

Swear Words in Santri Puppet as a Representation of Tegal Society: A Study of Semiotics

Irwan Suswandi

Abstract— Culture cannot be separated from society. It is embedded in a cultured society. Kridalaksana, et al (2001, 60) said that puppet cannot be separated from Javanese society because they have a closeness that is reflected in Javanese habits. In its development, wayang transformed into various types. One of them is wayang santri (santri puppet) in Tegal, one of the regencies in Central Java. Literally, santri refers to people who study Islam deeply. The language used in this puppet is Javanese language Tegal dialect, a dialect used daily by Tegal citizen. Although it has the main purpose as a means of teaching and religious education of Islam, there is an interesting phenomenon that exists in the santri puppet dialogue that contradicts the essential purpose of the wayang. In the dialogue there were some verbal utterances that contain swearing. From this explanation, the researcher is interested in analyzing the forms of swear words in santri puppet. The data is taken from the recording of santri puppet performance with the story “Rebutan Peti Warisan (Conquest of Heritage Box)” as long as 5 (five) hours. Researcher only used utterances from the puppet characters conversation, not the sindhen (singer) and niyaga (gamelan music player). The researcher used the concept of representation from Hall (1997) and used semiotics approach by Peirce as the main theory. The method used is a descriptive-interpretative method that was describing the word, phrase, clause, and sentence that containing the form of swearing. It found from the analysis that in the first dimension (firstness), the swear words included as qualisign, i.e. asu, bangset, goblok, kepret, kunyuk, and mlorod jemplot jemparatan; included as sinsign, i.e. cocote, dikepruk, dobole, takgaprok, turuke, cangkeme dawa, cangkeme muncis, ndasmu amoh, kepret raine, matane picek, serot raine, takcucruk lambene, and untu kari siji; and included as legisign, i.e. raimu. For the second dimension (secondness), utterances that contained swearing form used as indexical-sinsign, i.e. ilate melu mlodod; and conic-sinisgn, i.e. raine kaya trasi and rai kaya iwak sepat. And the third dimension (thirdness), only one utterance that contained swearing form is included as rhematic-iconic-sinsign; i.e. cangkem slonjor kaya Donald Bebek. The salient result is that these swear words are a common thing in Tegal culture to express anger. Tegal society has differences from the other society in Javanese culture that is they are more expressive and extroverted society, despite the mission to share the Islam values.

Keywords— puppet, santri, semiotics, swear, words.

I. INTRODUCTION

Society and culture are two bound things. Culture is produced by society as a grip as well as survival. This culture is the result of the interaction of members in the society. Geertz stated that the concept of culture is interpretative, a concept of semiotics, in

which he saw culture as a text that needs to be interpreted as meaning rather than as a concrete behavioral pattern (Geertz, 1992, 5). Koentjaraningrat explained that the form of culture consists of three forms, i.e. abstract culture, behavior or activity culture, and artifacts culture. The first is a culture that cannot be sensory, like ideas, values, or norms. This relationship of interconnection made the abstract culture to be called a system. The second is a culture that can be seen with the sense of sight. Koentjaraningrat said that the whole pattern of behavior or activity culture of members of society when interacting with each other is called as a social system. The latter is a culture as objects or artifacts because of the nature of physical culture (1979, 188). Such objects or artifacts are the results of the creation of members of the society itself.

In Indonesia, there are many cultural results embodied in various forms. This is due to Indonesia as the largest archipelago country in the world that is composed of the diversity of ethnic groups. One of the tribe that became the largest tribe in Indonesia is Java. As a culture, Java has various cultural forms that are categorized into three cultural forms as Koentjaraningrat said.

Wayang (puppet, in English) can be regarded as a culture of tangible artifacts, with shape and form in such a way. However, in the *wayang*, there is also a culture as ideas or concepts that contain learning related to the values of life. It is also recognized by the UNESCO, which made *wayang* as the “*World Master Piece of Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity*” on November 7, 2003. This indicates that *wayang* is viewed as a culture with ideas and concepts that affect the lives of people, especially the Javanese.

Hitherto, *wayang* transformed into various types. One of them is *wayang santri* (*santri* puppet). *Santri* puppet is a kind of wayang that came from Tegal, one of the areas that are geographically included in the Javanese culture. *Santri* puppet is created by Ki Enthus Susmono. Ki Enthus itself is a puppeteer who came from Tegal. This puppet created in 2009. The language used in this puppet is the Javanese dialect Tegal, the language of daily communication used by Tegal society.

As Hasrinuksmo, et al (1999, 35) stated that at the time of the development of Islamic values, the content and function of *wayang kulit* (shadow puppets), which was originally a religious ritual (Hindu) became a means of education, proselytizing, enlightenment, and mass communication. It also became the basis of making *santri* puppet, that in order to spread the virtues of the Islamic religion.

Although it has the main purpose as a means of teaching and education of Islamic religious values, there is an interesting

phenomenon contained in the dialogue among *santri* puppet characters that contradict the essential purpose of the puppet. In the dialogue issued by the puppeteers through the *wayang* characters, speech or verbal discovery is tended to lead to verbal language containing swearing in a meaningful way. Based on this background, the researcher formulates a research question that is how the expression of swear words as a representation of Tegal society.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Creswell (2014) argued that theory is used to provide a picture that shapes what is being sought and what is being asked in the study. More specifically in qualitative research, Creswell stated that theory is needed during the research process. Therefore, to obtain the expected research objectives in this study, researchers used two theories, i.e. theory of representation from Stuart Hall (1997) and theory of semiotics from Charles Sander Peirce in Short (2007).

A. Theory of Representation

representation with cultural practices and language in it. That in truth, representation connected meaning and language with culture (Hall, 1997, 15). Representation becomes the link between the concepts of meaning conceived, with the language used in conveying it. In this case, the intended language includes both verbal and nonverbal languages.

In the context of culture, there are three approaches that can be used by the language to find the meaning it represents, i.e. reflective approach, intentional approach, and constructive approach. The reflective approach, also called the mimesis, considers that meaning is contained in real-world objects, ideas, or events, and the existence of language is used in reflecting on that meaning. It can also be said if the language becomes a mirror that reflects the true meaning or what it is about something that exists in the world. The intentional approach sees that the meaning that is in the object is inscribed by the subject (author or speaker) so that the meaning is based on what they say or want. Because of it, this approach is too subjective as well as a weakness of this approach.

A latter approach is a constructive approach. This approach sees that meaning is not conceived by its own object as a reflective approach, and also the meaning not given by the subject like an intentional approach. Rather the existing meaning is constructed using a representation system, i.e. concepts and signs. This constructive approach combines the two. Meaning is not conveyed by a human as well as object, but a human being as a social actor using a conceptual system of culture and representational system that make it. Based on this, the researchers then used the constructive approach. The constructive approach is more complex in looking at a culture that is through the signs that exist in the culture. Through language, the meanings and concepts of these signs can be obtained and delivered.

B. Theory of Semiotic

Danesi said simply that sign is “something that stands to somebody for something else in some respect or capacity” (2004, 6). Furthermore, according to Danesi, there are three dimensions that make up the mark, i.e. 1) a physical form, which 2) brings about a concept, which 3) is given the form of the condition culturally. Regarding the mark, Peirce considers that “thoughts are signs, could rely on the word ‘significance’ to cover all cases of being ‘of’ or ‘about’” (Short, 2007, 6). That essentially, signification is what happens in our minds when we use or interpret a sign (Danesi, 2004, 12). Peirce introduces a three-dimensional analysis process, as *semiosis*, the process of meaning and multiple interpretations. Danesi defined this *semiosis* as the capacity of the brain to produce and understand signs (Danesi, 2004, 16). According to Peirce, there are three stages of processing in this *semiosis*, i.e. the stage of *representamen*, *object*, and *interpretant*.

At the representation stage, which is the first stage in the process of meaning, the sign is first absorbed through the senses. In the second stage, after the mark is absorbed, then spontaneously the representative is associated with human cognition and experience. Cognition and human experience that interpreted *representamen*, and the stage referred to as object. Finally, in the third stage, the object is then interpreted or interpreted. At this stage, the *interpretant* is generated.

These three stages or three dimensions of Peirce are called *firstness*, *secondness*, and *thirdness*. *Firstness* is closely related to the appearance or quality of feelings of a sign. That is, this dimension of parity refers to existence as it is, not referring to anything else potential (Pari, 1994, 16). Peirce divided this dimension into three types, i.e. *qualisign*, *sinsign*, and *legisign*. *Qualisign* is a quality of the mark itself (Short, 2007, 207). This *qualisign* cannot act as a sign until it is finally attached to another attribute, and the character of the quality it raises has no relationship at all with the character as a sign. *Sinsign* refers to the representation in its singular form. The embodiment of this *sinsign* is through its quality which is also related to the *qualisign*. A collection of these *qualisigns* constitutes the embodiment of quality into a view called *sinsign*. The third type of sign is *legisign*, taken from legitimation or validation or convention. Traced from the origin of the word, *legisign* means that the signs used are the result of a validation or convention that is generally accepted in society. A general type is that no longer refers to a single form, but has been agreed and affirmed by the public as a sign.

