JELTAL
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Hate Speech against the Bima Tribe: A Semantic Study in Perspective for Forensic Linguistics

Falesul Akbar[1] ✉ and Zamzani[2]

[1]Faculty of Languages, Arts, and Culture, State University of Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Professor, Faculty of Language, Arts, and Culture, State University of Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: Falesul Akbar, **E-mail**: falesulakbar.2021@student.uny.ac.id

| **ABSTRACT**

Language is one of the legal evidence tools that requires the field of linguistics to dissect disputed languages. The disputed language is inseparable from its ambiguous nature. Therefore, it is important that the language in question be analysed linguistically to help provide evidence in the judicial process. This paper aims to analyse speech as legal evidence. The study uses the methods of listening, recording, and using semantic approaches and forensic linguistics. The use of the listen-and-record method is necessary because the data is sourced from Saifudin Ibrahim's audio-visual video on Facebook and YouTube. The results of this study show that speech that has lexical meaning, such as people, humans, nations, or Bima, is speech that is directly intended by SI for its interlocutors. While the interlocutor referred to by SI is mentioned with words that are included in the referential meaning, such as the regent, his inferiority, Bima people, and brain, he is unable to express words or phrases referred to by SI as objects of discussion about his interlocutors. First, SI speech falls into several categories, primarily speech that attacks the honour of the Bima community by giving a negative assessment of the Bima community leader. Second, spreading fake news related to Bima society in the context of family and social psychology. Three utterances contain insults to the Bima tribe by degrading the ability or competence of the Bima people.

1. Introduction

The development of communication media gives freedom to each individual to express themselves and is able to play an important role in the exchange of information over long distances. Indonesia is one of the countries where communication media users continue to surge every year. This is corroborated by a survey conducted by the Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association (APJII) in Indonesia: internet users in 2020 will have reached 196.7 million, or 73.7% of the Indonesian population, who have become Internet users in the second quarter of 2020 (Beritasatu.com, 2020). The development of communication media makes everything easy so that the source and presenter of information also increase greatly in messages. The spread of information on social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and other social media applications causes various new problems for people in various circles. According to McLuhan, in the use of social media, cyber society tends to prioritise the content of messages rather than the source and truth of the messages received (Rahmat, 2022).

The increasing number of social media users in Indonesia has also increased public awareness of the freedom to express themselves through social media, such as expressing themselves in response to various issues that indirectly provide a way for criminal acts of insult or hate speech that cause hatred and hostility between certain individuals or groups (Forrester et al., 2016). The negative influence of social media, by itself, unwittingly changes the mindset and behaviour of people in human civilization globally (Suhariyanto, 2014, p. 2). Indonesia as a legal state has regulations that regulate hate speech in the form of legislation, namely Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information

and Transactions (UUITE) in Article 28 Paragraph (2), which states: "any person who intentionally and without rights disseminates information aimed at causing hatred or hostility between individuals and/or certain groups of people based on ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group (SARA)" (Working Committee of the R-KUHP DPR RI, 2017, p. 44). The ITE Law is expected to control the public's use of social media wisely without limiting people's rights to express opinions in public (Hasibuan, 2018).

Hate speech through digital platforms in delivering narratives causes a lot of bias in opinion, causing conflicts (Ardhianti & Indayani, 2022). Hate speech on social media, especially Facebook, has become a case that has recently occurred with perpetrators from various circles of ordinary people, artists (public figures), and officials (Permatasari & Subyantoro, 2020). Hate speech is one of the criminal acts that use language, commonly referred to as language crimes, to attack a person's psyche, resulting in noise, trouble, and peace between individuals or groups (Taufiq et al., 2023; Tis'ah, 2022; Wulandari et al., 2021). In this case, forensic linguistics is here to help provide information that can be explained to identify the profile of perpetrators of crimes and how perpetrators commit language crimes, such as crimes, by spreading hate speech to certain individuals or groups (Mahsun, 2018).

Forensic linguistics analyses language phenomena related to legal cases, case examinations, or personal disputes related to several parties, resulting in legal action (Olsson, 2008). This study wants to analyse the phenomenon of hate speech carried out by Rev. Saifudin Ibrahim. In this case, hate speech is one of the important legal evidence tools to be analysed in forensic linguistics. Because analysing hate speech included in legal evidence can help give judges consideration in determining judicial decisions, Judicial decisions can be made fairly if the legal evidence is not ambiguous. Therefore, forensic linguistics exists to help reveal the ambiguity of grammatical meaning and the ambiguity of lexical meaning in complex language (Coulthard, 2016). In addition, complex language phenomena are seen not only from the lexical, grammatical, and referential sides but also in other elements, such as vowel elements: changes in sound, intonation, and volume (Klein, 2018).

