

## Transformation of Novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* into Film *Sang Penari*: an Intertextual Analysis

I NYOMAN SUAKA

Study Program of Indonesian Language and Literature, Faculty of Education of Languages and Arts, Saraswati Teachers' Training College, Tabanan, Bali, Indonesia  
E-mail: imansuaka@yahoo.co.id

Penelitian ini ingin mengetahui transformasi novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* ke Film *Sang Penari*. Novel karya Ahmad Tohari ini diadopsi menjadi film oleh sutradara Ifa Ifansyah. Film *Sang Penari* banyak mendapat sanjungan karena kualitas akting, plot dan tema cerita sangat menarik menceritakan tradisi kesenian ronggeng telah ditunggangi oleh politik. Jenis penelitian ini tergolong penelitian kualitatif dengan analisis bersifat intertekstualitas. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan metode dokumen dan observasi. Dokumen yang digunakan adalah novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* dan kaset VCD film *Sang Penari* 2 keping. Metode observasi digunakan untuk menyaksikan dan mengamati tayangan visual film *Sang Penari*, termasuk menyaksikan tayangan film tersebut di salah satu televisi swasta. Analisis ini mengkaji hubungan antarteks yakni teks novel dengan teks visual dan dengan konteks lingkungan masyarakat pendukung kesenian ronggeng. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan, transformasi novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* ke film *Sang Penari* menghasilkan transposisi teks seperti dekonstruksi dan apresiasi teks. Dekonstruksi teks terjadi karena beberapa adegan penting dalam novel tidak muncul dalam film, sedangkan apresiasi teks terjadi penyempurnaan novel karena dalam film dimunculkan peristiwa sejarah yakni gerakan G 30 S PKI. Dalam novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* terbitan tahun 1982, sejarah kelabu bangsa Indonesia tidak tampak dengan jelas.

This present study was intended to identify the transformation of the novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* into the film *Sang Penari* (the Dancer). The novel, which was written by Ahmad Tohari, was adopted into the film which was directed by Ifa Ifansyah. The film was highly appreciated due its highly interesting acting, plot and theme, in which it was narrated that the art tradition of *ronggeng* was interfered with politics. This present study is a qualitative one with intertextual analysis. The data were collected using documentation and observation methods. The document used was the novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* and two CDs of the film *Sang Penari*. The observation method was used to view and observe visually the presentation of the film *Sang Penari*. The film which was presented on one of the private television stations was also watched. This present study analyzed the relation between the text of the novel and the visual text and environmental context of the supporting community of the *ronggeng* traditional art. The result of the study showed that the transformation of the novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* into the film *Sang Penari* (the Dancer) led to textual transformation such as deconstruction and text appreciation. The textual deconstruction took place as several important scenes in the novel did not appear on the film. The textual appreciation took place as the historical event *G 30 S PKI* (the Indonesian Communist Movement which took place on 30 September) was added, which the novel did not contain. In the novel, which was edited in 1982, such a bad historical event in Indonesia was not clearly mentioned.

**Keywords:** Transformation, novel, film, and intertextuality.

The people living at Dukuh Paruk, Banyumas Regency, Central Java, assume that a disaster will happen to them if there is no *ronggeng* dancer. Furthermore, one of them did not want to die before he danced with the *ronggeng* dancer. This

proves that the value of the *ronggeng*, as an art tradition bequeathed by their ancestor named Ki Secamenggala, is so strong. They feel that they will make a sin if they cannot maintain the dance. Ki

hey die if they do not maintain such a performing art.

The Javanese people especially those who live in Central Java have long been familiar with the *ronggeng* performing art. However, the *ronggeng* performing art performed at Dukuh Paruk is very specific and important. The lady who will become the *ronggeng* dancer should be good at *nembang* (singing) and dancing and is obliged to perform a three-stage ceremony. The three stages include 1) submitting and authorizing the candidate as a child of what is called 'dukun ronggeng'; 2) purifying the candidate in front of the grave where her ancestor was buried; and 3) performing a ceremony called *malam bukak klambu* (the night when the screen is opened), that is, a ceremony which is performed as a contest in which the candidate releases her virginity.

Such values of tradition are revealed by Ahmad Tohari, the writer of the novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* (1982), which is abbreviated to RDP. It narrates the journey of life of a *ronggeng* dancer named Srintil at Dukuh Paruk, a small hamlet at Tinggar Jaya Village, Jati Lewang District, Banyumas Regency, Central Java. At Dukuh Paruk, *ronggeng* is not simply one form of art; it is a symbol of social status and motivates the community's sacred life. This novel has been popular again after being transformed into a film entitled *Sang Penari* (the dancer). One of the strengths of this film is that it also inserts the G 30 S political event (the Movement of 30 September), which does not appear in the novel.