Secondness is a dimension already associated with ‘relation’ or ‘relationship’. The relationship referred to in this case is the existence of the mark with something else in the form of reality. Pari (1994, 18-20) stated that the basic idea of this *secondness* is the experience of striving, a generalized experience which refers to the life experiences that have compelled us to think, driven by confrontation with reality. This dimension can be divided into iconic, indexical, and symbol. The iconic is interpreted as the relationship of similarity between the signifier with its signified or its referent. The relationship shown by the icon is a direct or non-arbitrary relationship. Indexical is a sign denoting the

'existence' relationship between the sign and its object. The relationship here is to represent objects with those based on real existence, be it a dynamic relationship or causality relationship. Symbol is a type of sign by convention. According to Peirce, the symbol is defined as a sign referring to an object based on rules or conventions, which is usually a general idea association, which causes it to be interpreted as referring to that object (Short, 2007, 212). The relationship that arises from this symbol is arbitrary, which means it does not have to refer to a referent something, but based on the agreement alone.

Thirdness dimension in Peirce is also called the representational dimension. This is because the reference in the form of *interpretant*, which is a mental element, which also has a connection with culture. If it is released itself as an *interpretant*, Peirce divided this third dimension into three types; *rheme*, *dicent*, and *argument*. *Rheme* defined as a simple interpretive form, and its nature is individual. One of the most important of the propositions that include this *rheme* is its unrighteous and false nature. *Dicent* or *dicisign* has a higher *interpretant* scope than *rheme*, because it involves a number of people in their interpretation of a proposition. *Dicent* is the second form of the third stage which can be either true or false. Argument is part of a complex *interpretant* because the sign is from law or regulation. Therefore, the argument becomes a proposition that most people think is true and has been understood collectively.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a qualitative-interpretative method. The study begins with the description of the signs contained in the dialogue of *santri* puppet containing the swearing. Then the interpretive approach is used to interpret these signs as a proof of the existence of the swear words based on analyzing according to three dimensions of Peirce. To obtain the aims in this study, the researcher used the trichotomy Semiotics theory from Charles Sander Peirce, assisted by the concept of representation theory from Stuart Hall (1997).

In this study, the researcher used data sources from video recording *santri* puppet performance in the *compact disc* (CD). One cassette shows one story of *santri* puppet, with duration of five hours. For this study, the researcher chose story "*Rebutan Peti Wasiat*" or "Conquest of Heritage Box". The data of this research is the conversation among the figures of *santri* puppet. The conversation between *dhalang* (puppeteer) and *sindhen* (singer) and *niyaga* (gamelan player) is not included in the corpus data of this research. The selected tier is semantic level, using language units such as words, phrases, clauses, and sentences of the conversation.

IV. ANALYSING

From the results of transcription done, found the use of language units that lead to the form of swear words. Here is a text transcription sample in scene 7 that contains swear words.

Soma:

Kayong... Cangkeme muncis, ilate melu mlodod kaya kiye. Assalamu'alaikum warrohmatullahi wabarakatuh."

Lupit:

Wa'alaikumsalam warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh.

Soma:

Pertama-tama saya mengatakan memanjatkan puji syukur kehadiran Allah. Kenangapa puji dan syukur kita panjatkan, karena kita tidak bisa manjat sendiri. Adapun saya ke sini adalah pertama-tama mengucapkan syukur kehadiran Allah yang Mahakuasa yang telah melimpahkan rahmat dan salam kepada junjungan kita nabiyullah Muhammad SAW. Sing ping pingdone allahuma solli ala sayyidina Muhammad wa ala sayyidina Muhammad. Apa sing dadi kepentingane nyong kiye saiki sing pertama-tama mengucapkan syukur kehadiran Allah."

Radite:

Raimu angger wis ora takcucruk lambene sisan kowen. Asu! Kepret raine toli.

In this scene, there are some utterances that categorized as swear words. Here are the analysis of swear words in word form according to semiotics Peirce.

• **Raimu**

The word *raimu*, formed on two morphemes, *rai* and *-mu*. The morpheme *rai* is a *qualisign* because it is a sign based on the quality, nature, or characteristics of the *representamen*. In this case, morpheme *rai* (in English *face*) interpreted as 'front part of the head'. But then, the morpheme *rai* is due to the added meaning of morpheme *-mu*. Its signification becomes changed to *legisign*, no longer *qualisign* or *sinsign*. This is because the combination of these two morphemes into *raimu*, no longer merely means 'your face'. But in the Javanese society, the word *raimu* has been interpreted as a sign used to swearing or throwing anger at the addressee. From this, it can be said if the word *raimu* has a form of signification as *legisign*. It can be concluded that the *qualisign* form of *rai* that leads to the quality of the front part of head, when it gets an additional pronoun persona *-mu* the meaning turns into *legisign*. As a *legisign*, *raimu* in Tegal society in particular and the Javanese society in general contain the meaning of swearing in the conversation.

• **Asu**

This monomorphemic refers to a quality of a *representamen*. Since it has not formed with any other morpheme entity or set of languages, this word included in the *qualisign* because represents the *representamen* as the quality or appearance, i.e. '*kang lumrah diingu ing wong*' (Poerwadarminta, 1939, 20), or can be translated into English as 'the animal that is generally nourished'. The word *asu* has similarity with 'dog' in English. The use of this *representamen* in the conversation of Javanese society in general and Tegal society in particular is not only to point the appearance of animal *asu*, but also used to express anger and resentment to the addressee.

At the phrase level, there was no appearance of swearing in this scene, but quite a lot of swear word appearance as a clause. In the scene above, there are some clauses that contain the meaning of swearing. Here are samples of the analysis of swear word in clause form according to semiotics Peirce.

• **Cangkeme muncis**

If translated into English this clause has more or less meaning 'your mouth protruding'. If applied in trichotomy Peirce, this clause undergoes a continuous meaning process or *semiosis*.

The clause *cangkeme muncis* consists of polymorphemic *cangkeme* and monomorphemic *muncis*. *Cangkeme* has signification as *sinsign*. This word was originally a *qualisign* because it indicates the appearance or quality of *cangkem* or ‘mouth’ which becomes one part of the face. Then, from *qualisign* turns to *sinsign* because it derives a new meaning from the addition of affixation *-e* which in Javanese is a possessive pronoun, and the addition of the meaning of the additional word *muncis* From *cangkem* that is initially of a general quality, then becomes *cangkeme muncis* that has led to a clear form of entity directive or *sinsign*.

• *Ilate melu mlodod*

Not much different with the previous clause, *ilate melu mlodod* clause also undergoes a multilevel meaning process. From the beginning, the word *ilat* ‘tongue’ which is a *qualisign* signification, then changes its signification to *sinsign* because it gets additional meaning from the affixation *-e* and the phrase *melu mlodod* ‘protrude’. It is said that the *sinsign* signification because the *representamen* is no longer showing the quality or appearance in general, such as *ilat*, but has been directed to the clear form that the addressee has to say, *ilate melu mlodod* ‘the tongue protruding’.

• *Takcucruk lambene*

This clause composed of polymorphemic *takcucruk* and *lambene*. The main clause of this clause is *cucruk* ‘puncture’ which gets an extra morpheme *tak-* which in Javanese refers to the first person pronoun. If translated, *takcucruk* has meaning ‘I

puncture’. In its original form, i.e. *cucruk*, the signification of this *representamen* is *qualisign* because it leads to the quality of *cucruk* ‘puncture’ activity. Then, because of the added meaning of the presence of morpheme *tak-* and also polymorphemic *lambene* ‘the mouth’, the *representamen* is no longer of a general quality but has already led to a clear and singular entity. Therefore, the signification that occurs in the *lambene takcucruk* clause is *sinsign*.

• *Kepret raine*

Another clause in this 7 scene that contains swearing is *kepret raine*. It is composed of a monomorphemic *kepret* and also polymorphemic *raine*. If translated into English, *képrét* has meaning ‘slap’ that is categorized as a *qualisign* form of *representamen*, because it shows the quality of the slap. However, the signification form becomes changed when embodied with word *raine* ‘the face’ which has led to the form of a singular *representamen*, i.e. the face of addressee’s own. Therefore, the signification form of the clause *kepret raine* is *sinsign*.

In addition to the scene, a form of swear word also found in other scenes. From the analysis that done by research, they are the other swear words in *santri* puppet. If all the swear word summarized into a table, here is the table of signification of swear word in *santri* puppet.

Language Unit	Swear Words	Peirce’s Signification	Language Unit	Swear Words	Peirce’s Signification
Word	<i>asu</i>	<i>Qualisign</i>	Clause	<i>cangkeme dawa</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>bangset</i>	<i>Qualisign</i>		<i>cangkeme muncis</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>goblok</i>	<i>Qualisign</i>		<i>ndasmu amoh</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>kèprèt</i>	<i>Qualisign</i>		<i>ilate melu mlodod</i>	<i>Indexical-Sinsign</i>
	<i>kunyuk</i>	<i>Qualisign</i>		<i>kepret raine</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>cocote</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>		<i>matane picek</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>dikepruk</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>		<i>raine kaya trasi</i>	<i>Iconic-Sinsign</i>
	<i>dobole</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>		<i>rai kaya iwak sepat</i>	<i>Iconic-Sinsign</i>
	<i>tagaprok</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>		<i>serot raine</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>turuke</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>		<i>takcucruk lambene</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
	<i>rainmu</i>	<i>Legisign</i>		<i>untu kari siji</i>	<i>Sinsign</i>
Phrase	<i>mlorod jemplot jemparatan</i>	<i>Qualisign</i>	Sentence	<i>cangkem slonjor kaya Donald Bebek</i>	<i>Rhematic-Iconic-Sinsign</i>

V. CONCLUSION

According to the analysis, it is concluded that some things become cultural signification in the interpretation of swear words in Tegal society through *santri* puppet. The most commonly of swear words signification process is in the *firstness* dimension, through signification of *qualisign*, *sinsign*, and *legisign*. In *qualisign*, the most references point is to animals, i.e. *asu* and *kunyuk*; reference to nature, i.e. *bangset*, *goblok*, and *mlorod jemplot jemparatan*; reference to action, i.e. *kepret*. As for the *sinsign*, which is the next step of *qualisign*, the signification form is derived from *qualisign* which is affixed with some characteristic interpretation. *Qualisign* with reference to the part of body, will be *sinsign* when obtaining affixation (*-e*), i.e. *cocote*, *dobole*, and *turuke*; references to the part of body which obtain affixation (*-e*) and/or adjectives

behind it, i.e. *cangkeme dawa*, *cangkeme muncis*, *matane picek*, and *untu hari siji*; its reference to action, will become *sinsign* when *qualisign* acquires the passive-form affixation, i.e. *dikepruk* and *tagaprok*; reference actions that achieve targeted body parts; i.e. *raine*, *serot raine*, and *takcucruk lambene*. The third form in the *firstness* dimension, *legisign*, is a *qualisign* form with reference to the body part that gets second persona pronoun, *-mu*. When *qualisign* gets this embody, it will generally be a swear word as *legisign*. For the *secondness* dimension, the forms found were *indexical-sinsign* and *iconic-sinsign*. The swear words in this form all use the part of the body as the main reference, i.e. *ilate melu mlodod*, *raine kaya trasi*, and *rai kaya iwak sepat*. In addition, in this study also found the swear words shaped sentence that also became a new finding in the swear words research. The form of signification to the *thirdness* dimension, that is

rhetic-indexical-sinsign, with the swear word *cangkem slonjor kaya Donald Bebek*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks to Ministry of Finance RI which has given me opportunity through LPDP scholarship, and also opportunity to attend this international seminar. The experiences that I have gained over the past two years come from an opportunity to undergo a master's study through this scholarship. Of course, this is also the destiny and sustenance of Allah SWT. Hopefully, my knowledge that gained as awardee can be useful for many people.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Hasrinuksmo, et al, *Ensiklopedi Wayang Indonesia*, Jakarta: Sena Wangi, ch 1999, ch. 2, pp. 35.
- [2] C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Book, Inc., Publisher, 1973, ch. 1, pp. 5.
- [3] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approached*, 4th ed. California: SAGE Publication, Inc., 2014, ch. 3, pp. 82.
- [4] F. Pari, "Epistemologi Semiotik Peirce: Kajian dan Terapan Teori Semiotik," M. Hum. Thesis, Dept. Philosophy, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, 1994.
- [5] H. Kridalaksana, Rahyono, D. Puspitorini, S. Widodo, dan Darmoko, *Wiwara: Pengantar Bahasa dan Kebudayaan Jawa*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2001, ch. 7, pp. 60.
- [6] Koentjaraningrat, *Pengantar Ilmu Antropologi*, Jakarta: Aksara Baru, 1979, ch. 3, pp. 188
- [7] M. Danesi, *Messages, Signs, and Meanings: A Basic Textbook in Semiotics and Communication Theory*, 3rd ed. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc, 2004, ch. 1, pp. 6-16.
- [8] Pusat Bahasa Departemen Kebudayaan Nasional, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, Jakarta: Departemen Kebudayaan Nasional, 2008.
- [9] S. Hall, *Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd., 1997, ch. 1, pp. 15-27.
- [10] T. L. Short, *Peirce's Theory of Signs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, ch. 1, pp. 6, ch. 8, pp. 207-231.
- [11] W. J. S. Poerwadarminta, *Baoesastra Djawa*, Batavia: J. B. Wolters Uitgevers-Maatschappij N.V., 1939.