

Alleged case of blasphemy on podcast: Forensic linguistic analysis

Dugaan kasus penodaan agama di *podcast*: Analisis linguistik forensik

Novi Eka Susilowati ^a *, Sailal Arimi ^b, Surahmat ^c , Fardan Mahmudatul Imamah ^d 

^a Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

^{b c d} Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Submitted: October 30, 2022; Accepted: July 30, 2023; Published: August 31, 2023

KEYWORDS

blasphemy,
social media,
forensic lin-
guistic

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyze the linguistic features that allegedly contained elements of blasphemy in Jenderal Dudung Abdurrachman's (JDA) speech. The analysis was carried out using a forensic linguistic perspective. This research data is in the form of JDA utterances delivered in a broadcast conducted with Deddy Corbuzier (DC). Based on a forensic linguistic analysis of the text of JDA's conversation with DC on Deddy Corbuzier's podcast, it can be concluded that JDA's linguistic evidence does not support blasphemy but a lack of knowledge in religion, especially in matters of faith. Due to the lack of knowledge of religion, JDA interprets religion and personifies God according to his understanding. In JDA's speech, there is also no intention to tarnish religion because the controversial JDA's speech cannot be interpreted partially but can be interpreted with other speeches. If it is related to other utterances, it can be concluded that there is no intention of JDA to tarnish religion. However, there are efforts by JDA to invite audiences to follow JDA's understanding and interpretation of religion.

KATA KUNCI

penodaan agama,
media sosial, lin-
guistik forensik

ABSTRAK

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah menganalisis fitur kebahasaan yang diduga memuat unsur penodaan agama dalam tuturan Jenderal Dudung Abdurrachman (JDA). Analisis dilakukan dengan menggunakan perspektif linguistik forensik. Data penelitian ini berupa tuturan JDA yang disampaikan dalam siniar yang dilakukan bersama Deddy Corbuzier. Berdasarkan analisis linguistik forensik atas teks perbincangan JDA dengan DC di siniar DC, dapat disimpulkan bahwa tuturan JDA bukti-bukti kebahasaan tidak mendukung adanya penodaan agama, melainkan kurangnya pengetahuan dalam beragama, terutama dalam hal akidah. Akibat kurangnya pengetahuan dalam beragama tersebut, JDA menafsirkan agama dan mempersonifikasi Tuhan sesuai dengan pemahamannya. Dalam tuturan JDA juga tidak terdapat niat untuk menodai agama karena tuturan JDA yang kontroversial tersebut tidak dapat dimaknai secara parsial, melainkan dimaknai secara menyeluruh dengan tuturan-tuturan lain. Jika dikaitkan dengan tuturan yang lain, dapat disimpulkan bahwa tidak ada niat JDA untuk menodai agama. Meski demikian, terdapat upaya JDA untuk mengajak audiens agar mengikuti pemahaman dan penafsiran JDA tentang agama.

How to cite this article:

Susilowati, N. E., Arimi, S., Surahmat, & 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://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um015v51i22023p225>

* Corresponding author: novi.eka.fs@um.ac.id

Introduction

Many countries are still debating the issue of whether to criminalize speech or behavior that is indicated to contain blasphemy. Moreover, many countries maintain a blasphemy law to protect the religious life of their adherents in the country, including Indonesia. Reforming the crime of blasphemy in Indonesia is one of the issues debated as part of the proposed 2011 Draft Law on Religious Harmony (Crouch, 2012). The draft law, initiated by the Ministry of Religion in the 1980s, seeks to regulate various issues, such as funeral practice permits for places of worship, preaching, and religious ceremonies. On the issue of blasphemy, the 2011 bill proposes increasing the level of detail and criminalization of blasphemy offences. So, a draft blasphemy law was used to define the boundaries of religious life, not only in Indonesia but in late modernity more generally (Telle, 2018).

Cases of blasphemy in Indonesia often get public attention. Blasphemy cases in Indonesia are widely discussed, especially after the blasphemy case carried out by the former governor of Jakarta, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, in 2016 (Lintang et al., 2021). Moreover, cases of hate speech—including cases of blasphemy—are increasingly getting public attention nationally and internationally, along with the increasing concern for human rights (Cox, 2020; Hasani & Halili, 2022). Therefore, various preventive and curative efforts have been carried out by the government to prevent cases of blasphemy from increasing. This effort is carried out to protect religion and people accused of blasphemy so that acts of anarchy do not occur (Julius, 2016).

Blasphemy cases in Indonesia are quite common. Indonesia is a democracy with the largest Muslim population, and they care deeply about their religion (Wibisono et al., 2022). Even though Indonesia already has legal documents to prevent blasphemy from occurring, the fact is that religious blasphemy still occurs frequently. The Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (Yayasan Layanan Bantuan Hukum Indonesia/YLBHI) reported that from January to May 2020, there were 38 blasphemy cases in Indonesia (YLBHI, 2020). Cases of blasphemy are spread in almost all provinces in Indonesia. In addition, Amnesty International's report shows that in 2005-2014, 39 people were convicted of blasphemy cases in Indonesia, with prison terms ranging from 5 months to 6 years (Amnesty International, 2014).

The development of communication and information technology in the form of social media has contributed to the increasing number of blasphemy cases in Indonesia. It is inseparable from the function of social media, which has been used as a channel for users to express freedom of opinion. The widespread use of social media in recent decades has radically changed how people expresses their opinions. Expression of opinion is no longer staged in the streets or reconciliation rooms (Van Dijk & Hacker, 2013). Thus, social media has facilitated users to express themselves, sometimes including blasphemy of religion. Social media is often used as a vehicle against acts of blasphemy.

Blasphemy is an act of insulting, showing contempt, or lack of respect for God (US Commission on International Religious Freedom, 2017). The Pew Research Center also defines blasphemy as a speech or act that insults God or a divine entity (Pew Research

Center, 2011). In Indonesia, provisions regarding blasphemy are contained in Article 156a of the Criminal Code, which is sourced from Article 4 of Law no. 1/PNPS/1965, previously known as Presidential Decree No. 1/PNPS/1965 on the Abuse and/or Blasphemy of Religion.

Whenever a case is suspected of being blasphemy of religion, controversy inevitably spreads in the community (Arsil et al., 2018). It is understandable, considering the substance is related to personal beliefs, making everyone seem interested in the incident. Controversies related to blasphemy are always sensitive and often build societal polarisation that can lead to division. Therefore, alleged blasphemy of religion often attracts public attention (Uddin, 2011).