The local traditional values the novel contains and the film *Sang Penari* presents reflect that the art work cannot be separated from the context of the socio-cultural values of the surrounding society. The problems are that what the transformation of RDP into the film *Sang Penari* is like from the perspective of intertextuality; to what extent the event on the film reflects its community and era; how the writer behaves towards such a transformation. They are the questions which will be discussed below.

This present study is a qualitative one as it was analyzed using qualitative approach as what was explored has something to do with verbal and

audiovisual text and its context in community. The qualitative study leads to the descriptive data which are in the forms of written or oral words of the people or behavior which can be observed. The data collected in the present study were in the form of the words and figures which can be described.

In the qualitative study, process is more important than result. The reason is that the parts which are being explored will be much clearer if the process is observed. It is different from the quantitative study in which the result is more important than the process. In the qualitative study, the process includes when the study is started, when it is conducted, and when it is finished. The result is sometimes discovered in the process.

The writer watched the film which was recorded in two CDs and was presented on one private television station. In such an opportunity, the writer focused his attention to the comparative study of the texts; they are the novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* and the film *Sang Penari*. In 1980s Yasman Yazid and PT Gramedia Film presented it in the form of a film entitled *Darah dan Mahkota Ronggeng* (the Blood and Crown of Ronggeng); however, Ahmad Tohari was disappointed as there were pornographic scenes on the film. The writer recognized that, as a result of adaptation, it would not be possible to obtain the same story as what was read in the novel. An adaptation of any literary work should give freedom to the transformer to freely translate and interpret.

The primary data in the qualitative study are words or actions; the rest are called additional data. In relation to the type of the data used in the present study, the words and actions in the audiovisual text of the film were the primary data. The secondary data were obtained from books, newspaper, magazines and the information given by the informants. The data in the present study were collected using observation and documentation techniques.

Observation means the intensive observation which is done by reading, seeing and observing the object of the study. The novel RDP written by Ahmad Tohari, which was issued by Gramedia in 2002 was read and relevant information was recorded. The audiovisual technique was used to watch what was presented on the film SP in the form of two VCDs



and what was presented on TV. The documents used in the present study were the novel RDP and the VCD cassettes of SP. The other documents included retention, article RDP and the film SP.

The collected data were analyzed using the technique of analysis *Model Miles* and *Hubermen*. They offered the technique of analysis which is made up of three components; they are data reduction, data presentation and conclusion drawing. The presentation of the result of data analysis constitutes an activity in which pieces of information are assembled from which conclusions can be drawn. The result of data analysis is presented in a descriptive/narrative way through data identification and classification. The data are presented descriptively and qualitatively using inductive method; specific problems are described in order to be able to draw general conclusions. The qualitative descriptive data presentation is not limited to how the data were collected and composed, but also includes the analysis and interpretation of the meaning of the data. The result of analysis is presented in a narrative way using words and statements which are completed with figures and pictures.

### LITERARY SOCIOLOGY

The novel RDP, as a literary work, can be analyzed based on the theory of sociology of literature which focuses on the relation between text and context. This theory gives an opportunity to analyze the relation between a literary work and a social group, the relation between the cultural domain of the writer and his literary work, and the relation between the social phenomenon appearing around the writer and his literary work. According to the theory of sociology of literature, a literary work cannot neglect the existence of his writer, the world, his spiritual experiences and where such a literary work is written (Amminudin, Ed. 1990: 109). Alan Swingewood (in Junus, 1986: 1) divides the theory of sociology into 1) the theory of sociology and literature, 2) the social theory of literature, 3) the theory of literature and structuralism, and 4) the matters pertaining method. Sociology and literature include three approaches; they are: 1) The approach regarding a literary work as a socio-cultural document; 2) The approach viewing the writer's social position; and 3) The approach emphasizing

the community's reception of the writer's particular work.

Similar to what was described above, Wallek and Warren divides the sociology of literature into three parts; they are: 1) The writer's sociology; it discusses the writer's social status, political ideology and so on related to the writer; 2) The sociology of literary works; it discusses literary works; it focuses on what is implied in literary works; what messages are intended to be given; and 3) The sociology of literature; it discusses the reader and his/her social impact on the community (Semi, 1989: 53).

The societal problems in literary works are not simple; they are as complex as the real life in the community. Again this proves that only a number of writers who are able to catch them perfectly. Therefore, it can be understood that the opinion that generally any literary work which is social-oriented and present conflicts among characters, groups and society is a great one.

