

## ARTICLE

# Schematic Structure and Linguistic Realizations of Divorce Case Examination at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom: Systemic Functional Linguistic Study Approach

Wiwien Pratiwi Harsa<sup>1\*</sup> , Amrin Saragih<sup>1</sup> , Tengku Silvana Sinar<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

The settlement of divorce cases for Muslims in Indonesia is carried out through syari'ah courts. This study aims to investigate the schematic structures of the talaq divorce case examination and their linguistic realizations in the syari'ah courtroom. A descriptive qualitative design was applied in this study. The data were collected through observation, interviews, and text analysis with a forensic linguistic approach using Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) theory. All participants involved in interviews provided informed consent, and participation was entirely voluntary. Measures were taken to ensure confidentiality by anonymizing participants' identities and securely storing all collected data. A purposive sampling technique was used to select five talaq divorce case proceedings from different syari'ah courts across Indonesia, representing diverse regional backgrounds and linguistic nuances. This sample size was considered sufficient for in-depth qualitative analysis, allowing the identification of recurring schematic patterns and linguistic features. Methodologically, linguistic categorization was carried out by coding courtroom discourse into ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions as proposed by SFL. Each clause was analyzed for its transitivity patterns, mood structures, and thematic progression to uncover the rhetorical and social dynamics of courtroom interaction. The findings of the study revealed that there are four types of schematic structures in talaq divorce case proceedings at the courtroom, namely T-1, T-2, T-3, and T-4 schematic structures. The findings are justified by SFL theories. However, in the context of an SFL-based

### \*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Wiwien Pratiwi Harsa, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia; Email: [wiwienharsa11@gmail.com](mailto:wiwienharsa11@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 7 March 2025 | Revised: 14 April 2025 | Accepted: 16 April 2025 | Published Online: 17 April 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8997>

### CITATION

Harsa, W.P., Saragih, A., Sinar, T.S., 2025. Schematic Structure and Linguistic Realizations of Divorce Case Examination at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom: Systemic Functional Linguistic Study Approach. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(4): 1012–1027. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8997>

### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

study, a new finding was obtained such as the varieties of language typically used in syari'ah court.

**Keywords:** Schematic Structure; SFL; Divorce Case; Syari'ah Court

## 1. Introduction

Language is a meaningful and articulate system of sound symbols (produced by utterances) that is arbitrary and conventional and is used as a means of communicating by a group of people to produce feelings and thoughts<sup>[1]</sup>. Language is the most widely used means of communication to form social connections and is an element of our daily lives. It is the process through which a sender and a receiver create, exchange, and share ideas, information, views, facts, feelings, and experiences. Individuals, groups, societies, and nations all rely on communication to survive and thrive. If words do not address certain situations or specific contextual problems, people cannot attain a communicative goal. It is critical to helping people build relationships. Language, on the other hand, functions as a killer of human relationships or can harm relationships<sup>[2]</sup> because it can also divide individuals from one another. In this case, the end of the marital relationship between husband and wife leads to divorce.

A husband-and-wife relationship is legally bound by marriage. The purpose of marriage, which is regulated in the social value system, is inseparable from a person's religious value system, which universally in the implementation of marriage can be said to be the same in all religions and beliefs. Marriage is intended to create a happy and eternal family, for which husband and wife must assist and complement each other in order for each to develop their personalities, assist, and achieve spiritual and material well-being<sup>[3]</sup>. This statement is in line with the opinion of Hosen<sup>[4]</sup>, which states that marriage is prescribed by religion in line with the wisdom of man created by Allah, namely to prosper this world by maintaining the reproduction of mankind. So marriage is required to be able to organize and serve as a forum for channeling the potential of humanity, and to ensure this order, it must be followed by submission to the validity and legality of the marriage.

In the meantime, despite the fact that marriage is viewed as a physical and spiritual link between the husband and wife, there is still a significant number of divorce cases. In other words, the divorce rate in Indonesia is increasing

every year, which essentially contradicts the meaning and purpose of the marriage itself. Based on data from the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (*Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia, March 2023*), divorce cases from 2015 to 2022 have increased by 46%. There were 516,344 divorce cases in Indonesia in 2022. This number increased by 15.3% compared to the previous year of 447,743 cases. It is also noted that in 2020–2022 there were around 1.7 million married couples in Indonesia, and around 24.6% of them divorced. This means that every year there are around 418,200 divorced couples.

According to the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics, North Sumatra has the fourth highest divorce rate in Indonesia in 2021, with an increase of 16% in the following year, totaling 20,029 cases in 2022. Couples who separated experienced a huge spike in 2021 with 17,270 cases about 34.83% from the previous year (2020 with 12,809 cases). It is known that the number of divorces in 2018 was 13,767 cases, and the number of divorces in 2019 was 15,651 cases, where most of the reasons for divorce were economic problems.

Meanwhile, as the capital of North Sumatra province, the number of divorces that occur in the city of Medan also continues to increase every year, noting that the number of divorced couples in 2022 jumped by 21.4% from the previous year, which was about 3,289 cases. In 2022, there was also a spike in divorce cases of about 5.5% from the previous year which amounted to 2,709 cases, while the increase also occurred in 2019, rising by about 5.7% from the prior year.

With the large number of divorces that occur in Indonesia specifically in Medan city, the process of divorce cases is carried out differently according to the beliefs of the divorcing couple. If the couple is Muslim, the divorce process is carried out by a syari'ah court, where the entire settlement process must refer to the principles of Islamic law. For non-Muslim couples, if they want to divorce, they must first file a divorce suit with a conventional court where both of them are required to have a marriage certificate issued by the civil registry office beforehand. By separating the divorce process based on religion, it is hoped that it can provide treatment that is more in compliance with the values and principles

recognized by each community. It can also help minimize the potential for conflict and ensure that justice is served in accordance with the norms recognized by the parties involved. Nonetheless, this study is more focused on discussing the schematic structure and the linguistic realization that exist in the process of resolving the *talaq* divorce case at the syari'ah court.

In Islam, the end of the relationships between husband and wife occurs due to the divorce process (*talaq*) that is pronounced by the husband. This refers to the Qur'an, Surah At-Talaq verse 1, and Surah Al-Baqarah verse 236, which states that the right to divorce is in the hands of the husband. Therefore, for some Muslims, when a husband utters the word '*talaq*' to his wife, divorce has already occurred. Meanwhile, in Indonesia, which follows a legal system, divorce occurs when the husband declares the *talaq pledge* before a panel of judges. This is in accordance with Article 129 of the Islamic Law Compilation (KHI), which explains that the husband has the right to impose a divorce that is heard and ratified by a syari'ah court, as well as in Article 117 KHI, which states that *talaq* is a husband's pledge before a session of the syari'ah court, which is one of the causes of the dissolution of marriage, with methods as intended in Articles 129, 130 and 131. This may be determined as a theoretical gap in this study.

Due to the public's lack of knowledge about the divorce process in syari'ah courts, many couples who want to divorce admit feeling confused. Some of them hire lawyers or attorneys to assist with their divorce proceedings, while others try to face the process on their own despite feeling bewildered. Some of the people who registered their divorces at the syari'ah court were asked about their views on the divorce process at the syari'ah court. Most of them thought that the divorce process took a long time and cost a lot of money, and the repeated mediation hearings without any agreement between the two parties sometimes made them tired of continuing the divorce process yet desperate to get a divorce as soon as possible. They also did not know what to do when facing the courts, which sometimes made them feel unprepared to answer the questions from the judges. Long queues are also one of the reasons why they are hesitant to come to the syari'ah court because sometimes they have to bring witnesses who are very old, such as their parents, uncles or aunts who cannot afford to wait long. Addition-

ally, some people who filed for divorce also asked, "What should I do inside the courtroom?", "Will the judge make it difficult for me because we have been married for a long time, but want to get divorced at this old age?", "Will the judge scold me inside? This is my first time.", "I am tired because this divorce is taking so long and is complicated.", "I have presented many witnesses but the judge considers them not credible." This is due to their lack of information about legal issues, especially divorce case settlements, which is increasingly widespread in recent years in society. All of these assertions represent phenomenon gaps in this investigation.