In this study, the hate speech committed by Saifudin Ibrahim (SI) against the Bima tribe was motivated by the report of Firdaus Oiwobo, S.H. (FO), for blasphemy cases (deletion of 300 verses in the Quran) registered in TBL/B/526/III/2022/SPKT/POLRES TANGERANG SELATAN/POLDAMETRO JAYA. Therefore, Saifudin Ibrahim was reported again by Arif Rahman Hakim, S.H., M.H. (ARH), for a case of hate speech against the people of Bima (NTB, 2022; Simalungun, 2022). In this case, the application of forensic linguistics is needed to analyse speech transcribed in text form using semantic approaches, namely lexical semantics, grammatical semantics, and referential semantics. This analysis was carried out to enlighten the meaning of the disputed language in order to provide clarity of meaning to facilitate the process of consideration in court decisions. Hate speech is an important phenomenon to understand and realise because it can have a negative impact on relationships between individuals and trigger social conflicts (Klein, 2018). A disputed utterance will become an increasingly continuous conflict if the ambiguity of the utterance is not understood on the basis of analysis (Safaah et al., 2020). Hate speech cases are not only found in Indonesia; there are many similar cases in other parts of the world.

The data used in this study, namely Saifudin Ibrahim's speech, was used as legal evidence. This data was accessed on Facebook social media, which had been trending among the Bima community some time ago. Based on the description above, the purpose of the study entitled Lexical, Grammatical, and Referential Meanings in Hate Speech Against the Bima Tribe: Semantic Studies in a Forensic Linguistic Perspective is, namely, (1) analysing speech using a semantic approach to provide clarity of meaning that is ambiguous in speech, (2) providing an overview of the form and form of lexical, grammatical, and referential meanings, and (3) providing information that can be used as consideration for decisions in the trial.

2. Literature Review

Lexical meaning is a meaning not bound by other meanings, meaning lexical meaning that is lexically able to provide explanations for meaningful lexemes or language units (Kisworo & Hardivizon, 2020; Siahaan et al., 2022). In addition, lexical meaning is a meaning that has not undergone a grammatical relationship or has not undergone affixation. Therefore, lexical meaning has a role in connecting language, words, and sentences in the language itself. Lexical meaning in language is an unchangeable meaning (Sumiyati et al., 2022; Yanti et al., 2021). If lexical meaning is related to the meaning of language units or lexemes that have not undergone grammatical relationships, then the grammatical meaning is a meaning that is present due to grammatical processes such as affixation, reduplication, and composition to express grammatically nuanced meanings (Chaer Abdul, 2013, p. 62; Nafinuddin, 2020). Furthermore, grammatical meaning is also called structural meaning because grammatical meaning is conveyed through the order of words contained in the language level (Feist, 2022; Rafiek & Effendi, 2022). Grammatical meaning is the basic meaning of a word that changes into a new meaning after passing through a morphophonemic process (Nordquists, 2019; Rafiek & Effendi, 2022). Referential meaning is a meaning that clearly has references, both exophorical (situational) and endophoric (textual) (Arifianti & Wakhidah, 2020, p. 10). Referential meaning refers to the form of objects, symptoms, and events (Butarbutar et al., 2023; Nafinuddin, 2020).

Research related to forensic linguistics has been carried out by previous researchers. More specifically, analyses that review hate speech as well as similar studies that use forensic linguistic approaches by referencing a variety of perspectives, like research conducted by Suryani et al. (2021) entitled "Forensic Linguistics of Hate Speech against Artist Aurel Hermansyah on Instagram Social Media". The focus of this study

is to describe the forms of illocution-perlocutionary speech acts, taboo sentences, and hate speech by account owners @mantanaurelhermansyah using pragmatic analysis. The results of the study found that directive illocutionary speech acts were in the categories of asking, commissive illocutions offering, and expressive illocutions expressing feelings. In the taboo sentence data, there are taboo sentences for sexual harassment and containing hate speech in the category of inciting and spreading fake news, resulting in perlocutions from the hate speech. Atta Halillinta gave bad comments and tried to find out the owner of the account. The next research was conducted by Permatasari and Subyantoro (2020), entitled "Facebook Hate Speech in 2017–2019." This study aims to analyse the form of hate speech on Facebook by Ahmad Dhani Prasetyo (ADP). This research uses a pragmatic theory approach to analysing data. The results of this study found hate speech in the form of provocation, incitement, insult, defamation, and hate speech in the form of spreading fake news. Another study was conducted by Ibrahim et al. (2022) entitled "An Explainable AI Model for Hate Speech Detection on Indonesian Twitter". The focus of this study is to compare the Explanable IA Model with Local Interpretable Model Agnostic Explanations (LIME) in automatically detecting hate speech on Indonesian Twitter. The conclusion of this study is that Local Interpretable Model Agnostic Explanations (LIME) combined with XGBoost are able to provide the most logical results.

