



EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE USE IN THE TRIAL OF THE PREMEDITATED MURDER CASE OF BRIGADIER JOSHUA

Khafid Roziki¹, Mellinda Raswari Jambak², Chesa Andreana³

Fakultas Humaniora, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang,

¹e-mail: hafidroziki28@uin-malang.ac.id, ²e-mail: 200301110191@student.uin-malang.ac.id

³e-mail: 200302110121@student.uin-malang.ac.id

Article history:

Received
23 April 2024

Received in revised form
22 Mei 2024

Accepted
27 Agustus 2024

Available online
Oktober 2024

Keywords:

Language In Trials; Criminal
Law; Murder Cases.

DOI

10.22216/kata.v8i2.2854

Abstract

This study discusses the use of language in the context of criminal justice. The aims of this research are (1) to reveal the language used in the trial of the murder of Brigadier Joshua by the parties involved, such as witnesses, lawyers, judges, and defendants, and (2) to reveal the impact of the use of language in the trial of the murder of Brigadier Joshua on the outcome of trial and justice in the criminal justice system. Data source from Kompas TV's YouTube channel. This research method is descriptive qualitative. Data collection techniques uses observation and note-taking techniques. Then, the data analysis technique uses the Miles and Huberman model, namely data reduction, data exposure, and conclusion. The result of this research is that the research found the language used in the trial by the related parties: (1) straightforward language, (2) accurate language, (3) effective language, and (4) relevant language. Then, the research also found 3 impacts of the use of language in the trial of the Brigadier Joshua murder case on the final outcome of the trial and justice in the criminal justice system, namely: (1) legal impact, (2) psychological impact, and (3) social impact.

INTRODUCTION

As explained in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Indonesian Constitution, Indonesia is a constitutional state. Indonesia is a country dominated by the rule of law (Aji, Wiyatno, Arifin, & Kamal, 2020). According to the law, the rule of law is characterized by several principles, namely that all individual or group behavior must be based on existing laws and regulations before the action is carried out. Democratic law answers people's sense of justice and is based on the will of the people (Kartika, 2020). Fair law means the law that achieves the aims and objectives of law (Satria, 2022). Murder or eliminating the lives of other people is also a criminal act with very severe sanctions. In the Criminal Code, the criminal act of murder is known as accidental homicide (*culpose misdrijven*). Besides that, there are intentional or premeditated killings (*dolus misdrijven*). In intentional homicide, the punishment is more severe than that which is not premeditated (Muqita & Mentari, 2020).

In linguistics, language is the most important element that cannot be replaced. When communicating, language is a medium to facilitate human interaction (Manullang, 2021). John Naisbitt said, "We're moving on the ability to communicate anything to anyone, anywhere, anything from voice, data, text, or images at high-speed light" (Estuningtyas, 2021; Solikhah, Janah, & Sidik, 2020). When communicating, there is a separate context which is generally referred to as meaning. The meaning, in this case, means the intent of the utterances of two or more individuals.

Examination of cases, trying something, and examining events is a series of processes carried out in court. Several parties participate in the criminal law enforcement process,

Corresponding author.

E-mail address: 200301110191@student.uin-malang.ac.id

including judges, public prosecutors (prosecutors), suspects and defendants, investigators, legal advisors (lawyers), witnesses, and so on (Laku, Pongoh, & Barama, 2021). Usually, interrogation is an option when examining a case. People associated with a case or event will be asked for testimony to explain of the case. Interrogation requires language as a medium of communication. In this case, it is explained that studies examining language in law are forensic linguistics. This paradigm is useful for assisting legal attributes in settling cases in court. Linguistics and forensics are one unit that has a strong connection in the legal realm.

Indonesia was shocked by the murder case of Brigadier J alias Joshua involving high-ranking National Police. In this case, the mastermind behind the murder was Ferdy Sambo. He is a former Inspector General of Police, while Brigadier Joshua is Ferdy Sambo's adjutant. He killed Brigadier J on the pretext that Joshua had abused his wife. Ferdy Sambo did not kill individually, but He did it with his subordinates. He ordered Bharada E alias Eliezer to execute Brigadier Joshua until he lost his life. The first trial was held on October 17, 2022, and ended on February 13, 2023. The police officers involved in this case included Bharada Richard Eliezer as the executor of the shooting of Brigadier Joshua. *Bripka* Ricky Rizal knew and followed the scenario of the murder plan and saw firsthand the planned murder. *Brigjen* Hendra Kurniawan forbade others from opening Brigadier Joshua's casket. At the end of the trial, the judge sentenced Ferdy Sambo with the death penalty.

This case attracted public attention because of the tragic murder committed by Ferdy Sambo. Starting from the beginning of the trial until the verdict was decided, the public was always enthusiastic about hearing the results of the trial. Interrogations by law enforcement officers on witnesses were significant for the outcome of the trial. The language used was clear and easy to understand. The cruelty that Ferdy Sambo committed against Joshua was openly exposed in court through interrogation.