Dealing with this problem, people need to anticipate the awareness to understand the schematic structure of the divorce trial process because in legal discourse activities, phases appear to follow a predictable sequence. In other words, the schematic structure has a series of rhetorical moves and steps of communicative strategies used to achieve certain communicative objectives, and the lexicogrammatical features are used to achieve them.

The definition of schematic structure works on how the information in the texts is organized<sup>[5]</sup>. Schematic structure simply refers to the staged, step-by-step organization of genre<sup>[6]</sup>. In Martin's terms, "Schematic structure represents the positive contribution genre makes to a text: a way of getting from A to B in the way a given culture accomplishes whatever the genre in question is functioning to do in that culture"<sup>[7]</sup>. So, it can be said that schematic structure is same as generic structure.

The study on the schematic structure of divorce case examination in the syari'ah courtroom is a significant topic of research in relation to applied linguistics that aims to understand the role of language in the process of divorce case settlement because many people do not know or understand what actually happens in the process of resolving cases at the courtroom, specifically the settlement of divorce cases in the syari'ah court. The high rate of divorce cases in Muslim societies, including Indonesia, requires a better understanding of the process of divorce case examination in the syari'ah court, as well as the lack of awareness of the importance of understanding the schematic structure of divorce cases linguistically among the general public. The different stages and moves in divorce case trials, such as mediation, reading of the plaintiff's lawsuit, the defendant's response, the plaintiff's replication, and the pledge of divorce (*talaq vow*),

are realized in configurations of register variables that are realized in patterns of choices in language<sup>[8]</sup>.

The schematic structure of divorce case examination at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom is closely related to Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and the social context of the courtroom. SFL is a theoretical approach that analyzes the relationship between social contexts and linguistic aspects, and it can be applied to legal genres such as divorce case examination<sup>[8]</sup>. The core concepts of SFL are language as functional and language as meaning-making, which emphasize the importance of understanding how language is used in context and how it is structured for use. Also, the relational concept of linking the context of a situation with linguistic choices is called register, which has three features: Field, Tenor, and Mode, that are related to the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions<sup>[9]</sup>. Therefore, analyzing the schematic structure of divorce case examination using the SFL approach can provide insights into the linguistic features and communicative purposes of each stage and move, as well as the roles and relationships of the participants involved in the examination process.

In relation to applied linguistics study, many research studies on legal discourse of divorce cases have been conducted. Pal and Campbell<sup>[10]</sup> focused on the linguistic style used in legal documents in English divorce cases. Heisterkamp<sup>[11]</sup> examined conversational interaction to describe the conversational features seeking attempts of mediator neutrality in a divorce case. Olekalns, Brett, and Donohue<sup>[12]</sup>; Donohue and Liang<sup>[13]</sup> used Linguistic Word Count Program to analyze words and to test the influence of the transformative linguistic markers on mediation in divorce cases. Saarela and Finnas<sup>[14]</sup> examined the role of language convergence and discordance in divorce cases among exogamous couples in Finland (Finnish speakers and Swedish speakers). Furthermore, the most recent research was conducted by Sportel<sup>[15]</sup>, focusing on the linguistic features to construct and negotiate in divorce case narratives of Dutch-Moroccan and Dutch-Egyptian families.

However, no study on the subject of syari'ah law has been conducted, particularly on the schematic structure of divorce case examination at a syari'ah court. Nevertheless, there are some studies about schematic structure that are relevant using the SFL theory to discuss codes, signs, and words in different fields. For instance, Valipour, Assadi, and

Asl<sup>[16]</sup> discussed the generic structure in English academic research papers. Liu and Buckingham<sup>[17]</sup> focused on the schematic structure of the discussion section in the distribution of metadiscourse markers. Motlagh and Pourchangi<sup>[18]</sup> discussed about schematic structure of literature reviews in research articles. Zein, Sinar, Nurlela, and Yusuf<sup>[19]</sup>; Khan, Pervaiz, and Abbas<sup>[20]</sup> attempted the study on the schematic structure of narrative texts. Kuswoyo, Sujatna, Indrayani, and Rido<sup>[21]</sup> employed a study on the schematic structure of aerospace engineering English lectures. Melefa, Matthew, Maryjoy, and Adike<sup>[22]</sup> examined the generic structure of classroom interaction. Bakhtiari<sup>[23]</sup> conducted a study on schematic structure in writing business negotiation letters. Saragih, Batubara, and Khairina<sup>[24]</sup> conducted a study on schematic structure in virtual English language lectures.

In an attempt to clarify the issues raised in this study—namely, what the schematic structures of talaq divorce case examinations are at the syari'ah court, and how these are linguistically realized during the proceedings—this research aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of courtroom discourse. By employing Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) theory developed by Halliday, the study seeks to investigate and explore the schematic structure of divorce case examinations. It is hoped that the findings will enhance public understanding of how divorce cases are resolved in syari'ah courts, including the legal process itself, the roles of stakeholders, and the language used in these settings—an area where little research currently exists.

While previous studies in legal discourse<sup>[25, 26]</sup> have examined schematic structures in courtroom interaction, they have largely focused on Western legal systems and general criminal or civil cases. This study contributes originality by focusing specifically on talaq divorce case examinations in Indonesian syari'ah courts, a legal-cultural context that has been underrepresented in forensic linguistic research. Unlike earlier research, which often generalizes courtroom discourse structures, this study offers a context-specific schematic typology (T-1 through T-4) based on authentic syari'ah court data. By doing so, it not only extends SFL applications in legal settings but also introduces new insights into how religious-legal discourse operates structurally and linguistically.

Furthermore, the study is expected to raise awareness of the sanctity of marriage, encouraging individuals to give

careful consideration before entering into or dissolving a marital union. In addition to its societal implications, this research contributes to the development of science and technology in the field of forensic linguistics, particularly within applied linguistics, through the application of SFL theory in the context of divorce case settlements at the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom.

## 2. Methods

A descriptive qualitative design was applied to study divorce case trials conducted by the panel of judges at the Medan Syari'ah Court Class 1A from November to December 2023. Accordingly, the primary sources of data were *talaq* divorce case proceedings. Specifically, the data were collected from four types of courtroom sessions: the Reconciliation Attempt, Proof, Verdict, and *Talaq Vow* trials. The data consisted of the spoken utterances of courtroom participants, including judges, litigants (petitioners, attorneys, and witnesses), and other officers involved in the *talaq* divorce case examinations. Detailed observations were made on the structure of the proceedings, the language used, and the interaction among participants. Additionally, semi-structured interviews were conducted with judges, litigants, and court personnel to gain deeper insights into their perspectives on the structure and linguistic features of syari'ah legal discourse in the courtroom. Documentation such as photographs, audio recordings, and video footage of the syari'ah courtroom proceedings also served as valuable sources of data for in-depth linguistic analysis.

All participants were informed about the objectives of the study and participated voluntarily. Informed consent was obtained from each participant prior to interviews or recordings. To ensure confidentiality, all personal identifiers were anonymized, and data were securely stored and handled only by the research team.

The language used in each trial of the *talaq* divorce process was recorded then transcribed into written forms and analyzed as data. Ideally, there would be more than four trials of the *talaq* divorce process if the Petitioner and Respondent both presented in the hearings. However, in this case, the court rendered a verdict with *verstek* since the Respondent did not attend during the whole *talaq* divorce process. This implies that the findings presented in the current study are

still tentative as the *talaq* divorce case hearing with complete litigants will be thoroughly examined. Utterances of the parties involved in the courtroom were analyzed in order to determine linguistic realizations. The analysis of the divorce hearing texts and linguistic categories used are based on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory (SFLT). Thus, metafunctional classification "Process, Participants, Circumstances, Statement, Question, Offer and Command" expressions are used to describe or categorize lexicogrammar features.