A forensic linguistics study was also conducted by Ramadan S. (2021) with the title "Indonesian Netizens' Hate Speech in the Indonesian Celebgram Instagram Comments Column: A Forensic Linguistic Study." The focus of this research is analysing the hate speech of Indonesian netizens in the Instagram column of Rahmawati Kekey Putri Cantika. The results showed four implications, namely the implication of wanting to insult and blaspheme, the implication of feeling upset and angry, the implication of giving a warning, and the implication of wanting to provoke, which is generally valid and stated as hate speech, as stated in Article 27 paragraph (3) of Article 45 paragraph (1) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 9/2016 concerning the limitation of Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions (ITE). A forensic linguistics study was also conducted by Subuki et al. (2023) with the title "Construction of Arguments for Gunung Sitoli District Court Decision No. 07/Pid. B/2013/PN-GS: Forensic Linguistic Studies". The focus of the study is the construction of arguments for court decisions related to criminal justice as an argumentative text, with all legal considerations being the basis for dictums. The conclusion of this study shows that the claim of being deserving of the death penalty can be said to be bad from the point of view of argumentation theory because the criteria of "valid and convincing" and "planned and together" cannot be fulfilled argumentatively. In addition, forensic linguistics studies were also conducted by Sharbina and Setiawan (2022) entitled "Analysis of Hoax Texts Around Bank Information: Language Studies Perspectives on Critical Discourse Analysis and Forensic Linguistics". The purpose of this study is to find out if a text contains hoaxes or facts using the discourse analysis of criticism approach. The conclusion of the study shows that there are elements of lies and manipulation, so the news is said to be a hoax and can be used as legal evidence.

Based on previous research, in general, it has relevance to this research, which is both examining spoken and written language related to the realm of law. The difference between this study and the previous one is that some previous studies used a pragmatic approach as a review of analysis, while this study specifically focused on analysis using a semantic approach, namely lexical semantics, grammatical semantics, and referential semantics in the language used as legal evidence. This research is important because research on hate speech analysis using semantic approaches (lexical, grammatical, and referential) has not been widely conducted. Therefore, this research is expected to be able to contribute references to other relevant research.

3. Methodology
This research is qualitative descriptive research, which uses semantic approaches and forensic linguistics. This type of qualitative descriptive research allows researchers to present systematic, factual, and accurate data regarding the use of disputed language (Subyantoro, 2019). The theory used in this study uses semantic theory, namely lexical semantics, grammatical semantics, and referential semantics, as a basis for speech meaning analysis. While the forensic linguistics approach is used as a basis for grouping meanings that are identified as unlawful speech, In descriptive research, the implementation stage that must be passed is the stage of providing data, data analysis, and presenting or formulating the results of data analysis (Mahsun, 2017).

The source of the research data is a video of Saifudin Ibrahim's speech shared via Facebook social media (Facebook, 2022). The data collection method is carried out through listening and recording techniques. In this case, researchers listen to speech and record the content of the speech contained in the video as a form of data transcription into text form (Mahsun, 2017, p. 276). After the recording process, researchers collect data, classify it, and interpret it to obtain an overview of the research problem. Data analysis is carried out in several stages, namely: (1) the data reduction stage, which involves grouping data related to the research focus; (2) the stage of presenting data narratively so that it is easy to understand; and (3) the conclusion stage, which involves drawing conclusions from the results of data reduction and data presentation (Subyantoro, 2019).

4. Results and Discussion
Semantics exists as a foothold for meaning-rich language analysis. The composition of language produced in the public sphere is not always interpreted as the intention intended by speakers. Every human being in the public sphere has varying logic and language skills. This makes it possible for everyone to have different perceptions, responses, and meanings when understanding speech (Saifullah, 2018; Trott & Bergen,

2022). Therefore, semantics exists to classify meaning on the basis of semantic theory analysis, namely lexical, grammatical, and referential semantics. In this case, the meaning of the disputed language is important enough to be classified so that it is not ambiguous and used as a basis for court decisions. The following is a transcription of SI speech after the data classification or data reduction stage.

