

Lontar

by I Wayan Widana

Submission date: 06-Aug-2019 04:21PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1158047989

File name: 3._Lontar.pdf (639.61K)

Word count: 5275

Character count: 26822



Lontar Manuscript Readability



I Made Suarta ^a
I Wayan Widana ^b
I Wayan Citrawan ^c

Article history:

Received: 8 August 2017
Revised: 27 February 2018
Approved: 20 March 2018
Published: 24 March 2018

Keywords:

Readability;
Geguritan;
Intertext;

Abstract

I Gedé Basur and *I Ketut Bungkling* texts (*geguritan*) were two unique texts in Bali. The uniqueness was seen in the existence of both texts in the society. As a traditional literature work, the texts were very popular due to being often read as well as sung by art enthusiasts of *magegitan* (singer) in Bali. It was also an inspiration in the world of classical art performances in Bali. *I Gedé Basur* and *I Ketut Bungkling* figures were very monumental for the Balinese society. *I Gedé Basur* was famous for his prowess mastering a black magic. Whereas, *I Ketut Bungkling* was famous as a figure who was very critical towards an environment. Surprisingly, the text was not found its persona texts. The readability of the texts was able to be seen through *Geguritan Kidung Prémbon (KP)*. The study was conducted on the theory of inter-text and receptions to reveal the textual and readability texts processes both by *Ki Dalang Tangsub (I Gedé Basur and I Ketut Bungkling text)* on *Kidung Prémbon (KP)*. Regarding the hermeneutic method is expected an explanation of the original texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* could be explored.

1

2455-8028 © Copyright 2018. The Author. Published by IJCU Publishing.
This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

All rights reserved.

Author correspondence:

I Made Suarta,
Language and Indonesian Literature Education Studies Program, FPBS IKIP PGRI Bali.
Jalan Seroja, Tonja, Denpasar-Bali, Indonesia
Email address: madesuarta62@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Balinese society currently exists to preserve the inheritance of ancestral heritage. It is known as the *lontar*. The efforts to maintain and develop the tradition of writing on the *lontar* is done by writing various types of the new titles. There are two of the ancient Balinese heritage *lontar* used as the object of the study *i.e. Geguritan I Gedé Basur (GIGB) and Geguritan I Ketut Bungkling (GIKB) by Ki Dalang Tangsub*. The archiving an effort both titles is not encouraging due to unlike a text is written in the early nineteenth century, the authoritative text has so far not been found. Meanwhile, both texts are very popular in the society (Simpén, 1988). The readability

^a Language and Indonesian Literature Education Studies Program, FPBS IKIP PGRI Bali.

^b Mathematics Education Studies Program, FPMIPA IKIP PGRI Bali

^c Guidance and Counseling Education Studies Program, FIP IKIP PGRI Bali

of the two texts is conducted through a text entitled *Kidung Prémbon (KP)*. Regarding the KP text furthermore intertextuality traceable history of GIGB and GIKB text by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. It can be explained the process of authoring KP text. Therefore, KP text itself is a text knitting of the text that has been there before *i.e.* GIGB and GIKB by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. Thus, KP text is considered as an existing text to explain the receptive process of GIGB and GIKB texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*.

The study is intended to describe the process of readability text of GIGB and GIKB by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* through KP and trace the reader's response to GIGB and GIKB texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* if the literary traditions in Bali. The achievement of the purpose of the present article is expected to provide theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, it is expected to be useful to explain the readability of GIGB and GIKB texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* as well as the receptive process in the literature of *geguritan* in Bali. After, the history of the text can be traced, theoretically it is also expected to be useful for determining the history of Balinese literature particularly and as the basis of other scientific writings, such as literature generally, the study of Balinese literature, life view, and cultural values in accordance with the contents of GIGB and GIKB texts. Practically, it is expected to enrich the nation's cultural insight into social phenomena that are read in literary works of *geguritan* especially in GIGB and GIKB texts. Moreover, it is also expected to grow noble character and generate a creative appreciation of *geguritan* literature for the next generation.

The text on GIGB and GIKB by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* its process of readability and response, especially using intertext and reception theories is never conducted. Based on the observations cannot be found. The partial writing of the two texts has been conducted by the researchers as follows.