On November 30, 2021, Jenderal Dudung Abdurrachman (JDA), Chief of Staff of the Indonesian Army, conducted a podcast with a public figure named Deddy Corbuzier (DC). In the broadcast, JDA and DC discussed JDA's experiences during their careers, including JDA's life and religious views as guest stars on the broadcast. Among the topics JDA discussed with DC were JDA's religious beliefs and how JDA implements his beliefs in life and carries out his duties. However, from the discussion, various parties considered that there were statements by JDA that allegedly contained elements of hate speech in the form of blasphemy. The utterances which are alleged to contain elements of blasphemy read "...*Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (...our God is not an Arab)*" and "*Tuhan kan gak bisa turunkan uang dari langit hanya pada orang-orang yang amanah saja yang bermurah hati (God cannot send money down from the sky only to trustworthy people who are generous)*". JDA's statement is considered to be tarnishing the religion of Islam because JDA seems to equate or personify God with humans. Because of this, JDA's speech has drawn public reactions, both for and against. Therefore, Jenderal Dudung Abdurrachman's stories on Deddy Corbuzier's podcast have also become the subject of news coverage in several national mainstream mass media, for example, at <https://www.tvonenews.com/berita/16735-viral-dudung-sebut-tuhan-bukan-orang-arab> which reported on the virality of the JDA statement; and <https://www.suara.com/news/2022/02/10/195146/jenderal-dudung-dilaporkan-gara-gara-tuhan-bukan-orang-arab-mui-doa-bisa-pakai-bahasa-daerah-masing-masing> who reported on JDA's reporting of alleged blasphemy in his statement on the DC podcast. JDA's statement has also received a reaction in the form of a statement from the Chairperson of the Indonesian Ulema Council (Majelis Ulama Indonesia/ MUI). Although the statement from the Chairperson of the MUI does not represent an official statement from the MUI, the statement from the Chairperson of the MUI is a basis that can be used as a reference that the JDA's speech is suspected of containing problems because MUI is an institution that is formally tasked with providing advice or fatwas regarding religious and social issues to the government and the public (Majelis Ulama Indonesia, 2021).

Many reactions from the public cannot be separated from the media spreading the conversation between JDA and DC. As stated in the previous paragraph, JDA's speech, which allegedly contained elements of blasphemy, was carried out on a podcast conducted by JDA with DC. The podcast is published in the open through the YouTube channel. As a social media platform, YouTube is widely accessible to the public. JDA podcasts with DC will be easily accessible to YouTube users worldwide because DC has

20.6 million subscribers, placing him at number 9 in Indonesia (Socialblade, 2003). Meisyanti and Kencana (2020) mention that podcasts are an interesting media development technology because anyone can get involved, express themselves, exchange ideas, or pitch their products. Therefore, the domino effect created by the podcast will be very widespread. Without a system and strict rules, podcasts can reach a more geographically diverse audience than radio stations with AM/FM transmitters (Meisyanti & Kencana, 2020).

Apart from the ease with which the public can access JDA's speech, a domino effect of JDA can also occur, considering that JDA is a big figure. It can be said that JDA is a key opinion leader (KOL) (Agustina et al., 2020) because JDA is a figure who is believed to have a voice/opinion that is more valuable than most of the other participants (Suciati et al., 2019). These people are considered to have sufficient capacity and influence to represent most people's aspirations (Ibrahim et al., 2015). Their opinions are seen as more relevant, correct, and representative than ordinary people. Figures included in the KOL category can come from various backgrounds, such as writers, politicians, artists, activists, government officials, or even military officials. They certainly play an important role in rolling out and fending off political issues we are developing in society (Agustina et al., 2020).

Religious and political experts have widely analyzed the JDA's statement. These analyses are even published in mainstream newspapers and on personal and organizational websites. Existing analysis shows that there is partiality or rejection of JDA's speech. However, among the existing analyses, there has yet to be an analysis from a forensic linguistic perspective on JDA speech. Based on this fact, it is interesting to examine the alleged blasphemy in JDA's speech using a forensic linguistic perspective. The statement, which allegedly contained religious blasphemy, caused an uproar in the public, but it has not been analyzed linguistically so far.

Forensic linguistics is a branch of linguistics that can be used to analyze and parse legal cases through linguistic features. Forensic linguistics can be applied through sound identification, discourse analysis in legal regulations, interpretation of the meaning of spoken or written statements, and analysis of language in law, for example, the language used by judges, prosecutors, or suspects (Nasution, 2020). So, forensic linguistic analysis can be used to analyze legal issues related to language, for example, in cases of document authenticity, plagiarism, trademarks, defamation, and translation.

Forensic linguistics makes use of the analysis of various linguistic elements to gain a good understanding of the language with (allegedly) legal cases. Therefore, forensic linguistic analysis can be in the form of analysis starting from the level of phonology, syntax, semantics, idiolect, graphology, and so on (Mahsun, 2018). The analysis used is the analysis that is most relevant to the data that is (allegedly) a legal case.

Based on the explanation of this background, this study aims to unravel the potential for alleged blasphemy on linguistic features in JDA utterances. Specifically, this study aims to analyze linguistic features, elements of intention and awareness, context analysis, and elements of ignorance in JDA's utterances, which allegedly contain elements of blasphemy. In this study, the theory used is functional systemic linguistic (SFL). SFL was chosen because the purpose of this study was to try to understand the text of JDA's utterances which were allegedly in legal cases: whether JDA's utterances contained

religious blasphemy or not. To achieve this goal, a theory is needed that can describe the meaning of JDA utterances, so SFL was chosen because SFL aims to understand how a text forms its meaning in a context. To strengthen the analysis and understanding of the meaning of speech in its context, philosophy of language theory is also used which emphasizes the aspects of intention and awareness: that language is an action and every action has prerequisites, namely intention. Therefore, intention becomes an important part in analyzing and interpreting the language data which is (allegedly) in a legal case.

Theoretical background

Blasphemy in Indonesia

Although there is no single definition of blasphemy, several sources can be referred to (Hasani & Halili, 2022). The term blasphemy has been part of the Indonesian legal vocabulary since 1965, as written in Law Number 1/PNPS/1965 concerning the Prevention of Abuse and/or Blasphemy of Religion abbreviated as UU PPPA) as well as Article 156A of the Criminal Code related to it. Recently, blasphemy has become increasingly popular even in everyday conversation since the case that befell the former Governor of DKI Jakarta, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Bagir, 2017).