Table 1
Saifudin Ibrahim of Speech

No	Data	Types of Meanings
1.	Mulai dari bupatinya, sampai orang rendahannya.	**1**
	Starting from the regent to his lowly people.	
	a/mulai dari/	Grammatical
	b/bupatinya/	Grammatical & Referential
	c/sampai/	Referential
	d/orang/	Lexical
	e/rendahanya itu/	Grammatical & Referential
2.	Orang Bima itu, manusia emosional.	**2**
	Bima people are emotional human beings.	
	a/orang/	Lexical
	b/bima itu/	Referential
	c/manusia	Lexical
	d/emosional/	Lexical
3.	Biasalah pengacara Bima, paling cari istri.	**3**
	Usually, Bima's lawyer is looking for a wife.	
	a/Biasalah/	Grammatical
	b/Pengacara Bima/	Referential
	c/Paling cari istri/	Referential
4.	Gak ada orang Bima yang istrinya satu, kalau gak tiga ya lima.	**4**
	There is no Bima man whose wife is one, if not three, yes, five.	
	a/Gak ada/	Lexical
	b/orang Bima/	Referential
	c/yang istrinya satu/	Referential / Grammatical
	d/kalau gak tiga/	Referential
	e/ya lima/	Referential
	f/itu orang Bima	Referential

The utterance "*from the regent to his inferiors*" has several kinds of meanings. The phrase '*starting from*' belongs to the type of grammatical meaning because it has the root word 'beginning, which means the earliest, and then undergoes the process of affixation by adding the suffix -i to 'begin, which grammatically means the beginning '*to the end*'. Next, the word *begin* stands parallel to the lexeme 'of, which means to sort or line up something that has a *beginning and an end*. Furthermore, there is the word '*regent*' in data 1b, which has a meaning in the grammatical category. In accordance with the opinion (Hutagalung, 2022), one of the characteristics of grammatical meaning is the process of affixation. The affixation process in the word *regent* is a combination of the root word '*bupati,* which means a designation for someone who serves as the head of the regency area, which is then attached to the suffix –*nya*, which means referring to ownership. Therefore, the word 'regent' refers to someone who leads the district area and has people to lead.

Furthermore, the word 'until' is included in the referential category because it refers to the previous phrase, namely 'starting from, which can be interpreted as the initial level that has an end. Furthermore, the word 'person' is included in the lexical category, meaning people in a country (Language and Book Development Agency, 2016). In addition, the phrase 'lowly' belongs to the category of referential rammatical usage. The grammatical process occurs in the word 'low'. In this case, the root word 'low, which means despicable or nista, undergoes a morphophonemic process of adding the suffix -*nya* 'his' after the root word lowly becomes 'low'. One of the functions of the suffix '-*nya*' is to express ownership that certainly has a reference, so the lowness can be interpreted as the level attached to sreference(a reference) in the category of despicable. So in data 1, namely, '*starting from the regent to his inferior person, it* can refer to the entire Bima community. In this case, the word lowly has a negative connotation,

meaning that SI pinned on the Bima people by attacking their honour from the highest to the lowest structure.

Data 2, namely, *'Bima people are emotional humans',* In data 2a, the word *'people'* is included in the lexical semantic category, which can be interpreted as a group of social beings that inhabit an area. Then, a question arises. Who and where is the person mentioned by this SI? The answer is found in data 2b, namely *'Bima it'*. In the semantic category, the phrase *'Bima itu'* belongs to the referential meaning that refers to a group of entis inhabiting the east of Sumbawa Island in West Nusa Tenggara. Furthermore, in data 2c, there is the word 'human, which is interpreted as a creature that has reason. If correlated with the previous phrase, the humans mentioned by SI are humans who belong to the *'Bima ethnicity'*. The problem presented by SI regarding Bima ethnicity is emotional on 2D data. The word *'emosional'* grammatically comes from the root word *'emotion,* which means a feeling that develops in a short time (emotion). The root word *'emotion'* gets the addition of the suffix *'"-onal'* to *'emotional,* which semantically changes the meaning of the word into a feeling full of emotion or irritability possessed by a person in relation to the law. It cannot be proven to be true that the Bima people have an irritable nature. Therefore, SI tells a lie about the Bima ethnicity in the public domain.

The words in data 3, namely *'usually Bima's lawyer is most looking for a wife', and* The word *'habituated'* in data 3a are categorised according to its grammatical meaning. Starting from the root word *'ordinary,* which undergoes a morphophonemic process, adding the suffix '-lah' to the word ordinary ''changes the meaning of the word into something that cannot be separated from everyday life. In data 3b, *'Bima lawyer'* referentially refers to a profession owned by the Bima people. In the phrase *'Bima lawyer,* SI indirectly refers to the information that SI has a conflict with lawyers from Bima. Conflicts between individuals are not avoided in every social activity, but there are things that must be considered in acting in speech, such as teaching something related to a certain tribe or ethnicity, which raises other larger conflicts. The emergence of certain ethnicities in speech gives rise to other views for everyone.