- a) Hooykaas (1978) wrote a book entitled *The Balinese Poem Basur an Introduction to Magic*. In the book, Hooykaas only compared four *Geguritan Basur* texts and their versions, such as texts archived in (1) Faculty of Arts in Unud, (2) Gedong Kirtya Singaraja, (3) Kerambitan, and (4) Leiden collections. Meanwhile, the comparison of the Basur text consisted of in the text exists (KP) is not conducted.
- b) Supatra (1985), in his paper of bachelor, analyze GIKB text from the aspect of the idea. The thesis entitled: "Aspek Ide *Geguritan I Ketut Bongkling*" at the Department of Local Literature, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University. Before exposing the dominant idea to the author's message to the reader, after the introduction also described the form GIKB aspects. The form aspect (which he put in Chapter II) describing included diction, style, image, and rhythm and rhyme. Furthermore, Chapter III described the content aspects of the synopsis included story, theme, emotion and tone, and the message. Meanwhile, aspects of the ideas expressed in GIKB included (1) the idea of intellectual education; (2) religious ideas; and (3) concerning customs idea.
- c) Puspawati (1998), in her thesis of a master at the Indonesia and Java Literary Studies Program, Department of Humanities Sciences at Graduated from Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta in 1998, has conducted an editing, translation, and GIKB story analysis. In Chapter I discussed an introduction; Chapter II on and GIKB text; Chapter III on text and translation editing; Chapter IV on story analysis; and Chapter V as conclusions and suggestions. The study was conducted has a mistake in writing the name of the character on the title of *geguritan*. The name of the story character *I Ketut Bongkling* in accordance with the text of KP A (exists text) and Lontar Kidung Prémbon (text of KP B) is *I Ketut Bongkling*, not *I Ketut Bongkling*. Bongkling's name is used in a story entitled *Geguritan Pan Bongkling* by Ida Wayan Dangan. In addition, the text editing is not followed by stages in philological writing, such as (1) data collection; (2) manuscript description; (3) consideration and abortion of the manuscript; and (4) determining an original manuscript (otography) or authoritative texts. Thus, It does not a real text editing, considering only doing intuitive work methods without the basis of work steps as mentioned above.

Based on the above description, the writing focused on the aspects of intertextuality and receptive to GIGB and GIKB script by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* has never been done. Thus, the search purpose is increasingly important to be explored.

2. Research Methods

The method used in the present research is a hermeneutic method. The theory applied is *intertext* and *reception*. It is focused on explaining readability and trace readers' responses to GIGB and GIKB texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. In order to realize the above purpose, the first step is collected the data through documentation study and interview (as a supporting data). After the data has been collected, then it is performed data analysis with the hermeneutic method. As an interpretation method of the text (Ricoeur, 2006: 57), the application of hermeneutic methods is intended not only to find the true meaning, but also the most optimal meaning (Ratna,

2004: 46). In addition to hermeneutic methods, as well as applied qualitative methods. Qualitative methods is applied to the structural analysis of GIGB and GIKB texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*, i.e., by classifying verbal data thoroughly at giving attention to natural data, data in relation to the context of its existence. Related to the context, the data will be analyzed typographically and deductively. The application of hyperactive and deductive analysis is expected to produce adequate data accuracy. Furthermore, the presentation of the results is implemented formal and informal techniques.

3. Results and Analysis

3.1 Readability of GIGB and GIKB texts by Ki Dalang Tangsub

The present article applied 21 types of the data sources, whether in the form of hand script in Balinese script or printed script. Reading the script from all available data sources, finally, eight scripts are chosen as a primary data source to explain the process of GIGB and GIKB text readings by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* and its responding texts. The remaining data sources, i.e., thirteen scripts are secondary data sources.

Based on available data sources, the authoritative text of GIGB and GIKB scripts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* cannot be found. Readability of both scripts can be conducted through KP text. KP text previously is stated by [Simpén \(1988\)](#) as the work by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. After reading the existing scripts, it turns out KP text is not the work by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. KP text is merely the receptive script for them by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. In terms of forms of storytelling, KP text is a chain story that tells about I Ketut Bagus, I Ketut Bagus (Mpu Sruți) tells the story of I Rangda Kasihan (Siwa Tiga). *Ni Jempiring*, the daughter from Rangda Kasihan tells about Basur. Furthermore, I Ketut Bagus tells Bungklıng lastly Ida Pranda Bodakeling give a gift to I Ketut Bagus (Mpu Sruți) *Kidung Cowak*.

