insufficiently explored this issue, despite findings that such expressions contribute to symbolic degradation, ideological polarization, and violations of religious harmony (Sevilla Requena, 2024; Salama & Fawzy, 2023; Luo et al., 2021). The novelty of this study lies in its application of forensic pragmatics to an Indonesian legal context by analysing hate speech against religious symbols delivered by a religious figure through digital media. The research utilises a legally binding court decision as primary data. It integrates Searle's classification of speech acts with Grice's maxims to examine the linguistic and legal implications of religious defamation in digital communication.

1.2 Research Question

How are the linguistic forms and pragmatic functions of directive and representative speech acts in Pandji Gumilang's YouTube statements characterised as hate speech against religious symbols in a legally binding criminal case?

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Design

This research used a descriptive qualitative approach with a forensic pragmatic analysis design. The primary purpose is to examine hate speech against religious symbols conveyed by religious figures in the context of criminal cases that have been investigated. The focus of the analysis was directed at two types of speech acts, namely directive and representative speech acts and their functions, to assess the communicative intent and socio-legal impact of the analysed statement (Leech, 1983). This approach allows researchers to explain and interpret the meaning of speech based on social contexts, digital media, and legal documents. This study refers to Austin and Searle's theory of speech and Grice's violation of the maxim.

2.2 Research Objects

This research did not involve human participants directly, but instead used legal documents and digital data as the primary sources. The object of the study was in the form of Pandji Gumilang's statement in a video lecture uploaded through the Al-Zaytun Official YouTube channel. To ensure transparency and enable further scholarly examination, relevant video materials can be accessed at the official Al-Zaytun YouTube channel (<https://www.youtube.com/c/AlZaytunOfficial>), and examples of analysed content are publicly available, including a representative video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0BB-IxsEKU>. The primary source of data is taken from a copy of the Indramayu District Court Decision Number 323/Pid.Sus/2023/PN. Idm, which has permanent legal force (Inkrah). The analysed speech was selected using the purposive sampling technique, which is the selection of data based on considerations of relevance to the focus of the study of directive and representative speech actions, which are interpreted as hate speech against religious symbols.

2.3 Research Procedures

The research was carried out through several systematic stages. The first stage includes the collection of legal documents, especially a copy of the court decision containing Pandji Gumilang's statement as evidence in the case. The document was obtained through public access available on the official website of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, based on case number 365/Pid.Sus/2023/PN. Idm. In the second stage, the researcher identifies and classifies the linguistic units of the statements into directive and representative speech types. The analysis focuses on complete utterances that appear in the court decision, with attention to sentence-level structures and relevant clauses that contain pragmatic force and legal implications. Each utterance is systematically coded (e.g., D1, D2, and so on) and annotated with three contextual markers: S (Situation), O (Object), and N (Value). The marker S refers to the situational context in which the utterance occurs, including time, place, and social setting. The marker O identifies the specific religious symbol, figure, or practice targeted by the speech. The marker N indicates the underlying ideological or evaluative value conveyed by the speaker, such as rejection, provocation, or affirmation. These markers serve to clarify the pragmatic function and legal relevance of each utterance in the data set. In the next stage, the researcher analyses the form, function, and communicative purpose of each utterance quoted in the legal document. The results of the analysis are cross-

checked with expert witness testimony documented in the official court decision. No additional interviews were conducted; all expert opinions were sourced directly from the transcript of the judicial proceedings to ensure consistency and validity in interpretation.

2.4 Research Instruments

The main instrument of the research was the official court decision document, which includes direct excerpts from Pandji Gumilang's statements. The analysis focuses specifically on selected sections of the document, particularly the judge's legal considerations and the evidentiary transcripts that contain the defendant's speech. These sections provide the most relevant linguistic data for forensic pragmatic analysis. The auxiliary instrument is in the form of a forensic pragmatic analysis worksheet prepared based on speech theory actions, especially directive and representative classifications according to Searle (1979). This worksheet is used to mark the form of speech, identify the context, and interpret the communicative intent of the speech in question legally. The instrument was conceptually validated through conformity with the theoretical framework used, and compared with the results of forensic linguistic analysis in similar studies. The validity of the content was obtained through a process of cross-confirmation between the researcher's findings and the expert witness considerations cited in the court documents.

