SEMIOTICS ANALYSIS OF THE QURAN TEXT ABOUT JIHĀD FĪ SABĪLILLĀH IN JULIA KRISTEVA'S SEMANALISYS TO INTERTEXTUALITY APPROACH

Ihsan Nursidik
Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
sanssidik22@gmail.com

Abstract

The interpretation of the Qur'an, especially the word jihād fī sabīlillāh, is often trapped in a standard interpretation legitimized by closed interpretations. The secure interpretations make the meaning of the word lose its original purpose. This specific interpretation makes the meaning of the word jihād fī sabīlillāh lose its original meaning. This article aims to find a methodological review that might be able to open the veil that closes the interpretation of ijtihad in the original meaning of the jihād fī sabīlillāh pronunciation. Julia Kristeva, as one of the thinkers of poststructuralism, introduced the semanalist concept known for its revolutionary interpretation methodology. This research is a type of qualitative research with the analytical-descriptive method. This study will explain the concepts of Kristeva's interpretation of a text and then applied to the interpretation of the pronunciation of Jihad. The study results conclude that the interpretation of Jihad as war is an institutional meaning. In contrast, the hidden meaning of the pronunciation of Jihad, such as 'sincerity', does not get attention and tends to be neglected.

Keywords: *Semiotics, Semanalisys, Intertextuality, Julia Kristeva, Jihād fī sabīlillāh*

Abstrak

Penafsiran Al-Quran khususnya pada kata *jihād fī sabīlillah* kerap kali terjebak pada penafsiran baku yang banyak dilegitimasi oleh penafsiran yang tertutup. Penafsiran tertutup ini membuat makna dari kata tersebut kehilangan makna aslinya. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menemukan suatu tinjauan metodologis yang kiranya mampu membuka *tabir* yang menutup penafsiran terhadap *ijtihad* dalam makna asli lafal *jihād fī sabīlillah* tersebut. Julia Kristeva sebagai salah satu pemikir *poststrukturalisme,* memperkenalkan konsep *semanalis* yang dikenal dengan metodologi penafsirannya yang bersifat revolusioner. Penelitian ini merupakan jenis penelitian kualitatif dengan

metode analisis-deskriptif. Penelitian ini akan menjelaskan konsep-konsep penafsiran Kristeva terhadap sebuah teks, kemudian diaplikasikan pada penafsiran lafal *jihād*. Hasil penelitian menyimpulkan bahwa penafsiran *jihād* sebagai perang merupakan makna institusional, sedangkan makna yang tersembunyi dari lafal *jihād* seperti '*kesungguhan*' ini tidak mendapatkan perhatian dan cenderung terabaikan.

Kata Kunci: *Semiotika, Semanalisis, Intertektualitas, Julia Kristeva, Jihād fī sabīlillāh.*

Introduction

Jihād fī sabilillah is a term used by Islam for naming specific actions in the religion-oriented. Etymologically Jihad is taken from the word *juhd* (جهد), which means 'ability' or 'strength,'. At the same time, *jihād* (جهاد) means 'struggle'.[1] As for the term Yusuf Qarḍawi divides the meaning of this Jihad into three. First, Jihad against visible enemies. Second, jihad against the devil's temptations, and third, jihad against lust.[2] The three meanings provide an overview of activities in devoting action. So, in general, Jihad can be interpreted as a human endeavor carried out to the fullest.

However, in the current context of thought, the term jihad is often intended to legitimize an act of *ẓalim* that is contrary to the teachings of Islam itself. When reflecting on the suicide bombing cases, the perpetrators and victims always label their actions as a form of *Jihad fī sabilillah*. It is what causes the understanding of the meaning of *Jihad* to be so narrow. This reality then provides an account of the state of the *jihad fī sabilillah*, which is institutionalized into a single sign institution. It happens due to an exclusive interpretation, a monopoly practice of the verse to absolute misleading performance. Unwittingly, several groups agreed upon the meaning, until dogmatically, this understanding formed an ideology. This understanding consistently manifests itself in a radical movement and confirms the stigma of terrorism in Islam[3].

His issue of interpretation is closely related to humanity. As explained by Barthes that semiotics is an activity that deals with humans interpreting a sign. Signs are not just the meaning given to the reality of the object alone but also related to a vast network, covering everything related to human life.[4]

The word *jihad fī sabīlillāh* is a significant reality that needs to be reinterpretation in such a way. So that the meaning of the text is not trapped in a dogmatism that closes other possibilities for its interpretation, there are still meanings that have not been revealed (unspeakable) because the word *jihād fī sabīlillāh* does not only signify meaning in itself but also something outside of itself. The following about meaning is

---

[1] Munawir A.W, "Kamus Indonesia - Arab," dalam *Kamus Al-Munawwir Indonesia dan Arab* (Surabaya: Pustaka Progressif, 2007), 234.

[2] Yusuf Qarḍawi, *Fiqih Jihad*, ed. oleh a Yadi Saeful Hidayat dan Ayatullah Khoemini, trans. oleh Irfan Maulana Hakim dkk. (Bandung: Mizan, 2010), 3.

[3] Abbas J. Ali, "Jihad in Monotheistic Religions: Implications for Business and Management," *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 23, no. 12 (2003):19–46.

[4] Zoest Van dan Panuti Sudjman, *Serba-serbi Semiotika* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1992), vii.

the relationship between material and immaterial entities with a sign,[5]so it is essential to study these signs to analyze, criticize and disassemble the interpretations that contain monopolistic meanings.

The requirement to be an argument for the discourse on signs—semiotics itself—can encourage an interpretation that moves reality. In its implementation, efforts to dismantle this monopolistic interpretation require several conditions. Among them, such as the concept of multimodality or diversity of performances is arbitrary or driven based on the characteristic motif of the sign itself, the overall representation and purpose of communication must be in an evaluative study. Finally, the value of a sign can only be revealed by an in-depth question on it.[6]

As a signed study, searching for essential elements such as signifier and signified language is very important. So that the position of language—in this case, Arabic—is also involved in examining the relationship between the word *Jihad fī sabīlillah* and its representation. As Nyoman (2004), quoted by Ambarini and Umaya, explains, literary activities (semiotics), which have a vast complexity, allow to bring up aspects of the development of literary culture and language.[7] Barthes also emphasized that a language is a tool used to describe the meaning of metalanguage due to how humans interpret signs.[8]

So it is not strange if the word *jihād fī sabīlillah* is then used as a tool to legitimize terrorist behavior in the name of religion. This justification occurs due to the representation of meaning *jihad fī sabīlillah*, which is often associated with war. Not to mention if it is arbitrarily related to the context of battles that occurred during the time of the Prophets and Apostles in considering today's context. The meaning of the text and context in this linguistic element can then shape thoughts and culture related to it.

Furthermore, in the writings of Dadang Rusmana (2015), several experts, such as Umberto Eco (1979), Roland Barthes (1967), and Coward and Ellis (1977), seem to show agreement on the form of even if the sign and subject involved in the sign system are arbitrary, if the sign is based on a specific social agreement (convention or code), then the sign is counted as meaning.[9]

After that, a method is needed to see the reality of this sign. Among the figures in formulating this sign study methodology are Ferdinand de Saussure, Charles Andrea Pierce, Louis Hjelmslev, A.J. Greimas, Roland Barthes, M.A.K Halliday, and Paul Ricoeur. Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, Umberto Eco, Umberto Eco, Julia Kristeva, Tzvetan Todorov, and Michael Riffater. As for this paper, researchers are interested in dismantling the word of *jihād fī sabīlillah* through Julia Kristeva's approach.

---

[5] Stephen W Littlejohn, *Theories of Human Communication*, V (New York: Publishing Company, 1996), 64.

[6] Paul Cobley, "Sociolinguistics and social semiotics."," in *Semiotics and Linguistics"*, with Gunther Kress (London; New York: The Routledge Companion, 2001), 67.

[7] Ambarini AS dan Umaya Maharani, *Semiotika: Teori dan Aplikasi pada Karya Sastra*, 1 (Semarang: IKIP-PGRI, t.th): 29.

[8] AS and Maharani.

[9] Dadan Rusmana, *Tokoh & Pemikiran Semiotik* (Bandung: Tazkia Press, 2015).

Why Kristeva? as we know that the existence of the Quran, which can adapt to the existing contests of the times, makes its interpretation have consequences for its openness and vast possibilities. With her semanalisys theory, Kristeva is in that field, which demands a never-ending understanding. That is why this paper adopts Kristeva's theory for the analytical instrument.

Reviewing previous studies regarding the word of *jihād*, as in the research of Emad M. Al-Saidat and Muhammad I. al-Khawalda (2012) entitled "*Jihad: A Victim of Policy and Misinterpretation*," concluded that the meaning of *jihād* in the Qur'an is not used in an offensive rather than a defensive sense. In this study, the meaning of Jihad was examined using semantic analysis to reveal the meaning of *jihād* in the web of substances contained in the Qur'an.[10] Then there is also research from M. Yusuf Yahya (2015) entitled "*Interpretation of Jihad in The Quran*," which emphasizes four things in the meaning of this *jihād*. First, the spirit of monotheism that spreads da'wah is not based on violence. Second, historically, Muslims are a group that was expelled from their hometown. Third, it is aimed at creating peace. Fourth, to prevent attacks.[11] The previous research from Sri Mulyati (2019), entitled "*The Meaning of Jihad: Textual and Contextual*," discusses the meaning of Jihad in textual and contextual reviews. The study results conclude that there are two poles of the interpretation of Jihad: the group that defines *jihād* as physical warfare and the group that represents *jihād* as restraining one's lust.[12] From the three studies, it can be seen that the entire research intends to explain the meaning of friendly Jihad. There is a tendency to emphasize a particular purpose of *jihād*. This study intends to explain the reality of interpretation through Kristeva's semantic analysis as an effort to interpret open signs.

The focus of this study will be to uncover the existence of a monopolistic interpretation of the meaning of Jihad fī sabīlillah, which is often interpreted as war. Therefore, this researcher intends to propose research on the meaning of Jihad fī sabīlillah as an intention to present possibilities that are not closed. This recognition of the various interpretations is what the researcher wants to contribute. Even if the meaning of the jihād is understood as war, it is legal. However, this study of semantics seeks to uncover what has never been revealed. Therefore, an interpretation that is closed and does not tolerate other meanings is an area that is in the spotlight in this research.

Introduction to Semiotics

Semiotics comes from the Greek word semeion (meaning sign) or from the word semeiotikos (meaning 'theory of signs'). Even long before it was known in today's

---

[10] Emad M. Al-Saidat dan Mohammad I. Al-Khawalda, "Jihad: A Victim of Policy and Misinterpretation," *Asian Social Science* 8, no. 7 (2012): 202, https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n7p202.

[11] M. Yusuf Yahya, "Interpretation of Jihad in the Quran," *Syariati : Jurnal Studi Al-Qur'an Dan Hukum* 1, no. 02 (1 November 2015): 155–72, https://doi.org/10.32699/syariati.v1i02.1107.

[12] Sri Mulyati, "The Meaning of Jihad: Textual and Contextual Interpretetions," *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities* 27, no. 1 (2019): 419–24.

modern era, in Greece, the phrases *semeion* and *semeiotikos* have been used by musicians to look for song notes on musical instruments. The term, as written by A. Teeuw (1982), is that semiotics is a sign as an act of communication[13].

As for the meaning of signs, Pierce explains, "something which stands to somebody for some respect or capacity."[14] A sign is an object the subject sets as respect and quality. As for the sign, when referring to Saussure, it will talk about two essential entities, the signifier and the signified. Another opinion, as expressed by Hjelmslev, said that signs have two functions, the function of the expression plane and the content plane.[15] In addition to the two of them, Roland Barthes also explained the concept of a sign, which said that a sign has two levels. The first level is *denotation* (first order of signification), and the second level is called *connotation* (second-order signification system).[16]

In general, the locus of study from semiotics is searching for the sign's meaning. It is obtained from what Peirce said. The signal about the object designated through the representation can also be referred to as denotatum. Denotatum is a relationship between linguistic expressions and something or events in the world. However, it refers not only to the world inhabited by humans but also to other worlds and time dynamics that may be discussed. Ambarini AS and Umaya classify this denotation into three forms: icons, indexes, and symbols.

These three things have specific differences, such as an icon is a sign that inherently has something in common with the intended meaning. At the same time, the index is a sign that contains a causal relationship with the intended purpose. Then the symbol can be interpreted as a sign with a meaningful relationship even though the character is arbitrary[17].

Then this study developed with various new methods and approaches such as Structural Semiotics, Roman Jakobson; Glossematics, Hjemslev; Actential-Discourse Narrative, Greimas; Transitional Semiotics, Roland Barthes; Social Semiotics, Haliday; Long Road Semiotics, Paul Ricoeur; Psychoanalysis, Jacques Lacan; Deconstruction, Jacques Derrida; Petofi Model Semiotics, Umberto Eco, Revolutionary Semiotics, Julia Kristeva; Narrative Semiotics, Todorov and Superreader Michael Riffaterre.[18]

---

[13] Syafieh Syafieh and Nurbaiti Nurbaiti, "Potret Karakteristik Kepemimpinan Perempuan (Analisis Semiotika Surat Al-Naml: 23-44)," *Jurnal At-Tibyan: Jurnal Ilmu Alqur'an Dan Tafsir* 3, no. 1 (2018): 42–55, https://doi.org/10.32505/tibyan.v3i1.477.

[14] Charles Andrea Peirce, *Collected Papers Cambridge* (Cambride: Harvard University Press, 1931), 228.

[15] Umberto Eco, *Teori Semiotika Signifikansi Komunikasi, Teori Kode, Serta Teori Produksi Tanda* (Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana, 2009), 67-70.

[16] AS dan Maharani, *Semiotika: Teori dan Aplikasi pada Karya Sastra,* 36.

[17] Muhammad Nazrul Islam, "A Systematic Literature Review of Semiotics Perception in User Interfaces," *Journal of Systems and Information Technology* 15, no. 1 (2013): 45–77, https://doi.org/10.1108/13287261311322585.

[18] Rusmana, *Tokoh & Pemikiran Semiotik, 16.*

However, all of these opinions ultimately lead to an intense conflict between the direction of Saussure's and Peirce's thoughts. Saussure states that signs are the accumulation of language systems that exist in human cognition apart from reality, while Peirce emphasizes the close relationship between signs and reality.[19]

About Julia Kristeva

Julia Kristeva was born in Bulgaria on June 24, 1941. His father was training him to become a doctor, worked as an accountant, and was unsympathetic to the communist party. Thus, young Kristeva was not allowed to be acquainted with the Communist Party. Her father sent Kristeva and her sister to the Dominican Nuns school, where she studied French and grew up as a student.[20] Schooling around the Eastern Bloc, Kristeva came to the place to learn about the work of the Russian Formalists.

Then he studied at the University of Sofia, and when he graduated, he received a scholarship to move to Francis in 1965 when he was 24 years old. He continued his education at French Universities under the tutelage of Lucien Goldmann and Roland Barthes and other scholars.[21]

As a person who inherited the thoughts of Russian Formalism, Kristeva managed to make her name widely known. Starting from her paper appearance, Kristeva said, "I introduced someone unknown at the time in the West: Mikhail carnivalization of the novel" (Kuprel, 2000). After that, he wrote his first book, Semiotiké: Recherches poir une semanalye (Semiotics: Investigation for Semanalysis). In his book, he wrote:

> "Writer as well as "scholar," Bakhtin was one of the first to replace the statichewing out of texts with a model where literary structure does not simply exist but is generated about another structure. What allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is his conception of the "literary word" as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier cultural context."[22]

After the appearance and the book, Kristeva immediately received an offer to work as a lecturer in the United States. However, he turned down the offer because the American-led war against Vietnam was against his principles. Then he joined the Tel Quel group, publisher of the journal of the same name.[23] One of the participants in the

---

[19] Rusmana, 16.-17

[20] Wildan Taufik, *Semiotika Untuk Kajian Sastra dan Al-Quran* (Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya, 2004), 86.

[21] Nilo Kaupi, *Radicalism in French Culture: A Sociology of French Theory in the 1960s* (Burlington: VT, 2010).

[22] Julia Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. oleh Leon S Roudiez (New York: Colombia University Press, 1984), 64-65.

[23] Taufik, *Semiotika Untuk Kajian Sastra dan Al-Quran: 87.*

group was a well-known novelist, Philippe Sokkers, with whom he would later marry Kristeva, with whom he had a son named Phillipe Joyaux in the mid-1970s.[24]

In the Tel Quel group, Kristeva focuses on issues of language politics. Kristeva even became a trainer in psychoanalysis, which she received when she graduated in 1979. As a thinker of poststructuralism, namely a new thought movement in the history of the 20th century, especially in her critique of structuralism. There is a claim that Julia Kristeva based her concept on a grand narrative called interlaminating Lacanian concepts. According to Dadang (2015), in general, this Lacanian concept can be described as follows:

a. Familiar with the work of Sigmund Freud

b. The essential roles of language in everyday life

c. Focusing on the blurred relationship

d. Receiving the curse of funa pradipipal

e. Receive save status

Ross Guberman even mentions Kristeva as one of the groups he calls a "poststructuralist group" where the poststructuralist intellectual work initiated by Lacan, Foucault, Derrida, and others continues in the hands of a Kristeva. Guberman, as quoted by Becker-Leckrone, writes:

"Even so, it is essential to emphasize that these authors participated in a profound upheaval of mentalities and theories concentrated in France between the 1960s and the 1980s. This upheaval was unprecedented and met with great resistance, a resistance that lends these writings their apparent cohesiveness and that perhaps justifies the notion of a "poststructuralist group".[25]

Kristeva devotes her intellectual works to themes around linguistics (literature), psychoanalysis, philosophy, phenimism, autobiographical essays, novels, and other essays. the complete concerning his work in the field of linguistics can be called semiotics as follows:

• *Séméiôtiké: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art) in 1969

• *Le Langage, cet Inconnu*, (Revolution in Poetic Language) 1974)

• *Polylogue* (esire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art) in 1977 translated in 1980

• *Histoires d'amour, Denoël* in 1983 translated in 1987

• *Le Temps sensible. Proust et l'experience littéraire* (Time and Sense: Proust and the experience of literature) in 1983 translated in 1996

• *Dostoïevski* in 2000

---

[24] Noelle McAfee, *Julia Kristeva* (London: Routledge, 2004), 6.

[25] Megan Becker-Leckrone, *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory* (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 21.

Subject Determinant Signifiance

Kristeva, in her book Revolution in Poetic Language, says: "*Our Philosophies of language, embodiments of the Idea, are nothing more than the thoughts of archivists, archaeologists, and necrophiliaca*".[26] Kristeva dramatically describes the problem of the philosophy of language, which is nothing but an attempt to collect ancient artifacts, or in poststructuralist terms, dead artifacts.[27]

In Kristeva, the sign is what she calls a "speaking being", not as mere language users, but dealing with the rules they use in the language. Furthermore, Kristeva explained that language is a process of a sign system, which involves an active subject who processes the creation of the "sign" itself. Oliver explained in his introduction, "any theory of language is the theory of the subject" every linguistic theory is in the form of a theory of the subject.[28] This explanation seems to presuppose the objectivity of language theory that depends on the subject of the language user.

Guberman mentions that Kristeva's thought formed from elaborating ideas developed from Lacan's thoughts on the subject and consciousness. Saussure's linguistic structuralism made her thinking about semiotics seem genuine. In total, the Guberman explained it as follows:

> In the wake of Freud [...], we tried to highlight the heterogeneous, contradictory, and multifaceted nature of the psychic apparatus and thus of human existence itself. [...] Our work fought against [human-ism's unifying] tendencies, producing instead a vision of man and his discourse that is not "anti-humanist" in the simplistic amoral sense that people have attributed to it, but it is anti-identificatory. This new conception unveiled the hidden part of the iceberg. This part proved quite active: a network of contradictions, endless questioning, shifts from one level of representation to another, and the like. By focusing on excesses—avant-garde writing, psychotic states, hallucinatory or oneiric states, sexualities, marginal or rebellious groups—we made passion into the unexpressed side of normalcy.*[29]*

Kristeva's ideas about subjectivity can also be found implicitly in her novels. The three works are Power of Horror, Tales of Love, and Black Sun, which generally deal with practical actions rather than the theory of the subject.[30]

In addition, another keyword regarding the concept of Kristeva's language is the distinction between semiotic and symbolic. The relationship between semiotics and symbolism is the core of the "revolution" in meaning and subject. According to Kristeva, it is through psychoanalysis that it is possible to find a revolution in a sense.[31]

---

[26] Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language.*

[27] McAfee, *Julia Kristeva:* 14.

[28] Kristeva, Julia, *The Portable Kristeva*, ed. oleh Kelly Oliver (New York: Colombia University Press, 1997), xx.

[29] Becker-Leckrone, *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory,* 22.

[30] Becker-Leckrone, 23.

[31] Sara Beardsworth, *Julia Kristeva: Psychoanalysis and Modernity*, SUNY Series in Gender Theory (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004), 26.

Obtaining a whole meaning from the process of importance by Kristeva is called the concept of "*signifiance*" or "*signifying process,*" which directs the position of the subject and meaning to its symbolic function.[32] According to Kristeva, two fields must be passed to find "signifiance," knowing the "semiotic" and extended domains. The first field is "*semiotic*". "*Semiotics*" can be defined as abstract vocabulary, which contains subjective elements and influences how language is spoken. In this "*semiotics*" are subjects and articulations—their conceptual nature is not in a particular linguistic formula. At the same time, the symbolic field is a marker in language as a sign of a complete system of linguistic rules surrounding it.[33] So it can be seen from the information that the core role in the process of meaning lies in the subject with its subjectivity. Simply put, the substance can be obtained from the consciousness of the issue (semiotic), which is expressed in material form in the form of language along with the rules that surround and influence it (symbolic).

Through this relationship, it can be seen that the process of meaning in Kristeva's idea involves the role of the subject as a whole. The "semiotic" aspect worked on each person, which later became the starting point for their idea of "speaking being". The subject is the determinant of the original and pure meaning, even with the linguistic aspects that influence it.

Semanists and the Birth of Gonotex and Font text

Julia Kristeva introduced her concept under the name "semanalysis". His notion of semanalysis is different from that of semiotics. Semanists understand meaning no longer as a sign but as a signification process marked by the release of "meaning" through articulation that is controlled by social codes but has not been reduced by the linguistic system, while this is what Kristeva calls "goneteks". The starting point of this semantic idea is to emphasize the theory of the speaking subject, as mentioned earlier—semanalysis bypassing the typical language strategy of a specific situation, not langue.[34]

The burial of meaning occurs because the purpose is reduced when meaning is confirmed based on the actual text, also known as fonetext. Goneteks are texts that have unlimited possibilities, in Garwan's terms, as a source for real readers. This Goneteks is indicated by human knowledge that has the potential to be free. Kristeva describes it as follows:

"Designating the genotext in a text requires pointing out the transfers of drive energy that can be detected in phonematic devices (such as the accumulation and repetition of phonemes or rhyme) and melodic devices (such as intonation or rhythm), in the way semantic and categorical fields are set out in syntactic and

---

[32] Beardsworth: 40.

[33] Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 27.

[34] Muhammad Sakti Garwan, "Analisis Semiotika Pada Teks Al-Qur'an Tentang 'Khamar' Dalam Pendekatan Semanalisis Hingga Intertekstualitas Julia Kristeva," *Substantia: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin* 22, no. 1 (1 Mei 2020): 54, https://doi.org/10.22373/substantia.v22i1.6545.

logical features, or in the economy of mimesis (fantasy, the deferment of denotation, narrative, etc.)".[35]

The *genotext* can also be thought of as a means by which all historical evaluations of language and various signifying practices are made. All the possibilities that existed in the past, present, and future—before being buried and submerged in the *fonttext*—are included.[36]

Each text has two levels of meaning, at the level of *genotext* and *fonttext*. *Goneteks* is the meaning of the text obtained from the process carried out by an author in collecting and manifesting his "*semiotic*" functions and energy. The *fonttext* is the meaning of the text compiled by a concept map—the rules of language—in communicative parts. To clarify this, Kristeva gives an example with a depiction of a Chinese speaker and a Chinese writer. A Chinese writer must have confirmed all the concepts spoken on the concept maps, also called the previous actual texts. Meanwhile, according to Chinese (speaking Chinese), it has essential elements to change other possibilities.[37]

This explanation clearly illustrates the broad meaning on the other side, which is then rarely glimpsed as the meaning of the text. A depiction of subjectivity has a significant influence on the signing process. Even though this interpretation is considered very subjective, Kristeva's efforts are a gate that opens the authority of meaning, which always covers the possibility of the importance of the text to a broader understanding.

Intertextuality

Kristeva became the first person to introduce the term *intertextuality*. According to Nasri (2017), many studies on Kristeva's intertextuality study are discourses that presuppose links between texts and other texts. Think of the previous work as a hypogram of the work after it. However, what Kristeva means about *intertextuality* is as follows:

> "Intertextuality (intertexttualite) This French word was (initially) introduced by Kristeva, and she met with immediate success; it has since been much used and abused on both sides of the Atlantic. The concept, however, has been generally misunderstood. It has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer upon another writer or with sources of a literary work; it does, on the other hand, involve the components of a text such as the novel, for instance. It is defined in La Revolution du Langege Poetique as signs into another, accompanied by a new articulation of the enunciative and denotative position. Any signifying practice (q.v) is a field (in the sense of space traversed by lines of force) in which various signifying's undergo such a transposition.[38]

---

[35] Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language,* 86.
[36] Kris Budiman, *Abdurahman Wahid: Kiai Nyentrik Membela Pemerintah* (Yogyakarta: LkiS, 1999), 41.
[37] McAfee, *Julia Kristeva,* 8.
[38] Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language,* 5.

The meaning of a text or work lies in the internal relations, not external signifying ties, not even the 'soul' or 'voice' of the artist himself. Bakhtin explains this in his co-authored book M.M. Medvedev.

This meaning of a text can be understood for two reasons. First because the author is a text reader before writing the text. So, for this reason, the author will always be influenced by his reading texts which are nothing but 'other texts'. Second, a text is available through the reading process.[39]

The basic assumption of Kristeva's theory of intellectuality is that 'any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations'; *each text is a mosaic of quotes. Kristeva also mentioned, 'text is the absorption and transformation of another'*; each text is in the form of absorption and Transformation of other texts.[40]

Kristeva deepens her ideas through the division of the study of reality. Kristeva elaborates this view through the point of view, horizontal and vertical. In the horizontal dimension, the communicator distances himself from the author and other readers. The vertical dimension is the area that deals with the synchronic text corpus[41].

P. Elmo Raj symbolizes this *intertextuality* as an adjustment between words and speech, which he calls "*double voice*". The text is not isolated by the person but by cultural discourses through institutionalization. According to Kristeva, language performance relies on a movement called *redistributive* (destructive-constructive), and the consequence is involvement by using logical approaches rather than purely linguistic studies.[42]

In other words, the text is constructed of several components or pieces of text that make up the text into unity. The condition of the text and its existence consisting of textual and inseparable elements is then called ideologeme by Kristeva[43]. Ideology explains the situation of a text that has no meaning in itself but always has connectivity with the historical, social process of importance (as literature) in the period that exists and is in the text itself).[44]

The study of intertextuality is an attempt to discover the ideology in work.[45] The doctrine of a text can be seen from three processes: opposition, transposition, and Transformation. These three things can be understood simply: Opposition is a textual

[39] Faila Sufatun Nisak, "Penafsiran QS. Al-Fatihah K.H Mishbah Mustafa : Studi Intertekstualitas Dalam Kitab Al-Iklil Fi Ma'ani At-Tanzil" 3, no. 2 (2019): 168.

[40] Julia Kristeva, *Desire In Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York: Colombia University Press, 1977), 66.

[41] P. Prayer Elmo Raj, "Text / Texts : Julia Kristeva ' s Concept of Intertextuality," *Ars Artium: An International Peer Reviewed-Cum-Refereed Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 3, no. 1 (2015): 77–80.

[42] Raj, 209.

[43] Daratullaila Nasri, "Oposisi Teks Anak Dan Kemenakan Karya Marah Rusli: Kajian Intertekstual Julia Kristeva," *Kandai* 13, no. 2 (2017): 205–22, https://doi.org/10.26499/jk.v13i2.92.

[44] Saharul Hariyotno dan Nurhadi, "Opposition Buginese Society in Novel Silariang Cinta Yang (Tak) Direstui: An Intertextulity Study" (International Conference on Langunge, Literature, and Arts Education (ICLLAE 2019), Yogyakarta: Atlantis Press, t.t.), 423–27.

[45] Nasri, "Oposisi anak dan Kemenakan Karya Marah Rusli: Kajian Intertekstual Julia Kristeva."

relationship that cannot be reconciled; Transposition is the condition of moving text from one marker system to another; and Transformation, namely changes from one text to another.[46]

In my opinion, the process of forming text (meaning) in Kristeva's paradigm requires changes in the sense that they are continuous and unlimited (*ad infinitum*). Because with it, the import process will continue and increase the possibilities of new meanings. First, when viewed from the point of view of the subjectivity of the interpreter. In Kristeva's semanalis methodology, the subject of the interpreter is given a more significant portion in its contribution to forming meaning. Then the process takes place entirely in the interpreter's attempt to dialogue with the text's original purpose (*goneteks*) by avoiding various interpretations that have been confirmed (*fonetext*). This is driven by the paradigm of intertextuality, which describes a condition of meaning formed from a pile of related literature.

Application of *Tafsir* Verse *Jihād Fī Sabillilah*

What about the position of the Koran in the perspective of Julia Kristeva's interpretation. The Qur'an is a text that comes from God, which was revealed through the intermediary of Jibril and delivered by the Prophet Muhammad. So in Kristeva's semantic study, the Koran is a *gonetext*. On the other hand, the books of interpretation, or the opinions of the scholars, are the substratum of the millions of meanings (interpretations) confirmed or, in this position, are *fonttext*. The initial assumption in understanding Kristeva's interpretation is to understand that the subject has an essential role in determining what to mean. The Qur'an, which has a *supra-subject* condition, makes the Qur'an—*kalamullah*—self a speaking subject.

The process of meaning, or what Kristeva introduced as signifiance, includes cross-links between *semiotic-gonetex* and symbolic-fonttext. Several things need to be investigated to find out its position, including (1) knowing the things that include the context of the birth of certain verses; (2) criticizing the cultural discourse biases which are institutionalized in meaning or explicitly in the works of interpretation books (fonttext).

The word of *jihād,* along with its derivation in the Qur'an, is 40 times in 33 verses: 13 times in the form of past tense (*fi'il maḍi*); 7 times in the form of imperative (*fi'il 'amr*), five times in the form of the present tense (*fi'il muḍari*); and four times in the form of the subject (*isīm fa'il*). All of these expressions can be found in 17 suras.[47] As for the 40 mentions, the author limits the two verses contained in the QS. al-Taubah: 24 and QS. al-Mumtahanah: 1. This author is based on the connection with the word of *jihād,* which is explicitly attached to the word *of fī sabīlillah.*

Allah says in QS. al-Taubah verse 24:

---

[46] Nasri.

[47] Ahmad, Solihin Bunyamin, *Kamus Induk Al-Quran* (Granada, t.t.).

قُلْ إِن كَانَ ءَابَآؤُكُمْ وَأَبْنَآؤُكُمْ وَإِخْوَٰنُكُمْ وَأَزْوَٰجُكُمْ وَعَشِيرَتُكُمْ وَأَمْوَٰلٌ ٱقْتَرَفْتُمُوهَا

وَتِجَٰرَةٌ تَخْشَوْنَ كَسَادَهَا وَمَسَٰكِنُ تَرْضَوْنَهَآ أَحَبَّ إِلَيْكُم مِّنَ ٱللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِۦ وَجِهَادٍ فِى

سَبِيلِهِۦ فَتَرَبَّصُوا۟ حَتَّىٰ يَأْتِىَ ٱللَّهُ بِأَمْرِهِۦ ۗ وَٱللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِى ٱلْقَوْمَ ٱلْفَٰسِقِينَ ﴿٢٤﴾

Translation: "Say: If your fathers and your sons and your brethren and your mates and your kinsfolk and property which you have acquired, and the slackness of trade which you fear and dwellings which you like, are dearer to you than Allah and His Messenger and striving in His way, then wait till Allah brings about His command: and Allah does not guide the transgressing people" (QS. At-Taubah [9]:24).

Then in the next verse in QS. Al-Mumtahana verse 1, Allah says:

يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا۟ لَا تَتَّخِذُوا۟ عَدُوِّى وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَآءَ تُلْقُونَ إِلَيْهِم بِٱلْمَوَدَّةِ وَقَدْ

كَفَرُوا۟ بِمَا جَآءَكُم مِّنَ ٱلْحَقِّ يُخْرِجُونَ ٱلرَّسُولَ وَإِيَّاكُمْ ۙ أَن تُؤْمِنُوا۟ بِٱللَّهِ رَبِّكُمْ إِن كُنتُمْ

خَرَجْتُمْ جِهَٰدًا فِى سَبِيلِى وَٱبْتِغَآءَ مَرْضَاتِى ۚ تُسِرُّونَ إِلَيْهِم بِٱلْمَوَدَّةِ وَأَنَا۠ أَعْلَمُ بِمَآ أَخْفَيْتُمْ

وَمَآ أَعْلَنتُمْ ۚ وَمَن يَفْعَلْهُ مِنكُمْ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ سَوَآءَ ٱلسَّبِيلِ ﴿١﴾

Translation: "O you who believe! Do not take My enemy and your enemy for friends: would you offer them love while they deny what has come to you of the truth, driving out the Messenger and yourselves because you believe in Allah, your Lord? If you go forth struggling hard in My path and seeking My pleasure, would you manifest love to them? And I know what you conceal and manifest; and whoever of you does this, he indeed has gone astray from the straight path" (QS. Al-Mumtahanah [60]:1).

Find out the conditions of the *gonetext* of a verse—even though the *goneteks* of a poem do not require certain limits—can be traced from information about the context of the revelation of the verse (*asbab al-nuzul*). There is one history regarding this *Asbāb al-Nuzul*. As quoted by Imam al-Wāhidy, in surah al-Mumtahanah verse one, it reads as follows:

"Has told us Al Humaidi Has told us Sufyan Has told us Amru bin Dinar he said, Has told me Al Hasan bin Muhammad bin Ali that he heard Ubaidullah bin Abu Rafi' secretary of Ali, said, I heard Ali radliallahu 'anhu said; I, Zubair and Miqdad were once sent by the Messenger of Allah, sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam, and said: "You go until you arrive at Raudlah Khakh, because a woman is carrying a letter, and take it from her." After that, we immediately went with a galloping horse until we arrived at Al-Raudlah, and it turned out that we also found a woman in question.

We said, "Please get the letter out." The woman replied, "I didn't bring a letter?" we said, "You take out the book, or are we going to strip you of your clothes." Finally, the woman took out a letter from her hair. And we immediately took him to the Prophet sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam. And it turns out the letter was written by Hathib bin Balta'ah and will be delivered to the polytheists who reside in Mecca. He reported on some of the agenda of the Prophet sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam. Then the Prophet sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam said: "What is this, O Hatib?" Hathib said, "Don't be in a hurry to decide on me, O Messenger of Allah. I am a Quraysh, but I am not part of them. Those with you from among the Emigrants have relatives who can provide security for their family and friends. That's why I want when I no longer have kinship ties with them to do something with which they want to take care of my relatives. I did not do it because of disbelief or apostasy from my religion." Finally, the Prophet sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam said: "Indeed, he has told you the truth." Suddenly Umar said, "Allow me to cut his neck, O Messenger of Allah." He said: "Indeed, he participated in the battle of Badr. What is your reason? Did not Allah have given specialty to Ahlu Badr while saying: 'Do good deeds, as you please. Verily, I have forgiven you.'" Amru said; In connection with this incident, the verse was also revealed: "O you who believe, do not take My enemies and your enemies as guardians." (Surah Almumtahanah 1) I don't know if it's a verse listed in the hadith or if it's Amru's expression. Ali told us; He said; It was told to Sufyan that, in this matter, the verse was revealed: "Do not take My enemies and your enemies as guardians." (Surah Almumtahanah 1) So Sufyan said, "This is related to that incident. I memorized it from Amru, and I did not leave a single letter from it. And I have never seen anyone memorize it besides me." (Bukhari No. 4511)

The narration does not explicitly tell the purpose of the context of jihād, as for the information conveyed to Hathib from the presence of an apostle in his participation in the Battle of Badr. However, it does not indicate the intent of the war. Back to the initial assumption regarding the state of the completely pure *gonetext* apart from the influence of the confirmed text. The interpretation of the meaning of *Jihad fī sabīlillah* is very open.

Then the second search is to criticize the practices that have been institutionalized in the scholars' interpretations. It can be noted that several performances have given rise to discourse biases and the affirmation of meaning by some of the following scholars.

Abdullah Azzam and Kh. Bisri Mustofa defines this verse as the war verse.[48] Opinion of some jurists even named the meaning of Jihad in the syar'i definition as an attempt by a Muslim to fight an infidel who is not bound by an agreement after preaching to him to embrace Islam. Still, the person rejects it in order to uphold the word of Allah.[49]

The opinions of the four schools of thought regarding the meaning of Jihad, as explained by Yusuf al-Uyairi (2007), include:

---

[48] Bisri Mustofa, *Tafsir al-Ibriz*, 2 (Kudus: Pustaka Kudus, t.t.).
[49] Abdul Baqi Ramadhon, *Jihad Jalan Kami* (Solo: Era Intermedia, 2002).

Hanafi School. Imam Ibn Hummam said: "Jihad is inviting the disbelievers to the true religion and fighting them if they do not accept. Imam al-Kasunu said: "moving all abilities in fighting in the way of Allah with life, property, tongue and or something else". Ibn Arofah said: "Jihad is the war of Muslims against infidels who do not obey the agreement, or because they often enter the territory of the Muslims. Shafi'i School. Imam Ibn Hajar said: "In syar'i jihad is to mobilize energy in fighting the infidels". Imam al-Qasthalani said: "Jihad is fighting the unbelievers to win the Muslims and exalt the word of Allah. Hanbali school. Jihad is war by exerting all the power to exalt the word of Allah. Imam Baihaqi said: "Jihad according to the syar'i meaning is a special expression to fight the infidels.[50]

Husni Adham Jarrar (1994) mentions that there are at least three meanings of Jihad, it is stated: (1) mobilizing all abilities to uphold something truth, (2) as an effort to enlighten, disseminate and defend Islamic da'wah, (3) war to defend Allah's religion to uphold Religion Allah, this is by what was stated by Raghib al-Asfahany.[51]

Even more radically, Sayyid Qutb defines Jihad as an armed struggle to defend Islam against injustice and oppression by anti-Islamic governments and western and eastern neo-colonialism as parties who want to dominate Islam.[52]

As the goal is to find out ideologues rather than texts, three processes need to be taken. These three processes are intended to pay attention to the fabric of meaning between internal texts integrally and to see the kinds of relationships. So to know the conditions of proper interpretation, the process of intertextuality in understanding the Qur'an needs to be encouraged.

The first stage is opposition. The word *jihād fī sabīlillah* takes the form of interpretation as the meaning of war. Other rumors have the meaning of war. In the Qur'an, at least two terms expressly mean war, such as the words *qital* and *harb*. Other terms such as the words *gazwah* and *sariyah*. It can be found in the fiqh books in circulation. Most scholars use the meaning of war with the term *jihād* more often than previously mentioned words.[53] Among them such as the words *qital* and *harb* can be found respectively in the Baqarah verse 190 and al-Anfal: 57, Allah says:

وَقَٰتِلُوا۟ فِى سَبِيلِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلَّذِينَ يُقَٰتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوٓا۟ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ ٱلْمُعْتَدِينَ ﴿١٩٠﴾

Translation: "And fight in the way of Allah with those who fight with you, and do not exceed the limits, surely Allah does not love those who exceed the limits." (QS. Al-Baqarah [2]:190).

---

[50] Yusuf al-Uyairi, *Muslimah Berjihad: Peran Wanita di Medan Jihad*, I (Solo: Media Islamika, 2007), 20-21.

[51] Raghib Asfahany, *Mu'jam Mufradatul al-Faz al-Quran* (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, t.t.), 99.

[52] Sayyid Quṭb dan As'ad Yasin, *Tafsīr fī Ẓhilāl al-Qur'ān* (Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2004), 269.

[53] Faqih Dalil dan Abu Ishfah, *Buku Pintar Pedoman Dasar Agama Islam* (Surabaya: Apollo, 1995), 161-162.

$$\text{فَإِمَّا تَثْقَفَنَّهُمْ فِى ٱلْحَرْبِ فَشَرِّدْ بِهِم مَّنْ خَلْفَهُمْ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَذَّكَّرُونَ ﴿٥٧﴾}$$

Translation: "Therefore if you overtake them in fighting, then scatter by (making an
example of) them those in their rear, that they may be mindful". (QS.
Al-Anfal [8]: 57)

These terms, qitāl and harb, have the opposite meaning to *jhād*. So reconciling
these two terms is impossible. The word Jihad cannot necessarily be interpreted as war
because war itself has its equivalent in the Quran.

The second stage is a transposition. At this stage, it can be seen from the use of
the word *jihād* in several contexts of the verse that linguistically, the word Jihad comes
from the word *ja-ha-da,* which means serious. *Jihād* can be found in verse formats such
as those found in Maidah verse 53, Allah says:

$$\text{وَيَقُولُ ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوٓا۟ أَهَٰٓؤُلَآءِ ٱلَّذِينَ أَقْسَمُوا۟ بِٱللَّهِ جَهْدَ أَيْمَٰنِهِمْ ۙ إِنَّهُمْ لَعَكُمْ ۚ حَبِطَتْ}$$

$$\text{أَعْمَٰلُهُمْ فَأَصْبَحُوا۟ خَٰسِرِينَ ﴿٥٣﴾}$$

Translation: "And those who believe will say: Are they who swore by Allah with the
most forcible of their oaths that they were most surely with you? Their
deeds shall go for nothing, so they shall become losers" (QS. Al-Maidah
[5]:53).

In this verse, the word *ja-ha-da* is in the form of nominal (*mashdar*), namely
juhda, expressed in taking an oath seriously. It is different from the word *jihād,* which
is found in the verse that the author studies, generally in the form of the subject (*isim
fa'il*).

Then in the third stage, namely Transformation. The process of rewriting,
involving transliteration activities in various parts of the world, makes the Qur'an
continue to change. In this process, we can also understand that the interpretation of
the Qur'an regarding the meaning of *jihād* is obtained from a wrong translation process.

So through Kristeva's methodology, we can find the fundamental problem of the
meaning that occurs in the word *jihād. Jihād,* often understood as war, is a
standardization (institutionalization) by scholars or academics. Meanwhile, the
original meaning (*goneteks*), which was not mentioned by the mainstream ulama
circles, was forgotten and did not receive attention to expanding the definition of *jihād*
itself. Even in the three stages of Kristeva's interpretation process, it can be found that
jihād does not have an explicit meaning in war. Briefly, in the early stages, the purpose
of Jihad does not necessarily lead to the importance of 'war'. Oppositionally, other
words mean war, namely *qitāl* and *harb*. In the second stage, transpositionally, the
meaning of Jihad in different contexts means 'serious' rather than 'war'. In the third
stage, transformatively, the interpretation of Jihad is often defined by default on the

meaning of war, even though much literature explains the importance of Jihad outside of the purpose of war.

Conclusion

Some scholars often interpret these verses about jihād very strictly. The process of the ideological nation in understanding Islam is one of the most obvious. Reflecting on Kristeva, the sign of the interpretations of *jihad fī sabīlillah* is a *fonttext*. That interpretation has buried the original meaning (*goneteks*) of the word *jihād fī sabīlillah*. Not to mention the forms of action that legitimize the importance of *jihād* as war. It is a series of discourse forms from a culture that make the process of the significance of the text standardized. Therefore, through Kristeva, the meaning of the word *jihād fī sabīlillah* can be understood through three stages to restore its original meaning. First, in the opposition stage, it is found that there are other equivalents regarding the importance of war in the Qur'an. Then in the transposition stage, the meaning of Jihad is in different forms, such as *juhda* (*mashdar*), which still means the definition of "*serious*". Finally, it is possible that interpretive efforts undertaken in searching for the meaning of *jihād fī sabīlillah* may experience errors with the influence of the interpreter or the motives to be achieved by an interpreter.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, Solihin Bunyamin. *Kamus Induk Al-Quran*. Granada, t.t.

Ali, Abbas J. "Jihad in Monotheistic Religions: Implications for Business and Management." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 23, no. 12 (2003): 19–46.

Allan, Keith. "A History of Semantics." *The Routledge Handbook of Semantics*, 2016.

AS, Ambarini, dan Umaya Maharani. *Semiotika: Teori dan Aplikasi pada Karya Sastra*. 1. Semarang: IKIP-PGRI, t.th.

Asfahany, Raghib. *Mu'jam Mufradatul al-Faẓ al-Quran*. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, t.t.

A.W, Munawir. "Kamus Indonesia - Arab." Dalam *Kamus Al-Munawwir Indonesia dan Arab*. Surabaya: Pustaka Progressif, 2007.

Beardsworth, Sara. *Julia Kristeva: Psychoanalysis and Modernity*. SUNY Series in Gender Theory. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.

Becker-Leckrone, Megan. *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory*. England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Budiman, Kris. *Abdurahman Wahid: Kiai Nyentrik Membela Pemerintah*. Yogyakarta: LkiS, 1999.

Cobley, Paul. "Sociolinguistics and social semiotics." in *Semiotics and Linguistics"*, with Gunther Kress. London; New York: The Routledge Companion, 2001.

Dalil, Faqih, dan Abu Ishfah. *Buku Pintar Pedoman Dasar Agama Islam*. Surabaya: Apollo, 1995.

Eco, Umberto. *Teori Semiotika Signifikansi Komunikasi, Teori Kode, Serta Teori Produksi Tanda*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana, 2009.

Garwan, Muhammad Sakti. "Analisis Semiotika Pada Teks Al-Qur'an Tentang 'Khamar' Dalam Pendekatan Semanalisis Hingga Intertekstualitas Julia Kristeva." *Substantia: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin* 22, no. 1 (1 Mei 2020): 49. https://doi.org/10.22373/substantia.v22i1.6545.

Hariyotno, Saharul, dan Nurhadi. "Opposition Buginese Society in Novel Silariang Cinta Yang (Tak) Direstui: An Intertextulity Study," 423–27. Yogyakarta: Atlantis Press, t.t.

Islam, Muhammad Nazrul. "A Systematic Literature Review of Semiotics Perception in User Interfaces." *Journal of Systems and Information Technology* 15, no. 1 (2013): 45–77. https://doi.org/10.1108/13287261311322585.

Kaupi, Nilo. *Radicalism in French Culture: A Sociology of French Theory in the 1960s*. Burlington: VT, 2010.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire In Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Colombia University Press, 1977.

———. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Diterjemahkan oleh Leon S Roudiez. New York: Colombia University Press, 1984.

Kristeva, Julia. *The Portable Kristeva*. Disunting Oleh Kelly Oliver. New York: Colombia University Press, 1997.

Littlejohn, Stephen W. *Theories of Human Communication*. V. New York: Publishing Company, 1996.

M. Al-Saidat, Emad, dan Mohammad I. Al-Khawalda. "Jihad: A Victim of Policy and Misinterpretation." *Asian Social Science* 8, no. 7 (2012): p202. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n7p202.

McAfee, Noelle. *Julia Kristeva*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Mulyati, Sri. "The Meaning of Jihad: Textual and Contextual Interpretetions," *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities* 27, no. 1 (2019): 419–24.

Mustofa, Bisri. *Tafsir al-Ibriz*. 2. Kudus: Pustaka Kudus, t.t.

Nasri, Daratullaila. "Oposisi Teks Anak Dan Kemenakan Karya Marah Rusli: Kajian Intertekstual Julia Kristeva." *Kandai* 13, no. 2 (2017): 205–22. https://doi.org/10.26499/jk.v13i2.92.

Nisak, Faila Sufatun. "Penafsiran QS. Al-Fatihah K.H Mishbah Mustafa : Studi Intertekstualitas Dalam Kitab Al-Iklil Fi Ma'ani At-Tanzil" 3, no. 2 (2019): 30.

Peirce, Charles Andrea. *Collected Papers Cambridge*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Qarḍawi, Yusuf. *Fiqih Jihad*. Edited by a Yadi Saeful Hidayat and Ayatullah Khoemini. Translated by Irfan Maulana Hakim, Arif Munandar Riswanto, Saifuddin, Irwan Kurniawan, and Aedhi Rakhman Saleh. Bandung: Mizan, 2010.

Quṭb, Sayyid, dan As'ad Yasin. *Tafsir fī Zhilāl al-Qur'ān*. Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2004.

Raj, P. Prayer Elmo. "Text / Texts : Julia Kristeva ' s Concept of Intertextuality." *Ars Artium: An International Peer Reviewed-Cum-Refereed Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 3, no. 1 (2015): 77–80.

Ramadhon, Abdul Baqi. *Jihad Jalan Kami*. Solo: Era Intermedia, 2002.

Rusmana, Dadan. *Tokoh & Pemikiran Semiotik*. Bandung: Tazkia Press, 2015.

Syafieh, Syafieh, and Nurbaiti Nurbaiti. "Potret Karakteristik Kepemimpinan Perempuan (Analisis Semiotika Surat Al-Naml: 23-44)." *Jurnal At-Tibyan:*

Jurnal Ilmu Alqur'an Dan Tafsir 3, no. 1 (2018): 42–55. https://doi.org/10.32505/tibyan.v3i1.477.

Taufik, Wildan. *Semiotika Untuk Kajian Sastra dan Al-Quran*. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya, 2004.

Uyairi, Yusuf al-. *Muslimah Berjihad: Peran Wanita di Medan Jihad*. I. Solo: Media Islamika, 2007.

Van, Zoest, dan Panuti Sudjman. *Serba-serbi Semiotika*. Jakarta: Gramedia, 1992.

Yahya, M. Yusuf. "Interpretation of Jihad in the Quran." *Syariati : Jurnal Studi Al-Qur'an Dan Hukum* 1, no. 02 (2015): 155–72. https://doi.org/10.32699/syariati.v1i02.1107.