Adherents have long known the term blasphemy in various religions. From a historical perspective, the word blasphemy comes from the Greek *blasphemy*, which means 'malicious statement' or 'speaking evil'. In addition, the meaning of blasphemy is very broad, depending on the conception of each religion. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, blasphemy refers to any verbal violation of sacred values. A seventeenth-century Scottish jurist described religious blasphemy as treason against God. In Catholic theology, blasphemy is defined as any word of curse or reproach spoken unjustly against God and is considered a sin. Likewise, in Islamic thought, blasphemy involves insulting or hostile attacks (*sabb*), either against God (*Sabb Allah*) or the Prophet Muhammad (*Sabb al-Rasul*) or on other sacred things (Hassan, 2004). In other words, as explained by Robertson (Adam, 2015), the concept of blasphemy originating from monotheistic religions such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam includes the prohibition against a person or group to slander God or sacred things, including the Prophets and saints in those religions.

The scope of blasphemy laws is regulated differently in different countries. First, blasphemy is an act that insults, attacks or does not respect God or things that are sacred in a religion. Second, blasphemy not only includes acts that insult, attack, or disrespect the God of religion or things that are sacred in a religion but also includes attacks, insults, or disrespect for the religious feelings of its adherents (Ashraf, 2018). Third, in several countries, blasphemy also includes other acts, such as spreading a religion other than Islam, attacking religious leaders, shaking the beliefs of Muslims, a Muslim who is known to eat pork, even including regulations regarding the prohibition of atheism and the prohibition of apostasy (Arsil et al., 2018).

Blasphemy is an act of insulting, showing contempt, or lack of respect for God (US Commission on International Religious Freedom, 2017). Blasphemy is insulting religion and religious symbols or interpreting religious texts in a way contrary to the state's

interpretation (Fiss, 2016). The Pew Research Center also defines blasphemy as a speech or act that insults God or a divine entity (Pew Research Center, 2011). According to Bagir (2017), religious blasphemy, as stated in Article 1 of the PPPA Law, contains a prohibition on two things, namely (1) religious interpretation and (2) deviant religious activities. Furthermore, Bagir explained that what is generally more appropriate to be referred to as blasphemy of religion is what is prohibited by Article 4 (and Article 156A of the Criminal Code), namely expressing feelings or committing religiously hostile acts, abuse of religion, blasphemy of religion, and trying to prevent people from committing acts of blasphemy. Adhere to religion.

In Indonesia, blasphemy is regulated in Law no. 1/PNPS/1965, which regulates the criminal act of blasphemy as regulated in Article 4 or Article 156a of the Criminal Code, which reads:

“Dipidana dengan pidana penjara selama-lamanya lima tahun barangsiapa **dengan sengaja** di muka umum mengeluarkan perasaan atau melakukan perbuatan: a. yang pada pokoknya bersifat permusuhan, penyalahgunaan atau penodaan terhadap suatu agama yang dianut di Indonesia; b. dengan maksud agar supaya orang tidak menganut agama apapun juga, yang bersendikan ke-Tuhanan Yang Maha Esa.”

(“Shared with imprisonment for a maximum of five years whoever **intentionally** publicly expresses feelings or commits the following actions: a. which are essentially enmity, abuse or blasphemy against a religion professed in Indonesia; b. with the intention that people do not adhere to any religion, which is based on the belief in the One Godhead.”)

Law No. 1/PNPS/1965 Article 156a regulates two aspects. First, it regulates the public from telling, recommending, and seeking public support to interpret a religion adhered to in Indonesia or to carry out religious activities that resemble religious activities from the main points of religious teachings. Provisions can be interpreted as a prohibition in public to disseminate and carry out interpretive acts that are considered deviant. Second, regulate criminal acts for violations of the article.

Regarding Law no. 1/PNPS/1965 Article 156a, Arsil et al. (2018) interprets the article as follows.

- The element is intentionally limited to purely (essentially) intended to be hostile or insulting. Written or verbal descriptions that are carried out objectively, strict law '*zakelijk*', and scientifically regarding a religion accompanied by efforts to avoid the presence of words or wordings that are hostile, or insulting are not criminal acts.
- The element of expressing feelings or actions is done verbally, in writing or by other actions.
- The element is hostile; there is no explanation [considered clear enough], and it only explains that there is an act aimed at the intention of being hostile.
- Elements of religious abuse, no explanation [considered clear].
- The element of blasphemy of religion is no explanation and is only explained by the existence of actions aimed at insult.
- Elements of a religion adopted in Indonesia include Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. The explanation in Article 1 also states that other religions, for example, Judaism, Zoroastrian, Shinto, and Taoism, are prohibited in Indonesia. They get full guarantees as provided by Article 29 paragraph (2) (1945 Constitution before the amendment), and they are allowed to exist if they do not violate the provisions contained in this regulation or other laws and regulations.

- The element with the intention that people do not adhere to any religion, there is no explanation, and only it is stated that the perpetrators have betrayed the first principle of Pancasila, besides disturbing the peace of religious people.

In addition to Law Number 1/PNPS/1965, the law used to crack down on cases of blasphemy is Law 11/2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, which reads:

"Everyone intentionally and without rights disseminates information aimed at causing hatred or hostility to certain individuals and/or community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group (SARA)."

YLBHI has collected cases of blasphemy based on Law Number 1/PNPS/1965 and UU ITE. In its analysis, YLBHI found 38 cases of blasphemy, and 27 of them occurred on social media. Of the 38 cases, YLBHI formulated the category of blasphemy that occurred into seven categories, namely (1) interpreting religion not according to the mainstream, (2) claiming to be a prophet, (3) insulting religion or religious symbols: the Prophet, the holy book, the Prophet's family, prayer, and worship, (4) inviting or converting people, (5) spreading hatred, (6) obstructing worship, and (7) other actions that are contrary to religious teachings, for example in the case of rice wrap with a picture of a dog's head (YLBHI, 2020). In contrast to YLBHI, Bagir (2017) categorizes religious blasphemy into four types, namely (1) the existence of internal schools/groups within a religion, such as Shia, Baha'i, and Ahmadiyya, (2) sects or new religious movements, (3) public remarks or actions that offend certain groups and (4) hate speech, incitement, or provocation to violence.

Functional systemic linguistics as an instrument for decoding language in suspected legal cases

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is an approach that aims to understand how a text forms its meaning in a context (Wiratno, 2018). The word text refers to all linguistic phenomena carried out in any media that can be understood by speakers of the language used by the text. The word context refers to what language has in a speech situation.

In terms of functional systemic linguistics, there are systemic and functional keywords. The word systemic refers to a choice system, namely that in paradigmatic terms, the use of language is in the choice of form; for example, when speaking, the speaker will be faced with choosing declarative or interrogative forms, positive or negative forms, and others. The functional word implies that language is in the context of use and that the forms of language carry out certain functions.