This research makes the language used in the trial as the object of study. Conversations that occur between judges and witnesses was analyzed using conversational implicature theory. The recording of the trial of the murder case carried out by Ferdy Sambo against Brigadier Joshua is available on the Kompas TV YouTube channel. Apart from the implications, forensic linguistic theory is useful in relation to the legal realm.

Saferstein said that forensic science is the study of linguistics, which discusses its application to the realm of law (Bérubé et al., 2020; Ulin Nuha, Fathurohman, & Ristiyan, 2022). The use of linguistics can cover theory, methods, and analysis of language for legal purposes, for example, criminal law, civil law, constitutional law, customary and cultural law, environmental law, and so on (Coulthard & Johnson, 2010; Sarifuddin, Tadjuddin, & Iswary, 2021). In the study of forensic linguistics, other disciplines are needed as a complement, such as in the form of macrolinguistics or microlinguistics. This study uses a pragmatic approach, which is one of macrolinguistics. According to Grice (Sahara, 2020; Zumaro, 2021), implicature is related to conveying meaning beyond what is said. Thus, it can be concluded that conversational implicature is something that is implied or implied by an utterance. One of the scopes of language in pragmatic studies is the cooperative maxim. Grice divides maxims into four types, namely, 1) maxim of quantity, 2) maxim of quality, 3) maxim of relevance, and 4) maxim of manner (Fadli & Kasmawati, 2020: 68).

There are several previous studies that are relevant to this research. In the study of forensic linguistics, researchers found several previous studies that discussed defamation (Halid, 2022; Kusno, 2021; Sanubarianto, 2021), hoax text analysis (Handayani, Amir, & Juanda, 2021; Shabrina, Zamzani, & Setiawan, 2022), and unpleasant deeds (Hartini, Saifullah, & Sudana, 2020).

The fundamental difference related to previous research is the object of study. Halid (2022) The fundamental difference related to previous research is the object of study, Kusno (2021) utilizes defamation law cases with critical discourse analysis, Sanubarianto (2021)

makes regional language expressions in insult and defamation lawsuits in NTT with a pragmatic approach, Handayani et al(2021)used a pandemic hoax case, Shabrina et al (2022) using hoax cases around bank information, and Hartini et al (2020) with unpleasant behavior on social media with a pragmatic study. Some of the studies above both use forensic linguistic studies that link language and law.

The aims of this research are (1) how is the language used in the trial of the murder of Brigadier Joshua by the parties involved, such as witnesses, lawyers, judges, and the accused? (2) What is the impact of the use of language in the trial of the Brigadier Joshua murder case on the final outcome of the trial and justice in the criminal justice system?

This research has both academic and practitioner benefits. Academically, this research is useful as a reference or to provide reference contributions, especially in the realm of linguistics. In addition, this study can also contribute to the legal field because the approach used is forensic linguistics, namely the relationship between language and law. Practically, this research is useful for adding experience and insight to the author about the relationship between language and law.

METHOD

This type of research is a qualitative descriptive study using a pragmatic approach. Process and meaning are highlighted in this type of descriptive research. Descriptions, explanations, and validation are also needed in this type of research (Ramdhan, 2021). The conversations of witnesses in the murder case of Police Brigadier Nofriansyah Yosua Hutabarat alias Brigadier J at the trial is described using forensic linguistic theory and a pragmatic approach. Data source from Kompas TV's YouTube channel. Other data sources come from a literature review that supports this research.

Data collection techniques are through to observation and note-taking techniques. The researcher listened to the recordings of witnesses related to the murder of Brigadier Joshua on the Kompas TV YouTube channel, then recorded the important things related to the analytical knife. The data analysis technique used in this research is the Miles and Huberman (2019) analysis technique known as the flow model. This approach involves a series of systematic stages to organize and analyze data carefully. The first stage is data reduction, namely the process of selecting relevant data according to the research objectives. Next, the data display stage is carried out to display the selected data in a format that makes analysis easier. After that, the research reaches the conclusion drawing (Verification) stage, where the data that has been presented is used to formulate conclusions and answer the problem formulation (Sarosa, 2021: 3-4).

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The first trial in the case of Brigadier Joshua's murder which was carried out by his own boss, namely Ferdy Sambo, was held on Monday, October 17, 2022. The trial took place at the South Jakarta District Court. After several hearings, on February 13, 2023, the judge finally decided on the verdict for Ferdy Sambo. He received the death penalty for the treatment that had been done. During the trial, there was a conversation during interrogation between the judge, the accused, and witnesses.