## 3. Findings and Discussion

### 3.1. Schematic Structures

The divorce hearing is structured and takes place in phases. The phases define the text's schematic structures. Schematic structures of the *talaq* divorce hearing process with reference to its constituents and proportion.

The findings obtained in this study show that there is a different schematic structure in each trial of *talaq* divorce case proceedings. This can play a role in helping to understand the issues involved in the divorce process such as providing an overview of the background of the divorce case, the reasons behind the divorce, and the relevant social or legal context. Furthermore, the parties involved in the divorce can be clearly identified; this includes the husband, wife, and any other parties directly involved in the divorce cases, such as attorneys, friends or family members who act as witnesses. With this schematic structure, readers can have a better understanding of the various aspects involved in *talaq* divorce cases from the perspective of syari'ah law, legal, psychological, and social.

#### 3.1.1. First Trial – Reconciliation Attempt

The Schematic Structure is as follows:

OPENING THE TRIAL ^ LITIGANTS  
SUMMON ^ (JUDICIAL INQUIRY) ^  
THE POWER OF ATTORNEY ^ [[RELAAS  
CHECKING]] ^ (REASON FOR DIVORCE)  
^ TRIAL POSTPONEMENT ^ [[REMINDER  
FOR PETITIONER]] ^ CLOSING THE  
TRIAL.

With the description where the symbol ^ repre-

sents ‘followed by’, (...) signifies ‘optionally’, and [...] means embedded context. As said, the schematic structures are extended in a line.

At the stage of Opening the Trial, the composition of the panel of judges that convened was 1 chief judge, 2 member judges and 1 clerk, as well as 1 officer as Portier who will call people outside the courtroom according to the judges’ request. The hearing was opened and declared open to the public by the Chief Judge or the Chairman of the Panel.

At the stage of Litigants Summon, the Petitioner and Respondent or his/her Attorney were summoned to appear in the courtroom by the Officer or Portier. The stage of Judicial Inquiry is optional. The judge asked whether the Petitioner came with an attorney or alone without an attorney. If the Petitioner brings a legal representative, then the attorney must introduce himself/herself. Yet sometimes the judges skipped it and directly asked for the attorney’s paper without asking more if they noticed the Petitioner came with a companion who is normally his attorney.

At the stage of The *Power of Attorney*, the Petitioner’s attorney introduced himself, and showed the original ID Card (*KTP*), Business Card, and the most important thing is showing his special *Power of Attorney* to the Panel of Judges.

At the stage of Relas Checking the Judge must ensure that the Relas (court summon) has been received by the Respondent by checking it from the judge’s tracking device. This is an obligatory stage and an important part of the first trial that must be fulfilled in order to process the talaq divorce case hearing.

The stage of Reasons for Divorce is optional and omnipresent. The judge asked what the Petitioner’s reason was for filing a divorce suit to the Medan Syari’ah Court. In this process the Petitioner conveyed his arguments or reasons for filing divorce to the Medan Syari’ah Court. He also provided information on how long they had been married or arguing, as well as when the separation occurred, who left the house, how long they had been separated, and the other reasons that he must describe clearly. However, this stage is optional because sometimes the Judge skipped this part to save time due to the large number of trials that must be completed every day by the panel of judges.

At the stage of Trial Postponement, the chief judge adjourned the hearing until the following week, for summoning the Respondent to appear in court again.

The stage of Reminder for Petitioner is an obligatory stage, where the chief judge notified the Petitioner to reappear on that day and date mentioned earlier without being summoned as this notice constituted a formal summons, as well as reminding the Petitioner to present two witnesses for the next evidentiary hearing.

The stage of Closing the Trial occurred after the adjournment of the hearing was announced; the Chief Judge declared the hearing closed.

### 3.1.2. Second Trial – Proof

The Schematic Structure is as follows:

OPENING THE TRIAL ^ CASE QUEUE  
CALL ^ (JUDICIAL INQUIRY) ^ WIT-  
NESSES SUMMON ^ (JUDICIAL INQUIRY)  
^ WITNESSES’ OATH ^ [[FIRST WITNESS  
TESTIMONY]]n ^ [[SECOND WITNESS  
TESTIMONY]]n ^ JUDICIAL DELIBERA-  
TION.

Where ^ represents ‘followed by’, (...) signifies ‘optionally’, [...] means embedded context, [...]n indicates embedded context parat-actically. As stated, the schematic structures are extended in a line.

At the stage of Opening the Trial, the composition of the Panel of Judges was the same as in the previous session. The hearing was opened and declared open to the public by the Presiding Judge. However, this part is optional because the Judges sometimes directly ask the officer to call the Litigants.

At the stage of Case Queue Call, the summoning of litigants’ case number by the Officer/Portier occurs.

At the stage of Judicial Inquiry, the judge asked about the presence of the Petitioner or Respondent and the availability of the evidence and witnesses. This part is optional because the judges sometimes directly request the officer to call witnesses from the Petitioner’s side to enter the courtroom.

At the stage of Witnesses Summon, the two witnesses who will testify were escorted by the Portier into the courtroom and sat directly facing the Panel of Judges.

At the stage of Judicial Inquiry, the judge asked how the witnesses were doing and whether they were willing to be sworn in.

At the stage of Witnesses’ Oath, both Witnesses took

the oath in an Islamic manner by placing the holy Qur'an on the heads of the Witnesses, conducted by the Portier. The Witnesses took the oath by following the Judge's words: "Bismillahirrahmaanirrahiim. Wallahi, I swear. That I will tell the truth, and nothing but the truth."

The stage of First Witness Testimony is an obligatory stage where the first witness was the Petitioner's cousin, who stated that the Witness was aware of the household situation of the Petitioner and the Respondent, knew, heard, and saw first-hand the arguments between the Petitioner and the Respondent, when the Respondent left the house, and the Witness was also aware of the Respondent's rude behavior when arguing with the Petitioner. If the testimony of the witness is deemed insufficient by the panel of judges, a new witness will be summoned.

The stage of Second Witness Testimony is also an obligatory stage where the second witness was the Petitioner's colleague, who stated that the Witness was aware of the household situation of the Petitioner and the Respondent, heard first-hand the arguments between the Petitioner and the Respondent, when the Respondent left the house, and the witness was also aware of the Respondent's rude behavior when arguing with the Petitioner. Similar to the first witness, if the testimony is deemed insufficient by the panel of judges, a new witness will be summoned.

At the Judicial Deliberation stage, the panel of judges deliberated and declared the hearing closed to the public. This is the stage that is often crossed or shortened by the panel of judges to speed up the trial. No speech appeared or was heard at this stage.

### 3.1.3. Third Trial – Verdict

The Schematic Structure is as follows:

THE JUDGE'S VERDICT ^ CLOSING THE TRIAL.

Where ^ represents 'followed by'.

At the stage of The Judge's Verdict, the Chief Judge read out the Court decision in the case of a divorce application by the Petitioner right after deliberation and granted the Petitioner's request as *Verstek* because the Respondent was never present or sent someone as her representative during the trial, imposed *Talaq-1 Raj'i* on the Petitioner against the Respondent, as well as charged the Petitioner with court fees.

The stage of Closing the Trial emerged after the Chief

Judge rendered the verdict, the judge declared the trial closed.

### 3.1.4. Fourth Trial – Talaq Vow

The Schematic Structure is as follows:

OPENING THE TRIAL ^ LITIGANTS SUMMON ^ (JUDICIAL INQUIRY) ^ ISTIGHFAR RECITATION ^ [[TALAQ VOW]] ^ [[DETERMINATION READING]] ^ CLOSING THE TRIAL ^ [TRIAL FEE PAYMENT].

Where ^ represents 'followed by', (...) signifies 'optionally, [...] means embedded context, [...] indicates reiteration. As said, the schematic structures are extended in a line.

At the stage of Opening the Trial, the composition of the panel of judges was the same as in the previous session. The hearing was opened and declared open to the public by the Chief Judge or the Chairman of the Panel.