2.5 Data Analysis

The data were analysed using qualitative content analysis with a pragmatic forensic approach. The study focused on the identification of directive speech acts (speech intended to influence the actions of listeners) and representative speech acts (speech that expresses the speaker's beliefs or views). The analysis was carried out by tracing the illocution function of Pandji Gumilang's statement and examining the impact of the perlocution that emerged socially and legally. Each quote is analysed based on the context of speech, both in digital media and in the construction of legal narratives. The researcher evaluated the relationship between the form of speech, communicative intention, and legal decision. The validity and reliability of the analysis were strengthened through triangulation of sources, namely by comparing primary data (court decisions) with secondary data in the form of video recordings and the views of linguist witnesses. The results of the analysis were used to assess potential violations of the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE) through a forensic linguistic perspective.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Findings

The results of this study are divided into two parts, namely (1) the lingual form of blasphemy speech codes through directive and representative speech, and (2) the analysis of pragmatic forensic functions, which includes linguistic structure, communicative intentions, and their relevance to alleged violations of Article 156a of the Criminal Code. The following are excerpts from the words of the defendant Panji Gumilang presented in video evidence and transcripts of the lecture, as stated in the Indramayu District Court Decision Number 365/Pid.Sus/2023/PN. Idm.

Lingual Forms Containing Blasphemy

The results of this study show that various forms of speech contain blasphemy, including both directive and representative speech. The following is the directive speech found in the evidence of the Indramayu District Court Decision No. 365/Pid.Sus/2023:

Tidak usah mati ditanah suci yang jauh, di Indonesia, hidup matimu di Indonesia tanah suci. (You don't have to want to die in a distant holy land; in Indonesia, you live and die in Indonesia, the holy land.) 20/05/2016 – D1. S (Verdict, 2023, p. 15)

Indonesia tanah yang suci! Itu suci! Indonesia tanah yang suci! (Indonesia is a sacred land! It's sacred!) 20/05/2016 – D2. S (Verdict, 2023, p. 15)

Tau anak-anakku, orang mati di Mekah dilonjorkan saja bruk tidak ada tanda, mau yang begitu kok mau bayar 35 juta? (You know, my children, the dead in Mecca are just thrown out, and there is no sign, how do you want to pay 35 million?) 20/05/2016 – D3. S (Verdict, 2023, p. 15)

Viral Ajak Santri Nyanyikan Lagu Umat Yahudi (Viral, Invite Students to Sing Jewish Songs) – D4. S (Verdict, 2023, p. 3)

D1 Quote. S uses the negative imperative "*tidak usah mau*" (don't want to), which serves as an explicit prohibition against the established spiritual practice, namely dying and worshipping in the Holy Land of Mecca. This phrase pragmatically plays an effort to build an alternative ideology that places Indonesia as a substitute for the status of the Haram Land. The use of the word "*mati di tanah suci yang jauh*" (die in the distant holy land) contains a negative distance evaluation, creating a contrast with "*hidup dan matimu di Indonesia*" (living and dying in Indonesia), which gives positive affirmations. This form of prohibition contains a tactic of disguised persuasion and can be interpreted as an invitation that deviates from the central teachings of Islam. In the legal realm, this has the potential to be categorised as blasphemy because it interferes with the central doctrine of Muslims (Etchegaray, 2022; Sardo, 2022).

In quote D2. S, there is a repetitive exclamatory sentence "*Indonesia tanah yang suci! Itu suci!*" (Indonesia is a holy land! It's sacred!), which serves as an ideological reinforcement and symbolic affirmation. This form of repetition plays a role in instilling confidence in the listener that Indonesia is equal to or even higher in its holy status than the Haram. From a linguistic perspective, this form is a symbolic rhetorical strategy that aims to shift the religious meaning that has been historically attached. In the context of forensic pragmatism, this is a form of language manipulation that has implications for the desecration of religious symbols.