This chapter describes the form of language used in the trial of the murder of Brigadier Joshua by witnesses, judges, and defendants, as well as the impact of the use of language in the trial on the final outcome of the trial and justice in the criminal justice system. The forms of language used in the trial for the murder of Brigadier Joshua are straightforward, accurate, effective, and relevant. In addition, research found 3 forms of the impact of the use of language in the murder trial, namely legal impact, psychological impact, and social impact. Here is the presentation.

Forms of Language Used in the Trial on the Case of Brigadier Joshua's Murder by Witnesses, Judges, and Defendants

The language used during interrogation in court greatly influences the final outcome of the trial. When a witness speaks unclearly, not straightforwardly, and ambiguously, then his statement can be doubted. However, on the other hand, if someone says firmly and straightforwardly, then it can just strengthen the argument he conveyed during the trial. Similar to the trial in the murder of Brigadier Joshua, several witnesses related to the case were presented to state their arguments. In this study, the testimony of Richard Eliezer as a witness and Ferdy Sambo's statement as a defendant will be examined with conversational implications. The forms of the language used are as follows.

Straightforward Language

The use of straightforward language means that the speaker conveys sufficient information, not convoluted or direct about the topic of conversation. This definition corresponds to one of the maxims of conversation, namely the maxim of quantity. This type of maxim requires the speaker to convey sufficient information and not hide the truth (Retnosari & Pujiastuti, 2021), as in the following conversation between Ferdy Sambo and Hakim.

0.22-0.36

Judge : Kapan saudara tahu bahwa ada peristiwa pelecehan terhadap istri saudara?
 Defendant : Saya mengetahui di tanggal 8 pada saat istri saya kembali dari Magelang

Ferdy Sambo, the defendant in this trial, was questioned by the Judge. The judge asked about when he found out about the harassment that his wife had experienced. Then without hesitation, Ferdy Sambo replied that he knew about the incident on the 8th, namely when Putri Candrawathi, his wife, returned from Magelang.

Based on the data above, it appears that Ferdy Sambo's statement is a clarity, straightforward statement, and contains sufficient information. He answered the Judge's question confidently, not exaggerating and not keeping information. This statement is relevant with one type of maxim in implicature, namely the maxim of quantity. The maxim of quantity requires the speaker to convey information clearly and sufficiently. In this case, forensic linguistics plays a role in identifying characteristics such as anxiety or lies. The defendant's statement can be strong evidence to solve a criminal problem. And if there are conflicting answers, then you have to check the accuracy again.

Accurate Language

The accuracy of the language used by speakers is desired in court. Witnesses, defendants, lawyers and judges should tell the truth in court so that the trial goes well. Accurate language belongs to the types of Quality Maxims in pragmatic implications. This maxim requires the speaker to tell the truth without hesitation. The expression "setahusaya, kalautidaksalah, sepertinya," and so on can be used to show ignorance and avoid violating the maxim of quality, as in the following conversation.

39.08-39.34

Judge : Kemarin dalam keterangannya kuat Ma'ruf menyatakan "Panggil Joshua dan Ricky Rizal" demikian juga Ricky Rizal juga mengatakan "saya dipanggil kuat Ma'ruf untuk masuk ke dalam dengan Joshua" yang bener?

Defendan : Seingat saya Joshua yang mulia Tapi kalau mungkin keterangan kuat seingat dia dua-duanya ya mungkin dua-duanya yang mulia.

In the previous trial, the judge heard KuantMa'ruf's statement that the defendant and Ricky Rizal summoned him. Then Ricky Rizal said that KuantMa'ruf called him to go inside with Joshua. These two statements raise questions, so the Judge asked for clarification regarding this matter. The defendant explained this with uncertainty so that the expression appeared "seingatsaya."

In the study of implicatures, especially the maxim of quality, this expression is used to show ignorance of something and also to avoid violating the maxim of quality. This maxim requires the speaker to tell the truth without hesitation. In this maxim, speakers are not allowed to say things they are not sure about. So, to avoid this, the defendant stated his argument with the expression "seingatsaya."

Effective Language

The effectiveness of sentences made by speakers is successful if the statement is conveyed in a straightforward, clear, unambiguous, not obscure, and not excessive, namely conveying sufficient information. If you do not follow these conditions, you can violate the maxim of manner. Statements like these can have an effect on the course of the trial and also affect the outcome of the trial, as in the following conversation.

1.05.54-1.05.59

Judge : Siapa pimpinan Polri yang saudara temui pada malam itu?

Defendant : Bapak Kapolri

After the shooting incident that occurred at the defendant's residence, the defendant met with the National Police leadership to convey the scenario he had designed. The judge asked the defendant, whom the police chief had met that night, to present his scenario. Then, the defendant replied that it was the chief of police that he met that night.