The authentic evidence used as the reason that KP text perceives GIGB and GIKB scripts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* and simultaneously uses both texts as hipogram text can be seen from the texts responding to the story in I Gedé Basur B (4.3.3) found in Puri Gedé, Kerambitan, Tabanan. The text shows the similarity of the storyline and the length of the narrative with the story by *I Gedé Basur* as consisted of KP text. Other evidence may also be seen from persona texts as the respondent's that indicates the adherence of acceptance to the narrative in the initial text (hipogram text) and the plot alteration is conducted after the initial text story (hipogram text) ends. Thus, KP text (the story particularly in *I Gedé Basur* and *I Ketut Bungklıng*) as well as other respondent texts, responds well to the hipogram text without altering consist of the initial text by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. It can be indicated, readers of both texts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* is afraid being stated as plagiarism. Another possibility is the authors of GIGB and GIKB scripts studied to *Ki Dalang Tangsub* and at least as a result of the popularity of the two texts in the society. Therefore, the later authors are very respectful with *Ki Dalang Tangsub*. His reverence is shown by the second writing by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* into other forms of receptive texts. In addition to creative also still retain the principal things of the hipogram text.

3.2 Receptive process on GIGB and GIKB scripts by Ki Dalang Tangsub

The receptive process of GIGB and GIKB scripts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* occurs only in the variant and version. In terms of variants, it is intended during the acceptance process is a difference in reading between the initial text (hipogram text-in this case, GIGB and GIKB scripts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*) by its responder's text. At the version level, there is an addition to the initial text (hipogram text) by the respondent text only at the end of the initial text story (hipogram text). Based on the disclosure of variant and version differences, then the receptive process of the two texts can be explained as follows. As mentioned above that the readability of GIGB and GIKB scripts by *Ki Dalang Tangsub* can be conducted through KP text. KP text itself is a receptive text and simultaneously as an adaptation text of them by *Ki Dalang Tangsub*.

Before KP text is authored, GIKB script was perceived by the text entitled *Geguritan I Ketut Bangun*. It is then responded by a text titled *Geguritan I Ketut Bagus* itself. It is the initial story of KP text in the form of clock stories. Meanwhile, KP text itself, in this receptive process found two different versions. On the text physical characteristics, in terms of text reading, through the language and completeness of the content, then for the further analysis purposes is selected KP A text as an existing text to explain the readability of GIGB and GIKB scripts. KP A text is a transliteration text by IW. Simpén AB. The receptive process of GIGB and GIKB scripts furthermore, can be found in KP text. It also found in persona texts, e.g., (1) I Gedé Basur A (4.3.2), (2) I Gedé Basur B (4.3.3), (3) *I Ketut Bungklıng* A (4.3.4), (4) *Geguritan I Ketut Bungklıng* B text (4.3.5), and *Geguritan Pan Bongklıng* text (4.3.6).

The receptive process on GIKB and *I Ketut Bangun* text basically can be seen from the same motives that are not the same. The same motives, consisting of (a) separation and motivation of the main character and (b) seeking a truth. Unequal motives, consisting of (a) names of figure and place, (b) the additional episodes in the narration flow, and (c) exchange rate. Meanwhile, the variant of the respondent's on GIGB and GIKB scripts occurred in the writing of the name and place. Whereas, there in the version is an addition of the flow as shown in the following discussion.

GIGB story variant on KP A text with Basur B text responders

The process of receptive text on the hypogram text (episode text GIGB KP A) occurs only at the variance level. As well as the KP A text description (Basur episode) with the script respondent (I Gedé Basur B), the second episode of the text, both the hypogram text and the respondent text, in essence, there is no prominent difference (nearly equal episodes). The variant characteristic of the receptive process of the respondent text (Basur B text) on the hypogram text appears to occur in the substitution of several lexicon in the phrase, phrase or sentence level of the hypogram text in accordance with a particular temple with different lexicon or phrase or sentence variants on the script respondent (Basur B). Therefore, it has a slightly different meaning. The difference is not to eliminate the essence of the hypogram text. Thus, it is still in the unity of the main idea. The variant occurs mainly in some important concepts that are a characteristic of GIGB KP A text (hypogram text). Whereas, Basur B authored instead of replacing the keywords in the hypogram text with another word like that, can cause a shift in meaning.