In SFL, there are three principles. First, language is always in the form of text. As for what is meant by text, it is a lingual unit that expresses meaning contextually. These lingual units can be words, clauses, or groups of paragraphs (Wiratno, 2018). Second, the use of language must be seen as a process of selecting a linguistic system to express meaning. Third, language is functional in that language is never neutral from context because language reflects the attitudes, opinions, values, and, broadly, the ideology of its speakers. These three principles are related to each other in that if someone wants to express something, he will use a certain form of text to achieve his goal. The text created will be able to represent that person because the speaker's attitudes,

ideas, and ideology have been conveyed through the selection of relevant language forms.

In SFL, language is seen as a source of making meaning (Gerot & Wignell, 1994). Therefore, LSF tries to explain how language is used in reality. In addition, LSF also focuses on text and context so that text is understood differently from formal theory. Thus, SFL not only discusses the text's structure but also how the structure of the text forms meaning with the power of construal (determining and referring to each other) with the context.

In SFL, there are two kinds of context: situational and cultural. Situation context refers to everything outside what is written or spoken, which accompanies language or text during language use or social interaction. Halliday (1992) says that each actual situational context, the particular arrangement of the terrain, as well as the actors and means that make up the text, are not a random collection of features but a whole as a package that is uniquely linked in a culture. In other words, the context of the situation can be seen as a limiting meaning because the situation occurs from three components: field or content, participant, and style (Rosmawaty, 2011). In addition to situational context, a text is also constructed by cultural context. Cultural context refers to the values shared by a group of people (society). In other words, cultural context refers to how humans use language to achieve goals following the surrounding culture.

Leonard et al. (2017) state that in forensic linguistic studies, to analyze language with legal cases, linguists can analyze various features to uncover the case. Features that can be analyzed in forensic linguistics can be dialect, idiolect, mother tongue used, grammar (e.g., clause insertion, use of prepositions, discourse markers, omission of complements), usage patterns and spelling errors, mechanics, and punctuation; management of narrative time structures and departures from narrative sequences; choice of words; type of register (for example, letters, ransom notes, detective novels); level of formality; and stylistic peculiarities (e.g., parallel structures). It means that various dimensions can be used in analyzing language data in legal cases. In other words, linguistic forensic analysis can be carried out at the levels of phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, discourse, sociolinguistic, and so on. The aspects that analysts can use are very dependent on the condition of the data and the objectives to be disclosed.

Forensic linguistics can be carried out in the following stages (Mahsun, 2018). First, find a language unit that can be an entry point that can provide directions for describing the profile of the perpetrator and the legal case being analyzed. The language units can be in the form of language units that involve aspects of micro linguistics as well as macro/interdisciplinary linguistics. Second, carry out linguistic analysis according to scientific rules. Third, connecting with certain linguistic theories to provide an explanation for the facts of that language. Fourth, make an interpretation of the analysis that has been done.

Method

This study used a qualitative research design. This research data is in the form of JDA utterances, which are suspected of containing religious blasphemy. JDA's speech was obtained from a podcast that JDA did with DC.

This research data was collected in the following steps. First, JDA's conversations with DC on the DC podcast are carefully listened to. Second, the video conversation, launched on November 30, 2021, was downloaded through the YouTube channel containing JDA's conversation with DC. Third, the conversation between JDA and DC was transcribed so that written speech data was obtained. The conversation transcript is carried out in full from the beginning to the end of the podcast so that the context of the conversation is seen clearly and intact. Fourth, after the conversation was transcribed, the next step was to read the entire transcript to understand the contents of the conversation. Fifth, identification is carried out on statements suspected of containing religious blasphemy. The statement allegedly containing blasphemy is based on the 7th Ijtima of the Indonesian Council of Ulama (Majelis Ulama Indonesia/MUI) in 2021 concerning criteria for blasphemy. Acts of blasphemy and defamation of the Islamic religion are acts of insulting, blaspheming, harassing and other forms of acts that humiliate Allah swt, the Prophet Muhammad saw, the Holy Qur'an, Mahdlah worship such as Prayer, Fasting, Zakat and Hajj, Companions of Rasulullah, sacred symbols and or religious symbols such as the Kaaba, mosques, and the call to prayer. So, the researcher carefully read the transcripts of the JDA podcast with DC and then identified language features that contained elements of insulting, blaspheming, belittling, and demeaning the Islamic religion, which were included in the criteria for blasphemy according to the MUI criteria.

After the statements containing religious blasphemy were obtained, the next step was to analyze the data. The researcher analyzed the lingual features in the data that allegedly contained religious blasphemy regarding meaning, context, intention, and text producer. Thus, it is expected to obtain a thorough understanding of the lingual features suspected of containing religious blasphemy so that it can be determined whether the lingual features indeed contain religious blasphemy. Based on the SFL principle, the data of this study were analyzed from the aspects of the text, meaning, and context, which included the speakers' attitudes, intentions, and socio-cultural background. After that, the researcher interpreted the results of data analysis.

Results

Based on the criteria for blasphemy published by the MUI, it was found that two JDA's speeches allegedly contained blasphemy. Two JDA's speeches allegedly containing blasphemy are presented below.

- (1) *Mangkanya, saya kalau sholat berdoanya berdoanya simpel banget Ya Tuhan.... pakai Bahasa Indonesia aja, karena tuhan kita bukan orang Arab. (So, when I pray, my prayer is very simple. Oh my God.... Just use Indonesian because our God is not an Arab.)*
- (2) *Ya tangan Tuhan, Tuhan kan gak bisa turunkan uang dari langit hanya pada orang-orang yang amanah saja yang bermurah hati. (Oh, God's hand, God can't send money down from the sky only to trustworthy people who are generous.)*

The analysis of the two utterances is presented as follows.

First Utterance: Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (Our God is not An Arab)

Identification of the speech of "*Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (Our God who is not an Arab)*" in data (1) is carried out using semantic analysis, namely an analysis of the

use of the negation—which is part of the adverb—*bukan* ‘not’ and the use of the noun *orang* ‘a person’. Although adverbs are not a core word that can occupy a certain syntactic function, adverb plays an important role in determining the meaning of a sentence. The use of *a bukan* ‘not’ negation in JDA utterances contains three problems as stated below.

First, functionally, negation *bukan* ‘not’ is used to negate nouns (Alwi et al., 2003; Chaer, 2008). Negation *bukan* ‘not’ is usually attached to the constituent that occupies the predicate function. In syntactic analysis, the predicate is anything that describes the subject. Thus, the use of negation *bukan* ‘not’ in the predicate serves to negate the subject in the form of a noun.