Data 4, *'There is no Bima man with one wife, if not three, yes five,* is generally dominated by referential semantics; the only data in the lexical semantic category is the phrase *'none'*. The phrase *'nothing'* is a denial of the previous statement. Furthermore, SI clarified its statement by adding the phrase *'Bima people'*, which refers to something that Bima people do not have. Something that Bima people do not have in the context of SI speech is a wife of no less than two people. This is supported by the phrase *'whose wife is one'*. The existence of an affixation process on the word *'wife'* attached to the suffix 'his' changes the meaning of the word, which refers to the circumstances or events under which Bima society has more than one wife. Furthermore, SI speech is further emphasised by the phrase *'if not three, yes five'*.

The SI statement refers to the number of wives in the previous statement. In addition to affirming his statement regarding the number of wives, SI also emphasised the object of his speech with the phrase Bima people. The SI utterances in Data 4 are generally unverifiable. In this case, the phrase Bima people indirectly refers to the entire Bima society. Meanwhile, in the previous statement, SI's speech related to the number of wives only refers to Bima people whose profession is law, one of which is Firdaus (whistleblower). SI speech does not have a clear correlation of meaning; here, the researcher concludes two conclusions: (1) all lawyers in Bima have more than one wife; (2) all the Bima people have more than one wife. SI's speech is certainly not based on facts because not all Bima lawyers have more than one wife, and not all Bima people have more than one wife. In this case, SI's speech is a lie that greatly lowers the dignity of the Bima tribe.

Table 2
Saifudin Ibrahim Speech

No	Data	Types of Meanings
5.	Emang bangsa bikin gak punya malu. The nation makes you feel no shame.	**1**
	a/emang/	Lexical
	b/bangsa/	Referential
	c/bikin/	Lexical
	d/gak punya/	Lexical
	e/malu/	Lexical
6.	Orang bima gak punya malu. Bima people have no shame.	**2**
	a/orang Bima/	Referential
	b/gak punya/	Lexical
	c/malu/	Lexical
7.	Bima tak punya malu, di Quran-nya ada. Bima has no shame; in his Quran there is.	**3**

	a/bima/	Lexical
	b/tak punya/	Lexical
	c/malu/	Lexical
	d/di Quran-nya ada	Grammatical
8.	Otak orang Bima ngaku turunan raja Bima.	**4**
	The brain of the Bima people claims to be descended from the king of Bima.	
	a/otak/	Referential
	b/orang Bima/	Referential
	c/ngaku/	Lexical
	d/turunan/	Grammatical
	e/raja Bima/	Referential
9.	Saya turunan Yesus, beda sama turunan kamu, pantas gak mampu.	**5**
	I am a descendant of Jesus, different from yours, deserving of incompetence.	
	a/saya/	Lexical
	b/turunan Yesus/	Referential
	c/beda/	Lexical
	d/sama kamu/	Lexical
	e/pantas/	Lexical l
	f/gak mampu/	Referential

Based on the analysis in Table 2, data 5a, namely the word '*emang*, is lexically derived from the word '*indeed*'. The use of word *emang* is a diction that often appears in casual conversations without any change in meaning. Lexically, the word *emang* means affirmation to state the truth beforehand. In data 5b, the word '*nation*' refers to the Bima tribe, whose meaning has a correlation with the previous statement. In addition, SI also confirmed its statement regarding the Bima tribe. This can be seen in the use of the word '*make*, which is lexically interpreted as something that has been done or said to be true. The truth of his statement is further clarified by SI with the phrase do not have. The phrase '*don't have*' is lexically interpreted as something that is not owned. Something that Bima people do not have, according to SI, is '*shame*', as asserted by data 5e. The word '*shy*' is lexically interpreted as reluctant to do something because you feel embarrassed. Therefore, the statement in data 5 means '*the Bima people really have no shame*'. This is an insult to the Bima people because SI's speech is not in accordance with the culture that develops in Bima society.

Furthermore, in data 6, the Bima people's speech 'has no shame' in general, which confirms the previous statement. The phrase '*Bima people*' still very clearly refers to the Bima people. Another affirmation made by SI with the phrase 'do not have, which lexically does not belong to the Bima people and which the Bima people do not have in SI speech, is a sense of reluctance, fear, and malaise in doing something that is not within their rights and obligations as a cultured society. The speech in data 6 confirms data 5: that the behaviour of Bima people does not reflect a cultured society that respects each other. Furthermore, in data 7, namely, '*Bima has no shame; in the Quran alone there is',* As a native Bima person, SI certainly knows very well the culture of the Bima people, who are strong and thick in Islam. Therefore, the mention of the word '*Quran*' refers to the life guidelines of the Bima people who follow Islam. In this case, SI correlates the verse of the Quran with a reflection of the life of the Bima tribe without foundation, with the intention of mocking the Bima people.