The stage of Litigants Summon means summoning of litigants by the Portier. The Petitioner appeared in person with his attorney, while the Respondent did not appear nor did she send anyone to represent her.

The stage of Judicial Inquiry is an optional stage where the chief judge asked the Petitioner about his readiness to pronounce Talaq on the Respondent in front of the Panel of Judges.

At the stage of Istighfar Recitation, the Petitioner must say "Astaghfirullah" three times before the Pledge of Talaq.

The stage of Talaq Vow is an obligatory stage where the Petitioner pronounced the Talaq Vow, "Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. On this day Monday, December 11, 2023, I, S Bin J imposed Talaq-1 Raj'i on my wife N binti D."

The stage of Determination Reading is also an obligatory stage where the Chief Judge reads the determination. Firstly, it is declared that the marriage between S Bin J as the Petitioner and N Binti D as the Respondent is dissolved due to divorce with *Talaq 1 Raj'i*. Secondly, the court fees shall be charged to the Petitioner.

At the stage of Closing the Trial, the Chief Judge declared the hearing of this case closed by saying *Hamdallah*.

The stage of Trial Fee Payment is where the Chief Judge explained the court fees and the Petitioner left the courtroom heading to the cashier to make payment. This part is reiteration since the Petitioner already gave a deposit to the cashier for each trial of the case.

The description of each trial of the *talaq* divorce case examination process above resulted in a total of four types of schematic structures in the *talaq* divorce case at the Medan Syari'ah Court. The schematic structure for the *talaq* divorce is marked with the symbol T, which means *talaq* divorce trial. The number of trials is represented by a numerical symbol,

namely 1, 2, 3, or 4. With reference to its constituents or elements, the schematic structures have different stages in each session. Thus, the schematic structures of the *talaq* divorce case are T-1, T-2, T-3 and T-4. When put in tabular form, the schematic structures of the *talaq* divorce case at Medan Syari'ah Court are as follows (**Table 1**):

**Table 1.** The schematic structure of *Talaq* divorce case examination.

Schematic Structure	Stages
T-1	Opening the Trial ^ Litigants Summon ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ The Power of Attorney ^ [[Relaas Checking]] ^ (Reasons for Divorce) ^ Trial Postponement ^ [[Reminder for Petitioner]] ^ Closing the Trial.
T-2	Opening the Trial ^ Case Queue Call ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ Witnesses Summon ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ Witnesses' Oath ^ [[First Witness Testimony]]n ^ [[Second Witness Testimony]]n ^ Judicial Deliberation.
T-3	The Judge's Verdict ^ Closing the Trial.
T-4	Opening the Trial ^ Litigants Summon ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ Istighfar Recitation ^ [[Talaq Vow]] ^ [[Determination Reading]] ^ Closing the Trial ^ [Trial Fee Payment].

Based on the schematic structure table above, the patterns presented in each session change significantly. Normally, in the case of *talaq* divorce at the first trial, the judge will ask the reason why the Petitioner wants to divorce his wife. Specifically, at the first hearing, the panel of judges must ensure that the Relaas (court summon) is received by the Respondent in order to attend the hearing at the Syari'ah court. Also at this first hearing, the Petitioner was reminded by the Judge to present two witnesses at the next trial. In the second trial or Proof trial, the witnesses will give their testimony regarding the Petitioner's claim about the Respondent based on the judges' questions. In other words, the testimony of witnesses is to validate the Petitioner's claim against the Respondent as grounds for divorce. At the third hearing or Verdict session, the Chief Judge handed down the verdict after seeing and hearing the evidence presented by the Petitioner following the judicial deliberation process. At the fourth hearing or Talaq Vow trial, the Petitioner would make his *pledge of talaq* against the Respondent before the panel of judges. Then, the *talaq* divorce trial proceedings will end marked by the stage of trial fee payment by the Petitioner.

### 3.2. Intensity of the Stages

The intensity of each level of the schematic structures changes with the amount of time invested or length. Each of the four forms of *talaq* divorce process requires a different amount of time. The variance in time spent or duration is

used to calculate intensity. Thus, the proportion of time spent at each stage reveals the stage's intensity: the longer the time spent or the length, the greater the intensity. The intensity of each level is represented by the dimension of the (colored) bar, as seen in the following figures.

As indicated in **Figure 1**, the stage of Reason for Divorce is the most intense or the dominant stage among the other stages in the T-1 Schematic Structure. The least intense are the Opening the Trial stage, Litigants Summon, Trial Postponement and Closing the Trial. This stage lasts for 30 minutes. The figure also shows comparisons of intensity of the stages.



**Figure 1.** Intensity Proportions of T-1 Schematic Structure.

Note: 1. Opening the Trial; 2. Litigants Summon; 3. Judicial Inquiry; 4. The Power of Attorney; 5. Relaas Checking; 6. Reason for Divorce; 7. Trial Postponement; 8. Reminder for Petitioner; 9. Closing the Trial.

As illustrated in **Figure 2**, the stage of First Witness Testimony is the most in intensity or the dominant stage among the other stages in the T-2 Schematic Structure. The least are the Opening the Trial and Case Queue Call stages. This stage lasts for 45 minutes. The figure also show comparisons of intensity of the stages.

As shown in **Figure 3**, the stage of The Judge's Verdict is the most intense or the dominant stage among the other stages in the T-3 Schematic Structure. The least intense is



the Closing the Trial stage. This stage lasts for 5 minutes. The figure also shows comparisons of intensity of the stages.



**Figure 2.** Intensity proportions of T-2 schematic structure.

Note: 1. Opening the Trial; 2. Case Queue Call; 3. Judicial Inquiry; 4. Witnesses Summon; 5. Judicial Inquiry; 6. Witnesses' Oath; 7. First Witness Testimony; 8. Second Witness Testimony; 9. Judicial Deliberation.



**Figure 3.** Intensity Proportions of T-3 Schematic Structure.

Note: 1. The Judge's Verdict; 2. Closing the Trial.

As it turns out in **Figure 4**, the stage of Talaq Vow is the most intense or the dominant stage among the other stages in the T-4 Schematic Structure. The least intense are the Opening the Trial and Closing the Trial stages. This stage lasts for 15 minutes. The figure also shows comparisons of intensity of the stages.



**Figure 4.** Intensity proportions of T-4 schematic structure.

Note: 1. Opening the Trial; 2. Litigants Summon; 3. Judicial Inquiry; 4. Istighfar Recitation; 5. Talaq Vow; 6. Determination Reading; 7. Closing the Trial; 8. Trial Fee Payment.

### 3.3. Linguistic Realizations

In relation to the context of the divorce process in the syari'ah court, the language realization of the schematic structure of the *talaq* divorce case processes at Medan Syari'ah Court realized through the Experiential and Interpersonal functions, as well as the specification of communicative complexity of the divorce case, are explored below:

#### 3.3.1. First Trial - Reconciliation Attempt

The Opening Trial stage is realized with Material process as Statement such as *Dengan membaca bismillahirrahmanirrahim, pada hari ini, Senin, 20 November 2023, Pengadilan Agama Medan yang memeriksa perkara perdata, dengan ini, dibuka dan terbuka untuk umum* (By reciting bismillahirrahmanirrahim, on this day, Monday, November 20, 2023, Medan Syari'ah Court, which examines civil cases, is hereby opened, and opened to the public). This indicates that the trial is open to the public. When the panel of judges is about to open the trial, they state "the trial is open to the public", meaning any person wishing to follow the proceedings may enter the courtroom.

The stage of Litigants Summon begins with the officer calling the Petitioner and Respondent's names loudly in Verbal process as Command realized with expressions such as *Antrian 7, ruang sidang-2. Bapak S dan Ibu NA! (Queue-7, courtroom-2. On behalf of Mr. S and Mrs. NA!)*. Then the litigants will come immediately and enter the courtroom.