The relation between literature and its society is a highly common thing, meaning that they should be related to each other. The reason is that there is a direct relation among a number of literary tools. Language, for example, is a tool which is used to reveal things and it belongs to society. The writer as the creator belongs to society; he/she lives in and learns from society. Umar Kayam (1980: 408) states that an art, which, in this case, includes literature, is never independent.

In relation to any literary work and his writer, Hudson (1960: 14-15) states that it is the result of what is interpreted from life in accordance with the writer's assumptions which are subjective in nature. However, the writers, especially the great ones, may be stated as the creators who have great responsibilities. They write not simply for commercial purposes; they write not simply to free themselves from the burden in their minds; more than that they are responsible for making their literary works read by the community of its readers, even after they die and forever. According to Zeraffa (in Elizabeth and Tom Burns, 1973: 36), the writer should analyze, select, and consider various aspects of life thoroughly before they are constructed in a written form. The society should be described in accordance with the

writer's conception through what he/she is optimally aware of. Darmono (1978:13) states that a literary work will become a highly effective sociological parameter for measuring the response given by the society to social strengths. In relation to the practice of the analysis of literary sociology, the concept mentioned above may be divided into two aspects which are complementary to each other. They are 1) the literary tool used to reveal social problems in the imaginary world; and 2) the writer him/herself with his/her awareness and responsibilities.

Without paying attention to what Rene Wellek and Austin Warren worried (1989: 79-81), as far as to what extent the analysis of extrinsic aspects of any literary work is concerned, the concepts of the sociology of literature have made it possible to understand that the literary work is one of the better phenomena of life. Finally, the literary work does not only constitute the result of meaningless imagination; more than that it shows a social situation in its era.

### INTERTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

The theory of intertextuality can be used to analyze the two texts; the novel *RDP* and the film *SP*. According to Julia Kristeva, the term *intertextuality* is a key concept of structuralism which, at the same time, challenges the structural, synchronic and systemic model of thinking of structuralism. What is observed by Kristeva from a text or an art work is not as simple as the relation between form and meaning or the signifier and signified, as maintained by the conventional semiotics. What is observed is how important the dimensions of space and time are in the text analysis (Pilliang, 1999: 121).

Quoting what is stated by Kristeva, Pilliang (1999:121) states that a text or an art work is created on a concrete space and time. Therefore, there must be relations between one text or an art work to the prior text in regard to time. Kristeva, the French poststructuralist, views that a text or an art work is not independent; it does not have any basis in itself; and it is not autonomous either.

Kristeva further develops the term *intertextualism* from the original term *dialogism* proposed by Michael Bakhtin coming from Russia. In his work,

he criticizes the intellectual strategy and the approach of formalism in arts, both the approach of Russian formalism and the European formalism. From the point of view of the approach of formalism, the art work does not have any adequate social basis, except the appearance of the text itself. The meaning of the text is not from the internal relations in it; the meaning of the text is from what is reflected by the writer's sound or soul (Pilliang, 1999: 122).

Being inspired by the Bakhtin's concept of dialogism, Kristeva uses the term *intertextualism* to explain that a text and the text before it are dependent on each other. A text is not an independent and autonomous cultural phenomenon. It does not exist based on the internal relations or criteria without having an external background; it is a game and mosaic of what is quoted from the previous texts.

With reference to what is stated by Bakhtin and Kristeva, the analysis of the transformation of the novel *RDP* into the film *SP* involves the texts which are related to one another. The relations between the texts are so clear internally and externally. They involve the writer's expression, the obsession of the director and producer. They also include the relation with the real community life in the classical era, modern era and postmodern era. The text of the novel *RDP*, as the original text, was visually transformed by Ifa Ifansyah, the director, into the film presented on the theatre and television.

The film director clearly and firmly mentions that such a visual text was inspired by the text of the novel *RDP* written by Ahmad Tohari. In addition, it administratively proves that the two texts are not independent; the relations between the two led to a new text. Although what was intended to maintain in the electronic cinema or the film *SP* was the idea of the story, the deconstruction and appreciation of the original text were found.

According to Kristeva (Pilliang, 1999: 123), the new version of the text is the art work in which quotations cross one another. Both the readers and the viewers also constitute a place where quotations cross each other. Intertextuality means one system of sign crosses another system of sign termed as transposition. Kristeva (in Pilliang, 1999: 123-125) explains what transposition is in detail. Several



concepts of transposition may be formulated as follows.

- a. Deconstruction; the transposition which takes place by deleting or crossing out parts of the system of sign of the reference text.
- b. Distortion; the transposition which takes place by politically damaging or changing the sign of the reference text for the sake of criticism, sarcasm, or just for fun.
- c. Appreciation; the transposition of one system of sign to another system of sign; no distortion takes place; appreciation is given which is intended to recall things. Such a system of sign or reference is appreciated, preserved, or translated into the context of contemporary culture.

#### TRANSFORMATION OF RDP INTO THE FILM *SANG PENARI*

Being inspired by RDP (1982) which was written by Ahmad Tohari, Ifansyah adopted the *ronggeng* dancer into a film. Telling the love story made by two children named *Rasus* and *Srintil*, *Sang Penari* (the dancer) started it in 1953 when they were still small at a small and poor village named Dukuh Paruk. It was at this village the *ronggeng* became something which was highly glorified with its ritual; it was a heritage which should be maintained. At the same time, it was also an offering to the ancestors each time it was performed. The villagers believed that not everybody was able to be the *ronggeng* dancer as it was believed that it was their ancestors who would choose and determine who would be the *ronggeng* dancer. Srintil, whose face was beautiful and who was very good at dancing made the elders of Dukuh Paruk village believe that she was the reincarnation of the *ronggeng*.



Figure 1. The role of Srintil was played by Prisia Nasation on the Film *Sang Penari* (Source: <http://ardnas20.fik.wordpress.com/2011/11/Sang-Penari.jpg>).

The story started in 1953 when Dukuh Paruk lived with a dancer of *ronggeng Surti* (such a role played by Happy Salma). The atmosphere was cheerful and the childhood of Santayib and Rasus was too. Then a disaster took place; so many people, including Surti, died of poison resulting from the inedible fermented soybean cake (*tempe bongkek*) produced by Santayib, Srintil's father. Such a disaster was an important event, causing Srintil to be interested in becoming the *ronggeng*. Such a feeling was the realization of devotion to what is referred to as *dukuh* in order to expiate the parent's sin. The soul of Srintil, the *ronggeng*, was open with a dialogue between Srintil and Sakum in front of the grave where Ki Secamenggala, the Dukuh Paruk's ancestor, was buried. That Srintil was highly motivated to be the *ronggeng* dancer was known by Sakarya (such a role played by Landung Simatupang), Srintil's grandfather, who then visited Kartareja (Slamet Raharjo) as the *ronggeng* healer at the village. In the beginning, Kartareja was not interested; therefore, he did not come to dance with Srintil (ngibing). Such a scene was played by Prisia and was very interesting. Her face was gloomy as she was disappointed that she did not have any partner. She was able to act as a girl who was not good at dancing but strongly desired to be a popular *ronggeng* dancer.

Then *Sang Penari* caused us to be more familiar with how the *ronggeng* performing art should be maintained and glorified. The duty, obligation and responsibility of the *ronggeng* dancer were not easy. As the *ronggeng* dancer, she should sacrifice her personal interests as the realization of her devotion to the villagers in general and for the reputation of *Dukuh Paruk* in particular. She did not only have to dance but she has also to follow was desired by the *ronggeng* healer (*dukun ronggeng*).

The sadness which should be undergone by Srintil as the *ronggeng* made Rasus to be confused. He felt that his love had been carried away by force without any opposition. Finally, being frustrated, he left the village to join the army. Then the film was moving to the situation which was getting complicated. Srintil gradually felt that what he did was not what she had desired or not in accordance with what she had desired to live with Rasus. The situation was getting bad in Indonesia; many people who had

never made any mistake became the victims of the interests of particular classes with a promise that their lives would be better.



**Figure 2.** I Nyoman Antara, a Balinese artist as Rasus in the film *Sang Penari* (Source: <http://ardnas20.fik.wordpress.com/2011/11/Sang-Penari.jpg>).

In 1965 the era changed; Dukuh Paruk developed rapidly due to the *Ronggeng* performance. It was at this time Raus got back to his 'dukuh' (village) with a dilemma; either he should show his devotion to the state as he was a soldier or he showed his love to Srintil. In this phase of image *Sang Penari* was seen to brave enough to reveal the bad era of the Indonesian history in 1960. *Sang Penari* succeeded in inserting the vision of a political party into the village including the *ronggeng* art group. It seemed that the film director intended to show a gloomy picture after the 1965's tragedy which had been the dark side of the national life in Indonesia. After G.30 S (the movement of the Indonesian political party which took place on 30 September), the new order regime cleaned all the elements which were stated to be involved in such a bloody tragedy.

Rasus disagreed that Srintil would become the *ronggeng* dancer. On the other hand, all the villagers liked the *ronggeng* performing art as it was a cultural tradition which had been rooted from the parents, children and young people. Rasus, using his Banyumasan dialect, stated, "*Ronggeng ku kayak kelapa. Sapa bae bisa slaman slumun manjat*" as an antipathy to the *ronggeng* world. However, what Srintil desired could not be avoided; as a result, Rasus supported her by giving her *Ronggeng Surti* wavy double bladed dagger (*keris*). Such a support turned out to be in contrast with what Rasus desired, as he fled the night when Srintil was

officially announced in the program in which the net (*klambu*) was opened. The program was led by the *ronggeng* healer named Nyai Kartareja (acted by Dewi Irawan).



**Figure 3.** Cover of VCD of the Film *Sang Penari* (Source: <http://ardnas20.fik.wordpress.com/2011/11/Sang-Penari.jpg>).

Srintil was successful in becoming the *ronggeng*; however, Rasus fled and was disappointed in such a tradition. He became a soldier; however, what he was supposed to do was the same as what an office boy was supposed to do as he was illiterate. He was taken care of by a sergeant (acted by Tio Pakusudewo); he was taught how to be braver and to write and read. The Rasus' soul developed and the *ronggeng* performing art at Dukuh also developed as it was penetrated by the character Bahar (acted by Lukman Sardi), a leader of a political party who intended to search for sympathy by a promise he would improve the farmers' welfare and the *ronggeng* performing art as well. Mr Bahar, a political party, was very good at delivering speeches. He made use of the performance of Dukuh Paruk *ronggeng* (the people's *ronggeng*) as the form of propaganda. Those who were involved were highly paid; they were given a speaker, fabric and other equipment for Srintil and the *calung* (gamelan orchestra) players. Such assistance was provided by the political party and was used to recruit the people.

Visually, it could be observed from the film that the gate leading to Dukuh Paruk was decorated with the symbol and slogan of the political party.



Unfortunately, the people could not read it as they were illiterate. It was difficult for them not to get involved in the political party as they felt that they were bound by the good things which had been done by Bahar. The peak of such a condition was when hundreds of the watchers of the political party got so drunk that they made a chaos and damaged the rice plant and promoted the site of Ki Secamenggala, their ancestor. As the sacred grave was damaged, those who lived at Dukuh became emotional and angry; as a result, they got involved in the political current. The *ronggeng* group and players of the gamelan orchestra, and the *Srintil* dancer were caught and discriminated as political detainees.

#### Between the Novel Text and the Visual Text

Compared to what is narrated in the novel RDP, what was striking on this film was the visualization of what happened to Dukuh Paruk in 1965. Ahmad Tohari, the writer of the novel, was very satisfied with the film (the Discussion with Ahmad Tohari at Balai Bahasa, Yogyakarta, on 17 June 2013). In the novel RDP, he did not clearly describe the scene in which the people living at Dukuh Paruk were tortured. Several scenes were visualized to support the communist movement such as the red hats worn by the farmers, the sickles, the expression 'the board of revolution', the word USDEK was written on the roofs of houses, and the involvement of the soldiers to fight those who were suspected of being involved.

In the Historical and Cultural Encyclopedia, it was stated that the word USDEK was related to the Political Manifesto expressed by President Soekarno when he delivered a speech on 17 August 1959. The term USDEK stands for *Undang-Undang Dasar 1945* (the 1945 Constitution), Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy, Guided Economy and Indonesian Personality. Such a speech was well known for its *Manipol Usdek* used the official ideology and the state course at that time (2009: 246). This ideology was socialized to the public; the roofs of the houses were painted white in such a way that the word USDEK was formed.

The character Bahar, as a leader of the political party prohibited the offering before the *ronggeng* performing art was performed as this art group strongly believed in their ancestors. Such a view

was in contrast with the idealism of the political party. The farmers at that village were intimidated and were promised that they would be given land if they followed what was determined by the political party. However, such a promise never came true until the last episode. In the novel the political stories were not clear. It was only reported that the thief and bugler entered Dukuh Paruk to plunder what the villagers had. Then Rasus was asked to go home by his supervisor to save the village and catch the burglars.

It was the scene in which G 30 S PKI (the Indonesian communist movement) took place made the film SP superior, although it was not described as enormously as what was described on the film *Pengkhianatan G.30 S/PKI* (the Betrayal of the Indonesian Communist Movement which took place on 30 September). However, it was interesting enough to reveal the Indonesian history; especially how the ideology of the political party was introduced to the rural people through art and coffee shops. The only film which specifically presented the event of the G 30 S PKI movement in 1965 was entitled *Pengkhianatan G 30 S/PKI* directed by Arifin C. Noor. The climax of this film was when the Indonesian Communist Party brutally killed six generals and one Middle Officer. The frightening scene was when the Cakrabirawa troop gradually got off from a truck to surround the houses where the generals stayed. The other sadistic scene was when the generals were dragged to what is called 'lubang buaya' (the crocodile hole) where they were tortured.

In 1980s the young generation in general and the students in particular was obliged to watch such a film. It was presented repeatedly on 30 September on television with duration of almost four hours. Such a colossal film, which was produced by the New order government, appointed the character Soeharto the commander of the army. He took over the security and cleaned up the communist party from Indonesia. He also broke up the Indonesian Communist Party and its societal organizations. Although the film SP did not touch the event taking place in the state capital, Jakarta, the fact that the communist party was cleaned up was highly felt at Dukuh Paruk. The village leaders, the art leader and Srintil, the *ronggeng* dancer, were caught and

carried away by truck to be interrogated somewhere. They did not know anything as most of them were illiterate.

This film dramatized the meeting between Rasmus and Srintil perfectly, and at the same time directed that the viewers would expect that Rasmus might meet Srintil and the others who were also arrested. The viewers who did not read the novel suspected that Srintil was shot dead. Then the setting shifted to Dawuan Market in 1975, or more or less 10 years after the G 30 S/PKI. Rasmus met Srintil dancing the *ronggeng* at the market. Sakum and he were begging while singing playing musical instruments (*ngamen*). The viewers might predict that in the end of the story Srintil would marry Rasmus as they had met at Dawuan market. Rasmus successfully became a soldier, and Srintil was not a victim of what was done to clean up the Indonesian Communist Party; therefore, it was reasonable that they would meet as husband and wife as if nothing had happened before. The two characters separated again. Srintil and Sakum kept dancing along the way to the village. The end of the story was made open, making the viewers confused. If Srintil married Rasmus, the fact would be different. It was a prohibition for a soldier to get married with a lady who used to be a member of any prohibited political party; otherwise, he would be fired from his unit.

The other event which strengthened the plot of the film was the chaos which took place at Dawuan District in 1965. Such an event was closely related to the political attempts made by the Indonesian Communist Party, as the Prohibited Party. Particular groups intentionally made use of Srintil, the *ronggeng* dancer and her group as the communist tool of propaganda, as she was plain and honest. When the rebellion of the Indonesian Communist Party could be made to fail, Srintil and her group were stated to be involved. In the story of RDP, Srintil was forced to be imprisoned.

Ahmad Tohari told the writer that the story in the novel which was not politically strong had been censored by the editor. Almost 40 pages narrating the communist event were omitted. The writer was summoned by Laksamana Sudomo, the *Kopkamtib*, to be responsible for the novel he had written. He was suspected to be involved in the political

party. However, he refused such a charge. "Who could guarantee that you were not involved in the Indonesian Communist Party," Sudomo asked. "Abdulrahman Wahid", Ahmad Tohari said. Finally, he was released, although Ahmad Torri honestly said that he did not know Gus Dur (Abdulrahman Wahid). He only knew that Gus Dur was the leader of Nahdatul Ulama (NU) which the government was afraid of. What was stated by Ahmad Tohari was revealed in the interactive dialogue between the students and teaching staff of the Teachers' Training College of Tabanan at Balai Bahasa Yogyakarta on 17 June 2013.

### Deconstruction and Appreciation

RDP and *Sang Penari* narrated a story about a rural community in the past. The Dukuh Paruk community, which was highly traditional, strongly believed in the myth which was related to the *ronggeng* performing art. Ahmad Tohari could not be separated from the influences of the surrounding environment when presenting the characters. The fact that the sacred grave where Ki Secamenggala was buried could not be separated from the life of the Dukuh Paruk community. The pornographic expressions, curses of all sorts and the existence of the *ronggeng* dancer with its gamelan orchestra were the cultural roots which were still in existence at Dukuh Paruk. The characters Srintil, Kartareja, Sakarya and Dower intended to maintain and preserve such a traditional culture.

The character Srintil was strongly loyal to any tradition which was in existence at the village. Such a loyalty to a tradition required a highly valuable sacrifice; a ceremony called "bukak klambu" should be performed. This requirement was required by someone who would like to be the *ronggeng* dancer. The appearance of the character Kartareja, who acted as a traditional healer with his wife made the plot more vivid. Through this character all the requirements and equipment of the *ronggeng* performing art were prepared. Such husband and wife played a great role in orbiting Srintil to be the popular *ronggeng* dancer. Without their support, it would not have been possible for Srintil to be a *ronggeng* dancer.

The character Sakarta, who acted as a priest at Dukuh Paruh was a highly responsible leader. What he did was exemplified by so many people that he



was highly respected. He did his best to maintain and preserve the originality of Dukuh Paruk with the *ronggeng* performing art with its gamelan orchestra and curses of all sorts. He did not want to die before he saw that Dukuh Paruk had a *ronggeng* dancer again. The following quotation clarified this.

"...Pokoknya Dukuh Paruk akan kembali mempunyai *ronggeng*. Bukankah begitu Kang."

"... Eh, ya. Memang begitu. Kita yang tua-tua dari pedukuhan ini tak ingin mati sebelum melihat Dukuh Paruk kembali seperti aslinya dulu. Bahkan aku takut arwah Ki Secamanggala akan menolakku di kubur nanti bila aku tidak melestarikan *ronggeng* di pedukuhan ini ... " (RDP, p. 18).

[...Basically, *Dukuh Paruk* will have the *ronggeng* dancer again, won't it?

[...Eh, yes it will. We, the elders of the village, do not want to die before we see Dukuh Paruk as it used to be. Furthermore, I become afraid that the soul of Ki Secamanggala will refuse me when I die as I do not maintain the *ronggeng* performing art at this village ... "] (RDP, p. 18).

On the other side, a criticism appeared from the young character, Rasu, that, logically, the applicable custom and tradition at Dukuh Paruk in general and the *ronggeng* tradition in particular could not be accepted. As a consequence, this character finally left Dukuh Paruk. Through the character Rasus, the novel RDP wished to inform that the young people were seeking after their identity, which was obtained after leaving the village. Rasus could evaluate critically what happened at his own village. The most interesting experience of the character Rasus was that he was familiar with all sorts of challenges he met outside Dukuh Paruk. Rasus got surprised that the word "sin" turned out to be the word which he had never heard before at Dukuh Paruk Village. Pay attention to the following quotation: " ... Kata "dosa" sendiri baru kudengar setelah aku meninggalkan Dukuh Paruk." [I heard the word "sin" after I had left Dukuh Paruk. (RDP, p. 135).

It was stated that the art tradition of *ronggeng* with all its ceremonies such as "opening the net", "pornographic jokes" and "curses of all sorts" were part of the sin, if, at least, deemed from Islam as the socio-religious setting of RDP. The word "sin" at Dukuh Paruk, according to Rasus, had disappeared from the world, resulting from the boisterousness of

the *ronggeng* world which caused the sexual desire of adults to rise.

As far as the characters in RDP were concerned, there seemed to be two basic things. Several leaders desired to maintain the custom and tradition of Dukuh Paruk, meaning that what they did was appreciating culture. The other characters, which were inspired by Rasus, behaved critically. Such a behavior could be categorized as cultural deconstruction. The two groups of people did not come to an end in the dichotomy of appreciation and cultural deconstruction. Ahmad Tohari, the writer, enriched our insight into the values of life which were implied in the strong tradition and myth, although new culture had interfered with the principles of our lives.

Apart from what was described above and observing the scenes in the film *Sang Penari*, appreciation of the political culture in general and the Indonesian Communist Movement Occuring on 30 September (G 30 S PKI) in particular was found. As far as the textual transformation is concerned, this was referred to as appreciating, maintaining and remembering the past through text. The political nuisance could be strongly felt from the film; however, it was not clear in the novel. The political culture deeply interfered with Dukuh Paruk, resulting from the existence of the character Bahar. He appeared several times at the village; he appeared at a stall, on the stage where the *ronggeng* performing art was performed, and before the farmers. He inspired the local people to join him for the sake of a better life. Those who supported the *ronggeng* performing art and did not know politics at all also became interested in him for which they were finally suspected to be the communist political followers.

The original text written by Ahmad Tohari was like the text of the film. One chapter of the 2003's edition, which had been censored as narrating the Indonesian Communist Party movement, was published again. At that time Kompas and Gramedia did not want to publish it. The chapter, which had been censored, was published in English by Honolulu University Press in 1999 in the anthology of *Silenced Voices* (Tohari, 2013). The film pictured what happened after the 1965's tragedy. The film *Sang Penari* was brave enough as the director presented the scene of

massive slaughtering; the soldiers were presented to kill those who were suspected of being involved in the communist party massively. Ahmad Tohari, the writer, acknowledged that he was not as brave as Ifa Fansyah in presenting such a massive slaughtering. "Novel ini saya tulis tahun 1980-an, saya takut kalau menulis terlalu vulgar, bisa-bisa peluru menembus kepala saya" ujar Tohari (Subagyo, Kompas 9 January 2014) [I wrote this novel in 1980s, I was too afraid to write it vulgarly; I was afraid that I would be shot on the head, Tohari said].

Based on the intertextual analysis, the film SP turned out to be a deconstruction to appreciate the novel RDP. Deconstruction means the crossing of the sign system as several scenes in the novel were deleted and crossed out as what Rasmus thought of Srintil, whom was considered his mother (*emak*). She died when Rasmus was small. According to the local people, she was taken away by a medical aide who would like to marry her. Being confused, Rasmus gave his love to Srintil. Therefore, it was reasonable in a scene of love that Rasmus was too afraid to be "naughty" toward Srintil, although an opportunity was open to him. His imagination of the *emak* was so important to the readers of the novel. Therefore, the title of the novel RDP printed on its cover contained the sub title *Catatan Buat Emak* (a note for *Emak*). As a consequence, it was impossible for the story of the film to be exactly the same as the story of the novel. Furthermore, in the final part of the film SP the expression "being inspired by the novel *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk*" was written, meaning that the director was not transforming the novel but inspired by the novel.

### CONCLUSIONS

The transformation of the text of the novel RDP into the text of the film SP constituted a textual transposition in the forms of textual deconstruction and appreciation. Such a deconstruction was made by the film director to adjust it to the criteria of a film as time was limited. One of the scenes which did not appear on the film was the character *Emak* (the mother of Rasmus). In the novel it was implicitly narrated that Srintil, according to Rasmus, was the *Emak*'s image. Rasmus did not only love Srintil but also her *Emak* who had been missing for a long time. Being left when Rasmus was small, he did his

best to seek after her but he did not meet her. His love was only given to Srintil, as in her the image of his mother appeared.

The film *Sang Penari* could attract the viewers' attention as the film director showed that he appreciated the text of the novel RDP. The film could visualize the scenes which appreciated the text to remind them of the events in that era, the communist movement (G 30 S), the massive slaughtering and the infiltration of the party's ideology into the *ronggeng* performing art group. In the novel the sad Indonesian historical event was not clearly presented in the novel RDP, especially the one which was published in 1993 and before. This means that the viewers of the film SP would obtain enlightenment and a new insight into the original story of RDP as it had been censored by the publisher for safety's sake from the new order government at that time.

### REFERENCES

- Aminuddin. (Eds.). (1990), *Sekitar Masalah Sastra Beberapa Prinsip dan Model Pengembangannya*, Yayasan Asah Asih Asuh, Malang.
- Berns, Elizabeth and Tom. (1973), *Sociology of Literature and Drama*, London Penguin Education, London.
- Damono, Sopardi Djoko. (1978), *Sosiologi Sastra Sebuah Pengantar Ringkas*, Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Jakarta.
- Junus, Umar, (1986), *Sosiologi Sastra, Persoalan Teori dan Metode*, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur.
- Kayam, Umar. (1980), "Kreativitas Seni dan Masyarakat", dalam *Horison*, XV/ 12, Jakarta.
- Oktorino, Nino, dkk. (2009), *Ensiklopedia Sejarah dan Budaya Edisi 8*, PT Mandiriabadi, Jakarta.
- Pilliang, Yasraf Amir. (2004), *Dunia yang Dilipat: Tamasya Melampui Batas-batas Kebudayaan*, Jalasutra, Yogyakarta.



\_\_\_\_\_. (2003), *Hipersemiotika Tafsir Cultural Studies Atas Matinya Makna*, Jalasutra, Yogyakarta.

Semi, Atar. (1989), *Kritik Sastra*, Angkasa, Bandung.

Subagyo, Rz. (2014), "Sang Penari," Potret Buram Pasca Tragedi", dalam *Kompas*, 9 Januari.

Tohari, Ahmad. (17 Juni 2013), "Proses Menjadi Penulis/Pengarang," dalam *Diskusi Sastra dengan Tema Proses Kreatif* di Balai Bahasa Yogyakarta.

\_\_\_\_\_. (1982), *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk*, PT. Gramedia, Jakarta.

Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. (1989), *Theory of Leterature*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

**Web:**

[Http://ardnas20.fik.wordpress.com/2011/11/Sang Penari.jpg](http://ardnas20.fik.wordpress.com/2011/11/Sang-Penari.jpg).