Further to data 8*, 'The brain of the Bima people, claiming descent from the king of Bima',* The word '*brain*' refers to the abilities possessed by the Bima people (8b). Furthermore, the word '*ngaku*' is lexically interpreted as recognition or self-regard. SI indirectly confirms that there is one Bima person who claims or considers himself to be a descendant (8d) of the king of Bima (8e). Lexically, the word '*derivative*' comes from the root word descending, which means moving downward. After undergoing a morphophonemic process, the addition of the suffix '"-*an*' to '*derivative*' changes the meaning of the word into a genetic process, which in this case is to produce children. Data 9, 'I am a descendant of Jesus, different from you, and deserve not to be able'. The word '*I*' in data 9a is interpreted as a person who speaks, namely Saifudin Ibrahim, who has a genetic relationship with the messiah or saviour of the world through the utterance '*derivative of Jesus*'. In this case, SI makes a difference with Firdaus, who is only a descendant of the '*king of Bima*, who once led the Bima area. The word '*different*' is lexically interpreted as an unbalanced difference between two variables. SI asserts that unequal differences occur in ability through '*appropriate*' speech. Furthermore, SI clarifies the meaning of his speech with the phrase '*incapable*'.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of semantic analysis, SI speech lexically intends to convey the meaning of its speech straightforwardly about something referred to, such as 'person', 'man', 'nation', 'bima', and 'shy, which are words that correspond to the dictionary meaning. Furthermore, grammatically, such as the words 'derivative', 'habitual', and 'Quran', In general, SI speech grammatically occupies a collective noun. In addition, words that have grammatical meaning can also have referential meaning because they refer to an object, such as 'his regent', 'inferior', and 'wife'. Based on the results of referential semantic analysis, SI provides clarity related to what SI refers to regarding circumstances, such as 'regent', 'inferior', 'nation', 'Bima people', 'brain', and 'incapable'.

Based on the results of the analysis that has been carried out, namely lexical, grammatical, and referential semantic analysis, SI speech contains several aspects related to the legal realm. Semantic analysis is carried out to provide information or clarity of meaning in SI speech so that SI speech can be used as legal evidence. The language that has clarity of meaning and is not biased in meaning will easily provide information and ease the legal process. In this case, SI speech is included in several categories of speech: (1) speech that attacks the honour of the Bima people by providing an assessment of regional leaders and Bima society in general; (2) speech spreading false news related to Bima society in the context of family and social psychology in Bima society. (3) speech containing insults to the Bima tribe with a speech that degrades the ability of the Bima people.

This research can be used as a reference in making judges' decisions in court. The existence of various statements and purported statements of the defendant described through linguistic analysis is expected to be able to provide information to assist the judge in handing down the verdict without any party being harmed. This research, hopefully, will provide motivation and can be used as a reference for future researchers. The phenomenon of ambiguous language as legal evidence can harm the accused and victims if legal evidence does not go through the process of assessment or analysis with a forensic linguistic approach. The limitations of this study are that it only looks at the speech based on the context of the sentence; the researchers do not look at the background and context of situations occurring in speech from the speaker's side with the sociopragmatic theory. Socio-pragmatic theory is very effective in looking at the relationship between society and the individual that affects language. Therefore, it is expected of future researchers not just to look at language based on the context of sentences. However, it's important to look at the social context and the background of the act.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Ardhianti, M., & Indayani, I. (2022). Tuturan yang Berdampak Hukum Ditinjau dari Elemen dan Fungsi Konteks Kultural di Media Sosial Tik-Tok Indonesia. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa …*, *8*(1), 143–159. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v8i1.19235

[2] Arifianti, I., & Wakhidah, K. (2020). *Semantik: Makna Refersnsial dan Makna Nonreferensial* (Hamidulloh Ibda (ed.)). CV. Pilar Nusantara.

[3] Badan Pengembangan Bahasa dan Perbukuan. (2016). *KAMUS BESAR BAHASA INDONESIA EDISI V* (V). Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. https://github.com/yukuku/kbbi4

[4] Beritasatu.com. (2020). *PJII: Pengguna Internet di Indonesia Capai 196,7 Juta*. https://www.beritasatu.com/digital/696577/apjii-pengguna-internet-di-indonesia-capai-1967-juta

[5] Butarbutar, R. M., Ernanda, & Izar, J. (2023). Analisis Makna Referensial dan Nonreferensial dalam Umpasa Batak Toba. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*, *1*(3), 305–312. https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/kal/article/view/23277

[6] Chaer Abdul. (2013). *Pengantar Semantik Bahasa Indonesia*. PT. Rineka Cipta.

[7] Coulthard, M. (2016). An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics. In *Cenveo Publisher Services* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315630311

[8] Facebook. (2022). Saifudin IBrahim Menghina Suku Bima. In *Facebook.com*. sumber: https://www.facebook.com/deanana.dae.1/videos/1493340704415449/

[9] Feist, J. (2022). *Significance in language: A theory of semantics*. Routledge. https://doi.org/:10.4324/9781003259381

[10] Forrester, J., Zimmerma, A., & Finla, L. (2016). An Opportunity Missed? A Constitutional Analysis of Proposed Reforms to Tasmania's "Hate Speech" Laws. *He Western Australian Jurist*, *7*, 275–376. http://www.murdoch.edu.au/School-of-Law/Our-Research/Journals/The-Western-Australian-Jurist/Publications/Volume-7-2016/

[11] Hasibuan, Z. (2018). Penyebaran Ujaran Kebencian dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana Islam. *Adliya: Jurnal Hukum Dan Kemanusiaan*, *12*(2), 184–203. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15575/adliya.v12i2.4497

[12] Hutagalung, W. (2022). Analisis Semantik Puisi Penerimaan Karya Chairil Anwar. *EUNOIA (Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia)*, *2*(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.30821/eunoia.v2i1.1322

[13] Ibrahim, M. A., Arifin, S., Gusti Agung Anom Yudistira, I., Nariswari, R., Abdillah, A. A., Murnaka, N. P., & Prasetyo, P. W. (2022). An Explainable AI Model for Hate Speech Detection on Indonesian Twitter. *CommIT Journal*, *16*(2), 175 – 182. https://doi.org/10.21512/commit.v16i2.8343

[14] Kisworo, B., & Hardivizon, H. (2020). Telaah Leksikal, Gramatikal, dan Kontekstual Terhadap Makna Kata Syahida pada QS. Al-Baqarah ayat 185. *AL QUDS: Jurnal Studi Alquran Dan Hadis*, *4*(1), 163. https://doi.org/10.29240/alquds.v4i1.1473

[15] Klein, G. B. (2018). Applied Linguistics to Identify and Contrast Racist 'Hate Speech': Cases from the English and Italian Language. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, *2*(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2018.36855

[16] Mahsun. (2017). Metode Penelitian Bahasa. In *DEPOK*. Rajawali Press.

[17] Mahsun. (2018). *Linguistik Forensik: Memahami Forensik Berbasis teks Dalam Analogi DNA*. Rajawali Press.

[18] Nafinuddin, S. (2020). *Pengantar Semantik (Pengertian, Hakikat, dan Jenis)*. osf.io. https://osf.io/b8ws3/download

[19] Nordquists, R. (2019). *Lexical Meaning (Words): Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms*. ThoughtCo. https://www.thoughtco.com/lexical-meaning-words-1691048

[20] NTB, S. (2022). *Peguyuban Bima Dompu Demo Di Jabodetabek Tuntut Pendeta Saifuddin Ibrahim Di Hukum Seberat-beratnya*. Sentralntb. Id. https://www.sentralntb.id/2022/03/peyuguban-bima-dompu-demo-di.html

[21] Olsson, J. (2008). Forensic linguistics. In *Continuum International Publishing Group* (Vol. 9). Continuum.

[22] Panitia Kerja R-KUHP DPR RI. (2017). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik* (pp. 1–38). https://doi.org/LN.2008/NO.58, TLN No.4843, LL SETNEG: 25 HLM

[23] Permatasari, D. I., & Subyantoro. (2020). UJARAN KEBENCIAN FACEBOOK TAHUN 2017-2019. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, *9*(1), 62–70. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/jsi.v9i1.33020

[24] Rafiek, M., & Effendi, H. R. (2022). A Semantic Analysis of the Fishery Vocabulary of the Hulu Dialect of Banjarese. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *9*(3), 1256 – 1282. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i3.24750

[25] Rahmat, G. R. (2022). Pola Komunikasi Komunitas Virtual ICB dalam Meminimalisasi Hoaks. *Academic Journal of Da'wa and Communication*, *3*(2), 264–290. https://doi.org/10.22515/ajdc.v3i2.5302

[26] Ramadani S, F. (2021). Ujaran Kebencian Netizen Indonesia dalam Kolom Komentar Instagram Selebgram Indonesia: Sebuah Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *AKSARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *22*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.23960/aksara.v22i1.pp1-19

[27] Safaah, T. N., Andayani, A., & … (2020). Makna Leksikal, Gramatikal dan Kontekstual pada Slogan Kementerian Kelautan dan Perikanan (Studi Makna dan Relevansinya sebagai Bahan Ajar Linguistik). *JP-BSI (Jurnal …*, *5*(1), 18–26. https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.26737/jp-bsi.v5i1.1469

[28] Saifullah, A. R. (2018). *Semantik dan Dinamika Pergulatan Makna*. Bumi Aksara.

[29] Shabrina, S. N., & Setiawan, T. (2022). Analisis Teks Hoaks Seputar Informasi Bank: Kajian Bahasa Perspektif Analisis Wacana Kritis dan Linguistik Forensik. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan …*, *8*(2), 492–507. https://doi.org/hhttps://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v8i2.21478

[30] Siahaan, N. M., Turnip, K. P., Simanjuntak, F. S., & Barus, F. L. (2022). Analisis Makna Leksikal Pada Slogan-Slogan di SMP Negeri 35 Medan. *Kode: Jurnal Bahasa*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.24114/kjb.v11i2.35941

[31] Simalungun, K. (2022). *Hina Suku Bima! Arif Rahman Hakim: Polri Segera Tangkap Pdt. Intoleran Saifudin Ibrahim*. Kabarsimalungun.Com. https://kabarsimalungun.com/hina-suku-bima-arif-rahman-hakim-polri-segera-tangkap-pdt-intoleran-saefudin-ibrahim/

[32] Subuki, M., Sholeha, M., Hudaa, S., & … (2023). Konstruksi Argumentasi Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Gunung Sitoli No. 07/Pid. B/2013/PN-GS: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *KEMBARA: Jurnal …*, *9*(1), 492–507. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v8i2.21478

[33] Subyantoro, S. (2019). *Sumbangsih Kajian Bahasa dalam Penegakan HUKUM*. *1*(3), 36–50. http://jurnal.unw.ac.id:1254/index.php/AIJ/article/view/141

[34] Suhariyanto, B. (2014). *Tindak Pidana Teknologi Informasi (CIBERCRIME)*. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

[35] Sumiyati, C., Malik, A., & Lestari, D. (2022). ANALISIS MAKNA LEKSIKAL SYAIR ZAPIN MELAYU AKHIR ZAMAN KECAMATAN KUTE SIANTAN, KABUPATEN KEPULAUAN ANAMBAS. *Student Online Journal (SOJ) …*, *3*(1), 47–55. https://soj.umrah.ac.id/index.php/SOJFKIP/article/view/1449

[36] Suryani, Y., Istianingrum, R., & Hanik, S. U. (2021). *Linguistik Forensik Ujaran Kebencian terhadap Artis Aurel Hermansyah di Media Sosial Instagram*. *6*(1), 107–118. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32528/bb.v6i1.4167

[37] Taufiq, M., Maliki, D. O., Maldini, A. S., & … (2023). Pentingnya Etika Berbahasa Sebagai Upaya Pencegahan Kasus Kejahatan Berbahasa di Media Digital. … *Journal of Law …*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/Doi: 10.53363/bureau.v3i2.311

[38] Tis'ah, J. (2022). *Kejahatan Berbahasa (Language Crime)*. Langgam Pustaka. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en%5C&lr=%5C&id=WZtpEAAAQBAJ%5C&oi=fnd%5C&pg=PR5%5C&dq=kejahatan+berbahasa%5C&ots=tBgMsX7gCk%5C&sig=Dkb9wRw75V-gPirO6I0EQJlXH_U

[39] Trott, S., & Bergen, B. (2022). Languages are Efficient, But for Whom? *Cognition*, *225*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105094

[40] Wulandari, L., Hidayat, S., & Saefudin, L. (2021). PENINGKATAN PENGETAHUAN MASYARAKAT TENTANG KEJAHATAN MENGGUNAKAN BAHASA DI DESA NYUR LEMBANG KECAMATAN NARMADA KABUPATEN LOMBOK BARAT. *Prosiding PEPADU 2021*, 483–490. https://jurnal.lppm.unram.ac.id/index.php/prosidingpepadu/article/view/425/0

[41] Yanti, A., Lubis, P. A., Natasha, N. A., Sitorus, E., & Barus, F. L. (2021). ANALISIS MAKNA LEKSIKAL PADA LIRIK LAGU KAMU DAN KENANGAN KARYA MAUDY AYUNDA. *Asas: Jurnal Sastra*, *10*(2), 86–92. https://doi.org/10.24114/ajs.v10i2.26269