The Judicial Inquiry stage begins with the judges' Questions to the Petitioner or his Attorney to confirm their identities realized mostly in Relational process with expressions such as *Rizky Iriansyah? (confirm the attorney's name), Klien kamu bernama S ya? (Your client's name is S right?)*. Moreover, sometimes the judge shortens the question by only mentioning the Petitioner's name such as *Bapak S ya? (Mr. S, right?)*.

The Power of Attorney stage begins with the judge's Questions to the Petitioner's attorney to show his identity and the Power of Attorney. It is realized in the form of relational processes using expressions such as *Ada surat kuasa? (Is there a Power of Attorney?), Mana surat kuasanya? (Where is the Power of Attorney?)*

The Relas Checking stage begins with the judge checking the letter by using a tracking device to determine whether the Respondent has already received it or not. It realized with the Question expressions such as *Kelvin siapa Pak? (Who is Kelvin, Sir?), Apakah Bapak kenal orang yang menerima surat ini? (Do you know the person who received the letter?), Siapanya istri kamu ini? (What does he have to do with your wife?), Apakah istri Pemohon tinggal di rumah yang sama dengan penerima surat ini? (Does your wife live in the same house as the one who received the letter?), Apakah Termohon sudah tahu bahwa Pemohon akan menceraikan Termohon? (Does the Respondent know that you want to divorce her?), etc. The process is dominantly Relational. The judges must confirm that the *relas* was received by the Respondent in order to fulfill the conditions for the trial to take place which have been integrated into the judicial system, because if the Respondent turns out not to have received the *relas* or summon letter, then the trial cannot proceed as it should.*

The Reason for Divorce stage begins with the judge's Questions concerning the Petitioner's reason for divorcing his wife. It is realized mostly in Material process with expressions such as *Kenapa Bapak mau menceraikan istri Bapak? (Why do you want to divorce your wife?), Sekarang di mana istri kamu tinggal? (Where does your wife live now?), Di*

*mana alamat rumahnya? (Where is her address?), Apakah kamu pernah membujuknya untuk pulang? (Did you ever persuade her to come back?), Sama siapa istri kamu tinggal? (Who does your wife live with?), Kapan terakhir jumpa dengan istri kamu? (When did you last see your wife?), Di mana terakhir kali bertemu dengan istrimu? (Where did you last see your wife?),* and so on. This part is the most intense because the panel of judges will ask the Petitioner repetitive questions to ensure the validity of the Petitioner's answers.

The Trial Postponement stage begins with the chief judge giving her Statement in Material process with expressions such as *Sidang ditunda 1 minggu ke depan tanggal 27 November (The hearing is adjourned 1 week ahead on November 27th),* or *Sidang ditunda hingga minggu depan (The trial is postponed until next week).* Then it will naturally continue to the next stage.

The stage of Reminder for the Petitioner begins with the judge's Command that reminds the Petitioner to bring two witnesses who saw, heard and experienced the quarrel between the Petitioner and the Respondent in Material process with expressions such as *Hadirkan dua orang saksi minggu depan (Present two witnesses next week), Minggu depan bawa dua orang saksi yang melihat, mendengar atau mengalami langsung pertengkarnya (Next week bring two witnesses who saw, heard or experienced the quarrel firsthand),* etc.

The stage of Closing the Trial begins with the chief judge giving her Statement in Material process by saying *Sidang ditutup (Trial closed).* Then the chief judge knocks the gavel three times, signaling that the hearing is closed.

### 3.3.2. Second Trial – Proof

The Opening Trial stage in the second trial is realized with Material process as Statement such as *Dengan membaca bismillahirrahmanirrahim, pada hari ini, Senin, 27 November 2023, Pengadilan Agama Medan yang memeriksa perkara perdata, dengan ini, dibuka dan terbuka untuk umum (By reciting bismillahirrahmanirrahim, on this day, Monday, November 27, 2023, Medan Syari'ah Court, which examines civil cases, is hereby opened, and opened to the public).* This indicates that the trial is open to the public. When the panel of judges is about to open the trial, they state "The trial is open to the public", which means any person wishing to follow the proceedings may enter the courtroom.

The stage of Case Queue Call begins with the officer

calling the Petitioner and Respondent's names loudly in Verbal process as Command realized with expressions such as *Antrian nomor 13, nomor perkara 2769! (Queue 13, case number 2769!).* Then the Petitioner and his attorney will come to enter the courtroom.

The Judicial Inquiry stage begins with the judge asking Questions to ensure that the Petitioner and Respondent are present at the trial. In this case, the Petitioner was only represented by his attorney yet the Respondent was not present. It is realized mostly in Material process with expressions such as *Ini Prinsipalnya belum hadir ya? (Is the litigant not present yet?), Apakah di sidang sebelumnya Pemohon hadir? (Was the Petitioner present at the previous hearing?), Sudah hadirkan bukti-bukti? (Have you presented evidence?), Saksi sudah hadir? (Are the witnesses present?),* and so on.

The Witnesses Summon stage begins when the judge gives Command to the officer to call the witnesses, which is commonly in Material process with expressions such as *Panggil saksi, Zal! (Call the witnesses, Zal!), Saksi dari Bapak S! (Witness of Mr.S!), Silahkan maju ke depan! (Please come forward!), Tolong berdiri! (Stand up please!),* etc.

The Judicial Inquiry stage begins with the judge asking Questions about the witnesses' readiness to be sworn before testifying in accordance with the witnesses' religion mostly in Mental process as *Para saksi siap disumpah ya? (The witnesses are ready to be sworn in, yes?), Apakah para saksi dalam keadaan sehat? (Are the witnesses in good health?), Apakah para saksi siap disumpah? (Are the witnesses ready to be sworn?),* normally they will give positive answers like *yes,* and so on.

The stage of Witnesses' Oath is done by witnesses' pledge Statement before giving their testimony in Verbal process by following the judge's words. If the witness who swears is Muslim, the expressions will be like *Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Wallahi. Demi Allah saya bersumpah. Bahwa saya akan menerangkan dengan sebenarnya dan tiada lain dari pada yang sebenarnya (Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Wallahi. By Allah I swear. That I will tell the truth and nothing other than the truth).* If the witness who swears is Christian, the expressions will be like *Saya bersumpah bahwa saya akan menerangkan dengan sebenarnya dan tiada lain dari pada yang sebenarnya. Semoga Tuhan menolong saya (I swear that I will tell the truth and nothing but the truth. May*

*God help me*). If the witness who swears is Hindu, the expressions will be like *Om Atah Parama Wisesa. Saya bersumpah bahwa saya akan menerangkan dengan sebenarnya dan tiada lain dari yang sebenarnya (Om Atah Parama Wisesa. I swear that I will tell the truth and nothing other than the truth)*. If the witness who swears is Buddhist, the expression will be like *Demi Sang Hyang Adi Budha. Saya bersumpah bahwa saya akan menerangkan dengan sebenarnya dan tiada lain dari yang sebenarnya (Demi Sang Hyang Adi Budha. I swear that I will explain the truth and nothing other than the truth)*.