The difference also occurs in the script responder (Basur text B) number of stanzas of the whole *pupuh* that constructs both texts. GIGB KP A text is constructed with 78 stanzas, while the script respondent (Basur B) is 89 stanzas of *pupuh*. This distinction arises due to the author of the respondent's provides an illustration of several episodes that build Basur story on the hypogram text. The illustration is apparent in the depiction of the two main female leads by I Nyoman Karang daughters, namely Ni Sokasti and Ni Rijasa. In the hypogram text, the figures and characters are not very detailed (GIGB KP A, verse 3), but the script respondent is described in detail (Basur B, verse 3-4). Ni Rijasa figure is described just like her sister Ni Sokasti, mastering an ideal posture and the face. In the baboon text (GIGB KP A), there are no mention Ni Rijasa figures by the author. Unlike an excess of paint due to the respondent is to suffer from an overlap with the hypogram text.

Variants are indicated that the respondent really does perceive the hypogram text can be seen from the motivator of the responder as shown in the following table.

Table 1
Variant motivator of GIGB KP A and Basur B scripts

<i>GIGB KP A script</i>	<i>Basur B script</i>
<i>Pukuhun Hyang Kawisuara,</i>	<i>Pukuhun Hyang Kawisuara,</i>
<i>miwah Sanghyang Saraswati,</i>	<i>miwah Sanghyang Saraswati,</i>
<i>tabé tityang ngawé gita,</i>	<i>tan wruh tityang ngawé gita,</i>
<i>wong Abian kéwut mangutus,</i>	<i>wong Sudra mangawé kidung,</i>
<i>minta gita tatangisan,</i>	<i>iseng-isengan matembang,</i>
<i>Déwa gusti,</i>	<i>ngawé gurit,</i>
<i>tabé tityang tan cantula (Basur KP A, verse 1)</i>	<i>manuturang kakunayan (Basur B, verse 1)</i>

If it is compared with above Basur A script respondent. It does not show a different version. Therefore, the splitting flow is similar to the hipogram text (GIGB KP A script). In the script respondent (Basur A) despite the addition of the flow, the motivator of the script is exactly the same as the baboon text (GIGB KP A script), *i.e.*, "*Wong Abiankéwut mangutus*" with "*Minta gita tatangisan*" (GIGB KP A, verse 1 Basur A, verse 1). Meanwhile, Basur B script is the difference in the motivator for the script writing begins to appear that is indicated by the phrase "*Wong Abiankéwut mangutus*" on (GIGB KP A, verse 1, Basur A, verse 1) is replaced by the phrase "*Wong Sudra mangawé kidung*" Basur B has no motivator. It may be stated that the script was authored as a process of "*Iseng-isengan matembang*" 'Just for fun singing to spend the spare time'. As the process of sparing

Suarta, I., Widana, I., & Citrawan, I. (2018). Lontar manuscript readability. *International Journal Of Linguistics, Literature And Culture (IJLLC)*, 4(2), 58-65.
doi:10.21744/ijllc.v4i2.650

time (fad), it does not mean without meaning, but precisely it is manifested by the author as the transmission of values from the teachings that have been authored earlier "*manuturang kakumayan*" 'tell the past event', which can be interpreted as forwarding the noble concepts of Ki Dalang Tangsub as an authored.

The concept of "*menabung/saving*" in the priority of life-saving attitude for Balinese society seems realistically conveyed by the author in the Basur story on the hipogram text (KP A text). In the respondent text (Basur text B), the value transmission is displayed by replacing several words in phrase or sentence level. Therefore, it seems clear that the script respondent is subsequently belonging to the hipogram text. The variant differences are shown in the following table.