D3 Quote. S displayed a rhetorical and interrogative sentence "*orang mati di Mekah dilonjorkan saja bruk tidak ada tanda, mau yang begitu kok mau bayar 35 juta?*" (The dead in Mecca are just stretched out without a sign, why do you want to pay 35 million?), which satirises and devalues the value of death in the Holy Land. This form serves as an evaluative criticism that provokes the audience to question the sacred value of the hajj. This language strategy combines evaluative and interrogative imperatives to raise doubt while rejecting authentic traditional values. Legally, this can be considered an insult to the *Hajj*.

In quote D4. S, even though it is in the form of a video title and not direct verbal speech, the implicit action in the form of "*ajak santri nyanyikan lagu Yahudi*" (invite students to sing Jewish songs) shows the form of an implicit directive aimed at normalising non-Islamic culture in the Islamic educational environment. This form

represents a shift in social and religious norms that can blur the boundaries of religious identity. In the legal realm, this may constitute a violation related to the preservation of spiritual values and religious symbols. The following is the representative speech found in the evidence of the Indramayu District Court Decision No. 365/Pid.Sus/2023:

yang mengajarkan 'dzalikal kitabu laa raiba fihi' itu Nabi Muhammad, bukan Allah... itu kalam Nabi Muhammad yang diperoleh dari wahyu. (It was the Prophet Muhammad who taught 'dzalikal kitabu laa raib fihi', not Allah... it is the kalam (speech) of the Prophet Muhammad obtained from revelation) 2020 – D5. S (Verdict, 2023, pp. 3–4)

Kalau Allah bicara Arab, susah ketemu orang Indramayu... Prewe... Gusti ora weruh, Gusti ora ngerti. (If Allah speaks Arabic, it will be challenging to meet the people of Indramayu... Prewe... God doesn't know, God doesn't know) 2020 – D6. S (Verdict, 2023, pp. 3–4)

Masjid itu tempat orang putus asa. (A mosque is a place of despair) 18/03/2016 – D7. S (Judgment, 2023, pp. 11–14)

Wanita jadi khatib shalat Jumat di Al-Zaytun. (Women become the preachers of Friday Prayers in Al-Zaytun) 2020 – D8. S (Verdict, 2023, p. 3)

Aneh nasab keturunan Nabi Saw (Strange Nasab Descendants of the Prophet)– D12. S (Verdict, 2023, p. 3)

In quote D5. S, the statement "*Bukan Allah, itu kalam Nabi Muhammad*" (not Allah... it is the kalam (speech) of the Prophet Muhammad) is a representative declarative form that explicitly shifts the source of revelation from Allah SWT to the Prophet Muhammad PBUH. Linguistically, this is an informative clause that is personal and controversial.

D6 Quote. S conveyed the vulgar ironic sentence "*Gusti ora ngerti*" (God does not know) in the local dialect, accompanied by the word "prewe," which has a rough connotation. This phrase demeans the attributes of the godhead by stating that God does not understand human language. This evaluative form has the function of implicitly insulting through the strategy of sarcasm and satire. This is a form of insult to God Almighty.

In quote D7. S, the affirmative sentence "*masjid tempat orang putus asa*" (a mosque where despair) uses a nominal clause that has a negative connotation. This form lowers the symbolic value and spiritual function of the mosque, which in Islam is the centre of worship and teaching. From a pragmatic forensic aspect, this speech falls into the category of insulting religious symbols because it explicitly weakens the sacred meaning.

D8 Quote. S is a factual statement that "*Wanita jadi khatib shalat Jumat di Al-Zaytun*" (women become preachers of Friday prayers in Al-Zaytun), acting as informative representatives who support controversial practices that are contrary to the majority of *fiqh* schools. This sentence is a form of normalisation of religious behaviour that deviates from the applicable conventions. In the legal context, this statement can be interpreted as an endorsement of Sharia deviations.

Lastly, the D12 quote. S, which is in the form of the video title "*Panji Gumilang menyebut aneh nasab keturunan Nabi Saw*" (Panji Gumilang mentions strange *nasab* Descendants of the Prophet Saw), is an evaluative representative that implies degrading the honour of the Prophet's nasab. The phrase "*aneh*" (strange) in this context connotes negatively and obscures the sacredness of the Prophet's lineage. From the point of view

of forensic pragmatics, this is classified as a serious violation because it tarnishes the symbol of religious honor.

Speech Acts and Maximum Violations

The violation of the principle of politeness in the statement of the defendant Panji Gumilang mainly belongs to the violation of the maxim of wisdom, the adage of agreement, and the maxim of humility according to the theory of Grice (1975). The most dominant speech actions were found to include directive and representative speech actions based on Searle's classification. First, violations of the maxim of discretion are related to efforts to avoid providing information that is painful or causes harm to the opponent, as noted in D1. S "*tidak usah mati di tanah suci yang jauh*" (do not want to die in a distant holy land), the speaker uses negative imperatives as a directive speech that serves to prohibit or invite the audience to reject the intention to worship in Mecca. Speakers deliberately minimise these religious values so that they have the potential to hurt the audience's beliefs, thereby violating the maxim of wisdom.

Second, the maximum agreement requires that the information conveyed does not contradict applicable social norms and agreements in quote D2. S "*Indonesia tanah yang suci! Itu suci*" (Indonesia is a holy land! That is sacred!), the speaker uses excessive repetition as a representative speech act to change the religious paradigm. Speakers explicitly impose new views that are contrary to the consensus of Muslims, so that the violation of the maximum agreement occurs due to the lack of harmony with socio-religious norms. Next, quote D3. S, which is in the form of a rhetorical question satirising the hajj pilgrimage, also violates the maxim of the agreement. The speech contains an insult to widely accepted religious practices. This degrading act of representative speech has the potential to cause social conflict and damage respect for spiritual teachings.

Third, the maxim of humility regulates that the speaker does not praise himself excessively or demean others. In quote D5. S "*bukan Allah, itu kalam Nabi Muhammad*" (not Allah... it is the kalam (speech) of the Prophet Muhammad), the speaker performs a representative speech act by expressing an opinion that lowers God's authority over the Qur'an and maximises the authority of the Prophet. This speech violates the maxim of humility because it lowers religious norms and maximises respect for the speaker's self through the diversion of revelation. Fourth, violations of the maxim of decency arise from the use of disrespectful language as well as ridicule or insults. D6 Quote. S "*Gusti ora ngerti*" (God does not know) is a representative speech that contains vulgar irony and mockery of God's nature. The use of coarse language and irony violates the maxims of decency and wisdom by reducing respect in religious communication.

Fifth, quote D7. S "*masjid tempat putus asa*" (mosque of despair) is an affirmative nominal clause that degrades the spiritual function of the mosque. This speech violates the maxim of wisdom and agreement because it weakens religious symbols that should be respected, thus causing negative social impacts. In addition, D8 quotes. S's stating that women become preachers on Friday is a representative speech that conveys controversial facts and has the potential to cause social debate. The speaker violated the maxim of agreement because he conveyed information that was contrary to the majority norms regarding worship procedures, as evidenced by the D12 quote. S "*aneh nasab Nabi Muhammad*" (strange descendants of the Prophet), the speaker uses evaluative language that demeans the honour of the lineage of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). This form of violation has the potential to cause serious social uproar. The following is a summary table of the findings of the analysis of speech acts and maximum violations based on the context of Panji Gumilang's speech in the Indramayu District Court Decision No. 365/Pid.Sus/2023.

Table 1 Summary of Findings of Analysis of Speech and Maximal Violations

Code	Speech Quotes	Types of Speech Acts	Violation of the Maxim	Criminal Forms
D1.S	"Tidak usah mati ditanah suci yang jauh, di Indonesia, hidup matimu di Indonesia tanah suci" (You don't have to want to die in a distant holy land, in Indonesia you live and die in Indonesia, the holy land).	Directive	Tact	Blasphemy
D2.S	"Indonesia tanah suci! Itu suci!" (Indonesia is a sacred land! It's holy!)	Representative	Agreement, Tact	
D3.S	"Tau anak-anakku, orang mati di Mekah dilonjorkan saja bruk tidak ada tanda, mau yang begitu kok mau bayar 35 juta?" (You know, my children, the dead in Mecca are just thrown out and there is no sign, how do you want to pay 35 million?)	Representative	Agreement, Tact	
D4.S	"Viral mengajak santri menyanyikan lagu Yahudi" (Viral invites Santri to Sing Jewish Songs)	Implied Guidelines	Agreement, Tact	
D5.S	"yang mengajarkan 'dzalikal kitabu laa raiba fihi' itu Nabi Muhammad, bukan Allah... itu kalam Nabi Muhammad yang diperoleh dari wahyu" (It was the Prophet Muhammad who taught 'dzalikal kitabu laa raib fihi', not Allah... it is the kalam (speech) of the Prophet Muhammad obtained from revelation)	Representative	Modesty, Agreement	
D6.S	"Kalau Allah bicara Arab, susah ketemu orang Indramayu... Prewe... Gusti ora weruh, Gusti ora ngerti" (If Allah speaks Arabic, it will be difficult to meet the Indramayu people... Prewe... I don't know, God doesn't know)	Representative (Irony)	Politeness, Tact	
D7.S	"Masjid tempat putus asa" (A mosque of despair)	Representative	Agreement, Tact	
D8.S	"Wanita menjadi imam shalat	Representative	Agreement,	

	Jumat di Al-Zaytun" (Women become preachers for Friday prayers in Al-Zaytun)		Tact
D12.S	"Panji Gumilang menyebut aneh nasab Nabi Muhammad Saw" (Panji Gumilang called it strange that the descendants of the Prophet)	Representative	Agreement, Tact

The findings above demonstrate how directive and representative speech acts are realised through various linguistic strategies, including imperatives, evaluative clauses, rhetorical questions, and declarative statements. These utterances show pragmatic violations of politeness maxims such as tact, agreement, humility, and decency, which correspond to forms of symbolic defamation and legal blasphemy. Each speech act reveals a communicative intent that challenges religious norms and carries ideological implications.

It is essential to acknowledge that this study is based on a limited dataset derived from official video excerpts and written transcripts presented in the Indramayu District Court Decision Number 365/Pid.Sus/2023/PN.Idm. These materials represent selected portions of the defendant's speech submitted as legal evidence, not the entirety of his lectures or public discourse. As a result, the interpretation may not fully capture the broader pragmatic context, including tone, gesture, or surrounding dialogue. This limitation invites further research that incorporates multimodal data sources and broader sampling to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the pragmatic and legal significance of religiously charged speech acts.

3.2 Discussion

The findings from the analysis of twelve utterances made by Panji Gumilang, as documented in Verdict Number 365/Pid.Sus/2023/PN.Idm reveals a predominance of representative and directive speech acts. These two categories fall under the basic forms of illocutionary acts as classified by Searle (1979). Representative acts express the speaker's belief or worldview, while directive acts function to influence the audience's behaviour or response. These utterances are not limited to personal religious interpretations or symbolic opinions. Each speech act demonstrates a pragmatic structure that fulfils essential elements of criminal violations as codified in Indonesian law. Directive speech acts found in data D1 to D4 include explicit and implicit commands that incite resistance toward core Islamic teachings and alter public religious behaviour. These acts meet the legal criteria of inciting hatred based on religious identity under Article 28 Paragraph (2) in conjunction with Article 45A Paragraph (2) of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law. Representative speech acts, reflected in data D5 to D12, consist of assertions that degrade or insult religious symbols, such as denying the divine origin of the Qur'an, mocking God's attributes, or disparaging the sanctity of mosques and prophetic lineage. These statements fulfil the criminal elements of religious blasphemy as defined under Article 156a of the Indonesian Criminal Code. The acts also qualify as the dissemination of misleading information capable of causing public disorder under Articles 14 and 15 of Law No. 1 of 1946.

Directive utterances appear in data D1, D2, D3, and D4. Data D1 presents a negative imperative: "*tidak usah mau*" (do not want to), prohibiting the idea of worshipping or dying in Mecca and substituting Indonesia as a new spiritual reference. Data D2 contains repetitive exclamatory sentences such as "*Indonesia tanah yang suci! Itu suci!*"

(Indonesia is a holy land! It is sacred!) which assertively emphasises Indonesia's religious sanctity. Data D3 includes a rhetorical question criticising burial practice in Mecca, expressed informally and sarcastically. Data D4 features a non-verbal act where students are invited to sing a Jewish religious song within an Islamic boarding school. Although not delivered as a spoken sentence, this act carries directive intent through symbolic performance. Representative utterances appear in data D5 through D12. Data D5 contains a declarative statement denying the Qur'an's divine origin: "*bukan Allah, itu kalam Nabi Muhammad Saw*" (*not Allah, it is the kalam of the Prophet Muhammad*). Data D6 features vulgar irony with the phrase "*Gusti ora weruh* (God does not know), uttered in a sarcastic tone. Data D7 asserts "*masjid tempat putus asa*" (a mosque is a place of despair), a statement that diminishes the symbolic value of mosques. Data D8 states that women are appointed as Friday sermon preachers, while data D12 labels the Prophet's lineage as "*aneh*" (strange). These utterances are conveyed either directly in speech or through video titles and are often accompanied by emphatic tone, repetition, and firm gestures.

Each utterance operates as a speech act with illocutionary force. Directive utterances aim to redirect religious attitudes and behaviour by framing Indonesia as superior to Mecca and discrediting traditional rituals. According to Searle (1979), direction of fit theory, D1 functions as a coercive directive that demands alignment between belief and utterance. D2 and D3 rely on rhetorical emphasis and sarcasm to reinforce ideological rejection of Mecca. D4, although non-verbal, functions as an implicit directive by challenging dominant religious identity norms through symbolic deviation. Representative utterances, particularly in D5 and D6, are assertive and evaluative. D5 attempts to redefine the source of divine revelation, while D6 mocks God's omniscience, violating the maxims of politeness and tact (Grice, 1975). D7 diminishes the mosque's spiritual status through evaluative nominal clauses. D8 and D12 introduce controversial information that deviates from accepted religious doctrine. These utterances collectively manipulate meaning through linguistic strategies such as irony, sarcasm, repetition, and evaluative labels, as discussed (Oishi, 2022; Parvaresh, 2023; Peng et al., 2024). When delivered by an authoritative figure, these acts acquire amplified perlocutionary force, as confirmed by Kamariah et al. (2023) and Al-Ghazo (2024).

These utterances constitute more than potential threats; they meet legal definitions of religious defamation and hate speech. Directive speech acts in D1 through D4 fall under violations of Article 28(2) in conjunction with Article 45A (2) of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, as they incite rejection of religious doctrines and encourage ideological deviation. Representative speech acts in D5 through D12 fulfil the criminal elements of blasphemy under Article 156a of the Indonesian Criminal Code, particularly through expressions that insult God, the Qur'an, mosques, and prophetic lineage. Several utterances also qualify as dissemination of misleading or inflammatory content under Articles 14 and 15 of Law No. 1 of 1946. The speaker's social authority and the use of a digital platform intensify the impact of these utterances, which are not isolated but interconnected in a consistent ideological pattern (Volio, 2022; Rayon, 2022; Karandeeva et al., 2020).

Overall, this study aligns with contemporary forensic pragmatic research by Elyamany, Wisniewska, and Peng, which emphasizes the importance of interpreting hate speech not only semantically but also performatively, relationally, and contextually. The novelty of this research lies in its direct correlation between types of speech acts (directive and representative) and Indonesian criminal law through a systematic reading of court verdicts and digital evidence as forms of symbolic power expression.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the analysis of Panji Gumilang's speech in Decision Number 365/Pid.Sus/2023/PN.Idm, it was found that hate speech against religious symbols was realised through linguistic codes that were negatively charged, degrading, and had the potential to trigger social unrest, such as the phrase "tanah suci" (holy land) for Indonesia, "bukan kalam Allah" (not the kalam of Allah), and "nasab aneh Nabi Muhammad Saw" (strange nasab descendants of the Prophet Saw). The speech violates the principles of politeness, including the maxims of tact, agreement, modesty, and approbation, and can therefore be categorised as a desecration of religious symbols. The dominance of directive and representative speech in the data shows an ideological construct that deliberately shapes new perceptions contrary to the religious norms of the majority, with influence amplified by the speaker's social authority.

This study is limited to the analysis of speech acts that violate politeness principles based solely on court decision documents, without incorporating audio-visual nuances, broader audience interpretations, or cross-platform dissemination effects. Future research is encouraged to explore multimodal data sources, including paralinguistic cues (tone, facial expressions, gesture), audience reactions in comment sections, and comparative analysis across digital platforms.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend sincere gratitude to the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) for funding the publication, and to the Master's Program of the Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, for the academic support that enabled the successful completion of this research.

Authors' Contributions

Okta Diana Anggrayni: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing Original Draft Preparation. Ina Ika Pratita: Supervision, Writing, Review & Editing. Riki Nasrullah: Supervision, Writing, Review & Editing.

REFERENCES

- Al-Ghazo, A. (2024). The force behind illocutionary speech acts: Directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 13(3), 408–420. <https://doi.org/10.55493/5019.v13i3.5181>
- Al-Zaytun Official. Pernyataan panji gumilang dalam ceramah. (Online), (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g0BB-IxsEKU>, diakses 12 Mei 2025).
- Al-Zaytun Official. Kanal resmi al-zaytun di youtube. (Online), (<https://www.youtube.com/c/AlZaytunOfficial>, diakses 12 Mei 2025).
- Assem, S., & Alansary, S. (2022). Sentiment analysis from subjectivity to (im)politeness detection: Hate speech from a socio-pragmatic perspective. *Proceedings of the 20th Conference on Language Engineering, ESOLEC 2022*, 20(Im), 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ESOLEC54569.2022.10009298>
- Elyamany, N., Youssef, Y. O., & Abbas, N. (2025). Forensic analysis of populist discourse and multimodal craft of consensus in Netanyahu's July 2024 Congressional address. *Social Semiotics*, 0330(July 2024), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2025.2492162>
- Etchegaray, C. (2022). Les directives anticipées pour la fin de vie: Actes de langage et ascription. *Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale*, 114(2), 257–272. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rmm.222.0257>
- Fadhilah, N., & Arimi, S. Inkrah ujaran kebencian atas kasus pencemaran nama baik oleh FA di X: Sebuah Kajian pragmatik forensik. *Madah: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*,

- 15(2), 206–219. <https://doi.org/10.31503/madah.v15i2.795>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lis/studypacks/Grice-Logic.pdf>
- Hartini, L., Saifullah, A. R., & Sudana, D. (2020). Linguistik forensik terhadap perbuatan tidak menyenangkan di media sosial (Kajian pragmatik). *Deiksis*, 12(3), 259–269 <https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v12i03.5416>
- Kamariah, Laksono, K., & Savitri, A. D. (2023). A pragma-dialectical study as a directive speech act pattern of a lecturer to the students in an online learning. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 23(9), 95–104. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v23i9.6131>
- Karandeeva, L. G., Stanchuliak, T. G., Popova, S. V., Suyskaya, V. S., & Shvedova, I. V. (2020). The prosody of directive speech acts: Pragmastylistic aspect (on the material of the modern German language). *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9, 2112–2123. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.249>
- Lavitski, A. A. (2023). Parametric triangulation in forensic linguistic expertise: On the example of insult. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 14(2), 383–401. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-2-383-401>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=2uWXCwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=id#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Luo, C., Duan, L., Li, Y., Xie, Q., Wang, L., Ru, K., Nazir, S., Jawad, M., Zhao, Y., Wang, F., Du, Z., Peng, D., Wen, S. Q., Qiu, P., & Fan, H. (2021). Insights from Y-STRs: Forensic characteristics, genetic affinities, and linguistic classifications of Guangdong Hakka and She groups. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 12(May), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2021.676917>
- Oishi, E. (2022). Illocutionary-act-type sensitivity and discursive sequence: An examination of quotation. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 19(3), 381–406. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2022-3005>
- Parvaresh, V. (2023). Covertly communicated hate speech: A corpus-assisted pragmatic study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 205, 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.12.009>
- Peña, J. J., Castillo, F. A. T., & Sanchez, O. E. C. (2022). Identificación de locutor a partir de la fonética forense: Aplicación del software SplitsTree4 para una organización esquemática de los datos lingüísticos. *Boletín de la Academia Peruana de la Lengua*, 2022(71), 431–461. <https://doi.org/10.46744/bapl.202201.014>
- Peng, L., Wang, S., Jiang, H., Wang, K., & Li, G. (2024). Directive vs. commissive illocutionary acts? How illocutionary acts influence citizens' dissemination behavior of government information. *Journal of Global Information Management*, 32(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.4018/JGIM.349961>
- Rayon, L. D. (2022). Linguistic oddness in Philippine suicide notes: A forensic discourse analysis. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 30–56. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index>
- Salama, A. H. Y., & Fawzy, R. M. (2023). The YouTube-induced sequential categorization of the topical device of Amber Heard's "lies": An ethnomethodological forensic-linguistic perspective. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 8(2), 171–198. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2023-2009>
- Sardo, A. (2022). Hate speech: A pragmatic assessment of the European Court of Human Rights' jurisprudence. *European Convention on Human Rights Law Review*, 4(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1163/26663236-bja10054>
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/expression->

- and-meaning/09C632A3876CC93CB12CCDA0E4AE46FD
- Sevilla Requena, L. (2024). "She'll never be a man": A corpus-based forensic linguistic analysis of misgendering discrimination on X. *Languages*, 9(9), 291. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9090291>
- Sousa-Silva, R. (2022). Fighting the fake: A forensic linguistic analysis to fake news detection. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 35(6), 2409–2433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-022-09901-w>
- Susilowati, N. E., Arimi, S., Surahmat, S., & Imamah, F. M. (2023). Alleged case of blasphemy on podcast: Forensic linguistic analysis. *Bahasa dan Seni: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Pengajarannya*, 51(2), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um015v51i22023p225>.
- Syahid, A., Sudana, D., & Bachari, A. D. (2022). Perundungan siber (cyberbullying) bermuatan penistaan agama di media sosial yang berdampak hukum: Kajian linguistik forensik. *Semantik*, 11(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.22460/semantik.v11i1.p17-32>
- Taha, M., Febriningsih, F., Asfar, D. A., Zalmansyah, A., Muzammil, A. R. ul, Ajam, A., Lestari, S. A. B., Zar'in, F., Rauf, R., & Gritantin, L. A. L. (2024). ula Malay's hate speech in the Sanana jurisdiction: A pragmatic study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15(6), 1941–1950. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1506.19>
- Taufek, W. N. S. W. M., Pritam, H. M. H., Desa, W. N. S. M., Ismail, D., & Mahat, N. A. (2024). Geometric morphometric and pattern discrimination of handwritten numeral characters based on local ethnicities and native linguistic disparities in Malaysia for forensic applications. *Malaysian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 20(5), 1068–1082. <https://doi.org/10.11113/mjfas.v20n5.3639>
- Vidhiasi, D. M., Saifullah, A. R., & Bachari, A. D. (2023). The evaluation of alleged defamation: A forensic linguistics analysis. *Al-Lisan*, 8(2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v8i2.3482>
- Volio, G. C. (2022). Directive speech acts and ritualized politeness in medieval Spanish. *Romanica Cracoviensia*, 22(2), 137–145. <https://doi.org/10.4467/20843917RC.22.013.15862>