The First Witness Testimony stage is realized by Questions by the panel of judges to obtain formal truth (formeel waarheid) where the six processes in transitivity appear, but the Material process is dominant. The linguistic realizations are as follows: *Apa hubungan Saksi dengan Pemohon? (What is the Witness's relationship with the Petitioner?), Apakah Pemohon dan Termohon sudah lama menikah? (Have the Petitioner and the Respondent been married for a long time?), Apakah mereka sudah punya anak? (Do they have children?), Apakah mereka sekarang sedang bermasalah? (Are they in trouble now?), Sejak kapan mereka bermasalah? (Since when did they have problems?), Apakah Saksi pernah melihat sendiri keributannya? (Did the Witness ever see them arguing?), Apakah Saksi pernah mendengar mereka bertengkar? (Has the Witness ever heard them quarrel?), Apa penyebab pertengkarannya? (What was the cause of the quarrel?), Kenapa mereka bertengkar? (Why did they quarrel?), Apakah ada penyebab lainnya? (Was there any other cause?), Apa lagi penyebab pertengkarannya? (What else was the cause of the quarrel?), Apakah sekarang mereka masih tinggal serumah? (Do they still live in the same house?), Sejak kapan mereka pisah rumah? (Since when did they separate?), Siapa yang meninggalkan rumah? (Who left the house?), Apakah ada orang yang mendamaikan mereka? (Has anyone reconciled them?), Apakah Saksi pernah ikut mendamaikan mereka? (Has the Witness ever participated in reconciling them?), Dari pihak keluarga apakah ada yang mendamaikan mereka? (Has anyone from the family reconciled them?), Apa hasil dari usaha mendamaikan tersebut? (What was the result of the mediation?), etc.*

Similar to the First Witness Testimony stage, the Second Witness Testimony stage also asks almost exactly the same Questions as the first witness. The process is domi-

nantly the Material ones. In accordance with the law where the testimony of two witnesses is considered stronger for the panel of judges to consider the evidence before rendering its verdict, the judge will ask the same question to the second witness, which is realized with expressions such as *Apa hubungan Saksi dengan Pemohon dan Termohon? (What is the Witness's relationship with the Petitioner and the Respondent?), Apakah Saksi tahu bahwa mereka suami istri? (Does the Witness know that they are husband and wife?), Apakah Saksi mengetahui bahwa mereka sudah punya anak? (Does the Witness know that they have a child?), Apakah Saksi pernah melihat ribut-ributnya? (Has the Witness ever seen the quarrel?), Dimana Saksi melihat ribut-ributnya? (Where did the Witness see the quarrel?), Sejak kapan tahu ribut-ributnya? (When did you know about the quarrel?), Apa penyebab ributnya? (What was the cause of the quarrel?), Apa pemicu keributannya? (What was the trigger of the quarrel?), Siapa yang pergi meninggalkan rumah? (Who left the house?), Apakah Saksi mengetahui usaha damainya? (Does the Witness know about the reconciliation efforts?), Apakah Saksi pernah berusaha mendamaikan mereka? (Has the Witness ever tried to reconcile them?), Sudah berapa lama mereka pisah rumah? (How long have they been separated?), etc.*

The stage of the Judicial Deliberation begins after the Second Witness Testimony stage is completed. Then the panel of judges will deliberate before giving its verdict. At this point, there is no statement made by the judges, but this stage is part of the procedure for conducting the trial. Then the panel of judges immediately move on the third trial.

### 3.3.3. Third Trial – Verdict

The Judge's Verdict stage is realized by Statement dominantly in Material process related to the decision after seeing and hearing the evidence presented at the trial, namely written evidence in the form of family cards, identity cards and marriage books as well as the testimony of witnesses. The linguistic realizations are as follows: *Putusan nomor 2769/PDT.G/2023/PA Medan. Bismillahirrahmanirrahmin. Demi Keadilan, berdasarkan Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa, Mahkamah Pengadilan yang mengadili dan memeriksa perkara tertentu. Mengadili:*

1. *Menyatakan Termohon telah dipanggil secara resmi dan patut untuk menghadap ke persidangan, tidak hadir.*

3. Mengabulkan permohonan Pemohon dengan Verstek.
3. Menjatuhkan Talak-1 Raj'i Pemohon S Bin Y terhadap Termohon NA Binti D.
4. Membebankan biaya perkara kepada Pemohon.

(Verdict number 2769/PDT.G/2023/PA Medan. Bismillahirrahmanirrahmin. For the sake of justice, based on belief in the Almighty God, the Court of Justice that hears and examines certain cases. Adjudge:

1. Declare that the Respondent has been officially and properly summoned to appear in court, but is not present.
2. To grant the petition of the Petitioner by Verstek.
3. To impose Talak-1 Raj'i of the Petitioner S Bin Y against the Respondent NA Binti D.
4. Charged the costs of the case to the Petitioner.)

The stage of Closing the Trial begins after the verdict is done by the Chief Judge. It realized with Statement in form of Material process as *Sidang ditutup (Trial closed)*. Then the Chief Judge knocks on the gavel three times.

### 3.3.4. Fourth Trial – Talaq Vow

The Opening Trial stage in the fourth hearing is realized with a material process as a statement such as *Dengan membaca bismillahirrahmanirrahim, pada hari ini, Senin, 11 Desember 2023, Pengadilan Agama Medan yang memeriksa perkara perdata, dengan ini, dibuka dan terbuka untuk umum (By reciting bismillahirrahmanirrahim, on this day, Monday, December 11, 2023, Medan Syari'ah Court, which examines civil cases, is hereby opened, and opened to the public)*. This indicates that the trial is open to the public. When the panel of judges is about to open the trial, they state "The trial is open to the public", which means any person wishing to follow the proceedings may enter the courtroom.

The stage of Litigants Summon begins with the officer calling the Petitioner and Respondent's names loudly in a verbal process as Command realized with expressions such as *Selanjutnya antrian 3, ruang sidang-2. Bapak S dan kuasa! (Next, queue 3, courtroom-2. On behalf of Mr. S and the attorney!)*. Then the litigants will come immediately and enter the courtroom.

The Judicial Inquiry stage begins with the judge's questions about the Petitioner's readiness to say the pledge of talaq against the Respondent. The linguistic realizations are dominated by the Material process as *Apakah Pemohon sudah siap untuk mengucapkan ikrar talaq? (Is the Petitioner*

*ready to pronounce the talaq vow?)*, *Apakah Pemohon dalam keadaan sehat? (Is the applicant in good health?)*, *Apakah Pemohon tetap ingin bercerai? (Does the Petitioner still want a divorce?)*. Usually, the Petitioner will answer yes.

The stage of Istighfar Recitation begins with the judge commanding the Petitioner to say verbally Istighfar three times, and the Petitioner obeys it, which realized with the expressions such as *Istighfar dulu tiga kali (Say Istighfar three times)*. *Astaghfirullah. Astaghfirullah. Astaghfirullah*. And it will continue to the next stage.

The stage of Talaq Vow is realized by a statement where the Petitioner pronounces his pledge of talaq against the Respondent by following the judge's words in verbal process as *Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Pada hari ini, Senin, tanggal 11 Desember tahun 2023. Di hadapan Majelis Hakim Pengadilan Agama Medan. Saya bernama S Bin Y menjatuhkan Talak-1 Raj'i terhadap istri saya bernama N Binti D (Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. On this day, Monday, the 11th day of December, 2023. Before the Panel of Judges of the Medan Syari'ah Court. I, S Bin Y, have pronounced Talak-1 Raj'i against my wife, N Binti D)*. Then the judge will ask him to sit back.

The stage of Determination Reading begins with the judge directly reading the Statements from the syari'ah court, which is dominantly in a Material process with the expressions such as *Penetapan nomor 2769/PDT.G/2023/PA Medan. Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Demi keadilan, berdasarkan Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa, Mahkamah Pengadilan yang mengadili perkara tertentu pada tingkat pengadilan, telah menjatuhkan penetapan dalam perkara antara S Sebagai Pemohon dan N sebagai Termohon. Dirikan Pasal 71 ayat 2 Tahun 1989, menetapkan:*

- (a) *Perkawinan antara Pemohon S Bin Y dengan Termohon N Binti D putus karena perceraian dengan Talak-1 Raj'i.*
- (b) *Membebankan biaya perkara sejumlah Rp.20.000,00.*

(Stipulation number 2769/PDT.G/2023/PA Medan. Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. For the sake of justice, based on belief in the Almighty God, the Court that hears certain cases at the court level, has handed down a verdict in the case between S as the Petitioner and N as the Respondent. In accordance with Article 71 paragraph 2 of the 1989 Constitution, it is stipulated that:

- (a) *The marriage between Petitioner S Bin Y and Respondent N Binti D is dissolved by divorce by Talaq-1 Raj'i.*  
 (b) *Charged court costs in the amount of Rp. 20,000.00.)*

The stage of Closing the Trial begins after the determination reading is done by the Chief Judge. It is realized with Statement in the form of Material process as *Sidang ditutup* (Trial closed). Then the Chief Judge knocks on the gavel three times.