The defendant's statement can be said to be clear, unambiguous, and not exaggerated. He answered the judge's questions according to the terms of the maxim of manner so as not to violate the conversational implicature. The statement can also have an effect on the course of the trial and influence the final outcome of the trial. The same conversation is also found in the following conversation.

51.18-51.26

Judge : Pada saat saudara menjelaskan kepada Richard, Siapa yang mendengar itu?

Defendant : Waktu itu hanya kami berdua di dalam

Apart from the chief of police, the defendant also explained the scenario to Richard Eliezer. The judge asked the defendant who had heard the explanation of the scenario that he presented to Richard Eliezer. Then, the defendant replied that at that time, only Richard Eliezer was with the defendant, which means that only Richard Eliezer was listening.

It is clear that the statement answered the judge's question. The defendant's answer falls into the type of implicature, namely the maxim of manner. This maxim requires the speaker to state his argument in language that is clear, unambiguous, and not exaggerated. The effectiveness of the answer can also affect the course of the trial and also the final outcome of the trial.

Relevant Language

Continuity of speech between speakers and partners is a manifestation of the understanding of the characters involved in the conversation. That is, if there is a speech that is not continuous, then it is caused by a lack of understanding. This continuity is called the maxim of relevance. The maxim of relevance requires the speaker to make a relevant contribution to the topic of discussion, meaning that an utterance must be relevant to the content of the conversation being discussed, as in the following conversation.

1.06.04-1.06.20

Judge : Kapan saudara menemui beliau dan menjelaskan mengenai peristiwa atau skenario pertama yang saudara buat itu?

Defendant : Setelah jenazah di bawa ke rumah sakit kemudian saya berangkat ke Mabes Polri untuk melaporkan kejadiannya yang mulia

The judge asked the defendant when he met the chief of police to explain the incident or the scenario he had created. Then the defendant replied that after Brigadier Joshua's body was taken to the hospital, he then went to the Headquarters of the Indonesian National Police (MabesPolri) to explain to the chief of police about the scenario he was making.

The defendant's statement is relevant to the statement submitted by the judge. This means that what is asked corresponds to the answer given. So this can be called the maxim of relevance. That is the maxim that requires the speaker's utterance to be relevant to the topic of conversation. If it does not meet these requirements, it can violate the maxim of relevance. The final outcome of the trial depends on the statements of the accused and witnesses during the trial. So that a relevant statement is needed to support the trial.

The Impact of Using Language in the Trial on the Case of Brigadier Joshua's Murder on the Final Results of the Trial and Justice in the Criminal Justice System

The outcome of the trial in the murder of Brigadier Joshua and justice in the criminal justice system is greatly influenced by the way language is used. The language used by the parties involved, such as prosecutors, defense attorneys, witnesses, and suspects, can influence how information is conveyed, understood, and assessed by the court. Language also greatly influences the outcome of the trial that is decided by the court. It is very important for prosecutors, defense attorneys, and witnesses to use clear, orderly, and effective language when communicating evidence, arguments, and statements to judges. The use of persuasive and rhetorical language can influence a court's understanding and beliefs about a case. Prosecutors and defense attorneys who are able to use persuasive and rhetorical language can influence a judge's opinion and decision (Satria, 2016).

Within the criminal justice system, forensic linguistics is a branch of linguistics that is used to look at how language and communication are used in legal proceedings. The purpose is to find or confirm that the statement is true or to obtain other information that can assist the investigation (jatmikanurhadi, 2023). In the case of the Brigadier Joshua murder trial, the use of forensic linguistics can have a profound impact on how we understand, analyze, and evaluate the linguistic evidence related to the case. In the trial of the murder of Brigadier Joshua, if the testimony of witnesses does not produce accurate evidence or is proven to be untrue, it will have several impacts on the final outcome of the trial and justice in the criminal justice system, as follows:

Legal Impact

Indonesia is a constitutional state, as stated in Article 1 Paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. The rule of law applies in Indonesia. According to the law, all individual or

group actions must be based on the law that existed before the action was carried out. Democratic law that answers people's sense of justice and is based on the will of the people. Just law means the law that achieves the goal of justice (Hailes, 2022).

If the statement of the defendant is not in accordance with the evidence or facts that actually happened, then the statement may be doubted and will have an impact on the trial decision. Because it can raise doubts about the truth of witness testimony, reduce its credibility, and affect the court's decision, as in the following conversation between FerdySambo and Hakim.

56.62-1.00

Judge : Apakah saudara ikut menembak tubuh korban?
 Defendant : Saya sdh sampaikan didepan pimpinan polri bahwa saya tidak menembak yang mulia, meskipun di tanggal 5 ada pengakuan Richard bahwa keseluruhan penembakan itu ada saya kemudian berubah tanggal 7 itu saya menembak 2 kali dan terakhir saya menembak sekali, saya bantah yang mulia, saya tidak melakukan penembakan kepada Joshua. Tapi terkait perintah saya untuk menghajar kemudian untuk melakukan penembakan itu saya siap bertanggung jawab utk itu yang mulia.

FerdySambo as the defendant, was asked by the Judge whether FerdySambo took part in shooting Brigadier Joshua, who was the victim of the shooting. Then, FerdySambo immediately gave a statement that he did not shoot the victim. He only gave the order to beat and shoot Joshua.

FerdySambo's statement contradicts the statement of the witness and contradicts the evidence that has been obtained. Finally, the statement was questioned again by the judge based on the available evidence.

Judge : Saudara mengatakan bahwa saudara tidak ikut menembak korban. Tetapi dari keterangan hasil laboratoriuun otopsi pertama, yang disampaikan kepada para saksi kemarin, menyampaikan bahwa ada 7 penembakan, 6 yang keluar. Dari keterangan-keterangan para saksi disini kmrn menyampaikan bahwa, dari pengkuan terdakwa Richard seingat dia bahwa dia menembak kurang lebih 3-4 kali. Hal itu dibuktikan dengan pemeriksaan hasil jumlah peluru yang ada didalam senjatanya Richard setelah diminta oleh Saksi Beni Ali dan Susanto dihitug pelurunya masih ada 12. Kalau yang digunakannya hanya senjata dari Richard Eliezer itu adalah kord, senjata jenis glock 17, dimana isinya adalah 17 dan menurut pengakuan dari Richard adalah dia tidak mengisi penuh senjatanya itu ataupun kalau diisi penuh maka senjata itu yang keluar hanya 5. Tetapi didlm hasil otopsi, ada 7 tembakan, bisa saudara terangkan?
 Defendant : Saya sudah sampaikan yang mulia, saya tidak melakukan penembakan terhadap korban Joshua karena waktu itu sudah jatuh yang mulia jadi saya tidak melakukan penembakan kepada Joshua pada waktu itu.

Based on the above data, it appears that FerdySambo persisted in his statement, which was dubious because it contradicted the statements of witnesses and available evidence. Statements that are dubious and conflict with evidence and witnesses, like the data above can have a big impact on the final outcome of a trial.

Article 174 of the Criminal Procedure Code stipulates that a witness may not give false testimony. Article 174 of the Criminal Procedure Code states that witnesses must

provide statements based on oath and which are true or will have legal consequences for their statements. Even judges also have the authority to order the detention of witnesses who are suspected of giving false statements (Turambi, 2021).

Such false statements can have a negative impact on the final outcome of the defendant's trial. At trial, Ferdysambo received a life sentence because he was found guilty of planning the murder, ordering the murder, participating in the murder, and tampering with the electronic evidence of the crime. However, the final result of the trial gave a verdict on the death penalty against Ferdysambo. The punishment is more severe than at the time of prosecution. The things that made Ferdysambo's sentence aggravating were not admitting his guilt and giving false or unproven testimony during the trial.

Meanwhile, the defendant's statement that is honest and proven to be true can lighten the defendant's sentence, as in the following conversation between Richard Eliezer and Hakim.

Judge : Berapa kali saudara tembak?
 Richard : Seingat saya 3-4 kali yang mulia
 Judge : Setelah saudara menembak apa yang yang terjadi pada korban?
 Richard : Jatuh yang mulia. Habis Almarhum jatuh, pak FS langsung maju, saya lihat dia langsung pegang senjata, dia kokang senjata dulu, dia ke arah Almarhum, dia ada sempat tembak ke arah Almarhum.

Richard's statement can be said to be honest and beyond doubt because it is proven to be true and in accordance with the judge's statement in the conversation with Ferdysambo above. Honest and proven testimony can have a very good impact on the final outcome of a trial because it is seen as facilitating the investigative process in a trial.

Witnesses who know directly and are directly involved in cases and have the courage to report incidents and speak the truth are known as witness witnesses who cooperate with law enforcement or are called "justice collaborators." A justice collaborator is one of the perpetrators of a crime. He admits the crime he committed, and he is not the main actor in the crime and provides information as a witness in court proceedings (Lintang & Nugroho, 2021; Sugiri et al., 2021).

In the case of Brigadier Joashua's murder, Richard Eliezer volunteered to become a Justice Collaborator to the LPSK. By becoming a Justice Collaborator, Richard had to tell the truth (Lestari, 2023). Richard's testimony really helped the court in uncovering the truth and upholding justice. In addition, Richard also admitted his guilt in shooting Joshua on Ferdysambo's orders and apologized to the victim's family. Richard was also polite during the trial until finally, Richard's sentence was only 1 year and 6 months in prison from the initial demands of 12 years in prison.

Psychological Impact

The use of language in the trial for the murder of Brigard Joshua also had a psychological impact, especially on the families of the victims and the accused, as in the following conversation.