Negation *bukan* ‘not’ is used to deny a fact or presupposition (Sudaryono, 1993). If someone uses negation in his speech, he has previously had a presupposition or fact that is believed about something. Thus, if in JDA's speech, JDA uses the negation *bukan* ‘not’, it shows that JDA has a presupposition or fact that is believed about something, namely about God being a person. This analysis is because negation negates presuppositions or facts that are believed.

Second, negation *bukan* ‘not’ is used to make something that was originally true to be false or untrue or to make something that was originally factual become unfactual based on the speaker's presuppositions. Semantically negated constituents can deny other constituents from joining them (Sudaryono, 1983). There are no clear boundaries that can be used to determine denial. However, Givon (1984) reminds us that what is meant by denial is a denial of the truth, factuality, and presuppositions expressed by the interlocutor or the speaker himself.

Linguistically, the utterance of “*Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (Our God is not an Arab)*” can be interpreted that the speaker initially has the presupposition that *our God is an Arab*, then he negates his presupposition so that God becomes a non-Arab. The problem with this is that from the start, the JDA had the presumption that God was a person, and that person was not an Arab. In other words, JDA denies that God is not an Arab, which means that God is a person other than an Arab. Negation *bukan* ‘not’ causes the presupposition that God is an Arab to be denied.

Third, using the negation *bukan* ‘not’ is context-bound under certain conditions. In certain cases, negation *bukan* ‘not’ in an utterance must be accompanied by a context in the form of another utterance to make the sentence's meaning comprehensive. Look at the following example.

Fitri bukan orang Indonesia, melainkan orang Arab. (Fitri is not an Indonesian, but an Arab.)

The sentence above consists of two clauses, namely the first clause, “*Fitri bukan orang Indonesia (Fitri is not an Indonesian)*,” and the second clause, “*melainkan orang Arab (but an Arab)*”. The two clauses in the sentence above are both main clauses. However, the existence of the second clause can serve as a context that completes the understanding of the meaning of the first clause. If only the first clause is presented, the acceptance of the meaning of the first clause can be imagined. However, with the second clause, the meaning of the first clause becomes complete. That is, the second clause

clarifies the meaning of the first clause, which is to show that Fitri is not an Indonesian but an Arab.

From the example above, negation *bukan* 'not' sometimes requires a certain context to clarify the utterance's meaning further. In the utterance of *Tuhan bukan orang Arab* (*God is not an Arab*), we can conclude that JDA assumes God is someone other than Arab.

In addition to analyzing the use of the negation, an analysis of the JDA speech with data (1) was also carried out on the use of the word *orang* 'a/an (person)'. In data speech (1), JDA uses the personification of people to refer to God. Personification is a style of language that compares an object or thing with objects or things that have similarities or similarities in nature (Keraf, 2007).

In Islam, it is believed that God is something that cannot be personified with objects, people, or other things. It is done because humans, objects, or other things do not have the same or similar nature as God. God is God and cannot be equated with other objects or creatures. Therefore, using the personification of people (*orang*) to refer to God will degrade the majesty of God because it places God as having characteristics similar to or the same as humans.

After stating that "*our God is not Arab*", JDA also continued his statement by "*pakai bahasa Indonesia aja/saja (just use Indonesian)*" when praying. This utterance indicates the JDA's reluctance, unwillingness, or sense of needlessness to use Arabic in prayer. The adverb *aja/saja* 'just' also shows that JDA invites the addressee to use Indonesian in prayer. In fact, in Islam, Arabic has a privilege because Arabic is the language of the holy book of Muslims. Although God can understand various languages, for Muslims, Arabic still has a higher position when compared to other languages.

Second Utterance: Tuhan kan gak bisa turunkan uang dari langit (God cannot send money down from the sky)

In data (2), JDA stated as follows. *Ya tangan Tuhan, Tuhan kan gak bisa turunkan uang dari langit hanya pada orang-orang yang amanah saja yang bermurah hati. (Oh, God's hand, God cannot send money down from the sky only to generous and trustworthy people)*. The utterance is also alleged to contain blasphemy of religion with the following analysis.

First, on the personification of *tangan* or 'hands' for God, in his speech, JDA mentions the phrase *tangan Tuhan*, 'the hand of God'. It shows that JDA likens God to humans who have hands. The Qur'an states that Allah—the God to whom the JDA refers—can see. However, being able to see Allah, as mentioned in the Qur'an, is not the same as seeing humans. Although God can see, as humans can see, the concept of "seeing" for the two is different. Therefore, personifying God with humans is inappropriate because, for Muslims, God is sacred and cannot be personified with humans. In other words, Allah—the God that JDA refers to—is negated from various forms of resemblance presented by analogy, symbolization, or representation. The logic of this word implies the impossibility of approaching "God by any name" (Al Fayyadl, 2012).

Second, in the JDA speech in data (2), JDA uses *bisa* 'can'. Alwi et al. (2003) classify *bisa* 'can' as an epistemic modality. *Epistemic modality* is a modality that refers to possibility, predictability, necessity, or certainty. Based on the perspective of Alwi et

al., in this case, the *bisa* 'can' modality is included in the epistemic modality, which refers to the possibility. It means something attached to the word *bisa*, 'can' may or may not be done. The modal *bisa* 'can' is usually attached to the verb.

Based on the perspective, the use of the modality "can" indicate that the degree of certainty is low. This is different from the *pasti* 'definitely' modality, for example, which has a higher degree of certainty. The use of *bisa* 'can' can be used to indicate a low level of trust in something. If a person has a high level of trustworthiness, the modality that can be used is, for example, *pasti* 'definitely' modality.

In data speech (2), the modality *bisa* 'can' is attached to the *tidak* 'no/not' modality. Thus, the series of these two modalities will produce a stronger meaning of disbelief. In data (2), the constituent *tidak bisa* 'cannot', which refers to God's ability to do something, shows that JDA is hesitant or does not believe that God can do something as stated in the predicate of the sentence, namely being able to send down money from the sky (providing sustenance) only to those who are trustworthy and generous.

In speech (2), it is possible that the speech referred to by JDA is an utterance to show that God does not only provide sustenance to safe and generous people. However, using the *bisa* 'can' modality in the speech causes the sentence's meaning to change. Using the *bisa* 'can' modality in the utterance causes the sentence to mean that JDA doubts God's ability. The phrase "*Tuhan gak bisa turunkan uang (God cannot be able to send money down)*" can be interpreted as JDA justifying that God cannot do something as attached to the *tidak bisa* 'cannot' constituent.