The Trial Fee Payment stage starts mostly with Material process as Command that is realized with expressions such as *Ini receipt nya Pak* (Here the receipt Sir). *Silahkan pergi ke kasir ya* (Please go to the cashier). *Kalau ada uang lebih diambil* (If there is any refund, please take it). Then the Petitioner will show his gratitude by saying *Terima Kasih, Yang Mulia* (Thank you, Your Honor). Then the Petitioner and his Attorney exit the courtroom. The talaq divorce proceedings are completed.

It is found that there are various elements in each schematic structure in the *talaq* divorce case examined at the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom. Especially in the *talaq* divorce proceedings, there are four types of schematic structures, where the T-1 Schematic Structure during the Reconciliation Attempt trial consists of nine elements: Opening the Trial, Litigants Summon, Judicial Inquiry, The *Power of Attorney*, *Relaas* Checking, Reason for Divorce, Trial Postponement, Reminder for Petitioner and Closing the Trial; the T-2 Schematic Structure during the Proof trial is composed of nine constituents: Opening the Trial, Case Queue Call, Judicial Inquiry, Witnesses Summon, Judicial Inquiry, Witnesses' Oath, First Witness Testimony, Second Witness Testimony and Judicial Deliberation; the T-3 Schematic Structure during the Verdict trial has two elements, namely The Judge's Verdict and Closing the Trial; and the T-4 Schematic Structure during the Talaq Vow trial covers eight components, namely Opening the Trial, Litigants Summon, Judicial Inquiry, Istighfar Recitation, The Talaq Vow, Determination Reading, Closing the Trial and Trial Fee Payment. Those schematic structures are linear in the sense that elements proceed linearly through stages. That is the reason for calling an element or constituents or components as a stage. Thus the elements are also called stages or structures.

In addition, in terms of their general features, elements, constituents, phases, stages or structures are either obligatory or optional. In the context of *talaq* divorce case examination

at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom, the obligatory elements of the T-1 schematic structure are Opening the Trial, Litigants Summon, The Power of Attorney, *Relaas* Checking, Trial Postponement, Reminder for Petitioner and Closing the Trial, while its optional elements are Judicial Inquiry and Reason for Divorce. The T-2 schematic structure's obligatory components are Opening the Trial, Case Queue Call, Witnesses Summon, Witnesses' Oath, First Witness Testimony, Second Witness Testimony and Judicial Deliberation, as well as its optional components are the Judicial Inquiries part. The obligatory phases of T-3 schematic structure are The Judge's Verdict and Closing the Trial, yet there is no optional phase. The T-4 schematic structure's obligatory elements are Opening the Trial, Litigants Summon, Istighfar Recitation, Talaq Vow, Determination Reading, Closing the Trial and Trial Fee Payment, while its optional element is Judicial Inquiry. Specific or diacritic features may apply to a constituent or stage.

In favor of the *talaq* divorce case proceedings at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom, each of the four types of schematic structures has different intense stages. Among the nine stages of the T-1 schematic structure, Reason for Divorce is the most intensive, while Opening the Trial, Litigants Summon, Trial Postponement and Closing the Trial are the least intense. Within the nine constituents of the T-2 schematic structure, First Witness Testimony has dominant intensity, while Opening the Trial and Case Queue Call have minimum intensity. Between the stages of the T-3 schematic structure, The Judge's Verdict is the most intense, while Closing the Trial is the least intense. In the midst of the T-4 schematic structure, Talaq Vow has the highest intensity, whereas Opening the Trial and Closing the Trial have the lowest intensity.

One stage or element of the schematic structure is realized by specific linguistic features: experientially and interpersonally. In addition, the stages may be realized by the syari'ah law language such as *Panel of Judges, Clerk, Petitioner, Respondent, Plaintiff, Litigants, Attorney, the Power of Attorney, Relaa, Holy Qur'an, Witnesses' Oath, Verstek, Talaq, Talaq Divorce, Bin, Binti, Talaq-1 Raj'i, Istighfar Recitation, Talaq Vow, Bismillahirrahmanirrahim, Wallahi, Astaghfirullah, Jumadil Awal, Hijriah, Determination Reading and Stipulation*. This validates that there has been interaction of linguistic studies with Syari'ah Law.

The current study discovered that the schematic structures of divorce case examination at Medan Syari'ah court-

room are constitutently linear, vary in intensity with realization, and range from prominent linguistic elements to compound and complicated texts. Compared with previous study findings such as those done by Pal and Campbell<sup>[10]</sup>, Heisterkamp<sup>[11]</sup>, Olekalns, Brett and Donohue<sup>[12]</sup>, Saarela and Finnas<sup>[14]</sup>, Sportel<sup>[15]</sup>, the current study provides results that are much different in terms of topics, language elements, methods, approaches, analysis and concepts used in different contexts.

Meanwhile, compared to studies that have been carried out by Valipour, Assadi and Asl<sup>[16]</sup>, Liu and Buckingham<sup>[17]</sup>, Motlagh and Pourchang<sup>[18]</sup>, Zein, Sinar, Nurlela and Yusuf<sup>[19]</sup>, Kuswoyo, Sujatna, Indriyani and Rido<sup>[21]</sup>, Melefa, Matthew, Maryjoy and Adikke<sup>[22]</sup>, Bakhtiari<sup>[23]</sup>, Saragih, Batubara and Khairina<sup>[24]</sup>, the present study indicates new findings in four respects. First, the study conducted at the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom revealed four types of schematic structures of *talaq* divorce case examination, namely T-1, T-2, T-3 and T-4 schematic structures. Second, stages of the schematic structures vary with reference to the time spent. The type of trials conducted by the Panel of Judges are explicitly time-bound, and this has impacts on the trial process, which in effect is realized in the schematic structures of divorce case examination in the courtroom. Third, the realization of schematic structures ranges from simple salient linguistic, i.e., lexicogrammatical features through compound to compound-complex texts. Fourth, the use of syari'ah law language is found during the ongoing legal proceedings in the *talaq* divorce trials at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom as the novelty of the study.

The novel findings of this study have both theoretical and practical relevance. One important theoretical conclusion is that the new data support Halliday's theory of contextual interdependence. This is consistent with Martin's theory of text-context interconnectivity, in which social context influences and is determined by social context. The present study's findings have practical consequences in terms of establishing and analyzing the efficacy of and achievements resulting from the divorce case examination at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom.

Furthermore, this study will provide a comprehensive overview of how language plays a role in representing, experiencing and establishing interaction between all parties involved in the judicial process. By understanding the

schematic structure and function of language at divorce case trials, it is hoped to provide a deeper insight into the communicative dynamics at the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom, as well as stimulate reflection on how language can shape understanding and decisions in the context of divorce case settlement based on Islamic law. However, there are limitations to this study in terms of data source and context, specifically the divorce trial with *verstek* conducted by the panel of judges in Medan Syari'ah Courtroom. Additional study with more data sources and other research strategies will provide potential changes or justification for the new findings.

## 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

### 4.1. Conclusions

There are four types of schematic structures discovered within the *talaq* divorce case examination at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom, namely T-1, T-2, T-3 and T-4 schematic structures. The T-1 schematic structure consists of Opening the Trial ^ Litigants Summon ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ The *Power of Attorney* ^ [[Relaas Checking]] ^ (Reasons for Divorce) ^ Trial Postponement ^ [[Reminder for Petitioner]] ^ Closing the Trial. The T-2 schematic structure consists of Opening the Trial ^ Case Queue Call ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ Witnesses Summon ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ Witnesses' Oath ^ [[First Witness Testimony]]n ^ [[Second Witness Testimony]] ^ Judicial Deliberation. The T-3 schematic structure consists of The Judge's Verdict ^ Closing the Trial and the T-4 schematic structure consists of Opening the Trial ^ Litigants Summon ^ (Judicial Inquiry) ^ Istighfar Recitation ^ [[The Talaq Vow]] ^ [[Determination Reading]] ^ Closing the Trial ^ [Trial Fee Payment].

There are six processes of Transitivity revealed in the *talaq* divorce case proceedings at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom, namely Material process, Mental process, Relational process, Verbal process, Behavioral process and Existential process. Nevertheless, the Material process is mostly used by the parties involved in the trial proceedings at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom.

There are four kinds of Speech Functions in the divorce case process at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom utilized, such as Statement, Question, Command and Offer, with Statement

being dominantly used in the divorce trial proceedings at Medan Syari'ah Courtroom.

## 4.2. Recommendations

Along with the findings and implications previously outlined, the following recommendations can be put forward as constructive guidelines for the further development and improvement of the effectiveness of the Syari'ah judicial system, particularly in the handling of talaq and contested divorce cases at the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom:

1. Within each schematic structure, there are various stages or elements such as "Judicial Inquiry", "Witnesses' Oath", "Relaas Checking", "Istighfar Recitation", and "The Talaq Vow". It would be interesting to explore the functions and significance of these specific elements in the overall divorce proceedings to know what roles they play in terms of legal processes, religious, cultural practices or communicative purposes.
2. Since the study indicates that six transitivity processes (Material, Mental, Relational, Verbal, Behavioral and Existential) were identified in divorce case proceedings at the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom, it would be valuable to conduct an in-depth analysis of each process. This could involve examining the linguistic features, functions and patterns of each process, as well as their potential implications or significance in the context of divorce proceedings.
3. It would be interesting to investigate how the specific religious, legal, or cultural norms and practices shape the language use and communicative strategies employed in this setting since the dominant use of Statement and the overall patterns of Speech Functions might be influenced by the institutional and cultural context of the Medan Syari'ah Courtroom. Comparative studies with other courtroom contexts could shed light on the role of these factors.

## Author Contributions

Conceptualization, W.P.H.; methodology, W.P.H and A.S.; software, W.P.H and T.S.S.; validation, A.S and T.S.S.; formal analysis, W.P.H; investigation, W.P.H.; re-sources, W.P.H.; data curation, A.S. and T.S.S.; writing—original draft preparation, W.P.H.; writing—review and edit-ing, A.S. and

T.S.S.; visualization, W.P.H.; supervision, A.S. and T.S.S.; project administration, W.P.H.; funding acquisition, A.S. and T.S.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## Funding

This work received no external funding.

## Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

## Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

## Data Availability Statement

No new data were created.

## Acknowledgments

The utmost gratitude to all lecturers and colleagues for their wisdom, shared knowledge and guidance throughout the process of conducting this study. My sincerest appreciation to Universitas Negeri Medan for aiding in the process of publishing this research.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Wibowo, W., 2001. *Manajemen Bahasa: Pengorganisasian Karangan Pragmatik dalam Bahasa Indonesia untuk Mahasiswa dan Praktisi Bisnis* (Language Management: Organizing Pragmatic Compositions in Indonesian for Business Students and Practitioners). PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama: Jakarta, Indonesia. (in Indonesian).
- [2] Scuka, R.F., 2010. "That's just who I am": How the ambiguities of language influence our concept of personality and negatively impact couple relationships. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*. 9(1), 16–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332690903473051>
- [3] Rofiq, A., 1998. *Hukum Islam di Indonesia* (Islamic

- Law in Indonesia), 1st ed. RajaGrafindo Persada: Jakarta, Indonesia. (in Indonesian).
- [4] Hosen, K.H.I., 1971. *Fiqh Perbandingan dalam Masalah Nikah, Thalaq, Rudjuk dan Hukum Kewarisan* (Comparative Fiqh in Marriage, Divorce, Reconciliation and Inheritance Law), 1st ed. Balai Penerbitan dan Perpustakaan Islam: Jakarta, Indonesia. (in Indonesian).
- [5] Hyon, S., 1996. Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30(4), 693–722. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587930>
- [6] Eggins, S., 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, 2nd ed. Continuum: New York, NY, USA.
- [7] Martin, J.R., 1985. *Factual Writing: Exploring and Challenging Social Reality*, 2nd ed. Deakin University Press: Victoria, Australia.
- [8] Pramoolsook, I., DaliMunte, A.A., 2020. Systemic functional linguistics-legal genres and their configurations in the Islamic law and jurisprudence textbooks at a university in Indonesia. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*. 16(3), 1594–1610.
- [9] Halliday, M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M., 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed. Routledge: London, UK.
- [10] Pal, K., Campbell, J.A., 1995. A hybrid system for decision-making about assets in English divorce cases. In: Watson, I.D. (ed.). *Progress in Case-Based Reasoning*. Springer: Berlin & Heidelberg, Germany. pp. 152–165. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60654-8\\_30](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60654-8_30)
- [11] Heisterkamp, B.L., 2006. Conversational displays of mediator neutrality in a court-based program. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 38(12), 2051–2064. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.03.005>
- [12] Olekalns, M., Brett, J., Donohue, W., 2010. Words are all I have: Linguistic cues as predictors of settlement in divorce mediation. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*. 3(2), 145–168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2010.00053.x>
- [13] Donohue, W.A., Liang, Y.J., 2011. Transformative linguistic styles in divorce mediation: Linguistic styles in mediation. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*. 4(3), 200–218. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2011.00080.x>
- [14] Saarela, J., Finnäs, F., 2018. Ethno-linguistic exogamy and divorce: Does marital duration matter?. *Sociological Focus*. 51(4), 279–303. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2018.1431506>
- [15] Sportel, I., 2022. Stories of conflict: Ethnicity, social class, and difference in transnational divorce narratives. *Population, Space and Place*. 28(5), 1–11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2427>
- [16] Valipour, V., Assadi, N., Asl, H.D., 2017. The generic structures and lexico-grammaticality in English academic research papers. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*. 35(2), 169–182. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2017.1373365>
- [17] Liu, Y., Buckingham, L., 2018. The schematic structure of discussion sections in applied linguistics and the distribution of metadiscourse markers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 34, 97–109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.04.002>
- [18] Motlagh, H.S., Pourchangi, A.K., 2019. Schematic structure of literature review in research articles: A cross-disciplinary investigation. *Journal of New Advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 1(1), 67–87.
- [19] Zein, T.T., Sinar, T.S., Nurlela, N., et al., 2019. The incomplete linguistic features and schematic structure in EFL university students' narrative texts. *JETL (Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning)*. 4(1), 203–209. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v4i1.675>
- [20] Khan, M.T., Pervaiz, D.A., Abbas, D.S., 2021. Mapping schematic structures in narratives: A genre-based approach. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*. 18(10), 97–109.
- [21] Kuswoyo, H., Sujatna, E.T.S., Indrayani, L.M., et al., 2020. Schematic structure and lexicogrammatical features of aerospace engineering English lectures: A systemic functional linguistic approach. *Asian EFL Journal*. 27(4.6), 171–203.
- [22] Melefa, O.M., Amoniyani, O.M., Adike, M.I., 2020. Generic structure potential analysis of classroom interactions in a Nigerian university. *Journal of English and Communication in Africa*. 3(1), 146–168.
- [23] Bakhtiari, A., 2021. Schematic structure and stance in students' writing in business communication: A comparative study of native English speaking and Iranian students. *Journal of Language and Literature*. 21(2), 252–266. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v21i2.3039>
- [24] Saragih, A.; Batubara, K.; Khairina, Y., 2021. Schematic Structure and Linguistic Realizations of Virtual English Language Lectures in the Social Context of the Pandemic Covid-19. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Innovation in Education, Science and Culture, ICIESC 2021*; August 31, 2021; Medan, Indonesia. pp. 1–9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.31-8-2021.2313753>
- [25] Gibbons, J., 2003. *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford, UK.
- [26] Heffer, C., 2005. *The Language of Jury Trial: A Corpus-Aided Analysis of Legal-Lay Discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK.