

**GEGURITAN (MANUSCRIPT) OF
I GEDE BASUR AND I KETUT BUNGKLING
WRITTEN BY KI DALANG TANGSUB:
INTERTEXTUAL AND RECEPTIONAL ANALYSIS**

I Wayan Suardiana¹, Nyoman Kutha Ratna²,
I Wayan Cika², I Made Suastika²

¹Postgraduate Program of Udayana University,
²Linguistics Program, Concentration of Literary Discourse,
Udayana University

ABSTRACT

This study employs the texts of *I Gede Basur* and *I Ketut Bungkling* contained in the text of *Kidung Prembon* (abbreviated into KP) as the data source to explain the intertextual relationship and receptive process of the texts of *Geguritan I Gede Basur* (abbreviated into GIGP) and *Geguritan I Ketut Bungkling* (abbreviated into GIKB) written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The reason is that when this study was conducted the neither the text of GIGB nor GIKB written by the authoritative Ki Dalang Tangsub was found. Then the text of KP has multiple functions; on one side, as an existing text, it is assumed to contain the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by the authoritative Ki Dalang Tangsub, and on the other side, it is a receptive text of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub.

The theories of intertexts, reception and discourse were used as the means of analysis in this study. The theory of intertexts could reveal the historical process of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub and the creation process of the text of KP. The theory of reception was basically used to explain the process of how the readers gave responses to the texts of GIGB and GIKP written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The process of how the readers gave responses was revealed by the text of KP (in clock stories) as well as the other individual texts.

Intrinsically, the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub give particular colors to the texts of the responses given, as *Pupuh/Tembang Ginada* (strophe) is entirely adopted in the texts of responses given the readers making the particular characteristics of the hypogram texts compared to the following texts clear. Having magical and social critical themes, many hyperboles, similes and sarcasms are used in the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The plots of the texts of GIGB and GIKB are made up of 28 big sequences and 29 small sequences with the main characters are I Gede Basur and I Ketut Bungkling (*Mantri* as one of the characters).

Key words: intertexts, reception, GIGB and GIKB, KP, the dominant concepts (ideology)

1. Background and Problems

So far Balinese people still maintain the great thoughts inherited from their ancestors by recording them on palm leaves. Attempts have been made to maintain and develop the tradition of writing such thoughts on palm leaves. In addition, various new topics have also been written on palm leaves. Two of the manuscripts inherited from the ancestors of the Balinese people which are under study are GIGB and GIKB which were written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The attempts made to maintain these two texts have not been so pleasant. The reason is that, written in the beginning of the 19th century (in 1825), their authoritative texts have not been found so far, although they are very popular in the community (Simpfen, 1988). Therefore, their readability was made through the text entitled *Kidung Prembon* abbreviated into KP). It is from the text of KP that the histories of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub can be traced and at the same time the process of how the text of KP was created can be explained. The text of KP itself is a knitted text of the texts of GIGB and GIKB previously existing. This means that the text of KP is the existing text used as the basis for the readability of the texts of GIGB and GIKP written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. In addition, it also explains the receptive process of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub.

The act of expressing the meanings of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub from the discourse point of view is intended to discover the practices of discourse as one dimension or one moment of every social practice in its dialectical relation with the other moments (Fairclough as quoted from Jorgensen, 2007). This means that some aspects of the social world function in accordance with the different logics of discourse and that they should be observed employing the instruments not available in the discourse analysis. Therefore, the meaningfulness of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub was discovered by the analysis of the sociological aspect of text, thereby it was expected that the dominant concepts contained in the texts as the writer's ideology to hegemonize his environment could be explained. The reason is that it is the dimensions of discourse and the other dimensions of social practice which form our world (ibid.).

In general, this study aims at describing the process of readability of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub and the process of how the text of KP

was created from the hypogram texts, that is, the texts of GIGB and GIKB and the texts responding to them in the form of *geguritan* as part of literary work in Bali. In addition, it also aims at revealing the concept of local genius expressed by the writer in transferring great values to the community.

It is hoped that the results of this study can be theoretically and practically meaningful. Theoretically, it is hoped that this study can explain the process of the readability of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub in *geguritan* literary work in Bali. The understanding of the text of KP, the hypogram texts and the responding texts will give a real description of the process of the receptive texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub in *geguritan* literary work in Bali. After the histories of the texts can be traced, theoretically it is also hoped that this study will help determine the history of the Balinese literary works in particular and will be referred to by other scientific researches such as those on general literary works, way of life and cultural views which are in accordance with the content of the texts of GIGB and GIKP. Through the narrative structure of the texts (in the level of narrative discourse/the extrinsic elements of the texts), the values of the local genius as well as the attempts made by the writer to struggle for the universal values (especially the struggle made by those belonging to the social stratification of *sudra*), that is, to struggle to hegemonize the readers and the community in general for the critical attitude of the characters. Practically, it is also hoped that this study can enrich the nation's cultural insight of the social phenomenon read in *geguritan* literary works, especially the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. In addition, it is also hoped that this study will enhance morals and cause the next generation to appreciate *geguritan* literary work creatively.

Based on what is described above, it is hoped that this study will respond to the following four problems; they are 1) to what extent is the process of the readability of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub?; (2) What is the attitude of the readers towards the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub?; (3) what is the intrinsic structure (the narrative structure) of the texts of GIGB and GIKB as a whole?; (4) what is the dominant ideology contained in the texts of GIGB and GIKP as far as their discourse practices are concerned?

2. Discussion

The theories employed to answer the above mentioned problems are the philological, receptional, intertextual and narrative discourse ones. The data needed in this study were obtained by library research and interview (as the supporting technique). After being collected, the data was analyzed applying the hermeneutic method. The research results were formally and informally presented. Based on the theories, the technique and method described above, the results can be presented as follows.

This study employs 21 (twenty one) types of data sources, some are in the form of manuscript using Balinese characters and the others are printed. After they were thoroughly read, finally 8 (eight) were chosen as the primary data sources which were hoped to explain the process of readability, the receptive texts and the concepts of local genius as the ideology of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The others (thirteen) were used as the secondary data sources.

Based on the data available, the authoritative texts of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang were not found. The readability of the two texts could be done through the text of KP, which had been previously stated to be written by Ki Dalang Tangsub by I W. Simpen AB (1988). After the texts available were read, it turned out that the text of KP was not Ki Dalang Tangsub's work. It is only the receptive text of the two texts written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. From its narration, it is a clock story telling a story about I Ketut Bagus; I Ketut Bagus (Mpu Sruti) tells a story about I Rangda Kasihan (Siwa Tiga). Ni Jempiring, the daughter of I Ranga Kasihan, tells a story about Basur. Then, I Ketut Bagus (Mpu Sruti), tells a story about Bungklung, and the last, Ida Pranda Bodakeling gives something to I Ketut Bagus (Mpu Sruti) in the form of *Kidung Cowak*.

The readability of the texts of GIGB and GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub, as stated above, can be done through the text of KP. The text of KP itself is a receptive as well as an adaptation text of the texts of GIGB and GIKP written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. Before the text of KP was created, the text of GIKB written by Ki Dalang Tangsub was receipted by the text entitled *Geguritan I Ketut Bangun*. This text, which is anonymous, was then responded to by the text entitled *Geguritan I Ketut Bagus*, which was the initial form of the text of KP. The text of KP itself, in the process of being receptive, was found

to have two different versions. Based on the language and the completion of the content, for the sake of analysis, the text of KP A, which had been transliterated by I W.Simpen AB., was selected.

The authentic evidence used as the basis that the text of *KP* has received the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub and that at the same time they were used as the hypogram texts can be seen from the text telling a story about *I Gede Basur B* (4.3.3) found at Gede Palace, Kerambitan, Tabanan. The narration and the length of the story are similar to those found in the text of *KP*. The other evidences can also be seen in the individual responding texts which show similarity in the way in which the stories are narrated as in the hypogram texts. The change in narration in the responding texts is made after the narration in the hypogram texts came to an end. This means that the text of *KP* (especially the stories about *I Gede Basur* and *I Ketut Bungklung*) and the other responding texts respond well to the hypogram texts written by Ki Dalang Tangsub without changing the content. This indicates that the writer of the two responding texts written by Ki Dalang Tangsub was scared to be stated as a plagiarist. The other possibility is that Ki Dalang Tangsub could have been the writer's teacher (*guru waktra*) or at least the two texts were so popular in the writer's community that he was very respectful towards Ki Dalang Tangsub. Such a respect was shown by writing what had been written by Ki Dalang Tangsub in the form of receptive texts, although only particular parts, as mentioned above, were created.

The receptive process of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKP* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub only took place in the levels of variants and version. With regard to the variants, during the receptive process, there are some differences between the hypogram texts, in this case, the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKP* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub, and the responding texts. With regard to the version, additional narration was added to the end of the hypogram texts by the responding texts.

Based on the differences with regard to the level of variants and version, the receptive process of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIGB* written by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* could be discovered in the individual texts such as (1) the text of *I Gede Basur A* (4.3.2), (2) the text of *I Gede Basur B* (4.3.3), (3) the text of *I Ketut Bungklung A* (4.3.4), (4) the text of

Geguritan I Ketut Bungkling B (4.3.5), and (5) the text of *Geguritan of Pan Bungkling* (4.3.6).

The receptive process of the text of *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub and the text of *I Ketut Bangun* can basically be viewed from both the motives which are the same and different. The same motives include (a) the narration and what motivated the main characters and (b) the search for truth. The different motives include (a) the names of the characters and places, (b) additions of episodes to the plots, and (c) the exchange rates of currency. With regard to the variants of the responding texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub, the different motives are seen in how the names of the characters and places take place. And in terms of the version, some plots are added (as can be seen from Table 6 up to Table 18).

The discussion of the narrative structure (the intrinsic structure of the text of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub) is made in three aspects: (a) the aspect of structure of form, (b) the aspect of content (narrative structure), and (c) the analysis of characters. The discussion on the structure of form of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* is made in two aspects; the aspect of poetic meter and the language style building the text. This is done in order to be able to see the characteristics of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub appearing in the responding texts.

The unique poetic meter of the two texts written by Ki Dalang Tangsub is that one type of *pupuh* (strophe) called *Pupuh Ginada* is used for building the narration. So far it is assumed to feature the Ki Dalang Tangsub's works, at least, the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB*. This model was then referred to by Ida Wayan Dangin from Karangasem in his work *Geguritan Bang Bungkling*; however, the strophe used is different, that is, *Pupuh Sinom*. The text of *Geguritan Pan Bungkling* is the receptive text of the text of *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The language styles used in the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub are hyperboles, similes and sarcasm.

The analysis of the content (the narrative structure) of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* is represented in three aspects. They are (1) the textual sequence of the narrative units; (2) the chronological sequence of events; and (3) the logical sequence of events. As a whole, the sequences building the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* can be divided as follows. The textual sequence in the episode level (the first level sequence) of the texts of *GIGB*

and *GIKB* is made up of two subsequences; the level of plot of episode (the second level sequence) is made up of 28 subsequences; while the level of sub-sequences of plot (the third level sequence) is made up of 29 subsequences. The chronological sequence of events is seen from the times when what was done or experienced by the characters took place. The events were seen taking place when the main characters in every episode directed the plot. The main characters are I Gede Basur and I Ketut Bungkling (Mantri). The events in the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* are related to each other in one episode. In one episode of one plot, the sequences moved in such an integrated way that logical cause and result relationship was formed.

The characters of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* analyzed were the central ones building the sequences of plot in each episode. They are *I GedeBasur* and *I Ketut Bungkling*. The aspects of the characters which were expressed were: (1) the physical aspect; (2) the social aspect; and (3) the psychological aspect. I Ketut Bungkling is physically described as handsome, while I Gede Basur is physically described as less handsome. I Ketut Bungkling is socially described as poor, while I Gede Basur is socially described as wealthy. Psychologically, I Ketut Bungkling is a foster child; therefore, he is faced with a psychological conflict in which he criticizes the characters that are arrogant towards the environment. While the character, I Gede Basur, although physically less handsome, psychologically he is polite and behaves as he is. However, as he is impolitely treated by Ni Sokasti, finally, he takes revenge on her. I Gede Basur is made to do so due to his love to I Wayan Tiragon, his only son. I Wayan Tiragon does not want to be married to anybody else, except Ni Sokasti. I Gede Basur's proposal is neglected by Ni Sokasti causing him to take revenge on her.

The detailed dominant concepts which constitute the ideology of Ki Dalang Tangsub as a writer for his readers are: (1) environmental conservation; (2) saving; (3) the marriage of *nyentana/nyeburan* (a type of marriage in which the husband stays at his wife's house); (4) *ngalap kasor*; (5) *tetadahan* (sacrifice in a magical process); (6) social criticism; (7) feudalistic syncretism; (8) introspection.

The concepts of environmental conservation, saving, the marriage of *nyentana/nyeburan*, and *tetadahan* (sacrifice in a magical process) to Hindus are explicitly expressed by I Gede Basur and I Nyoman Karang in the text of *GIGB*. The

concept of social criticism is actualized by the character of I Ketut Bungkling and the educated characters such as Ida Wakih, Sengguhu Pangi, and Ida Wayan Sakti. And the concept of feudalistic syncretism is explicitly expressed by the characters of I Ketut Bungkling and Ida Wayan Sakti in the text of *GIKB*. And the concept of introspection is explicitly expressed by the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB*.

3. New Novelties

The new novelties in this study are as follows:

- (1) The readability of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub which are considered prestigious (close to the original texts) can be made through the text of *KP*.
- (2) The text of *KP* itself, which was stated to be Ki Dalang Tangsub's work by I W.Simpen (1988), after the related texts were explored, is not his. It is an anonymous receptive text of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub.
- (3) The text of *GIGB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub is one form of the texts created to be performed in Bali during its era. This means that the existence of the text of *GIGB* in the treasure of Balinese literature breaks the theory that traditional performing arts do not need texts when performed (Rendra, 1984: 32-34).
- (4) Basically, the monumental concepts, as an author's ideology, which need to be more intensively introduced to the public include: (a) the concept of environmental conservation; (b) the concept of saving; (c) the concept of the marriage of *nyentana/nyeburan* ; (d) the concept of *ngalap kasor*; (e) the concept of *tetadahan* (sacrifice in a magical process); (f) the concept of social criticism; (g) the concept of feudalistic syncretism; and (h) the concept of introspection.

4. Conclusion

The readability of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub can be made through the text of *KP*. In addition to being the existing text, the text of *KP* constitutes the receptive texts of the two texts written by Ki Dalang Tangsub. As the receptive text, it does not only include the hypogram texts (the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB*

written by Ki Dalang Tangsub), but the writer is also creative enough in organizing the plots to form clock stories consisting of five episodes.

The texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* written by Ki Dalang Tangsub turn out to be well welcome by their readers, although they are in the forms of *geguritan*. The text of *GIGB* is receipted by the text of *I Ketut Bangun*, the text of *Basur A* (which is in the form of a book transliterated by I Made Sanggra), and the text of *I Gede Basur B* (available at Gede Palace of Kerambitan); while the text of *GIKB* is receipted by the text of *I Ketut Bungkling A* (available at the Perpustakaan Lontar of the Faculty of Letters, Udayana University), the text of *I Ketut Bungkling B* (available at the Library of the Department of Culture of Bali Province), and the text of *Geguritan Pan Bungkling* (available at the Perpustakaan Lontar of the Faculty of Letters of Udayana University).

In the intrinsic level, the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* are analyzed with regard to their structure of form (poetic meter), content (narrative structure), and characters. The analysis of the structure of form of the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* are divided into two aspects, that is, the aspect of poetic meter and the aspect of language style building the texts.

In the level of content (narrative structure), the analysis was done based on the distributional function (syntagmatic) and paradigmatic. Based on that reference, the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* were analyzed based on three sequences of story units, that is, (1) the textual sequence of the units of the story content; (2) the chronological sequence of events; and (3) the logic sequence of events. With regard to the analysis of the characters, three aspects were revealed; they are: (1) physical aspect; (2) social aspect and (3) psychological aspect.

The writer's ideology which was revealed in the texts of *GIGB* and *GIKB* as a whole includes: (a) the concept of environmental conservation; (b) the concept of saving; (c) the concept of the marriage of *nyentana/nyeburin* (a type of marriage in which the husband stays at the wife's house); the concept of *ngalap kasor*; (e) the concept of *tetadahan* (sacrifice in a magical process); (f) the concept of social criticism; (g) the concept of feudalistic syncretism; and (h) the concept of introspection.

5. Acknowledgements

In this opportunity, the writer would like to thank the Rector of Udayana University, Prof. Dr. dr. I Made Bakta, Sp. PD (KHOM) and the Director of Postgraduate Program of Udayana University, Prof. Dr. Ir. I Dewa Ngurah Suprapta, M.Sc. and Head of the Doctorate Program of Linguistics, Prof. Drs. I Ketut Artawa, M.A., Ph.D. who have provided facilities to the writer from the beginning to the end. The writer would also like to thank Prof. Dr. I Nyoman Kutha Ratna, S.U., as the Promoter, Prof. Dr. I Wayan Cika, M.S., as Co-Promoter I, and Prof. Dr. I Made Suastika, S.U., as Co-Promoter II, who have been so wise and patient in supervising the writer, who have always marked and discussed the parts of the dissertation considered important and who have given approval for continuation. The writer would also like to give his appreciation to Prof. Dr. I Wayan Ardika, M.A., the Dean of the Faculty of Letters, Udayana University for the permit given to the writer to continue his study at the Doctorate Program of Linguistics, Postgraduate Program of Udayana University. Finally, the writer would also like to extend his thanks to all the parties supporting the completion of this dissertation. It is hoped that God reward you all.