Judge : Berapa kali saudara tembak?
 Richard : Seingat saya 3-4 kali yang mulia
 Judge : Setelah saudara menembak apa yang yang terjadi pada korban?
 Richard : Jatuh yang mulia. Habis Almarhum jatuh, pak FS langsung maju, saya lihat dia langsung pegang senjata, dia kokang senjata dulu, dia ke arah Almarhum, dia ada sempat tembak ke arah Almarhum.

The conversation above had a very psychological impact on the victim's family who heard the testimony. In the conversation above, Richard admitted to having shot the victim 3-4 times and mentioned that the victim fell after being shot. Then, he said that FerdySambo also shot the victim after the victim fell. This had a very psychological impact on the victim's family, including:

1. **Feelings of Shock and Trauma:** Brigadier Joshua's family learned and heard firsthand through court conversations that their family members were shot by Richard, Joshua's own friend, on orders from FerdySambo. Until Joshua had fallen, FerdySambo still shot him again. This can cause deep feelings of shock and broken feelings for the victim's family. They may be traumatized by threatening events and unexpected losses.
2. **Deep Sense of Loss:** Learning that Joshua fell after being shot by Richard and then shot again by FerdySambo can deepen the loss felt by the victim's family. They have to face the fact that their family members not only died tragically, but also became victims of violence and murder by their own friends.
3. **Anger and Hatred:** The conversation above can trigger a deep feeling of anger and hatred for the victim's family towards the perpetrator of the murder. Knowing that the victim was shot several times by Richard and then shot again by FerdySambo can reinforce feelings of wanting to hold the perpetrators accountable and seek justice for the victims.
4. **Difficulties in Emotional Recovery:** The conversation above can affect the emotional recovery process of the victim's family. They may have difficulty coping with feelings of trauma, loss, and anger related to the tragic incident with Brigadier Joshua. Appropriate support and recovery may be needed to help the victim's family deal with and recover from the psychological impact that has arisen.

The conversation above also greatly impacted FerdySambo's psychology as the defendant and his family, as in the following conversation.

Judge : Saudara mengatakan bahwa saudara tdk ikt menembak korban. Tetapi dari keterangan hasil laborat otopsi pertama, yang disampaikan kepada para saksi kemarin, menyampaikan bahwa ada 7 penembakan, 6 yang keluar. Dari keterangan-keterangan para saksi disini kmrn menyampaikan bahwa, dari pengkuan terdakwa Richard seingat dia bahwa dia menembak kurang lebih 3-4 kali. Hal itu dibuktikan dengan pemeriksaan hasil jumlah peluru yang ada didalam senjatanya Richard setelah diminta oleh Saksi Beni Ali dan Susanto dihitng pelurunya masih ada 12. Kalau yang digunakannya hanya senjata dari Richard Eliezer itu adalah kord, senjata jenis glock 17, dimana isinya adalah 17 dan menurut pengakuan dari Richard adalah dia tidak mengisi penuh senjatanya itu ataupun kalau diisi penuh maka senjata itu yang keluar hanya 5. Tetapi didlm hasil otopsi, ada 7 tembakan, bisa saudara terangkan?

Defendant : Saya sudah sampaikan yang mulia, saya tidak melakukan penembakan terhadap korban Joshua karena waktu itu sudah jatuh yang mulia jadi saya tidak melakukan penembakan kpda Joshua pada waktu itu.

From the conversation above, it is clear that FerdySambo did not admit his crime when questioned by the judge at trial. The judge clearly had evidence for his statement, but FerdySambo still refused to admit it. The following is the psychological impact that might have on FerdySambo due to Richard's statement in court.

1. **Complex Emotional Impact:** Conversations about FerdySambo's actions, including seeing the victim fall and being shot again by FerdySambo, can trigger a variety of emotional

responses. FerdySambo, as a criminal who tries to cover up his crime, may experience confusion, fear, anger, and even shock at what Richard said in court. FerdySambo probably never thought that Richard would give a true statement at trial. He may have been angry that the statement was against him in court.

2. **Stress and Anxiety:** Awareness of the legal ramifications one faces and the experience of trial can lead to high levels of stress and anxiety for offenders. FerdySambo may feel threatened by the possibility of severe punishment and continuing social consequences.
3. **Fear and Insecurity:** The perpetrator may experience fear and insecurity due to the social reactions and retribution he may face. FerdySambo may be worried about the charges he will receive at the end of the trial and the social impact he may face.

Social Impact

Statements in court can also have a social impact, especially for the perpetrators of murder. A statement that reveals the truth in the murder case of Brigadier Joshua will have a social impact on both the perpetrator and the Police Institution, which is the place of work of the perpetrator.