Third, in structural linguistic theory, verbs are elements of the universality of language, which are the centre of speech (Mahsun, 2018). The centre of language is in the verb, or the core element of an utterance is in the verb. If it is related to the JDA speech in data (2), the central of the speech is the verb that occupies the predicate of the sentence, which reads *gak/tidak bisa turunkan* 'cannot be able to send down'. The verb *gak bisa turunkan* 'cannot be able to send down' has a negative tone because it contains a "no/not" negation and is attached with a "can" modality. The combination of negation and modality further negates the verb as a predicate filler role, which is the centre of speech. In fact, the predicate is an explanation of the subject. If the predicate is negative, it means that the subject being described is something negative. In the speech data (2), the sentence's subject is God. Thus, something JDA is negative about is God. In other words, the saying "*Tuhan kan ga bisa turunkan uang dari langit hanya pada orang-orang yang amanah saja yang bermurah hati (God cannot send money down from the sky only to trustworthy people who are generous)*" seems to degrade God's power or ability.

Discussion

Elements of intention and awareness in JDA Speech

Philosophically, language is seen as an act (speech acts). As an action, language has a prerequisite, namely, the intention. Human communication is crucially dependent on communicative intentions that exist in speakers' minds and about which addressees make inferences (Haugh, 2008). The intention is related to the goals and activities carried out to achieve them. Therefore, if there is no intention, then the effectiveness of

the action or activity cannot be determined (Mahsun, 2018), likewise, in language. When someone chooses and produces words systematically as a power to express ideas, of course, there is an intention that underlies the selection of these language features. If there is no intention, the language features produced are random and meaningless language features that are difficult for others to understand.

Talking about intentions, Mua'dz, as quoted by Mahsun (2018), states that in the act of speech act, there is an intention to express concepts/ideas (expression intention) that is in the heart or brain (intentional state). The existence of conformity between what is in the heart and what is expressed (expressed) will give birth to honesty in language. On the other hand, if there is a discrepancy between what is in the heart and what is expressed, it will give birth to lies. Therefore, both honesty and lying are intentional phenomena. That is, it is impossible for someone who does not know he is being honest or lying. Furthermore, if someone has expressed his intention in the form of a verbal expression, someone will believe in the truth of his verbal expression, which is accompanied by an intention.

Based on the concept of intention, the JDA statement can be analyzed as follows. The saying "*Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (Our God is not Arab)*" shows that JDA intends to express his thoughts. If what is in JDA's mind is in line with his verbal expression, then JDA's speech is based on certain intentions. Furthermore, if JDA expresses his ideas in the form of verbal expressions, then at the same time, he believes in what he says. In speaking on the podcast, it can be explained that JDA's speech is based on certain intentions. In his speech, JDA claims that God is not an Arab and cannot provide sustenance only to trustworthy people. Someone cannot make such claims if the speech is not done intentionally or consciously. In this case, JDA believes that the verbal expression that he does in the fragment of verbal expression represents the truth that he believes in and expresses with full intention and awareness.

Talking about awareness, JDA speech is done with awareness. This can be seen from the space where the speech occurs. As stated in the previous section, JDA's speech was carried out on a podcast conducted with a public figure. Before the podcast is conducted, the resource person has prepared what will be conveyed and under certain conditions, the interviewer also conveys an outline of the content of the conversation or the questions that will be asked. The resource person can prepare the material to be delivered in the podcast. In fact, the structure of the conversation in podcasts is also in line with the structure of the text in general, which includes the opening, body, and closing. So, a conversation in a podcast is a planned conversation that requires careful and careful planning so that it is impossible if the speech is not based on intention and awareness.

Regarding JDA's intention and awareness in utterances (1) and (2), it has been concluded that these utterances are spoken with the intention and awareness to speak. However, when juxtaposed with other JDA utterances, it can be conveyed that JDA's intention embodied in utterances (1) and (2) is not to desecrate religion, which is done by personifying God with humans. It can be seen from the meaning of JDA's speech. The focus of JDA's speech is to show the contents of JDA's prayer and how JDA prays, namely by using the Indonesian language and not focusing on the personification of God with humans.

In a speech (1), JDA reveals that "*Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (our God is not an Arab)*" in the context of praying. In praying, Muslims can use any language; they do not always have to use Arabic because Allah, the God of Muslims, can understand any language spoken by humans. In speech (2), JDA does not intend to tarnish religion, which is done by personifying God with humans and degrading God's power. JDA's speech can be interpreted as an expression of his heart that God sends sustenance to everyone, not only to trustworthy people. In this speech, JDA wants to mention that God has the power to lower sustenance to anyone.

The absence of an intention to tarnish religion can be seen in the absence of an element of hostility. If JDA's speech is associated with Law no. 1/PNPS/1965 Article 156a, JDA's speech does not contain elements of a hostile nature. If it is associated with other JDA stories in the podcast, JDA emphasizes the importance of maintaining unity. In another story, JDA even believes that his duty as an Indonesian national soldier is to ensure the welfare of the people. Ensuring the welfare of the people also means that the Indonesian National Army (Tentara Nasional Indonesia/TNI) [A2] is tasked with protecting the people and keeping the people feeling calm as citizens. In JDA's speech, there is no visible attempt by JDA to attack Islam. This case differs from the blasphemy case committed by Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok). In the Ahok case, Ahok was proven to have attacked Islam by saying that the Al-Qur'an Surah Al-Maidah verse 51 was used to deceive the public. In this JDA case, there is no evidence of JDA's speech, which is considered to attack Islam.

Context analysis

JDA's speech was conveyed in a conversation with DC. In these speeches, JDA produced utterances that allegedly contained religious blasphemy. If JDA's speech is only seen from linguistic analysis, it can be concluded that the initial (and superficial) conclusion is that DA's speech does indicate an element of religious blasphemy. However, if JDA's speech is interpreted contextually, another perspective is explained below.

The speech "*Tuhan kita bukan orang Arab (Our God is not an Arab)*" is a fragment of JDA's speech. In his full speech, JDA said that when he prayed, JDA used Indonesian because JDA's God was not an Arab, so God understood all the languages used in prayer, including Indonesian. JDA's understanding that God is not an Arab is true because God is God, not a creature and not a human being with ethnicity. However, in the speech, JDA caused controversy by saying that God is not a person because JDA seems to personify God with humans.