Table 2
The variant of the concept of "saving" GIGB KP A and Basur B script

2	<i>Basur KP A script</i>	4	<i>Basur B script</i>
	<p><i>Lamun nglah pipis patpat, né dadua sepel pang ilid, adasa mangelah jinah, lalima sepel di bungbung, makelo ada antosang, bliang klambi, eda goro budag amah.</i> (Basur KP A, verse 12)</p>		<p><i>Lamun ngelah pipis patpat, né dadwa sepel pang ilid, yan ngelah pipis adasa, lalima penpen ka bungbung, wekasan ada antosang, bliang tapih, 'da bogbog budag madahar.</i> (Basur B, verse 14)</p>

Differences in the reveal meanings using different words in both texts, especially in the responder's text imply that the text of the responder of language shows a deviation of meaning compared to the hypogram text. The word '*simpan/save*' in GIGB KP A text implies a more subtle meaning when compared to the word '*penpen*' 'put' in Basur B text. The phrase of '*bliang klambi*'/buying a cloth GIGB KP A text also shows wider and logical meaning when compared with the phrase '*bliang tapih*' for the women' on Basur B text. The above two words (*sepel:penpen; klambi:tapih*), it is to show a dichotomy (low and high addressee) also show the verbal expression of the responder's text. Unlike the expression, the author of Basur B text suggests that the use of the word as an expression commonly used by the society of the environment (in this case coastal societies in Kerambitan, Tabanan, originally Basur B text author). It is interesting from this process that Basur B text readers use two text variants as comparative text to write their works, namely GIGB KP A and GIGB KP B. The authoring process of the Basur B text such as, in philological terms, referred to as text contamination or horizontal transmission (Robson, 1994: 19). Meanwhile, the utterance *Eda goro budag amah* 'do not eat too greedy' on GIGB KP A text, although it has rough connotations, when it is contextualized to the meaning of the text as a whole, has a clarity as opposed to the sentence choice of *Da bogbog budag madahar* 'do not show pride by eating gourmand 'in Basur B text. The word 'greedy' *budag* are just exactly combined with the word eat (*amah/ngamah*) which connotes harshly. It is assumed that the author of Basur B text replaces the word *amah*/eat (in rude connotation) with the word *madahar/madaar* 'eat' (in good connotation) only to high addressee meaning for politeness for looking a modesty although in terms of language sense. There is inequality.

3.3 Narrative Structure of GIGB and GIKB Texts by Ki Dalang Tangsub

The discussion of aspects of narrative structure (intrinsic structure of GIGB and GIKB texts) is conducted in three views, namely (a) structure of the form, (b) content (structure of narrative text), and (c) character analysis. The review of GIGB and GIKB form structure is conducted in two aspects, *i.e.*, the *metrum* aspect and the language variations that constructs a text. This is conducted to know the characteristic of GIGB and GIKB text by Ki Dalang Tangsub that were authored as the text of the responders.

Regarding the structure of the form, is conducted in two reviews, *i.e.*, aspects of *metrum* and language variations. The unique *metrum* aspect of both texts is the use of one kind of *pupuh* to build its story. There is *Pupuh Ginada*. In the literary works tradition of *geguritan* in Bali, the use of a single *pupuh* in *geguritan* literature is also found in: (a) *Geguritan Jayaprana (Ginada)*, (b) *Geguritan Pakangraras (Ginada)*, *Geguritan*

Burayut (Sinom), Geguritan Lingga Peta (Ginada) Geguritan Bagus Diarsa (Sinom) (Agastia, 1980: 19). The model of writing, unlike *geguritan* works, until now still considered as an icon and characteristic of the creation by Ki Dalang Tangsub. The same story of a model of writing, in the receptive process of GIKB texts, was followed by the writer of *Geguritan Pan Bongkling* by Ida Wayan Dangin from Karangasem, but with a different kind of *pupuh*. There is *Pupuh Sinom*. The most widely used language variations in GIGB and GIKB text are hyperbole, parable, and sarcasm.

In terms of content analysis (narrative structure of GIGB and GIKB texts), it is reviewed: (1) textual sequence of story contents, (2) sequence of events chronologically, and (3) sequence of events logically. Overall sequences that construct GIGB and GIKB can be detailed as follows. GIGB and GIKB text sequences in the episode level (first level sequence) are built on two sequences; at the plot level in the episode (second-order sequence) consists of 28 sequences; while in the sub-plot in the episode (third order sequence) consists of 29 sequences. The sequence of events chronologically appears that time runs primarily around the events experienced or performed by the characters of the story. The event rolled after the main character of each episode moved its narrative path. Those figures are *I Gedé Basur* and *I Ketut Bungkling (Mantri)*. The events in GIGB and GIKB text logically occur in a close connection between stories in one episode. In one episode in a single split, the flow appears to move in the united form a logical causal relationship.

The analysis of characters in GIGB and GIKB texts is conducted only against the dominant central figures building the narrative path of each episode. The figures are *I Gedé Basur* and *I Ketut Bungkling*. The aspects of the figures revealed included (1) physical aspects, (2) social aspects, and (3) psychological aspects. The physical figure *I Ketut Bungkling* is expressed handsome, while *I Gedé Basur*, physically a figure who is less handsome. The social status *I Ketut Bungkling* figure mentioned is poor while *I Gedé Basur* socioeconomically is rich. Psychologically, *I Ketut Bungkling* figure is a child picked. Therefore, he has a psychological conflict that wants to criticize the attitude of the inner figures arrogant to the environment. Whereas, *I Gedé Basur* figure although physically classified as less handsome, psychologically has a courteous soul and what it is. But, due to the disrespectful treatment by Ni Sokasti, he finally took revenge against Ni Sokasti. The act was apparently done by *I Gedé Basur* because he was forced to result unfortunately with *I Wayan Tigaron*, the only one son by *I Wayan Tigaron*. He does not want to marry other women than Ni Sokasti. Meanwhile, *I Gedé Basur* is rejected by Ni Sokasti. Therefore, he wants to black magic Ni Sokasti for revenging is avenged.

4. Conclusion

Readability text towards GIGB and GIKB by Ki Dalang Tangsub can be conducted through KP. Aside from being an existing text, KP is also a receptive text. As a receptive text, KP contains not only the hipogram text but also the author is very creative to be able to arrange the story in a clock story into five episodes. GIGB text and GIKB scripts have been well received by the readers even though only in the form of *geguritan*. GIGB script is perceived by *I Ketut Bangun* script, *Basur A* text (the textbook that was translated by *I Madé Sanggra*), and *I Gedé Basur B* script (script of *Puri Gedé Kerambitan*). Whereas, GIKB script is perceived by *I Ketut Bungkling A* script (script of *Lontar Library of Udayana University, Faculty of Arts*), *I Ketut Bungkling B* script (script is owned by *Library of Culture Department, Bali Province*), and *Geguritan Pan Bongkling* text (script is owned by *Lontar Library, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University*).




Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments and appreciation are presented to *Panglingsir Puri Gede Kerambitan*, the Head of *Lontar Library of Faculty of Arts, Udayana University*, and the Head of *Culture Department, Bali Provincial* for a willingness to facilitate various libraries of books and *Lontar*.

References

1. Hooykaas, C. (1978). *The Balinese poem Basur: an introduction to magic* (Vol. 17). Nijhoff.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
2. Indiani, N. M., & Suda, I. K. (2018). Interpret Ogoh-ogoh towards Hindu Contemporary Society. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences (IRJMIS)*, 5(1), 65-71.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
3. Jauss, H. (1982). Toward an aesthetic of reception.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
4. Jorgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2007). Analisis Wacana: Teori dan Metode. *Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar*.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
5. Kapoor, K. (2018). Representation of Female Characters through Item Songs in Selected Hindi Movies. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 2(1), 1-9.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
6. Karakter, P., & Aryani, N. W. Nilai kearifan geguritan i ketut bungkling dalam.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
7. Larrain, J., Bottomore, T., Gunawan, R., & Al-Zastrow, N. (1996). *Konsep ideologi*. LKPSM.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
8. Mandala, H. (2018). Divergent Principles of Politeness in Verbal and Non-Verbal Directive Speech Act. *International Research Journal of Engineering, IT and Scientific Research (IRJEIS)*, 4(2), 41-51.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
9. Marrison, G. E. (1987). Modern Balinese-A regional literature of Indonesia. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land-en volkenkunde/Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, 143(4), 468-498.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
10. Ratna, I. N. K. (2004). *Teori, metode & teknik penelitian sastra: dari strukturalisme hingga postrukturalisme: perspektif wacana naratif*. Pustaka Pelajar.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
11. Ricoeur, P. (2006). Hermeneutika Ilmu Sosial. *Terj: Muhammad Syukri*. Yogyakarta: *Kreasi Wacana*.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
12. Suardiana, I. W., Ratna, N. K., Cika, I. W., & Suastika, I. M. geguritan (manuscript) of i gede basur and i ketut bungkling written by ki dalang tangsub: intertextual and receptional analysis. *e-journal of linguistics*.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
13. Suarta, I. M. (2017). Revitalization of Oral Literature Tradition of Balinese Society Based Character Values As Deradicalism Effort. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 1(3), 8-16.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
14. Sugiharta, I. P. S. O. Penguatan jiwa keagamaan pada anak usia dini sebagai prophetic thinking.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)
15. Wirawan, I. W. A. (2018). Maintaining Social Relationship of Balinese and Sasak Ethnic Community. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 2(1), 92-104.
[View in \(Google Scholar\)](#)

Biography of Authors

	<p>I Made Suarta graduated his bachelor degree in Indonesian Language and Literature Education FPBS IKIP PGRI Bali in 1989. He as well as graduated his bachelor degree in Civil Law, Faculty of Law, Mahendradatta University in Denpasar, 1994. He finished his master degree in Linguistics (Literature Discourse) Postgraduate Program, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University in 2003. He completed his Ph.D. in Linguistics (Discourse of Arts) Doctoral Program in 2010. His work experience and organization: (1) Lecturer Foundation in the Institute of Higher Education IKIP PGRI Bali at the Department of Language and Literature Education FPBS IKIP PGRI Bali, in 1989. (2) Lecturer of civil servant Kopertis Wilayah VIII DPK at the Department of Language and Literature Education FPBS IKIP PGRI Bali, in 1991. (3) Head of D2 Program Studies PGTK FIP IKIP PGRI Bali, 2004 - 2010. (4) Vice Rector II, IKIP PGRI Bali, 2007 - 2011. (5) Rector of IKIP PGRI Bali, Period I, 2010 - 2014. And so forth. <i>Email: madesuarta62@gmail.com</i></p>
	<p>I Wayan Widana is an associate professor of Mathematics Program Studies, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences Education, Teacher Training Institute and Education Sciences of PGRI Bali. He graduated his bachelor degree in Jakarta State University in research and education evaluation. He finished his master degree in Ganesha Education University on research and education evaluation. He completed his doctoral degree at Terbuka University, Jakarta. He has been published some books with ISBN in learning and education field as well as authored some modules. <i>Email: i.wayan.widana.bali@gmail.com</i></p>
	<p>I Wayan Citrawan graduated his bachelor degree at Education Studies, FKIP Udayana University in 1983. He finished his master degree at Research and Evaluation Education, IKIP Singaraja in 2004. He completed his doctoral degree at Cultural Studies, Udayana University of Education in 2013. He has been published some research in the last 5 years. (1) <i>Marginalisasi Guru Perempuan dalam Pengangkatan Kepala Sekolah SMPN dan SMAN Denpasar.</i> (2) <i>Meningkatkan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten Klungkung melalui Indeks Pendidikan: Mixed Method Study.</i> (3) <i>Penyusunan Naskah Akademik Rancangan Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Badung tentang Pendidikan Inklusif.</i> (4) <i>Sebagai Tim Penyusunan Naskah Akademik Revisi PERDA No 5 tahun 2008 Tentang Sistem Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Kabupaten Badung.</i> <i>Email: citrawanwayan@yahoo.com</i></p>

Lontar

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

3%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

ijcu.us

Internet Source

1%

2

atavisme.web.id

Internet Source

1%

3

ijcujournals.us

Internet Source

<1%

4

www.lpdkedonganan.com

Internet Source

<1%

5

www.portalgaruda.org

Internet Source

<1%

6

es.scribd.com

Internet Source

<1%

7

Submitted to Udayana University

Student Paper

<1%

8

G. E. Marrison. "Literary travels in Bali",
Indonesia and the Malay World, 11/1994

Publication

<1%

9

repository.warmadewa.ac.id

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On