1. **Impact on Public Trust:** A murder case involving a member of the National Police as the perpetrator, such as FerdySambo, can undermine public trust in the police institution as a whole. The incident in the Brigadier Joshua case can cause public concern and distrust of the integrity and professionalism of the police, as well as raise questions about the effectiveness of the oversight and accountability system within the institution.
2. **Disturbances in Relations with the Community:** Cases of murder involving members of the Indonesian National Police as the perpetrators can cause tension and disturbance in relations between the police and the community. Communities can feel insecure and find it difficult to interact or cooperate with the police, especially if their trust has been lost.
3. **Negative Perceptions of Police:** Such cases can exacerbate negative perceptions of the police in general. Communities may become skeptical of the integrity and morality of the police, and negative views of this kind can influence community cooperation and obedience to the police in maintaining security and law enforcement. This perception also greatly impacted Richard, who is a member of the Indonesian National Police, who will be accepted again into the police force after serving his sentence. He might get a negative perception from society. He could be considered a negative example of a profession that is supposed to protect society. Such perceptions can affect his reputation, career, and social relationships.
4. **Impact on Institutional Reputation:** Cases of murder involving members of the National Police as perpetrators can damage the reputation of the police institution as a whole. The Polri institution can be considered to be incapable of maintaining the integrity and quality of its members, and this can affect public confidence in the state law enforcement system.
5. **Dismissal of Task Against the Actor:** The perpetrator of the murder in this case was dismissed from his duties as a member of the Indonesian National Police and must accept the legal consequences.

The language used as a medium of communication turns out to be evidence in the realm of law. This study is called forensic linguistics. The results of this study show some of the influences of language and the impact of using language in the trial of Brigadier Joshua's murder. In the following, the researcher presents the answers to the problem formulation.

CONCLUSION

The language used at trial has a major influence on the final outcome of the trial. The researcher found 4 types of language used by the parties involved in the trial of Brigadier

Joshua's murder, namely: (1) straightforward language, (2) accurate language, (3) effective language, and (4) relevant language. Then, the researcher also found 3 impacts of the use of language in the trial of the Brigadier Joshua murder case on the final outcome of the trial and justice in the criminal justice system, namely: (1) legal impact, (2) psychological impact, and (3) social impact.

Every utterance uttered by the parties involved in the trial supports the course of the trial. Forensic linguistics is used to strengthen evidence on aspects of language. If there are discrepancies in the statements by the parties involved, then identification of the correct language will be carried out by forensic linguistics. In addition, language also has an impact or influence in the legal realm. That is, what is expressed by the speaker can have an impact on the law, the speaker's psychology, and the social impact that he will receive.

This research can contribute to references, especially in the realm of linguistics. Many parties were involved in the murder case of Brigadier Joshua, but the researcher only uses conversations between the judge, the defendant and one witness, namely Richard Eliezer. The researcher hopes that further research can expand this study in the realm of forensic linguistics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my gratitude to the Arabic Language and Literature study program at Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang. Additionally, I would like to extend my thanks to my friends who have continuously supported me throughout the process of writing this article, aiding in the discovery of references, brainstorming ideas, and providing valuable input for this research. Without their assistance and encouragement, the completion of this article would not have been possible. I am truly thankful for their contributions and collaboration.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Aji, A. B. W., Wiyatno, P., Arifin, R., & Kamal, U. (2020). Social Justice on Environmental Law Enforcement in Indonesia: The Contemporary and Controversial Cases. *The Indonesian Journal of International Clinical Legal Education*, 2(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.15294/IJICLE.V2I1.37324>
- Bérubé, M., Tang, T. U., Fortin, F., Ozalp, S., Williams, M. L., & Burnap, P. (2020). Social media forensics applied to assessment of post-critical incident social reaction: The case of the 2017 Manchester Arena terrorist attack. *Forensic Science International*, 313, 110364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FORSCIINT.2020.110364>
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Estuningtyas, R. D. (2021). Strategi Komunikasi dan Dakwah Pada Kalangan Milenial di Era Modernisasi. *Muttaqien; Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Islamic Studies*, 2(1), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.52593/MTQ.02.1.05>
- Fadli, I., & Kasmawati, K. (2020). Maksim Kerja Sama Berbahasa Model Grice dalam Peristiwa Tutar Di Pasar Tramo Kabupaten Maros: Kajian Pragmatik. *Jurnal Idiomatik: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 3(2), 67–72. <https://doi.org/10.46918/IDIOMATIK.V3I2.675>
- Hailes, O. (2022). Lithium in International Law: Trade, Investment, and the Pursuit of Supply Chain Justice. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 25(1), 148–170. <https://doi.org/10.1093/JIEL/JGAC002>

- Halid, R. (2022). Tindak Tutur Pelaku Pencemaran Nama Baik di Media Sosial Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *KREDO: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 5(2), 441–458. <https://doi.org/10.24176/KREDO.V5I2.6342>
- Handayani, N., Amir, J., & Juanda, J. (2021). Kasus Hoaks Pandemi Covid-19: Suatu Tinjauan Linguistik Forensik. *Fon: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 17(2), 169–177. <https://doi.org/10.25134/fon.v17i2.4432>
- Hartini, L., Saifullah, A. R., & Sudana, D. (2020). Linguistik Forensik terhadap Perbuatan Tidak Menyenangkan di Media Sosial (Kajian Pragmatik). *Deiksis*, 12(03), 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.30998/DEIKSIS.V12I03.5416>
- Kartika, A. (2020). The Urgency of the Criminal Provision Regulationss in Cooperatives Law at Indonesia. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 3(2), 947–955. <https://doi.org/10.33258/BIRCI.V3I2.922>
- Kusno, A. (2021). Redefinisi Kosakata Terkait Perang Bahasa (Kajian Linguistik Forensik). *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 4(3), 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.30872/DIGLOSIA.V4I3.183>
- Laku, F. K., Pongoh, J. K., & Barama, M. (2021). Wewenang Kejaksanaan dalam Penanganan Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *LEX CRIMEN*, 10(1), 54–62. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/32025>
- Lintang, K., & Nugroho, S. (2021). Criminal Law Policy of Justice Collaborator in Corruption Crime Case. *LAW REFORM*, 17(1), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.14710/LR.V17I1.37550>
- Manullang, S. O. (2021). Understanding the sociology of customary law in the reformation era: complexity and diversity of society in Indonesia. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.21744/LINGCURE.V5NS3.1352>
- Muqita, B., & Mentari, R. (2020). Saksi Pidana Pembunuhan dalam Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana dengan Hukum Islam. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 23(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.56087/AIJH.V23I1.33>
- Ramdhan, M. (2021). *Metode Penelitian*. Surabaya: Cipta Media Nusantara.
- Retnosari, I. E., & Pujiastuti, R. (2021). Maksim Kuantitas dan Maksim Kualitas dalam Tuturan Bahasa Indonesia pada Anak Disabilitas Intelektual. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 10(2), 270–282. <https://doi.org/10.26499/RNH.V10I2.4053>
- Sahara, M. U. (2020). Prinsip Kerja Sama Grice pada Percakapan Film. *BASINDO: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, Dan Pembelajarannya*, 4(2), 222–232. <https://doi.org/10.17977/UM007V4I22020P222-232>
- Sanubarianto, S. T. (2021). Implikatur Ungkapan Bahasa Daerah dalam gugatan Penghinaan dan Pencemaran Nama Baik di NTT: Sebuah Studi Kasus Linguistik Forensik. *Haluan Sastra Budaya*, 5(1), 60–76. <https://doi.org/10.20961/HSB.V5I1.44803>
- Sarifuddin, Tadjuddin, M., & Iswary, E. (2021). A Hate and Provocative Speech Act in Social Media: A Forensic Linguistics Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 4(3), 363–368. <https://doi.org/10.34050/ELSJISH.V4I3.18196>
- Sarosa, S. (2021). *Analisis Data Penelitian Kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: PT Kanisius.
- Satria, H. (2022). Implikatur Percakapan Interogasi Terhadap Saksi/Korban Penganiayaan: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *JURNAL ILMU BUDAYA*, 10(2), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.34050/JIB.V10I2.19830>

- Shabrina, S. N., Zamzani, & Setiawan, T. (2022). Analisis teks hoaks seputar informasi bank: Kajian bahasa perspektif analisis wacana kritis dan linguistik forensik. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 8(2), 492–507. <https://doi.org/10.22219/KEMBARA.V8I2.21478>
- Solikhah, I. Z., Janah, N. M., & Sidik, M. (2020). Kesalahan Berbahasa Tataran Semantik dalam Unggahan Instagram @Kominfodiy. *Lingua Rima: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(2), 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.31000/LGRM.V9I2.2896>
- Sugiri, B., Apriandi, N., Hartadi, H., Narapidana, K., Kejahatan, P., & Abstrak, T. (2021). The Position of Convict as Justice Collaborator in Revealing Organized Crime. *PADJADJARAN JURNAL ILMU HUKUM (JOURNAL OF LAW)*, 8(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.22304/PJIH.V8N2.A5>
- Ulin Nuha, A., Fathurohman, I., & Ristiyani. (2022). Analisis Curhat Korban Kejahatan Asusila Menggunakan Pendekatan Semantik: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *KREDO: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 5(2), 547–562. <https://doi.org/10.24176/KREDO.V5I2.7219>
- Zumaro, I. J. (2021). Implikatur Percakapan dalam Sinetron “Dunia Tebalik” Episode ke-2006-2007 di RCTI: Kajian Pragmatik. *Alinea: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajaran*, 10(1), 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.35194/ALINEA.V10I1.1250>