JDA's speech must be placed on two sides. First, JDA as an individual. Second, JDA is a member of a group. As an individual, JDA is an Indonesian citizen with the same position as other Indonesian citizens. In this case, JDA is free to express its opinion in the private and public spheres. However, as a group member, it must be realized that JDA is a member of the TNI. As a member of the TNI, JDA is bound by 8 *Military Mandatory* duties, namely (1) being friendly to the people; (2) being polite to the people; (3) upholding the honour of women; (4) maintaining self-respect in public; (5) always be an example in his attitude and simplicity; (6) never harm the people; (7) never frighten and offend the people; and (8) being an example and pioneering efforts to overcome the difficulties of the people around them.

Based on the *8 Military Mandatory*, it can be concluded that the TNI should maintain the integrity of the community. From the *8 Military Mandatory*, it is not found that the TNI's obligation to broadcast religion is found. In the discussion between JDA and DC, it appears that JDA participates in broadcasting religion, namely Islam. Broadcasting Islam is the task of a preacher. The podcast's topic is not religious, so the JDA may not make extensive preparations for discussing religion-related topics. The topic of the podcast is JDA's life journey. In recounting his life journey, JDA said that he always prayed so he could help others. At the time of delivering this statement, the JDA expressed the statement, "Our God is not Arab". The JDA stated that the host's question provoked the statement.

As a Muslim, JDA has the same right to broadcast religion publicly. However, sufficient knowledge is needed to broadcast religion so there is no commotion in the community. JDA's behaviour in broadcasting religion in public spaces without being balanced with deep religious knowledge has surpassed JDA's duties as a member of the TNI.

Element of ignorance

If JDA's speech does not contain elements of blaspheming religion, why does JDA produce speeches that cause controversy in the community? It can be analyzed from the element of JDA's ignorance about the substance of the speech he conveyed.

For Muslims, personifying God with creatures is unjustified because God is not similar and does not have the same characteristics as creatures. In addition, God's attributes are also higher than human traits, so God cannot be personified with humans. It is also inappropriate to think that God is part of a certain ethnic group because, in the Islamic faith, God is not of a tribe or nation. Not only that, in the discussion of the creed of Muslims, God (Allah) is God Almighty. God can do whatever He wills. There is nothing that God cannot do.

In his speech, JDA said as follows.

*"Nah! Itu yang tidak boleh, zaman nabi tidak boleh. Nabi Muhammad waktu perang kemudian ada agama lain itu dihargai, rumah ibadah agama lain betul-betul dihormati, itu zaman nabi. Nabi itu kan yang kita.. **Mas Deddy di islam itu ada tiga yang pertama akidah, syariah, yang ketiga ada akhlak. Akidah itu kan berbicara bagaimana iman kepada Allah, iman kepada rasul, iman kitab dan sebagainya. Syariahnya kan kita syahadat, sholat, zakat, puasa mungghah haji lah yang penting itu akhlaknya yang kita contoh kan akhlaknya Nabi Muhammad ini. Dia jujur dia tidak berbohong dia berbudi pekerti yang luar biasa**"*

*["Here! That is not allowed, the time of the prophet is not allowed. Prophet Muhammad during the war then there were other religions that were respected, houses of worship of other religions were really respected, that was the time of the prophet. The prophet is what we are. **Mas Deddy, in Islam there are three, the first is faith, sharia, and the third is morals. The creed speaks of faith in Allah, faith in apostles, faith in books and so on. The sharia is the creed, prayer, zakat, fasting and hajj, the important thing is the morals that we emulate the character of the Prophet Muhammad. He's honest, he's not lying, he's of great character.**"]*

In the speech above, according to JDA, Islam includes three aspects: *aqidah*, *sharia*, and *morals*. From these three aspects, according to JDA, morality is an important aspect as reflected in the speech "...yang penting akhlaknya... (*...the important thing is*

morality...).” From this speech, JDA is a person who does not make faith an important aspect or makes faith no more important than morality. This view causes JDA to not delve into the Islamic creed, thus causing JDA not to know or understand that it is not allowed to personify Allah with creatures. In addition, because of their ignorance of the Islamic creed, JDA also uttered an utterance that reads, “... *Tuhan kan gak bisa turunkan uang dari langit hanya pada orang-orang yang amanah saja yang bemrurah hati... (... God cannot send money down from the sky only to trustworthy people who are generous...)*” because Allah is almighty and able to do whatever He wants.

In the speech above, JDA also said that "we" (JDA and DC) are examples of Prophet Muhammad's morals. The Prophet Muhammad gave many examples to Muslims in various aspects, not just the moral aspect. JDA's decision to imitate only the moral aspects of the Prophet Muhammad caused him to lack in-depth knowledge of the Islamic religion. Moreover, in another story, JDA advised DC not to be too fanatical in studying religion. If checked into the Big Indonesian Dictionary, fanatic means 'very strong (about belief or belief in a teaching, such as politics and religion)'. It means, if you go back to the definition of *fanatic* as stated in the Great Dictionary of Indonesian, religious fanaticism is normal.

Conclusions

Based on the forensic linguistic analysis of the text of JDA's conversation with DC on the DC podcast that uses SFL theory, it can be concluded that the linguistic evidence does not support the existence of blasphemy in JDA's speech. Based on the analysis conducted, JDA's speech is a manifestation of his insufficient knowledge of religion. With its inadequacy about religion, JDA invites others not to be religious fanatics and invites others not to use Arabic in prayer. It is because of the shallowness of knowledge that JDA is falsely preaching religious teachings.

References

- Adam, H. (2015). *Blasphemy law in muslim-majority countries: Religion-state relationship and rights based approaches in Pakistan, Indonesia and Turkey*. Department of Legal Studies, Central European University.
- Agustina, A., Nurizzati, N., Liusti, S. A., Adek, M., & Rahmi, A. (2020). Light and shadow in hate-speech cases: A forensic linguistics. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Language, Literature, and Education*, 485, 1-22.
- Al Fayyadl, M. (2012). *Teologi negatif Ibn 'Arabi: Kritik metafisika ketuhanan*. LKiS.
- Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, H. & Moeliono, A. (2003). *Tata bahasa baku Bahasa Indonesia [Standard Indonesian Grammar]*. Balai Pustaka.
- Amnesty International (2014). *Prosecuting beliefs, Indonesia's blasphemy law*. Amnesty International Ltd.
- Arsil, D. R., Aziezi, M. T., Syarifah, N., & Abidin, Z. (2018). *Penafsiran terhadap pasal 156a kitab undang-undang hukum pidana tentang penodaan agama (analisis hukum dan hak asasi manusia) [Interpretation of article 156a of the criminal code on blasphemy of religion (law and human rights analysis)]*. Lembaga Kajian dan Advokasi Independensi Peradilan (LeIP) Bekerja sama dengan WSD Handa Center for Human Rights and International Justice Royal Norwegian Embassy in Jakarta dan East West Center.
- Ashraf, S. (2018). Honour, purity and transgression: Understanding blasphemy accusations and consequent violent action in Punjab, Pakistan. *Contemporary South Asia*, 26(1), 51-68.

- Bagir, Z. A. (2017). *Kerukunan dan penodaan agama: Alternatif penanganan masalah [Religious Harmony and Blasphemy: Alternative Problems]*. CRCS (Center for Religious and Cross-cultural Studies), Sekolah Pascasarjana Lintas Disiplin, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Chaer, A. (2008). *Morfologi bahasa Indonesia: Pendekatan proses [Indonesian orphology: Process Approach]*. PT Rineka Cipta.
- Cox, N. (2020). Justifying blasphemy laws: Freedom of expression, public morals, and international human rights law. *Journal of Law and Religion*, 35(1), 33–60. doi:10.1017/jlr.2020.11.
- Crouch, M. (2012). The Indonesian blasphemy case: Affirming the legality of the blasphemy law. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, 2(2), 514-518. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojlr/rws025>.
- Fiss, J. (2016). *Anti-blasphemy offensives in the digital age: When hardliners take over*. The Brookings Institution.
- Gerot, L. & Wignel, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar*. Gerd Stabler, AEE Publishing.
- Givon, T. (1979). *On understanding grammar*. Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. (1992). *Language context and text aspects of language in social semiotic Perspective*. OUP & Deakin University Press.
- Hasani, I. & Halili. (2022). Human rights and constitutionality issues of blasphemy law in indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 19(2), 406–430. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31078/jk1927>.
- Hassan, R. (2004). Expressions of religiosity and blasphemy in modern societies. In *Negotiating the Sacred: Blasphemy and Sacrilege in a Multicultural Society*. ANU E Press. <http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/p35161/mobile/ch11.html>.
- Haugh, M. (2008). Intention in pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5(2), 99-110. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2008.006>
- Ibrahim, M., Abdillah, O., Wicaksono, A. F. & Adriani, M. (2015). *Buzzer detection and sentiment analysis for predicting presidential election results in a twitter nation*. IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW).
- Indonesian Ulema Council. (2021). *Keputusan Ijtima' komisi fatwa se-Indonesia VII*. Sekretariat Komisi Fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia.
- Julius, Q. (2016). The experience of minorities under Pakistan's blasphemy laws. *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations*, 27(1), 95-115.
- Keraf, G. (2007). *Diksi dan gaya bahasa [Diction and language style]*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Law Number 1/PNPS/1965 concerning the prevention of abuse and/or blasphemy of religion.
- Leonard, R.A., Ford, J.E.R., Christensen, T.K. (2017). Forensic linguistics: Applying the science of linguistics to issues of the law. *Hofstra Law Review*; 45(3), 881.
- Lintang, L.C., Martufi, A., & Ouwerker, J.W. (2021). The alternative concepts of blasphemy law in Indonesia: Legal comparison with Ireland and Canada. *Bestuur*, 9(1), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.20961/bestuur.v9i1.51632>.
- Mahsun. (2018). *Linguistik forensik: Memahami forensik berbasis teks dengan analogi DNA [Forensic linguistics: Understanding text-based forensics with DNA analogies]*. Rajawali Pers.
- Majelis Ulama Indonesia. (2021). *Sejarah MUI [MUI's History]*. MUI digital. <https://mui.or.id/sejarah-mui/>
- Meisyanti & Kencana, W. H. (2020). Platform digital siaran suara berbasis on demand (studi deskriptif podcast di Indonesia) [On demand based digital voice broadcasting platform (descriptive study of podcasts in Indonesia)]. *Commed : Jurnal Komunikasi dan Media*, 4(2), 191-207.
- Nasution, H. (2020). Uji keaslian surat tanah dari perspektif linguistik forensik. *International Journal of Forensic Linguistics*, 1(1), 30–39.
- Pew Research Center (2011). *Rising restrictions on religion: one-third of the world's population experiences an increase*. Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life.

- Rani, Putri. (2021). *Viral, Dudung sebut Tuhan bukan orang Arab*. TvOne News. <https://www.tvonenews.com/berita/16735-viral-dudung-sebut-tuhan-bukan-orang-arab>
- Rosmawaty (2011). Tautan konteks situasi dan konteks budaya: Kajian linguistik sistemik fungsional pada cerita terjemahan fiksi "halilian" [Links situational context and cultural context: A functional systemic linguistic study of the "halilian" fiction translated story]. *LIT-ERA*, 10(1), 76-86.
- Socialblade. (2023). Top 100 Youtubers in Indonesia sorted by subscribers. Socialblade. <https://socialblade.com/youtube/top/country/id/mostsubscribed>.
- Suciati, A., Wibisono, A. & Mursanto, P. (2019). *Twitter buzzer detection for Indonesian presidential election*. 3rd International Conference on Informatics and Computational Sciences (ICICoS).
- Sudaryono (1993). *Negasi dalam bahasa indonedia: Suatu tinjauan sintaksis dan semantik [Negation in indonesian: An overview of syntax and semantics]*. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Tanjung, E. & Sari, R.R.N. (2022). *Jenderal Dudung dilaporkan gara-gara Tuhan bukan orang Arab, MUI: Doa bisa pakai bahasa daerah masing-masing*. <https://www.suara.com/news/2022/02/10/195146/jenderal-dudung-dilaporkan-gara-gara-tuhan-bukan-orang-arab-mui-doa-bisa-pakai-bahasa-daerah-masing-masing>.
- Telle, K. (2018). Faith on trial: Blasphemy and 'lawfare' in Indonesia. *Athnos: Journal of Anthropology*, 83(2), 371-391.
- Uddin, A. T. (2011). Blasphemy laws in muslim-majority countries. *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 9(2), 47-55.
- US Comission on International Religious Freedom, 2017. *Respecting rights? Measuring the world's blasphemy law*.
- Van Dijk, P. & Hacker, K. (2013). *Digital democracy: Issues of theory and practice*. SAGE Publication.
- Wibisono, S., Louis, W. & Jett, J. (2022). Willingness to engage in religious collective action: the role of group identification and identity fusion. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 1-14.
- Wiratno, T. (2018). *Pengantar ringkas linguistik sistemik fungsional [Brief introduction to functional systemic linguistics]*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- YLBHI (2020). *Laporan YLBHI tentang penodaan agama Januari-Mei 2020 [YLBHI report on blasphemy of religion January-May 2020]*. Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia.