

Bernard Arps, 1996. "The Song Guarding at Night: grounds for cogency in a Javanese incantation." In: Stephen C. Headley (ed.), *Towards an anthropology of prayer: Javanese ethnolinguistic studies / Vers une anthropologie de la prière: études ethnolinguistiques javanaises*, pp. 47–113. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence.

The Song Guarding at Night. Grounds for Cogency in a Javanese Incantation

1. Songs for Guarding the Night. In contemporary Java there are a multitude of texts available for strengthening people whose well-being is disturbed or under threat. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* ‘Song Guarding at Night’ belongs to a particular genre within this realm of prayers, the genre known as *kidung* – ‘songs’, or, more specifically, ‘incantatory poems’.¹ The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* comes first in *kidung* collections and is often cited as the *kidung par excellence*. Many Javanese can sing the opening stanza or more from memory. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is cast in *Dhandhanggula*, the most frequently used of traditional Javanese verse forms. A common version consists of nine stanzas, listing its effects on evil forces and unlucky places (stanzas 1–3), locating prophets and figures from the early history of Islam in human body parts and faculties (3–5), and giving examples of and instructions for application of the song (6–9). The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*’s authorship is usually attributed to the legendary Muslim saint Sunan Kalijaga, who is thought to have lived on Java’s north coast from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth century.

Kidung are intoned as song, but they constitute a literary genre. While certain stanzas circulate in oral tradition, full *kidung* tend to be recited from written texts. There are manuscripts containing *kidung* in Javanese, Balinese, Perso-Arabic, and Roman script. Compilations of them have been published in central and east Java since the early twentieth century. Initially, these were in Javanese characters, soon they were romanized. While some may consider *kidung* impious or anachronistic, the fact that collections of them are regularly reprinted by commercial publishers today testifies to their continuing role in Javanese religious thought and practice.²

¹ This is Behrend’s (1987 : 340) apt characterization.

² In the 1980s I found published *kidung* in Andjar Any s.a. : 71 ; *Kidung tetulak* [1973] ; *Kidungan* s.a.[1] ; *Kidungan* s.a.[2] ; Mustaka Rancang 1981 : 9–10, 240–242 ; Padmosoekotjo s.a. : 108–109, 124–126 ; Primbon Atassadhur 1980 : 86–124 ; Seh Amongraga 1981 : 7–17 ; *Serat Kidungan* 1979 ;

In terms of form, contents, and use, kidung are a borderline genre within the universe of Javanese discourse. They are situated between literature and prayer. As written texts in the verse forms that make up the bulk of traditional Javanese poetry, they can be classed as *belles lettres*. Like other poems they can be sung for the allure of their diction and versification, narrative, instructional value, religious or moral truth, and philosophical depth. Meanwhile, in terms of contents and applications, the same kidung resemble prose spells recited for various purposes and incantations chanted for ritual purification. Hence they also belong in the sphere of prayer. Indeed, my teachers in central Java characterized the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as a supplication (*panyuwun*, *panyuwunan*) or invocation (*donga*).

One fruitful approach in the anthropological analysis of prayer is to posit the act of praying as the central object of study and to search out the components, processes, and ideas that underlie and constitute this act. Now individual acts of prayer using the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi may differ significantly from each other in such respects as the number and roles of participants, the way the text is processed, the portion of the text that is used, the ritual acts that accompany its use, the purpose of the event, and its physical and social setting. Yet, however variable, all these acts share one component: the text in some version or another. In linguistic terms the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is an instance of codified, “prescribed”, language use that is actualized in certain conventional situations. In this paper I consider the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi from a such a perspective. Many Javanese consider it potentially effective. This is due, as I shall demonstrate, to the fact that it may be cogent. I examine the text and the ways it is used, against the background of similar texts and their treatment, in order to probe its cogency. I shall argue that the main source from which its cogency springs is reference to certain states of affairs and events, and in particular to individuals. The former are the situations of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi’s performance and interpretation and the conditions of its use that are represented in the text. The latter are participants in the performance and powerful historical and mystic figures.

Padmosusastra 1980 : 198–200, 211–212, 218–222 ; Rama Panji 1984 : 17 ; Tanojo s.a.[1], s.a.[2], 1965, 1966 ; Trunarimong and Indrajati s.a. : 50–51 ; Wiryapanitra 1979.

The plan of the essay is as follows. In section 2, I introduce the *kidung* genre and the books in which *kidung* are brought together. This is followed by a text and translation of the version of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* on which I focus, which is from Surakarta in central Java. After an interlude clarifying my approach to its cogency in relation to earlier studies of Javanese prayer (section 4), I turn to its applications (5) and performance (6). The modes of interpretation applied to the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* by Javanese are reviewed in section 7; this is followed by a detailed discussion of its textual structure and a number of actual interpretations. The ninth section is concerned with the links the text lays between its contents and the circumstances of its use. In section 10, I discuss the song's supernatural and legendary references. The argument is summarized in the concluding section.

2. “*Kidung*” as a Label for Different Discourse Genres. The term *kidung* can be applied to various genres, which renders it somewhat elusive. In its most general sense it designates a text composed in sung verse forms. The verse forms most common in Javanese writing since at least the late sixteenth century are the so-called *tembang*, and any work in *tembang* may be styled a *kidung*.³ This applies to all manner of works, ranging from long written narratives to single stanzas sung from memory for personal pleasure.⁴ The *tembang* incorporate tunes and imply text, which is why the verse forms themselves can be called *kidung* as well. *Kidung* in this sense is synonymous with *tembang*.⁵ In Java today, however, these uses

³ As in the introduction to the narrative work *Rengganis*: ‘I have composed it as a *kidung* / in the *tembang* . . .’ (*sun-iket kinarya kidung / atembang . . .*) (Poerbatjaraka *et al.* 1950: 12). A *tembang* in central Java has a fixed number of verse lines per stanza, each individual line containing a fixed number of syllables and a fixed vowel in the final syllable. For instance, the metrical structure of *Dhandhanggula* (the verse form of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*) can be summarized in the formula 10i / 10a / 8é / 7u / 9i / 7a / 6u / 8a / 12i / 7a.

⁴ Such as those collected in MS SOAS 231240 (B) (Ricklefs and Voorhoeve 1977: 86).

⁵ Hence the alternative term *kidung macapat* for the verse form category more commonly known as *tembang macapat*.

of the word *kidung* are rare.

Kidung is also the generic name for poems in an archaic variety of Javanese known to scholarship as Middle Javanese. Its verse forms are similar or identical to the *tembang* of contemporary Java. Many of these *kidung* were composed in Bali, and those that originate from Java have fallen into oblivion here.⁶ The term *kidung* is now more common in Bali than it is in Java.

In Java at least two genres of songs not in *tembang* are labelled *kidung*. The first is Christian church hymns, introduced among Javanese in the nineteenth century.⁷ The second type consists of octosyllabic lines without a clear stanzaic organization, chanted by a specialist for ritual purification (*ruwatan*), most commonly in dedicated performances of *wayang* shadow theatre. These incantations are also called by other names, but at least one of them, the *Kidung Banyak Dhalang* ‘Song of the Puppeteer’s Goose’, refers to itself as *kidung*.⁸ Content-wise they resemble the final genre known as *kidung*, that is the incantatory poems in *tembang* of which the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is the most prominent example.⁹

The latter two kinds of incantations are also known as *kidungan*, a collective noun that alternates with *kekidungan*. (To add to the confusion, there is also a verb *kidungan* meaning ‘sing *kidung*’.) Whereas *kidung* is used with titles in reference to individual

⁶ On Middle Javanese *kidung* see Robson 1971 : 16–19 ; Zoetmulder 1974 : 121–125, 144–145, and 407–443. A few have magical overtones (e.g., Zoetmulder 1974 : 435) ; hence Robson’s idea that there may be a historical relation with Modern Javanese incantatory *kidung* (Robson 1979 : 306). But *kidung* in Middle Javanese which do not so overtly have this flavour are more numerous, and the correspondence may thus well have come about via the use of the term *kidung* for texts in particular verse forms.

⁷ See Arps forthcoming.

⁸ Recently published *wayang* scripts in which such chants are quoted are Probohardjono s.a. : 33–36 ; Serat padhalangan 1978 : 33–47 ; and Tanojo s.a.[3]. Trunarimong and Indrajati (s.a. : 15–24) do not mention an accompanying *wayang* performance. That *wayang* is not the sole medium of ritual purification by means of *kidung* also becomes clear from Djajadiningrat 1936 : 145, 221–222, concerning Banten in west Java.

⁹ In some regions the *kidung* in *tembang* are or were indeed used in ritual purification by means of *wayang* performance ; see Van Dapperen 1934 : 227–228, Pigeaud 1980 : xv, xxii. MS LUB Or 7847 from Tasikmalaya in west Java, which contains a versified text telling the story of the god Kala (the common repertoire for purificatory *wayang*), ends with the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*.

incantations – as in ‘Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi’ and ‘Kidung Banyak Dhalang’ – *kidungan* is a generic term, used for the genre and in a narrower sense for the set of kidung in the verse form Dhandhanggula. Finally, *kidungan* is the label of a type of quatrains and couplets sung in the east Javanese *ludrug* theatre (Kunardi 1985 ; Mukhsin *et al.* 1987). Figure 1 summarizes the uses of the nouns *kidung* and *kidungan* in Java. Unless specified otherwise, in the following I use these terms only to refer to the incantations in *tembang*.

<i>Kidung</i>	<i>Kidungan</i>	Usage of term
1. Any sung poem	—	Rare
2. Any text in <i>tembang</i>	—	Rare
3. Verse forms (= <i>tembang</i>)	—	Rare
4. Middle Javanese poem	—	Rare
5. Church hymn	—	
6. Octosyllabic incantation	The genre	
7. Incantatory poem in <i>tembang</i>	a. The genre b. Those in Dhandhanggula	
8. —	Stanzas sung in <i>ludrug</i>	East Java

Figure 1. Meanings of the nouns *kidung* and *kidungan* in Java

Kidung were used in courts (see Bambang Sularto *et al.* 1981/2 : 89 ; Kartomi 1973 : 10 ; Pigeaud 1938 : 321), towns, and rural areas. Some observers state that the genre was and is frowned upon in Islamic circles such as *pesantrèn* schools (Poensen 1869 : 203–204 ; Sunarno 1972c). Yet *kidung*, and not in the last place the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, are found in compilations of Islamic mystical works, which does point to their association with traditionalist Islam.¹⁰ In recent years *kidung* have been sung in radio broadcasts of traditional Javanese poetry, and at least one audio cassette containing *kidung* has been issued (entitled *Mocopat gayeng*).

Incantatory *kidung* in *tembang* are found in manuscripts separately, but they have also been brought together in collections known in central Java as *layang kidungan* (‘*kidungan* books’ ; polite Javanese : *serat kidungan*). In early publications and in manuscripts in Javanese characters the *kidung* in such books are found in

¹⁰ As in MS LUB Or 1796, in Surakarta court script ; Mustaka Rancang 1981 from Kedhiri ; Poerbatjaraka *et al.* 1950 : 163. See also Behrend 1987 : 340.

continuous sequence without typographical indication of their relative independence. Yet oral tradition distinguishes them, and in more recent published collections the individual kidung are often separated and named.

It is well known that several versions of the kidungan book exist (Suhadi 1984 : 29 ; Suryanto 1984 ; Tanojo 1966 : 3–4), but in central Javanese manuscripts and publications from around 1900 a certain uniformity of arrangement emerges, to such an extent that it is possible to speak of a standard central Javanese kidungan book. This version has seven cantos, each consisting of one or several kidung (see the Appendix).¹¹ The song that makes up canto III is ascribed to Ranga Sutrasna writing at the instigation of Paku Buwana V (1785–1823), the ruler of Surakarta from 1820 to 1823.¹² Ranga Sutrasna is known from other sources as a court scholar who worked for Paku Buwana V from the time when the latter was still crown prince (Behrend 1987 : 83–84 ; Winter 1911 : 355). While the attribution is not necessarily genuine, there can be no doubt that this kidung originates from Surakarta since it lists the guardian spirits of this town (see Appendix). The same may well apply to the compilation as a whole. Printing probably played a role in its dissemination ; it appeared in print from at least 1919. It is now common in Yogyakarta as well.

¹¹ Robson 1976 : 79, version B. Robson's version A is Tanojo s.a.[2], from which the names of the kidung in the Appendix derive. The kidungan books published by Tanojo (s.a.[1], s.a.[2], 1965, 1966) are hybrid ; the editor probably used the standard Surakarta version as a base but rearranged and inserted stanzas and whole kidung. The fullest assemblage is Tanojo 1966, with 23 cantos. This hybridity is of great philological interest but remains unexamined here. All these versions open with the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi.

¹² Serat Kidungan 1919 : 16 (II.24), referring to the following canto : 'the one who wrote the kidung book / was *kyai* Ranga Sutrasna / at the command of the king / who reigns as Paku Buwana V / /' (*kang ngripta wilapa kidung / kyai Rongga Sutrasna / ngemban timbalan sang aji / kang jumeneng Paku Buwana ping gangsal* //). Similar in MS Arps [a] ; MS LUB 8622b ; MS Soesilo ; Kidungan s.a.[1] : 12 ; Serat Kidoengan 1926 : 23 ; Serat Kidungan 1979 : 12 ; Tanojo s.a.[1] : 12 ; Tanojo s.a.[2] : 12 ; Tanojo 1965 : 12 ; Tanojo 1966 : 25 ; Wiryanitra 1979 : 153.

3. A Translation of One Version. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* opens the standard *kidungan* book, but, like other *kidung*, is also found separately. Versions are known from an area ranging from west Java to Lombok, and even from south Kalimantan.¹³ Its title varies. Alternative titles include *Aji Belias* in Bali (Pigeaud 1967 : 93),¹⁴ *Kidung Nabi* ‘Song of the Prophets’ in Cirebon and Banten (west Java), after the contents of lines 3g to 5g (e.g., MS LUB Or 8592 ; Poerbatjaraka *et al.* 1950 : 168 ; Djajadiningrat 1936 : 37), and *Kidung Sarira Ayu* ‘Song of the Body Free from Harm’ in central Java, after a phrase in line 3d (Tanojo 1965 : 3 ; *Kidungan* s.a.[2] : 1).¹⁵

The text of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* that I shall discuss derives from the earliest published *kidungan* collection that has come to my attention : *Serat Kidungan* 1919 (pp. 1–3). It is a version of the standard central Javanese *kidungan* book and in Javanese characters. According to its title page, the handwritten exemplar was in the possession of a Ratu Pambayun of Surakarta. This is the title traditionally given to the eldest daughter of the ruler of Surakarta when she reaches adulthood (Darsiti 1989 : 59), which makes it difficult to identify her. This particular version is not the only one circulating in central Java, but it is authoritative because of its princely provenance ; the text of *Serat Kidungan* 1919 was reproduced in the romanized *Serat Kidoengan* 1926,¹⁶ which in turn

¹³ The use of what is probably the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* in Sunda (west Java) is noted by Akip Prawira Soeganda (1982 : 155). An instance of use in the Tengger highlands of east Java is discussed in Singgih Wibisono 1956. For the work in Bali and Lombok see Vickers 1987 : 50. Sunarti *et al.* (1978 : 172) quote a spell from Banjar, south Kalimantan, which consist of fragments from lines 1a–b, c–d, and 2h of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*.

¹⁴ I suspect that *belias* is a variant of literary Javanese *paliyas* ‘means of averting’, a word that occurs in the *Kidung Artati* (stanza I.23 in *Serat Kidungan* 1919 : 6). An *aji* is a sacred and supernaturally powerful text.

¹⁵ The title *Kidung Mantrawédha* in Primbon Atassadhur 1980 : 99 from Yogyakarta is idiosyncratic. To complicate the matter further, the song known in central Java as *Kidung Artati* is sometimes called *Kidung Rumeksa* (or *Angraksa*, with the same meaning) *ing Wengi*, as in MS IOL Jav. 8, probably from Yogyakarta and antedating 1814 ; LUB Or 8592, no. 39 (pp. 227, 229), from Cirebon ; and LUB Or 3986 (6) from Bali (see Brandes 1903 : 62–63).

¹⁶ Its title page is worded identically and the text is the same apart from script and orthography and the absence of a stanza attributable to a *saut du même au même* (VII.20 in *Serat Kidungan* 1919 : 39 ; cf. *Serat Kidoengan* 1926 : 40).

was the ancestor of Serat Kidungan 1979. A manuscript that today circulates in Yogyakarta in photocopied form (MS Arps [b]) was transcribed from a book in Javanese characters published in 1942 with the same text as Serat Kidoengan 1926. In some parts of Java other versions of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi remain in use. In Banyuwangi (east Java) in 1989 I found a text that at first hearing was similar to the text translated by Poensen (1869).

In the following presentation, the text is arranged to facilitate reference to stanzas and verse lines. It has been transliterated following the Romanized orthography of Javanese. Whereas in the original, verse lines and stanzas run on, divided only by stanza and verse line punctuation marks, here each verse line begins on a new typographical line. In translating, I have attempted to remain close to the Javanese, both lexically and syntactically.¹⁷

Stanza 1

<i>a</i>	Ana kidung rumeksa ing wengi	A song exists guarding at night
<i>b</i>	teguh ayu luputa ing lara	steadfast, unharmed, be free from sickness
<i>c</i>	luputa bilai ¹⁸ kabèh	be free from all disaster
<i>d</i>	jim sétan datan purun	spirits and devils are reluctant
<i>e</i>	paneluhan tan ana wani	no sorcery dares
<i>f</i>	miwah penggawé ala	and evil witchcraft
<i>g</i>	gunaning wong luput	others' enchantment fails
<i>h</i>	geni atemahan tirta	fire ends up as water

Whereas Serat Kidungan 1919 was published in Surakarta where the exemplar also originated, Serat Kidoengan 1926 was published in Kedhiri in east Java.

¹⁷ I know four other translations into European languages, all partial. Judging from the Dutch, Poensen (1869 : 204–207) used an east Javanese version close to that of MS LUB Or 4000 (published with some misprints in Brandes 1903 : 60–62). After the stanza corresponding to 12 in Or 4000 the translation is abridged. Quinn's (1975 : 51) translation of the first stanza from a different edition of Trunarimong and Indrajati s.a. is not entirely faithful to the Javanese. Pink (1977 : 441) translates part of the opening stanza into German. The first stanza is translated into English in Subagio *et al.* 1985 : 285. This rendition seems to be based on the Indonesian translation published earlier (Subagio *et al.* 1983 : 287) and is unreliable.

¹⁸ The Javanese text reads *bilali* (Serat Kidungan 1919 : 1), a misprint.

<i>i</i>	maling adoh tan ana ngarah mring kami	thieves keep away, no one takes aim at me
<i>j</i>	guna duduk pan sirna	for enchantment and magic vanish

Stanza 2

<i>a</i>	Sakèhing lara pan samya bali	For all sickness turns back
<i>b</i>	sakèh ngama pan sami miruda	for all pests take flight
<i>c</i>	welas asih panduluné	looking with compassion and affection
<i>d</i>	sakèhing braja luput	all weapons miss their mark
<i>e</i>	kadi kapuk tibaning wesi	like cotton is the impact of iron
<i>f</i>	sakèhing wisa tawa	all venoms are harmless
<i>g</i>	sato galak tutut	wild beasts are docile
<i>h</i>	kayu aèng lemah sangar	eerie trees, unlucky land
<i>i</i>	songing landhak guwaning wong lemah miring	porcupines' burrows, people's caves, sloping land
<i>j</i>	myang pakiponing merak	and peacocks' lying-places

Stanza 3

<i>a</i>	Pagupakaning warak sakalir	All rhinoceros' wallows
<i>b</i>	nadyan arca myang sagara asat	even statues and dried-up seas
<i>c</i>	temahan rahayu kabèh	all end up safe
<i>d</i>	apan sarira ayu	for the body is free from harm
<i>e</i>	ingideran kang widadari	circled by the heavenly nymphs
<i>f</i>	rineksa malaékat	guarded by angels
<i>g</i>	sakathahing rusul	for all God's envoys
<i>h</i>	pan dadi sarira tunggal	constitute a single body
<i>i</i>	ati Adam utekku Bagéndha Esis	the liver is Adam, my brain is Lord Sis
<i>j</i>	pangucapku ya Musa	my speech is indeed Musa

Stanza 4

<i>a</i>	Napasku Nabi Ngisa linuwih	My breath is the eminent prophet Ngisa
<i>b</i>	Nabi Yakup pamiyarsaningwang	the prophet Yakub is my hearing
<i>c</i>	Yusup ing rupaku mangké	Yusup now is in my appearance

<i>d</i>	Nabi Dawut swaraku	the prophet Dawud is my voice
<i>e</i>	Jeng Suléman kasektèn mami	the honourable Suléman is my power
<i>f</i>	Nabi Ibrahim nyawa	the prophet Ibrahim is the soul
<i>g</i>	Édris ing rambutku	Idris is in my hair
<i>h</i>	Bagéndha Li kulitingwang	Lord Ali is my skin
<i>i</i>	getih daging Abu Bakar Ngumar singgih	blood and flesh are Abu Bakar and Ngumar verily
<i>j</i>	balung Bagéndha Ngusman	the bones are Lord Ngusman

Stanza 5

<i>a</i>	Sungsumingsun Patimah linuwih	My marrow is the eminent Patimah
<i>b</i>	Siti Aminah bayuning angga	Siti Aminah is the firmness ¹⁹ of the body
<i>c</i>	Ayup ing ususku mangké	Ayub now is in my intestine
<i>d</i>	Nabi Nuh ing jejantung	the prophet Nuh is in the heart
<i>e</i>	Nabi Yunus ing otot mami	the prophet Yunus is in my muscle
<i>f</i>	nétraku ya Mukhammad	my eyes are indeed Muhammad
<i>g</i>	pamuluku rasul	my countenance is the Envoy
<i>h</i>	pinayungan Adam sarak	shaded by Adam's law
<i>i</i>	sampun pepak sakathahing para nabi	complete already are all the prophets
<i>j</i>	dadya sarira tunggal	constituting a single body

Stanza 6

<i>a</i>	Wiji sawiji mulané dadi	One seed was the origin of its being
<i>b</i>	apan pencar saisining jagad	for it diffused into the world's contents
<i>c</i>	kasamadan déning daté	blessed by the Essence
<i>d</i>	kang maca kang angrungu	those who recite it, those who hear it
<i>e</i>	kang anurat kang animpeni	those who write it, those who keep it
<i>f</i>	dadi ayuning badan	it causes well-being of the body

¹⁹ *Bayu*, lit. 'wind, air', here refers to the force that keeps the body from collapsing (cf. Tanojo s.a.[3] : 8).

<i>g</i>	kinarya sesembur	used for sputum
<i>h</i>	yèn winacakna ing toya	if recited over water
<i>i</i>	kinarya dus rara tuwa gelis laki	used to bathe, a spinster soon has a man
<i>j</i>	wong édan nuli waras	a madman is shortly sane

*Stanza 7*²⁰

<i>a</i>	Lamun ana wong kadhendha kaki	If someone is fined, young man
<i>b</i>	wong kabanda wong kabotan utang	someone put in bonds, someone burdened by debt
<i>c</i>	yogya wacanen dèn agé	it is pertinent to recite it soon
<i>d</i>	nalika tengah dalu	in the middle of the night
<i>e</i>	ping sawelas wacanen singgih	recite it eleven times verily
<i>f</i>	luwar ingkang kabanda	freed is the one in bonds
<i>g</i>	kang kadhendha wurung	the fined one is cleared
<i>h</i>	aglis nuli sinauran	swiftly repaid
<i>i</i>	mring Hyang Suksma kang utang puniku singgih	by the Divine Spirit is that debt indeed
<i>j</i>	kang agring nuli waras	a sick person is shortly cured

Stanza 8

<i>a</i>	Lamun arsa tulus nandur pari	When wanting to grow rice untroubled
<i>b</i>	puwasaa sawengi sadina	fast a night and a day
<i>c</i>	iderana galengané	circle the dike surrounding the field
<i>d</i>	wacanen kidung iku	recite the song
<i>e</i>	sakèh ngama sami abali	all pests turn back
<i>f</i>	yèn sira lunga perang	when you set out for battle
<i>g</i>	wateken ing sekul	mutter it over cooked rice
<i>h</i>	antuka tigang pulukan	with a mere three handfuls
<i>i</i>	mungsuhiira rep sirep tan ana wani	your enemies are silenced, none of them dare
<i>j</i>	rahayu ing payudan	unharmd on the battlefield

²⁰ In a number of sources the order of stanzas is : 8 – a stanza that advertises the use of the manuscript as a talisman – 7. Some of these texts do not contain stanza 9 ; see section 10.

Stanza 9

<i>a</i>	Sing sapa reké bisa nglakoni	Whoever now can carry it out
<i>b</i>	amutiya lawan anawaa	eat only rice and drink only water
<i>c</i>	patangpuluh dina baé	just for forty days
<i>d</i>	lan tangi wektu subuh	and rise at dawn
<i>e</i>	lan dèn sabar sukur ing ati	and be patient and thankful at heart
<i>f</i>	isa Allah tinekan	if God so wishes, will be met
<i>g</i>	sakarsanirèku	all of your wants
<i>h</i>	tumrap sanak rayatira	concerning your relatives and family
<i>i</i>	saking sawabing ngèlmu pangiket mami	from the beneficence of the knowledge I composed
<i>j</i>	duk anèng kali Jaga	when at the river Jaga

4. Efficacy and Understanding. How is it possible for the singing of such a tangle of abstruse images and prodigious claims, lacking explicit petition, to be considered an efficacious act of supplication ?

The question of the efficacy of prayer is notoriously thorny. In many attempts to account for the workings of religious discourse, the solution is sought in the prayers' cogency, and the referential function of language, to borrow Jakobson's term, features as an explanatory device.²¹ It is agreed that, while prayers are spoken, sung, or thought in order to be perceived by a deity or spirits or suchlike, and participants feel their utterances may bring about the desired results owing to the mediation of those supernaturals, the efficacy attributed to them is in effect a matter of the beliefs and feelings of the human language users. The symbolism of religious action, including discourse, serves to create or reinstate, reinforce, and focus those feelings and beliefs. In his classic essay, Tambiah phrases it as follows : '... it is possible to argue that all ritual, whatever the idiom, is addressed to the human participants and

²¹ To avoid misunderstanding I should perhaps point out that in Jakobson's famous model of the factors and functions of discourse, a message's reference is towards a "context", which is 'seizable by the addressee, and either verbal or capable of being verbalized' (1960 : 353).

uses a technique which attempts to re-structure and integrate the minds and emotions of the actors' (Tambiah 1968 : 202). Ritual performance (including prayer), then, is considered efficacious because it communicates something to participants.

Thus far there is agreement, but how the cogency, this compelling intimation of efficacy, may actually come about remains open to debate. Tambiah argues against the traditional notion that belief in the efficacy of magical discourse is based on a naive identification of word and thing that makes the word capable of influencing reality. He stresses instead that language is used in ritual in conjunction with material objects to represent metaphorically the transfer of required qualities to people lacking them (Tambiah 1968). Schieffelin's argument (1993), which usefully complements Tambiah's, is that it does not suffice to point out that the symbolic material used in ritual is intellectually plausible. One should take into account the ways in which this material is actualized and experienced in the course of the ritual performance. Participants interact during performance, collectively constructing a reality, or rather various individual but intersecting realities, that offer new perspectives on the uncertain or threatening situation at hand.

The social and performative aspects of prayer have received little consideration in studies relating to Java. Most attention has long gone to texts, whose ability to convince by communicating referential meaning is usually taken for granted. The most detailed study of a Javanese prayer genre published to date is the one by Soedjijono, Imam Hanafi, and Kusnan Adi Wiryawan (1987). The authors subject a set of prose formulas collected from four magic specialists in east Java to extensive linguistic and pragmatic analysis. While they do not treat the question of cogency to human participants, it is clear from their discussion of the techniques of persuasion encountered in the spells (Soedjijono *et al.* 1987 : 45–53) that they consider their contents central to their efficacy. They distinguish two classes of spells : those addressed to magical forces and those addressed to supernatural beings (1987 : 27–29, 84–91).

The same distinction is made by Koentjaraningrat when he contrasts two Javanese attitudes in dealing with the supernatural which he styles magical and religious. In magic, the human agent manipulates and controls supernatural forces and 'wishes the desired objectives to occur', while in religion he surrenders himself passively to supernatural beings and 'prays for the fulfilment of his

wishes' (1985 : 410–411). Koentjaraningrat thus classifies Javanese ritual discourse according to two broad speech acts performed through it – expressing a wish and making a petition. Again, efficacy hinges on the communication of meaning.

Soedjiono and associates and Koentjaraningrat did not consider *kidung*, but other scholars have done so, albeit briefly in most cases. Poensen, probably the first Western scholar to discuss the genre, characterizes the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* as 'a magical song of extraordinary power' (1869 : 203–204). He sees *kidung* as evidence of Javanese concepts and doctrines that accredit great power to sorcery, spells and the like, and observes that orthodox Muslims disapprove of *kidung* as heretic. He proceeds to give an abridged translation of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* and a few other *kidung*.

Most Western scholars have followed in Poensen's footsteps, regarding the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, or *kidung* generally, as magical or exorcist texts, though without commenting on Javanese perceptions. Pigeaud (1967 : 92–93) classes *kidung* among 'incantations addressed to spirits' and approaches them from the perspective of the history of religious thought. Although they appear in written literature in the Muslim period and usually contain Islamic elements, he finds reason to speculate that they belong to an ancient stratum of Javanese culture and originate from exorcist rites. Drewes (1968 : 236–237) presents and translates a *kidung* which he describes as 'an exorcist charm . . . in purpose not unlike the well-known *Kiduñ Ruměksa ing Wěñi* and likewise aiming at security from all kinds of evil' (1968 : 210). In his study of the Javanese lore of burglary, Quinn groups *kidung* among 'exorcistic songs and stories believed to have the power of holding off evil influences' and calls the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* – of which he translates the first stanza – 'a popular exorcistic *kidung*' (1975 : 50). Florida designates it a 'magic incantation' (1993 : 259, 260, 265). Only Vreede views the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* in a different light when he labels it 'a mystical representation in which the Islamic prophets together form one body' (1892 : 315). These scholars saw *kidung* primarily as texts – no wonder if one remembers that they were confronted with them in manuscript or printed form. Their characterizations seem to derive from their own understandings of the contents.

Few have drawn attention to the fact that *kidung* tend to be

performed, which means that Javanese do not experience them exclusively as written texts but also as lingual processes central to social events. Kartomi and Robson have given some consideration to this. In her discussion of the singing of *kidung*, Kartomi does not distinguish between the incantations and other *tembang* poems that can be styled *kidung* as well (1973 : 7–10). In a statement that does clearly refer to incantatory *kidung*, she relates how guerilla fighters in the Indonesian struggle for independence (1945–49) sang *kidung* ‘in the belief that this might help to frighten the enemy away’, which if anything ‘certainly helped to build-up their self-confidence’. She calls this an outspoken expression of the “animist” outlook that was still common in rural areas (1973 : 8).

Like Kartomi, Robson considers the performance of *kidung* and also their workings. He proposes that a *kidung* is ‘basically an invocation of powerful spiritual forces’, such as God, the Prophet, angels, and guardian spirits, which, in his view, are ‘called upon to exercise their powers toward beneficial ends by warding off danger and illness’ (Robson 1976 : 80). According to Robson, the effectiveness that follows from this mediation is reinforced by a formal feature. Finding that *kidung* vary widely in content while they are all versified in the same kind of verse forms, he concludes tentatively that ‘it is the mere fact of being in one of the *macapat* metres [i.e., *tembang*] that makes the *kidung* efficacious’ (1976 : 80).

Students of Javanese culture, then, have commented on *kidung* as texts and assumed without question that these texts communicate referential meaning. They have attended to their literal contents, as derived from the text, potentially captured in translation, and imparted to human and supernatural audiences by means of sung performance. They have not, however, studied Javanese understandings of *kidung*.

The importance attached to the communication of textual meaning in analyses of Javanese prayer has also been subject to criticism, and precisely from scholars who did investigate Javanese views. In his impressive ethnography of Tengger religion, Hefner points out that the experience of ritual texts in the Tengger highlands of east Java varies along social lines. One should not assume, he argues, ‘that the meaning of prayer texts is the same for all actors, and reducible to simple translation’. Hence, analysis of the liturgy of the Tengger priest ‘cannot be restricted to textual reconstruction or linear translation’ (Hefner 1985 : 175–176). The

Tengger prayers are cast in an archaic and arcane variety of Javanese and, viewed from a philological perspective, often corrupt. Moreover, the priest usually utters them in such a way that they are inaudible to other human participants. Hefner observes that in Tengger 'ritual words are accorded power by the faithful even when they are not, in any propositional sense, directly accessible or intelligible' (1985 : 212). It is thus important to look beyond the content of ritual discourse ; in general 'the power of ritual language . . . may at times be more directly dependent upon the *said* of ritual speech, and other times not' (1985 : 212–213). The crucial factor supporting the cogency of Tengger ritual is the authority of the priest, which is already established prior to the performance of the liturgy. 'The efficacy of ritual speech depends . . . on the prayers being performed by the right person in the right fashion under the right circumstances' (Hefner 1985 : 213). In other words, Tengger prayer connotes efficacy, and this connotation is evoked by the *personalia*, style, and setting of the performance of prayer.

The Tengger liturgy is exceptional in several respects in present-day Java, but one way in which the priest's position resembles roles elsewhere on the island is in his personal power and access to lingual means of influencing the world. Personal power or "potency", which involves both self-control and control over others, is a major theme in Keeler's masterly anthropological study of the puppeteer in central Java (Keeler 1987). In a prevalent Javanese view, the discourse of persons who possess such potency takes immediate effect. 'This means that the instance one says something, it is/becomes true', and 'powerful speech is no longer simply referential but effective' (Keeler 1987 : 48).

According to Keeler's analysis the effectiveness of potent persons' discourse does not, however, find its origins in those persons. Like language, potency exists in the world. It can be acquired, primarily through ascetic practice. But very few people succeed in securing it in this way. When those without potency are in need of it, they may turn to individuals who do have the privilege of possessing it, such as magic specialists and certain kinds of spirits (Keeler 1987 : 112–134, 140). Formulas or spells, obtainable from magic specialists, are a means of mastering the potency that inheres in language.

Spells may well be intelligible only to a limited extent, and there is no need for them to be fully so. According to Keeler, words that appear meaningless or confusing are in fact considered particularly

effective (1987 : 137–138), ‘promising fulfillment in the displacement of sense’ (1987 : 140). And indeed, malevolent spirits ‘are not under the sway of normal language’ (1987 : 118). There is a kind of inverse proportion between intelligibility and efficacy : ‘Words, as in *rapal* [spells], that are learned and pronounced secretly, and that are (at the surface level) meaningless, confusing, or pronounced in reverse order, convey less immediate sense but more immediate effect than everyday language’ (1987 : 138). Keeler rationalizes this Javanese metalingual idea as follows :

*I believe the potency of opaque language lies in its suggestion of reserved reference, of meaning held in readiness rather than released in intelligibility. Then effectiveness replaces intelligibility. Like potency itself, language that is formulaic but obscure can be registered only in its effects. . . . One cannot understand a *rapal*, but one can use it and see if it works. The promise of meaning, that is, effectiveness, is then not dispersed in mere sense but, like potency, unleashed. (Keeler 1987 : 139)*

While Javanese sources of potency are primarily defined with reference to and by analogy with language (1987 : 113, 140), it is not language’s ability to refer that underlies its power, and thus the efficacy of prayer. It is ultimately, according to Keeler’s interpretation, language’s potential to serve as a tool for shaping interpersonal relations, as a means of exerting control over others. The idea that opaque discourse is especially efficacious is due, Keeler implies when he discusses ceremonial speeches, to greater interest on the part of Javanese in the connotation than in the reference of ritual discourse : ‘The length of the words and their marked status as formal and formalized expression make them no more denotatively significant, but connotatively far more important than their colloquial equivalents’ (1987 : 138). The problematics are thus moved to connotation – the same factor that we saw at work in Hefner’s treatment of *Tenggler* prayer.

It would seem that the possibility of the cogency of *kidung* springing from their contents is seriously flawed. Both Hefner and Keeler have demonstrated that certain kinds of prayer in Java need not be intelligible to their human participants. These genres are nevertheless felt to be efficacious, in spite of or even due to their opacity of reference. It is clear that their cogency cannot derive

wholly and immediately from their contents. Instead, Hefner and Keeler seek it in the authority of the utterer – the Tengger priest in Hefner’s case and the potent individual in Keeler’s – and the connotation of efficacy attached to the texts, which apparently can be isolated from their reference.

Like Soedjijono *cum suis* and Koentjaraningrat, Hefner and Keeler did not discuss kidung, but given the obvious parallels between the genres that they considered and kidung, their explication of the workings of prayer might well be applicable here too. There are similarities in the general lingual accessibility of the Tengger priest’s prayers and prose formulas in all regions of Java on the one hand and kidung, including the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, on the other. Certain elements of kidung are difficult to understand, like Tengger prayers and Javanese spells. Furthermore, kidung may be performed in group ceremonies like the Tengger liturgy, and they may also be muttered in private like spells. The ritual acts accompanying their performance are similar, sometimes identical. And finally, if contents are not completely irrelevant, there are also analogies on this plane. Identifications of powerful individuals with body parts of an “I”, for instance, are frequent in all three genres. The same applies to statements of threatening factors fleeing or dissolving and uncanny places becoming harmless.²²

But there are also differences. Most important in view of Hefner’s and Keeler’s arguments is that the personal authority of the performer of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi cannot be the main source of its perceived efficacy, since it may be used by anyone, and without ascetic preparation. It is a prayer also for the potency-deficient, to borrow Keeler’s term (1987 : 112). (The austerities recommended in lines 9a–c are not a necessary condition for the song’s effectiveness and not, in fact, commonly performed in connection with it.) The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is not privileged, esoteric knowledge, like the Tengger prayers and most prose spells (at least before these were published, as they often are today). It can be employed in various ways – there is no single valid

²² See Smith-Hefner’s editions of Tengger ritual texts (1990, 1992). It should be noted that the transliterations contain numerous erroneous spellings and word separations. Hooykaas’s version of the first text, while linguistically more reliable (and furnished with a translation), is a composite from several Balinese manuscripts (Hooykaas 1974 : 52–84). For Javanese prose formulas, see for instance Soedjijono *et al.* 1987.

fashion of performance. We shall see that it can even do its protective work without being performed. Although, as signalled by its title, the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is specifically suitable for nocturnal singing, its use is not restricted to calendrically recurring rituals or rites of passage, like Tengger prayers, but tends to be *ad hoc*. Neither is it dedicated to a single problematic state of affairs, like spells ; it is multi-purpose on the one hand, and, on the other, it may effectuate a general state of well-being, also when and where no particular danger is apparent.

In explaining prayer in Tengger, according to Hefner, a focus on interpretation of the liturgy would do no justice to the experience of most of those involved. Keeler implies the same regarding spells. It is indeed the experience of users that should be the focus of attention in the anthropology of prayer. I would like, however, to advance the argument by querying the antecedents of this experience. I propose that in the case of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, and probably other prayers as well, the text is not only the vehicle of its perceived efficacy but also the ultimate source of the perception of its efficacy. The former is obvious. The text is the vehicle of efficacy simply because this lingual composition is the only feature common to all valid employment of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. Without text there is no prayer. Hefner and Keeler would not dispute this. In the cases that they discuss, too, the utterance of dedicated texts is constitutive of the act of prayer.

But my claim that the source of the prayer's cogency is the text does require clarification, given the observation that other prayers in Java do not make referential sense to participants due to their fashion of performance or their lingual make-up. In the end both Hefner and Keeler trace the suggestion of efficacy of prayers to their connotations. The crucial question is then : how do connotations of efficacy emerge and how are they maintained, socially and historically ?

The answer does lie in the interpretation of the text as a meaningful lingual construct. It must be pointed out that, while they both single out their inaccessibility for discussion, Hefner and Keeler do not claim that their prayers are and have *always* been *completely* obscure to *all* participants. Certain elements or parts are and/or were interpretable, at least to some. This interpretability-in-principle is the source of their present connotations. We shall see that alongside the prayers themselves there is also discourse about

the prayers : prescriptions, explanations, evaluations. Such commentary, which incorporates understandings by others in the distant or not so distant past, also reaches those with limited access to the prayers' contents.²³ Consequently, in the discourse processing of the prayers, the transparent elements support, by association, the perception of efficacy of the whole, including the material that is opaque. This material is considered pertinent and thus meaningful in spite of its opacity. Associative thinking, the filling in of semantic lacunae, then, rather than comprehensive interpretation, is also important in the Javanese case (cf. Schieffelin 1993 : 291–294). The aura of efficacy that may surround a Javanese prayer derives from full or partial interpretation of the text in the present and/or the past, by the believer and/or others. This aura may persist through social and historical time and space as it is maintained in discourse about the prayer and regenerated in each performance. (It can of course change in the process.)

Moreover, in the case of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, the idea of efficacy is not a mere vestige of past understandings. As I shall demonstrate presently, it is not at all impenetrable to Javanese in the late twentieth century. It is regarded as intelligible and indeed interpreted, both literally and figuratively. Stated in general terms, it is considered and processed as a representation. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* represents something to those who attend to it, which is to say that it leads them, by way of their interpretation of its wording, and drawing on extratextual knowledge, to imagine a configuration of entities, processes, conditions, and moods. This complex construct represented through the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* I shall refer to as its diegesis.²⁴

The text of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, then, is the vehicle of its efficacy. This vehicle is set in motion in language use and it is the

²³ See Arps 1992 : 378–400 for an analogous situation with regard to the verse biography of the prophet Yusup in Banyuwangi, east Java. This work is cast in archaic, inaccessible Javanese but nevertheless widely interpreted due to an accompanying oral tradition.

²⁴ While its roots as a term in poetic theory lie in the Greek academy where its sense was somewhat different, diegesis is the established term in film studies and some brands of narratology for 'the (fictional) world of the story'. It was introduced in this sense by Souriau in 1953. In line with its etymology – 'exposition, a setting forth', lit. 'a leading through' – I do not reserve this term for narrative or fiction ; it resembles Jakobson's verbalized context.

processing of the text in discourse that should provide the clue to its cogency. In discourse interpretation,²⁵ a diegesis may be divorced from the circumstances in which the discourse takes place, but diegesis and circumstances may also be linked. I shall argue in the remainder of this paper that the text of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi contains elements that encourage such linking. If it occurs, the discourse may become cogent to interpreters. In short, the representation that is the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi offers connections between its diegesis, the states of affairs that occasion its use, and the situations in which it is used. These affairs and situations are the subjects of the following sections.

5. Various Applications of the Song. Most texts in the Javanese realm of prayer are dedicated to a single purpose such as procuring safety during a forthcoming journey, invisibility, physical strength, charisma, health, or wealth (see numerous examples in Soedjijono *et al.* 1987). The applications of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi are more variable. It does have an overall thrust, worded in lines 1b–c of the text: ‘steadfast, unharmed (*ayu*), be free from sickness / be free from all disaster’, and in 6f: ‘it causes well-being of the body (*ayuning badan*)’. The archaic word *ayu* is synonymous with *slamet* (polite pendant *wilujeng*) ‘in well-being, free from bad influences, safe’, the ideal mental, physical, and material state according to Javanese cultural commentary. While *badan* and its synonyms are usually translated “body”, as I have done, they should not be taken in a physical sense only; witness such common expressions as *awaké dhéwé* ‘ourselves’ (*awak* being the common pendant of *badan*, which is polite vocabulary), *badan kawula* ‘myself’ (more literally, ‘the servant’s “body” ’), *sliramu* ‘you’ (literally, ‘your “body” ’, using *slira*, the honorific pendant of *awak* and *badan*) and *ngawaki* or *nyalirani* ‘do something personally / oneself’. Other possible English renditions are “person” or “self”. The song can be used as a means to strive for a person’s or persons’ general well-being.

This overall thrust of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is broken

²⁵ The same may be said of the formulation and presentation of discourse, but these aspects do not feature in my analysis because I am concerned with the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as a “pre-scribed” text.

up into various more specific applications. While its uses are multiple, it is goal-oriented like other prayers, and its goals are specified. They are listed in two sections, lines 1d to 3c and 6d to 9h, which together make up a substantial portion of the text. The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi can be used against the threats to personal well-being posed by malignant spirits (1d), various types of sorcery (1e–g, 1j), thieves (1i), illness (2a), pests (2b), weapons (2d–e), venom (2f), wild beasts (2g), and various kinds of haunted places (2h–3c). For each of these goals dedicated prose spells are also available.

The goals listed in lines 1d–3c are not accompanied by specification of the ways in which the text should be treated in order to bring about the desired effects, but those in lines 6d–8j are. Some of these elaborate on applications mentioned in the opening lines of the second stanza. First mentioned is general well-being. The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi can effectuate this for people who engage in the conventional modes of discourse processing of written *tembang* text : reciting (6d), hearing (6d), and writing (6e). It also has this general beneficial influence on those who keep it (6e). Line 6g ‘used for sputum’ indicates a further way in which the text effectuates well-being. A traditional healing practice involves swallowing water that has been subjected to various acts such as the dipping into it of paper or palm leaves inscribed with spells (Koentjaraningrat 1985 : 417). Such water can also be spat (*disemburaké*) over the patient’s body.

This section of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi continues with various kinds of social misfortune. Spinsters soon marry and mentally disturbed people are cured if the text is recited over water, which is then used to bathe the persons in question. For people who are fined or imprisoned and people in financial difficulties it should be recited eleven times at midnight. This will also cure illness (cf. 2a). The next part of the section with directions for use (stanza 8) is concerned with two potentially disastrous undertakings. To ensure the successful cultivation of rice, the song should be sung while circumambulating a rice field on its surrounding dike, preceded by a twenty-four hour fast (cf. 2b). Before departing for battle (cf. 2d–e), the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi should be muttered (*diwatek*) over rice which is then eaten. The final stanza of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi contains general advice on how to attain goals related to relatives. The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is here alluded to as a

science composed by an “I”.

Not all these applications were equally prominent in the conceptions of the song that I encountered in central Java in the 1980s. Furthermore the applications listed in the text are not the only ones for which the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* was actually used. I found that the applications that most immediately sprang to mind were : (1) safeguarding the well-being of infants ; (2) curing illness ; (3) keeping away burglars ; (4) keeping away pests ; and (5) in a ceremony preceding weddings.²⁶

In Surakarta and Yogyakarta the first application of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* that was mentioned was to protect newborn babies. It can be sung during the nights following birth and especially on the eve of an infant’s thirty-fifth day. This was rare in Surakarta but still practised in Yogyakarta. While, of course, this application is not at all incompatible with the text, infants and childbirth are not mentioned in the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. It became clear during a number of reading sessions which I attended why it was associated with birth. The reason was that the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is emblematic of the *kidungan* genre. It may serve as a *pars pro toto*. It is in fact not the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* but other *kidung* in the *kidungan* book that are specifically appropriate for this purpose. Stanzas 41 to 46 of the first canto (see the Appendix) constitute the *Kidung Akadang Premati* ‘Song of Having Eminent Siblings’ which contains prescriptions for ritual acts to be performed following birth. It can be used as a set of guidelines for these ritual acts (as represented in Padmosusastra 1980 : 218–220) and should be sung every night before a child is five days old or its umbilical cord has come off (Primbon Atassadhur 1980 : 109). Stanzas 1 to 30 of the fourth canto are the *Kidung Pangléla-Léla* ‘Lulling Song’ which serves to dispel illness and spirits threatening infants. It should be sung nightly before a child is thirty-five days old, and especially before the umbilical cord has fallen off (Primbon Atassadhur 1980 : 115 ; see also Partahadiningrat 1980 : 7). The *Kidung Sesinggah* ‘Song of Disposal’ (canto V) is also intended for keeping spirits away from infants. It is announced in the *kidungan* book as ‘praises / for the protection of infants’

²⁶ The following exposition applies to the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. There are similar uses for the complete *kidungan* book. If I refer to use of the full text, I state so explicitly.

(*pupujiyan / tutulaking jabang bayi* ; IV.30c–d in Serat Kidungan 1919 : 22). It should be sung inaudibly by a pregnant woman before she goes to sleep, and continued up to the thirty-fifth day after birth (Primbon Atassadhur 1980 : 117 ; cf. Padmosusastra 1980 : 198–200). According to another commentary, however, this song is suitable only for casting away illness and should not be sung without good reason (Tanojo s.a. [2] : 17, 21). I never heard it performed.

A second prominent application of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, which is mentioned in the text itself, is to dispel illness. It is to be sung when *nunggoni wong lara* ‘keeping watch over an ill person’. While I did not have the opportunity to witness this use, it was mentioned very frequently.

The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi keeps away burglars. This does not mean that the song is sung only or especially when one suspects that thieves are afoot. The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi may be sung at night in the home for no particular reason. Hearing it being sung will restrain thieves from breaking into a house (Trunarimong and Indrajati s.a. : 50–51).

Although I carried out my research into the use of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi in the cities of Yogyakarta and Surakarta and not in rural areas, there was repeated reference to the use of the song to keep away pests in particular of rice. The text mentions that the song should be sung while circumambulating the rice field on its dike, and this was confirmed by one informant who added that it applied to the first stanza only (as in Wiryapanitra 1979 : 114), which should be sung forty times. Singing tembang verse while walking is quite rare in Java. One usually sings it while seated or lying down. The interpretation given to the pertinent passage by one of my teachers was that the song should be sung at each of the four corners of the rice field, and thus not while walking.

The final prominent usage of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is in the ceremony called *adol kembar mayang* ‘selling the two racemes of areca blossoms’, which concludes the public ceremonies taking place on the eve of a wedding.²⁷ During this ceremony representatives of the bride’s parents symbolically buy a pair of ornaments in the shape of trees composed on the spot from a banana trunk, leaves, and other vegetable materials. The maker of

²⁷ This was mentioned in Surakarta ; I do not know whether it is or was common in Yogyakarta.

the trees or a representative sings a number of stanzas in *tembang* before “selling” them, potentially including one or more stanzas of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. The trees are then brought in a procession to the parents of the bride. They will flank the bridal couple during the wedding ceremony on the following day. It seems that this use is modelled on a stanza further on in canto I of the *kidungan* book (I.19 in *Serat Kidungan* 1919 : 5). This stanza, which begins *Ana kayu apurwa sawiji* ‘There was one primordial tree’ and describes a tree that makes up the universe, can be construed as an allusion to the *kembar mayang*. According to one of my teachers it should be sung first, followed by the five opening stanzas of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. A number of published handbooks for weddings contain an edited version of the stanza referring to the mystical tree ; most them also give the first stanza of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* as a possibility (Andjar Any 1986 : 70–71 ; Rama Panji 1984 : 16–18 ; Suyadi s.a. : 74).

In sum, the general purpose of using the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is to change certain precarious or problematic circumstances for the better. It shares this purpose with many other prayers in Java. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* stands out among them in that it serves many ends ; most other prayers, including *kidung*, are dedicated to a single, more narrowly defined purpose. I have reviewed the most salient purposes on the basis of the use of and commentary on the song in 1980s central Java and with reference to the text. The states of affairs that may occasion the use of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* fall into three main categories : those brought about by invisible agents (this includes pests, witchcraft, and illness threatening infants, which according to traditional thinking are mediated by spirits) ; by physical threats such as fire, war, wild beasts, and weapons ; and by personal and interpersonal misfortune. It is especially the first category that I found to be prominent in discourse about the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*.

Not all of the states that the song can remedy and that are represented in the text are equally prominent in current thinking and practice, however, while yet other applications, unmentioned in the text, are common. These discrepancies between prescriptions in the text and actual practice are due to the fact that the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is emblematic of the *kidungan* genre : other songs in the *kidungan* book are dedicated to such applications. Moreover, the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is indeed represented as

serving well-being in general, thus allowing for a wider range of purposes than those listed explicitly.

6. Performing the Song. The use of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is embedded in several conventional types of situation. The two main ones are private and group performance. In private performance others may or may not be present besides the reciter, but if they are, they do not participate in the performance. In group performance several people take turns at reciting the song, each singing one or several stanzas. The participants are seated in a rectangle on mats and in turn approach a low lectern on which the book lies. Alternatively the book is passed around from reader to reader on a pillow. Group performances of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi are a kind of *macapatan*, group reading of traditional Javanese verse.²⁸

As the song text and commentary on it underline, the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is performed at night. A significant moment which is mentioned in the text (line 7d) and was repeatedly stressed is midnight, but it can also be used to introduce a reading session and hence in the late evening, and it can also be sung during a whole night, until dawn.

The reading matter in group sessions may be just the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, but often more is recited. In one session that I attended in Yogyakarta only the first stanza was used, by way of a prayer to open the event. The recitation continued with a narrative poem of a completely different nature. At another occasion a full kidung was sung as an introduction, in this case the *Kidung Balé Anyar* 'Song of a New Building' (L in the Appendix). A magazine article reports a reading session in which the first canto of the kidungan book was treated in the same way (Gon 1983). I attended three sessions on the occasion of a baby's thirty-fifth day during which the first and fourth cantos of the kidungan book were performed. Canto I was sung first, followed by part of a narrative poem in two cases. Around midnight the fourth canto, the *Kidung Pangléla-Léla* 'Lulling Song', was performed. At the inauguration of a newly founded reading society the kidungan book was the only

²⁸ For a description of *macapatan* in Yogyakarta in the 1980s, see Arps 1992.

reading matter : it was read from the beginning and into the second canto (when I and the people with whom I had come left).

None of these sessions were occasioned by illness or other misfortune. The songs served as prayers for well-being in general. Group singing for problematic states of affairs featured in commentary on the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, however. One of my teachers from Surakarta recounted how the first five stanzas were performed by a group of a dozen acquaintances of a man who had fallen ill with cholera during an epidemic (*ambah-ambah*). Each participant sang the five stanzas in turn. During the session, which lasted from about 10 p.m. to daybreak (c. 4 a.m.), they were read forty times. The patient recovered.

I did not witness private performances of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, but did hear about them. First it should be noted that in the experience of one elderly singer in Yogyakarta, before World War II the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi was only read privately, never in group sessions. I suspect that group performance of the kidungan book was introduced from Surakarta – where according to several informants it was practised both in the city and in the surrounding rural area – possibly along with the Surakarta version of the book itself. Although the text of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi leaves room for different interpretations, it does not contain an explicit reference to group performance.

Group reading sessions of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi or other tembang texts in central Java include only a minimum of other activity apart from the requisite but, by current Indonesian standards, usually brief opening and closing speeches, an optional meal mid-way, and a considerable amount of social talk among participants, also during the recitation. In the text and in some written commentary, however, mention is made not only of preconditions but also material requisites and bodily movements as part of the successful use of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. A popular handbook for mystico-magical practice from Yogyakarta, the *Primbon Atassadhur Adammakna*, takes up each of the applications of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi mentioned in the text, further explains them, and provides more elaborate instructions on how the aims in question are to be achieved through fasting, ritual acts involving rice and water and objects such as flower petals, an earthenware water vessel and a scoop, a plate or saucer, and ritual meals with specified ingredients (Primbon

Atassadhur 1980 : 100–101). In other written sources I came across mentions of specific movements to be performed in connection with the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, such as standing on one leg when one wants to engage a personal enemy (MS LUB CB 141). It seems that in some circles there has been a tendency to differentiate formally – not in the text, which after all is codified, but in the ritual accompanying its use – between different applications of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. Like spells, which are dedicated to single purposes and often involve specified ritual acts and implements (see Soedjiono *et al.* 1987), different rituals are specified for the various applications. By means of an elaboration of the rather sketchy instructions for use in stanzas 6 and following, the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi thus comes to share more characteristics with prose spells. Like the utterance of spells, however, such more strongly ritualized performance of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi takes place in private. This explains why I never had the opportunity to witness such ritual acts, and probably also why I did not hear about them either. The use of prose spells in Java is clouded in secrecy even though the texts are often published.

Two major dimensions, then, serve to identify the situations of usage of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. The first is social ; it concerns the number and roles of the participants in the performance. It can be performed solitarily and by a group. The second dimension is pragmatic. It can be applied for specific goals and it can be applied to ask for general well-being. The two dimensions result in four broad types of usage of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi : as a personal and as a group request for general well-being, and as a personal and group request for the elimination of a specific problematic state of affairs.

The portion of the text that is used varies. In one reading session that I attended only the first stanza was sung, and several informants stated that this sufficed for various purposes (also Wiryapanitra 1979 : 112, 115). In fact the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is often equated with this stanza (as in Siti Kolimah 1985 : 30). In other cases the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is identified with stanzas 1 to 5 of the text given in section 3. This becomes apparent in the use of the text for the man suffering from cholera referred to earlier. In a number of published versions only these stanzas are quoted (as in Padmosoekotjo s.a. : 124 ; Trunarimong and Indrajati s.a. : 51). Most frequently, however, it is the nine stanzas

reproduced and translated above that are said to constitute the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. In most of the group performances that I attended these stanzas were all sung, followed without a break by the remainder of the opening canto of the kidungan book.

Like other tembang texts, the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is usually sung aloud. This applies to three types of usage : both kinds of group performance and the solitary performance for general well-being. Singing aloud or reciting (*maca*) is indeed the mode of discourse mentioned most often in the text itself (6d, 6h, 7c, 7e, 8d). A teacher from Yogyakarta stressed that the song's wording was of primary importance. While other texts in tembang would never be spoken, only sung, kidung could be spoken if the user did not master a tune for Dhandhanggula, the song's verse form. But it was clear from his comments that this was an emergency measure, as it were. It would of course also detract from the poetic allure of the text, which, as in all tembang verse, is dependent on sung performance (see Arps 1992 : chapter 14).

The modes of use in the service of general well-being are listed in lines 6d–f : 'those who recite it, those who hear it / those who write it, those who keep it / it causes well-being of the body'. Most of these uses clearly involve discourse processing of the text. Listening is the receptive aspect of performance. Writing the text, too, is a way of processing it in discourse. Only keeping (*animpen*) appears to be of a different order. But I would argue that this use is founded on discourse processing. The text has been inscribed onto the manuscript. The manuscript may have been used for recitation. It is thus the product of discourse and it encapsulates the potential for performance. Storing away is mentioned in other kidung, too. In the *Kidung Artati* it is formulated in very similar words, but expressly represented as a last resort : 'those who recite it, those who hear it / those who write it and who keep it safe / if you cannot recite [i.e., are illiterate or do not know the requisite tune] / keep it safe / so that the body is unharmed' (*kang maca kang angrungu / kang anurat myang animpeni / yèn nora bisa maca / simpenana iku / temah ayu kang sarira*) (I.12d–h in Serat Kidungan 1919 : 3).

When used in solitary circumstances for specific problematic states of affairs the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi can be processed in yet other ways. It can not only be recited over water (6g–h) but also muttered over cooked rice (8g). To the extent that it is meant to be perceived by supernatural beings, this muttering could be seen as

private, “unstaged” performance. At any rate it is a mode of utterance. The use of water and rice to transmit the beneficence of the song to people is derivative of performance : it is clearly the prior utterance of the text that imbues these substances with the song’s salutary qualities. These substances then transmit it to those in need of it as they are brought into external or internal contact with their bodies by means of spitting, bathing, or eating.

Thus, if one reviews the various ways of using the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, it transpires that the efficacy of the song resides not in the text itself but rather in its processing or having been processed in discourse. Only in private application the way of using may deviate from the standard sung recitation. In group sessions the text is always sung audibly. This means that all participants, as well as possible eavesdroppers, can hear it. The same applies to much private performance. For instance, as mentioned earlier, when thieves hear the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi being recited in a house, they will refrain from burgling it (Trunarimong and Indrajati s.a. : 50–51).²⁹ When those on whom the song is hoped to have an effect, alongside the user him- or herself, are not physically present anyway, it can be muttered (as in 8g). Keeping and writing it only benefit those who do this themselves. Although they do not utter it audibly, they do experience it in discourse or at least know that it is there. The idea that the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is intended for humans as much as for supernaturals, and thus the importance of communication of the text for the prayer’s cogency, seems to be confirmed by the ways in which it is processed. When the text is hoped to affect a person within earshot, it is sung audibly. When it is hoped to affect the self or people *in absentia*, it may also be written, muttered, or stored.

7. Javanese Interpretations of the Song. If my hypothesis

²⁹ Quinn translates ‘If it happens that a burglar plans to break into a house, and while on his way there he hears this kidung being sung he is certain to cancel his plans for that night because he knows that if he goes ahead he will meet certain disaster’ (1975 : 50). The ‘while on his way there’ reads *ana ing dalan* in the Javanese, which could also be interpreted ‘in the street’, i.e. outside the house about to be burgled. Javanese houses made from plaited bamboo or planks are not well sound-insulated.

concerning the grounds of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi's cogency is to have any explanatory value, it must be established that it is interpreted by Javanese, and secondly, what modes of interpretation are applied to it. As Keeler has pointed out, interpretability is not considered a necessary condition for the efficacy of spells in central Java. In fact opacity may contribute to their effectiveness (1987 : 137–138). This was confirmed by several of my teachers. Yet Javanese can and do interpret prayers.

The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi's syntax is unproblematic for readers and listeners with some experience of interpreting *tembang* verse. Its wording is transparent to those who are conversant with simple archaic vocabulary such as used in theatre and written literature. While some may find certain images in the text puzzling, the surrounding text helps to infer the purport of the relevant passages. In 1981 one of my song teachers, a professional singer who had often performed it, in fact gave an impromptu oral explanation of the five opening stanzas. The language and contents of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi even received some media exposure in the 1970s. This happened in connection with its authorship. As noted earlier, the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is widely attributed to Sunan Kalijaga, a legendary saint counted among the so-called *wali sanga*, the 'nine apostles' who are said to have spread Islam in Java. Sunan Kalijaga is 'the saint of the southern region of Central Java' (Drewes 1968 : 209), the area where Surakarta and Yogyakarta are located. He is supposed to have lived on Java's north coast, mid-fifteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries. The attribution to Sunan Kalijaga is reflected in the allusion to a river Jaga (*kali Jaga*) in line 9j. This attribution was confirmed by all my teachers and it is found on the title pages of published kidungan books, including *Serat Kidungan* 1919.³⁰

The attribution to Sunan Kalijaga has been the subject of an argument in a number of articles in Javanese-language magazines. One author in particular, Sunarno Sisworahardjo, argued forcefully against it. His objection was not that Sunan Kalijaga is a legendary person only known from later narratives, but that the present-day conception of him is not in accordance with the tenor that he

³⁰ The creation of *Dhandhanggula*, the verse form of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, is also attributed to Sunan Kalijaga (see Hardjowirogo 1952 : 66). Sometimes other authors are credited with the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, but these other attributions are less widespread (see section 10).

detected in the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. On the basis of his impression of the diction of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, Sunarno at first stated that it might contain Sunan Kalijaga's teachings, but these must have been versified in what he called the later Surakarta period (Sunarno [1972]a : 18), by which he probably meant the nineteenth century. His view of the contents as magical later led him to reject altogether the idea of Sunan Kalijaga's connection with the work (1972c), although he did not judge it impossible that it reflects ideas Sunan Kalijaga had held before becoming a Muslim saint (1972b : 14). Sunarno observed that the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* contains elements that are at odds with Islam, such as the advice to fast a day and a night in line 8b, while according to Islamic teachings fasting should take place at nighttime, the advice to mutter the song over rice in 8g, which is sorcery (1975a), and the characterization of the Islamic personages of 3i to 5g as 'all the prophets' despite the fact that there are more prophets and some of those mentioned are not prophets at all but rather Muhammad's companions (1975b : 17). Moreover it is inconceivable for a Muslim saint to have preached that prophets incarnate themselves into one's body ; one should ask God for help (1972b : 14). Although Sunarno did not doubt the authenticity of the mention of the river Jaga in 9j, he noted that others, too, would have lived near that river (1975a). Finally, the text contains no explicit author's name (Sunarno 1976). Other critics have later expressed opinions similar to Sunarno's (Suhadi 1984 ; Suryanto 1984).

This argument demonstrates not only that interpretation of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is feasible, but also, and more importantly, that the work is construed against a historical background. Javanese are well aware that it has been transmitted from the past, and that it reflects ideas that were in force then.³¹ Other noteworthy points are that the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is considered important enough to warrant extended discussion, and that there are different attitudes towards it. The attribution of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* to Sunan Kalijaga, a powerful and

³¹ I am concerned with late twentieth-century perceptions of the origins of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, not with the question whether these are historically correct. According to Pigeaud the attribution of *kidung* to the Javanese saints 'cannot be true' (1967 : 93), but since no contemporaneous information is available on these saints, there is insufficient ground for such a definite statement.

revered saint of Java, locates it in a religious and mystical setting and at a time in history in which the Javanese began to replace *buda* (Indic-Javanese) with Islamic views of the world. Even though the implication of authorship in the text may be a falsification (*akon-akon* ; Sunarno 1972[b] : 14), the falsifier wanted the text to be perceived as originating from such surroundings.

It is clear that the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi's contents are not considered trivial. But neither is it a impenetrable formula which only needs to be sounded or thought in order to do its protective or remedial work. The most salient interpretation given to it is symbolic rather than merely literal. In this view the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi carries a deeper significance than its wording suggests at first. The title page of Serat Kidungan 1919 and Serat Kidoengan 1926 already points in this direction : 'The kidungan is an ancient book allegorizing the real Islamic knowledge, and giving guidance on a servant's worship of the Lord' (*Kidungan punika serat kina pralambangipun ngèlmu Islam ingkang sajati, tuwin minangka wawarah pamujining kawula dhateng Gusti*).

In 1937 a certain Wiryapanitra completed an exegesis of the opening and closing cantos of the kidungan book. This 'Kidungan book laid bare' (*Serat Kidungan kawedhar*) was reissued in 1979. After a literal paraphrase of each stanza, which largely proceeds line by line, Wiryapanitra presents a mystical explanation. He states that the unreserved belief in the efficacy of the kidungan book which he has observed in rural areas is 'highly obscure' (*peteng sanget*) and 'no longer in harmony with the present time' (*tumrapipun kanggé jaman sapunika sampun boten salaras*) (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 101). The kidungan book 'contains teachings explaining the origins of man's being and the working force of the mystery' (*isi piwulang ingkang nerangaken purwaning dumadosipun manungsa dalah daya pakartining gaib*) (1979 : 102). That it is an edifying text does not imply that it is not a prayer as well. It is efficacious, but, as Wiryapanitra puts it, 'it is possible for these teachings to possess force only if the directions they provide are observed and carried out in full, in a way that should be in harmony with the public social life of those who abide by mystical knowledge' (*piwulang punika sagedipun anggadhahi daya, inggih manawi sampun katindakaken dipun-lampahi punapa ing sapitedahipun, ingkang saged selaras kaliyan pasrawunganing gesang umum ingkang sami angagem ngèlmi*) (1979 : 102). In other words, the text consists of covert instructions that are to be discovered through

figurative interpretation. Insight into its symbolic significance, according to Wiryapanitra, does not merely contribute to the song's efficacy, it is what renders it efficacious – provided that those who have this insight act properly in accordance with it. It is important to note that in spite of this figurative approach, Wiryapanitra regards the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as dedicated to effectuating well-being for people caught up in the same precarious or problematic affairs that a literal interpretation finds represented in the text: misfortune, illness, madness, debt, etc. But at the same time the diegesis on this plane does not make the text cogent to Wiryapanitra. Only a further diegesis, a product of reflection that builds on the first but moves beyond it, renders it convincing.

8. Discursive Worlds of the Song. As stated earlier, my teachers in Yogyakarta and Surakarta described the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as a supplication (*panyuwun*, *panyuwunan*) or invocation (*donga*). Pronouncing the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as a prayer is *nyuwun* 'supplicate' or *ndonga* 'utter an invocation'. The same words were applied to kidungan generally – both those in tembang and the octosyllabic ones – as well as prose spells. That it is a supplication implies that the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is addressed to a privileged, powerful personage, and indeed the second characterization implies that it is God who is invoked. Yet neither illocution nor address appear to be as straightforwardly represented in the text as these characterizations suggest. In the following *explication de texte* I thus give special attention to the representation of speech acts and their performers and addressees.

My definition in section 4 implies that the diegesis of a lingual composition is variable. As we have already seen, it varies with the knowledge that producers and interpreters bring to bear on it. It is feasible nevertheless to speak of the diegesis of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi (or any other text) to the extent that in an instance of discourse processing the text is there, made manifest in the discourse process, and appeals to a command of lingual, textual, and more generally cultural rules, conventions, and data that is shared by participants. In the case of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, the primary (or literal) diegesis is intersubjectively shared to a considerable extent.

The following could be seen as an annotation of the English translation in section 3, but it is important to stress that I am not interested here in fixating a single reading of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* in orthodox hermeneutic fashion. My conception of diegesis implies that I should, rather, outline its potential for representation. In order to do this I discuss the lingual and textual composition of the song in some detail. I also involve accounts of actual interpretation by Javanese commentators. This is of great importance because exegesis may digress substantially from the interpretation that is grounded on the lexical meanings of the song's words and the semantic relations established by its syntactic constructions. Moreover, some parts of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* are obscure or ambiguous to many present-day users. They may be clarified taking into account other versions of the text or earlier cultural environments, but these are not generally accessible to them.

A diegesis is constructed and experienced progressively in the process of discourse. At the same time there is also the possibility that a text or portions of it are reflected upon as coherent wholes. Consequently, to allow for both discourse interpretation and subsequent reflection, I treat the text stepwise, referring backwards and forwards where necessary.

My information on Javanese interpretation of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* comes from the oral commentary on the first five stanzas given in 1981 by my song teacher Mrs Soesilo of Surakarta and the written explanation by Wiryapanitra (1979) introduced above. I have also incorporated data from discussions with other Javanese experts and from other written sources. Some of these pertain not to the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* but to kindred images in other Javanese prayers. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is to be viewed against the backcloth of formally or functionally similar texts.

Verse line 1a. The opening line states the existence of the song and gives the song its title. Two major questions emerge with regard to the diegesis of this line : who or what carries out the *rumeksa* 'guarding', and what is it that it guards? As for the first question : does the song itself guard or is it available to people or other figures who are guarding? The syntax of the sentence points in the former direction : there is no mention of an entity that could be construed

as the topic of the verb phrase *rumeksa ing wengi* ‘guard at night’ other than the kidung. Wiryapanitra’s literal interpretation is ‘there exists a devotional prayer (*puji*) which is applied at nighttime’ (*ingkang kanggénipun manawi ing wanci dalu*) (1979 : 103), and Mrs Soesilo clarified line 1a as : ‘while one sings this it is always night’ (*setengahipun ngidung menika mesthi wonten dalu*). Western commentators have construed similarly. Poensen translates neutrally ‘here is a song for protection in the night’ (1869 : 204). Pigeaud renders the title Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as ‘the song of the night-watch’ (1938 : 321), and Quinn translates the first line as ‘there is a song to be sung while keeping watch at night’ (1975 : 51).³² Yet in Wiryapanitra’s figurative understanding, line 1a does state that the song itself is the guardian : the song stands for God, whom Wiryapanitra here refers to as *Sang Sabda Kun* ‘He who says “be” ’ (i.e., the Creator³³). It is He who guards at night (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 103).

The verb *rumeksa* can be glossed as ‘attend to the security or well-being of someone or something’, i.e. ‘guard, protect, watch over’. It is commonly followed by the preposition *ing* which, in this case, marks an object, as in *Carub Awor kang rumeksa ing Nglamongan* ‘it is [the spirit] Carub Awor who guards [the town of] Lamongan’.³⁴ The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, then, attends to the safe condition not of a place but of a certain time.

No addressor (speaker) or addressee is represented in line a. Since the song as a whole is attributed to Sunan Kalijaga one may take him to be the addressor – at least if a personified addressor is what one is looking for. This is not necessarily the case in Java (or in Western writing, for that matter). Most literary works and spells are anonymous and so are the narrators that feature in them. Line a is an existential sentence, which simply postulates the existence of this song, and as anyone can see or hear this proposition is true. For

³² Subagio *et al.* translate ‘I am a song to watch the night’ (1985 : 285). The “I” seems to stem from the Indonesian translation in Subagio *et al.* 1983 : 287, where *ada* – the Indonesian pendant of the *ana* ‘exist, be present’ of line 1a – is misprinted as *aka*, which the English translator erroneously took as a misprint for *aku* ‘I’.

³³ A reference to God’s words when He creates something *kun fa-yakūnu* (‘ “be”, and it is’), found repeatedly in the Qur’ān.

³⁴ This sentence occurs further on in the kidungan book, in canto II.4 (Serat Kidungan 1919 : 12).

some interpreters this will suffice. This is a public statement. The addressees are those who hear, recite, think, or otherwise know the song, including of course a supernatural audience.

Verse lines 1b–c. The words and phrases in the next two lines represent a condition of general well-being. No addressor or addressee is specified, and these sentences do not contain subjects.³⁵ Hence it is up to the reader or hearer to infer who or what is to be free from sickness and disaster. It could be the song, but this is implausible since the song is the instrument of personal well-being. It is more likely the night mentioned in the first line, that is to say anything that exists or occurs at night, especially participants in the discourse event. Thus Mrs Soesilo took these lines as a statement concerning its users. Line b implies : ‘Those who recite it are healthy and unaffected by misfortune’ (*Sapa sing maca kuwi saras awaké lan kalis ing sambékala*), and line c : ‘People who know this book will not be affected by hindrances and evil deeds’ (*Wong sing wis ngenal lan buku-buku menika ora bakal kena alangan lan piala*).

It is significant that both instances of *luput* ‘free from’ carry the suffix *-a*, which either functions to express an irrealis such as a wish (‘may . . . be free from’) or hypothetical condition (‘. . . might be free from’), or has imperative force (‘be free from!’ or ‘. . . must be free from!’). Wiryapanitra interprets this as a wish contained in the devotional prayer but does not state explicitly whom or what it is hoped to affect : ‘may . . . be granted steadfast[ness] and safe[ty], be exempted from illness, and exempted from all disaster’ (*mugi-mugi pinaringana teguh, rahayu, linepatna ing sesakit, tuwin linepatna sakathahing bilahi*) (1979 : 103).

Verse lines 1d–2g. The remainder of the first stanza and the second stanza contain a specific enumeration of which malignant factors do what. The subject–predicate structure of these sentences is clear : the subjects of the successive statements represent the threatening factors and the predicates represent their responses : turn back, flee, miss, be harmless, etc. It is not explicitly stated what leads them to do these things ; presumably the influence of the guarding song.

³⁵ I use the term *topic* to refer to the contextual matter that a sentence is about, and *subject* for the word or phrase that states the topic. It is extremely common for Javanese sentences to lack subjects, in which case their topics are to be inferred from the context (which can be lingual or situational).

Indeed Wiryapanitra comments that the reactions are due to the force (*daya*) of the prayer (*puji*) if it is performed every night (*katindakna ing saben wanci dalu*) (1979 : 103). The particle *pan* in 1j, 2a, and 2b has the syntactic function of marking the boundary between subject and predicate and the semantic function of marking the sentence as causal. It can be translated ‘because, for, since’.

In line 1i the first indication of an addressor turns up : *kami* is an archaic first person pronoun, quite rare in nineteenth-century texts from Surakarta but common in older texts from the north coast. It can be singular or plural. It may be inferred that the postulated addressor or addressors are also at the centre of the surrounding verse lines. The “I” or “we” can be taken as a reference to the users of the text. Mrs Soesilo continued her commentary in the third person, indeed referring to people who use or know the song. Wiryapanitra glossed *kami* as *kita* (1979 : 103), which he used as an inclusive first person plural pronoun (‘I/ we-and-you’). In line with his symbolic interpretation of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, with *kita* he was thinking of man in general.

Verse lines 2h–3c. The threats up to 2g are self-evident. The continuation in 2h–3b, a list of noun phrases, can be understood as a range of forbidding places, which, as represented in the predicate of 3c, all become harmless (*rahayu* is a synonym of *slamet*). Whereas the statements up to 2g refer to malignant factors directly threatening persons and in one case, the rice fields, this section focuses on locations. Mrs Soesilo explained that unlucky land, trees, palaces, graveyards, and similar places inhabited by evil spirits were all “made calm” (*disirep*) by means of these phrases. Although most of the locations represented in 2h–3b are also mentioned in *ruwatan* texts and litanies from Tengger, they are not all commonly known as unlucky today. For instance, while formulas against rhinoceros occur in older collections of spells (as in Drewes 1925 : 69), in central Java one is not very likely to stumble upon a rhinoceros wallow these days. Wiryapanitra gives literal paraphrases up to 2g, but explains that the porcupine’s burrows, peoples’ caves, sloping earth, peacocks’ lying places, rhinoceros’ wallows, and dried-up seas³⁶ are ‘only metaphors’ (*namung pralambang*). He provides no literal interpretation. They symbolize that a human being originates from

³⁶ The statues are not found in his version of line 3b.

the seed of the father infused into the mother, where it comes into being by the force of various elements through the power of the Creator (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 104–105).

Verse lines 3d–h. The next five lines formulate the reason why the song has its salutary effects on the threatening factors and places represented earlier. *Apan* (3d) does not mark the boundary between a subject and a predicate, but like *pan* (3h) means ‘for, because’. While the sentences in 3d–h have the grammatical form of statements, there is the possibility to interpret them as expressing wishes. This is not “word magic” peculiar to spells but reflects a common politeness phenomenon in Javanese. Yet this is an unlikely reading in this case because such polite indirect address would require *widadari* and *malaékat* to be preceded by honorifics.³⁷

The repeated mentions of “the body/person” in this and later passages – *sarira* (honorific vocabulary) in 3d, 3h, and 5j, *angga* (poetic vocabulary) in 5b, and *badan* (polite vocabulary) in 6f – probably but not necessarily refer to the addressors or users. Unless they are indexed by means of a deictic word, which is not the case here, they might be understood as references to any (human) body or person. *Sarira* in lines 3d and 3h is not explicitly linked to the “I”, but the repeated first person pronouns in connection with body parts and faculties in 3i to 5g do stimulate one to construe this as the body or person of the “I/we”, the addressor(s) represented in the text. While they are usually singular in the absence of indications to the contrary, these pronouns are unmarked for number. They may be used for plural reference, though excluding the addressee(s). The addressors’ identity, namely the persons using the text, was established in line 1i. There is no reason to doubt that they are the same here. Mrs Soesilo took this approach, explaining : ‘having recited this, the reciter is certainly safe’ (*yèn wis maca iki, sing maca kuwi mesthi rahayu*). Wiryapanitra again provides a symbolic and more generic interpretation, explaining that various elements (*anasir*) together constitute the human body or person, which is subsequently imbued with forces and properties symbolized by the

³⁷ In theory it is also possible to consider these sentences as Yes/No questions, since word order in such questions may be the same as in statements, while intonation cannot mark questions here because the melody is given by the verse form. But this would be highly unusual; questions in *tembang* verse are as a rule signalled by interrogatives.

heavenly nymphs and the prophets. In his interpretation only the angels of 3f are to be understood literally ; according to mysticism the body is guarded by four angels who reside in the skin, bones, sinews, and flesh. The heavenly nymphs (3e) stand for the five substances light, mystery, spirit, emotion, and mind. The prophets (3g) are God's emissaries, that is to say three kinds of feeling : true feeling, ageless feeling, and external feeling (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 105–106).

Verse lines 3i–5j. This is followed by an expansion of the statement made in 3g–h, consisting of sentences linking named prophets and other Islamic personages to parts of the single body and its faculties. The links are equations and in a number of cases localizations marked by *ing* 'in, at, on'. The word *mangké* 'now' in lines 4c and 5c can be taken as indicating that the equations and locations take effect at this point in the discourse event. It can also be regarded as a reference to the process of listing, or even as a semantically empty filler that does not make a contribution to the representation. *Mangké* is common as a filler in lines requiring /e/ in their final syllable ; relatively few words in the Javanese lexicon meet this requirement and suffixes ending with /e/ are not in order here. Likewise, *sampun* 'already' in 5i may be given a temporal sense : at this juncture in the discourse event, the prophets are fully embodied. But again it is possible to take it as a reference to the enumeration being completed, thus not necessarily linking the diegesis to the discourse situation. Soesilo and Wiryapanitra did not comment explicitly on *mangké* and *sampun*.

These sentences have the form of public statements. They are not specified as addressed to anyone in particular. They postulate a state and are not phrased as requests, commands or other speech acts that can be lexically or grammatically marked in Javanese. However, as noted, it is possible to understand third person statements as expressing wishes.

The first person pronominals vary in form and do not occur in each sentence. Their distribution can be attributed to metrical requirements and the aesthetic desirability of "elegant variation" over successive syntactic units ; all the parts of the body and the faculties are likely to be those of the postulated addressor. The choice of pronominals could also be taken as implying certain social relations. In several instances the pronominal suffix *-ku* is found

within lines (3i, 3j, 4a, 4c, 5c, 5f, 5g), which means that its employment is not constrained by final vowel requirements. It is non-polite, representing the addressor as socially equal or superior to the addressee. This is even clearer in the case of *-ingsun*, used line-internally in one case (5a). It is the first person pronominal typically used by the king when addressing his subjects.³⁸ It is also used in the mystical speculations known as the “*ingsun* doctrine”, where it refers to man as the Lord while *aku* (the full pronoun corresponding to *-ku*) refers to man as servant (see Zoetmulder 1995 : 219 n. 9). However, since *ingsun* is not used regularly in the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, and *-ku* is in fact more frequent, it would go rather far to take *ingsun* as implying an equation of the addressor with God. Wiryapanitra, not exactly the most positivistic of interpreters, does not do this either. He states plainly : ‘The explanation of “My marrow is the eminent Patimah” is that it indicates that the marrow originates from the mother’s entrustment [to a human being]’ (*Sungsumingsun Patimah linuwih, kateranganipun : namung anedahaken bilih sungsum punika asalipun saking titipaning biyung*) (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 109).

Javanese commentators are quick to point out the legendary antecedents of several of the equations and locations. For example, regarding the prophet Musa (Moses), equated with ‘my speech’ in 3j, Mrs Soesilo explained that whatever he said became true (*Nabi Musa saucap-ucapé dadi*). All his followers trusted his words. Wiryapanitra also makes the latter point (1979 : 107). The prophet who is located in the appearance of the “I”, Yusup (Joseph), is well known in the Muslim world, including Java, as exceedingly handsome (see Arps 1992), while the prophet equated with the addressor’s supernatural power (*kasektèn*) is Suléman (Solomon), famous for his dominion over spirits and his ability to understand the secret language of birds. Not all the equations are that straightforward, but the purport of the passage as a whole is clear. Mrs Soesilo commented that here ‘the strengths of the prophets of the past strengthen those who recite, (so that) they almost (attain) what all those prophets epitomize’ (*kekiyatanipun para nabi rumiyin, ngiyataken tiyang ingkeng sami maos, mèh tuladané kaya kanjeng nabi kabèh mau*). According to Sunarno Sisworahardjo (1972b : 14) this

³⁸ In central Java ; in several other Javanese dialects and in older texts *ingsun* and its variant *isun* do not have these status implications.

passage says that the Envoy and others should incarnate into one's body (*padha nitisa ing awaké*). Wiryapanitra regards the passage as a whole as detailing the equipment (*prabot*) of man as symbolized by the prophets (1979 : 106). He explains the equations and localizations one by one, interpreting the first person pronominals as references to an inclusive "us" (*kita*), that is to say "man" (*manungsa*). Often he expands on the body parts and faculties in terms of human attributes common in mystical speculations and accounts for the prophets and other figures as personifications of those attributes. In other cases he takes the body parts at face value and explains the prophets etc. as symbols for the mother or father who entrusted the body parts in question to the human being (1979 : 106–110). An example is the explanation of the marrow and Patimah quoted above.

The section is concluded in 5i–j with the statement that all prophets are complete in forming a single body or person. One may assume that this is the "I". Mrs Soesilo commented : 'thus the entire body is like the prophets' (*dadi sranduning badan menika kaya kanjeng nabi kabèh*). Wiryapanitra explains that they all constitute the body of man in the form of an infant (1979 : 110).

Verse lines 6a–c. The opening statement of stanza 6 contains the only genuinely ambiguous syntactic construction in the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. The question is what the suffix *-né* in 6a does. It could be the possessive suffix, linking *mula* 'origin' to the following *dadi* 'be, become', which would lead to the translation 'one seed was the origin of being'. But the question is then : the being of what? The image of a seed as the origin of the world is known from the (heretical) Islamic doctrine of Ibn al-'Arabī (1165–1240), which was widespread in Indonesia and is reflected in Javanese texts (Drewes 1969 : 16, 60). In this doctrine, however, it is *dat* (God's essence, Arabic *dhāt*) which is compared with a seed. In the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi the Essence is mentioned, but apparently as blessing the seed, not as the seed itself. Only if the topic of line 6c is line 6b's "the world's contents" (*saisining jagad*), the Essence can be identified with the single seed, so that the seed's diffusion into the world parallels the Essence blessing the world. This interpretation is plausible but hardly supported by the text. In this case one would expect the phrase *saisining jagad* to be syntactically connected to *kasamadan* by means of the anaphoric

particle *kang* ‘which, that’. In the absence of such linkage, the principle of topic continuity which is of great importance in Javanese language use leads one to take the topic of lines 6a–b, the single seed, as the topic of 6c as well.

The suffix *-né* might be also be the third person pronominal suffix and point to the prophets (in which case *-né* should be translated ‘their’ not ‘its’) or to the directly preceding single body (5j) constituted from the prophets. Wiryapanitra interprets on these lines. He takes the single body as the topic of 6a–c and explains 6a as a reference to man, who originates from the single seed that is God. What is blessed by the Essence is the life of man (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 112).

A final possibility, and a likely one in view of the textual organization of this passage and the following, is to construe *-né* as pointing to the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, which, as noted, is often identified with the preceding five stanzas. This would imply that *wiji* here has the same sense as Old Javanese *wīja*. While its basic meaning was ‘seed’, *wīja* also stood for the mystical letter or syllable that is the essential part of a mantra, typically the sound *om* (Zoetmulder and Robson 1982 : 2268–2269). I should stress, however, that this is not necessarily the interpretation given to this statement in twentieth-century central Java, as Wiryapanitra’s exegesis makes clear. Yet the textual structure of the following section and the metrical and prosodic composition of this part of the song make an interpretation on these lines least problematic. Although this is not made explicit by means of mention of the kidung as the subject of the sentences, the topic of the remainder of stanza 6 and of stanza 7 is without doubt the song. In the next stanza the song is stated as the subject (8d). In retrospect the principle of topic continuity thus implies that the topic was the same in 6a–c. Stanza 5 and earlier represent the make-up of the addressor’s body and lines 6d and following describe the uses of Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. There is thus a radical break in the diegesis either between lines 5j and 6a or between 6c and 6d. The metrical and prosodic structure of tembang makes it more natural for this break to be located between stanzas than within a stanza. As I have argued elsewhere, a stanza boundary leads readers and listeners to expect a textual boundary as well (Arps 1992 : 372–376).

Verse lines 6d–8j. The focal point of the following lines is the song

itself. Lines 6d to 8j contain an enumeration of applications, sometimes repeating applications mentioned earlier. These lines consist of unmarked statements (6d–g), a statement marked by an irrealis verb form (6h), and conditional statements involving imperative verb forms : “if *x* is the case, do *y*, and *z* will result” (7a–i, 8a–e, 8f–j). From the use of imperatives it is clear that the addressor is no longer the “I” of the first five stanzas, identifiable with the user of the text, but rather someone giving instructions about the use of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. This change of perspective becomes explicit in line 7a, where the postulated user is addressed with the vocative of endearment *kaki* ‘young man’. *Kaki* is common in edifying verse, which typically has the form of a father or grandfather addressing his descendants or a teacher addressing his pupils. The use of imperatives and this vocative word make it indubitable that the pronoun *sira* in 8f and the suffix *-ira* in 8i are second person. In other contexts they can also be third person.

It is striking that here, unlike the first five stanzas, there is explicit mention of the use of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* for the benefit of others than the reciter (6i, 6j, 7a, 7b, 7j). Javanese commentators have nevertheless taken some of these as references to possible reciters. The phrase ‘If someone is . . .’ (*Lamun ana wong . . .*) in 7a is third person and the reciter is addressed in the second person in 7c and further, yet Wiryapanitra interprets : ‘the people who have been thus affected should immediately recite the *kidungan* book’ (*tiyang ingkang kataman wau tumuntena maos serat kidungan wau*) (1979 : 112). In its explanation of these lines, the *Primbon Atassadhur Adammakna* (1980 : 100–101) also seems to say that those affected should recite the *kidung* themselves. These observers appear to have had in mind solitary performance analogous to the use of prose spells.

In his commentary on lines 6d to 8j, Wiryapanitra goes to great lengths to stress that the ways of using the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* represented in the text are not a sufficient condition for its efficacy. In addition, the song or other factors such as one’s own actions or those of people who come to one’s help should be blessed by God. In order to achieve this blessing, one should attain mystical union with God (1979 : 111–113). Wiryapanitra puts this most comprehensively in his paraphrase of lines 6d–6f :

[T]his means : those who recite, listen to, write, or take care

of the kidungan book all receive beneficence in the form of well-being in everything they do. The explanation : it is essential for all this that we must really believe – as the saying goes, ‘those who are sincere will receive sincerity’ – because whatever the shape of the substitute that the Lord Allah may use when He intends to help His servants, it really possesses force or beneficence. But those who believe in this manner can be called people with mediocre [mystical] knowledge. As to those who have achieved insight into the mystery, their belief does not stop short at the substitute, but they consider it necessary to strive for direct contact, so that they can have an encounter [with God].

([T]egesipun : *tiyang ingkang maos, ingkang mirengaken, ingkang nyerat, tuwin ingkang ngrimati ing serat kidungan punika, sadaya sami angsal sawab wilujeng salampah-lampahipun. Kateranganipun : sadaya wau bakunipun kita kedah pitados ingkang saèstu, bebasanipun : sapa temen tinemenan, amargi ing atasipun Gusti Allah manawi sumedya mitulungi dhateng kawulanipun, punika sanadyan mawi warana wujud punapa kémawon, saèstunipun inggih anggadhahi daya utawi sawab. Nanging tiyang ingkang pitados kados makaten punika namanipun tiyang ingkang ngèlminipun saweg setengah, déné manawi tumrap tiyang ingkang sampun pana dhateng gaib, kapitadosanipun punika boten kandheg namung wonten ing warana, nanging perlu macung piyambak, sageda sapatemon.*) (Wiryapanitra 1979 : 111)

The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, Wiryapanitra states once more, stands for God, and the song’s force derives from God’s power. It is necessary to achieve experiential union with God in order to be able to borrow (*ngampil*) His power (1979 : 112).

Verse lines 9a–9j. The concluding stanza of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi contains one long but coherent sentence complex. It, too, is a conditional statement involving imperatives, but it differs from those in stanzas 7 and 8 in several respects. It does not refer to the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi qua song. It does not represent particular states of affairs and particular ways of processing the text but what are probably ritual and mental preconditions for its

successful use in general (9b–e). It qualifies the phenomenon of efficacy in an important way : the addressee’s wishes take effect *Deo volente* (*isa Allah*, Arabic in *shā’ Allāh*) (9f). It refers only to efficacy for others than the addressees : their relatives and family (9g–h). And, finally, it names the beneficence (*sawab*) of a knowledge or science (*ngèlmu*) as the source of efficacy (9i). This science is probably the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi itself ; the word *pangiket* ‘composition’ is typically used for verse. Wiryapanitra’s exegesis of this stanza is mainly a paraphrase with additional details about the required fast. To him, however, the science is not the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi but a doctrine called *makdum sarpin*.

The postulated addressee is the person who wishes his relatives well, as indicated by the second person pronominal suffixes *-nirèku* in 9g (i.e., *-(n)ira* in vowel sandhi with the demonstrative *iku* ‘that’) and *-ira* in 9h. The postulated addressor can be identified from the phrase *ngèlmu pangiket mami*, literally ‘the science [that is] my composition’ (9i). The first person pronoun *mami* here is usually taken as a reference to Sunan Kalijaga because of the location named in 9j. We saw a new addressor appearing on stage in lines 6d to 8j : someone giving instructions for use. It is a sensible move to identify the present addressor with Sunan Kalijaga as well. If, as argued above, the change of addressors occurs between stanzas 5 and 6, lines 6a–6c could be taken as an utterance by the same addressor. The final four stanzas, then, are represented as instructions for use of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi directed by an “I” who is presumably Sunan Kalijaga to the potential user of the text. As always there is the possibility of eavesdroppers here, who would include the supernatural factors causing the unwanted states that prompt the song’s use. More importantly, God is observing as well.

In spite of its relative shortness the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi’s diegesis is structured in a complex way. The construction of the text accounts for the three different conceptions of the size of the work (discussed in section 6). In all cases the core is stanza 1. It opens the text and lists an illustrative range of beneficial effects. This makes it a suitable epitome for the song as a whole. It transpires from the text’s own representation of addressors, speech acts, and addressees that stanzas 1 to 5 are the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi proper, on which the final four stanzas comment. The most inclusive

conception of the song covers all nine stanzas. There are several reasons why this understanding of its extent is feasible. In the first place, in the context of the kidungan book a new kidung is only announced in stanza I.10 (see the Appendix). Secondly, there is continuity of form. All stanzas are cast in the same tembang and display the same poetic style. Finally, while there is a break in the diegesis, most likely between stanzas 5 and 6, there is a considerable measure of diegetic coherence across this boundary. Similar topics occur before and after it, especially the various applications of the song. The break only becomes clear with hindsight, in the course of stanza 6 and following. Ultimately, though, the variable conception of the extent of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is not a matter of great importance, because, as repeatedly seen above, initial sections of kidungan can stand as *partes pro toto*.

Western commentators have sometimes referred to address in their characterizations of kidungan (see section 4). The same applies to Javanese commentators. As noted earlier, the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is called a supplication, a *panyuwun(an)*, which suggests that it is addressed to a privileged personage. The other characterization, *donga* 'invocation', implies that it is directed to God. Looking at the text, however, it transpires that the only lexically or grammatically marked address occurs in the second half and is directed to its users, not to a supernatural being: the vocative word *kaki* 'young man' in line 7a, the imperatives *wacanen* 'recite it' in 7c, 7e, 8d, *puwasaa* 'fast' in 8b, *wateken* 'mutter it' in 8g, *amutiya* 'eat only rice' and *anawaa* 'drink only water' in 9b, and the second person pronominal suffix *-ira* in 8i, 9g and 9h. There are explicit references to God in 7i (*Hyang Suksma*) and 9f (*Allah*), but these are part of third-person statements about the effects of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi and not supplications addressed to Him.

It is clearer who are the addressors represented in the text. According to commentary on the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, those who supplicate or pray are its users. The song indeed contains several first person pronouns. As we have seen, in the first five stanzas these refer to postulated users. *Kami* in 1i points to someone who is free from the threat of thieves. *Aku*, *ingwang*, *mami*, and *ingsun* in 3i–5g are part of statements locating prophets in parts of someone's body and faculties. But again, these sentences are not marked as questions or requests. From stanza 6 onwards the addressor is a different figure, commenting on the song proper. The

mami in 9i must be the postulated originator of the text, Sunan Kalijaga.

The semantic value known as social meaning is an aspect of lingual representation as well as the propositional meaning that has been discussed so far. In Javanese one kind of social meaning, namely politeness in reference and address, is formalized to a considerable extent in the shape of the so-called speech levels. The speech level of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is basically the non-polite, familiar *ngoko* (i.e., *tutoyer*). It largely lacks elevating honorifics (*krama inggil*, used to demonstrate deference toward a second or third person) and humbling honorifics (*krama andhap*, used especially by speakers in reference to themselves). Where such honorific words do occur (e.g., *sarira* ‘body’ in 3d, 3h, 5j), they seem to have been chosen *metri causa*. The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi thus exhibits the flexibility of speech level usage that is found in tembang text generally (Arps 1992 : 196, 200, 222–223, 233). The lack of polite vocabulary seems to contradict its typification as a *panyuwun(an)*, which word denotes deferential requests *par excellence*.

In lines 1b and 1c, the suffix *-a* occurs twice, both times attached to the verb *luput* ‘miss’ or ‘be free from’. As noted above, this suffix marks an irrealis or an imperative. Its use here is striking, because the other salutary effects of the song in lines 1b to 3c are represented in absolute statements. It is impossible to decide on the basis of the text alone which function *-a* has here. An imperative would be at odds with the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi being a supplication or an invocation of God, while an irrealis is compatible with this. Yet taking *-a* in 1b and 1c as an irrealis marker does not make the text into a supplication or invocation. All it does is signal that the states of affairs in question are not or not yet actual ones.

In spite of the lack of grammatical and lexical support for the characterizations “supplication” and “invocation”, there is no reason to doubt that my teachers felt justified in calling the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi by those terms. The solution must be sought in metadiscursive ideas about prayer. God is, as we have seen, never explicitly addressed ; He is invoked twice, but in the third person. But He is omnipresent and He observes. Thus, if the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is a supplicatory invocation, it is so indirectly, through its third-person reference (cf. the notion of ‘indirect speech acts’ ; Searle 1979). A Javanese prayer, then, can be formulated in

ways other than as a request. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* certainly is. Broadly speaking, it is designed as a statement asserting its own effects.

Koentjaraningrat (1985) proposed a dichotomy between magical and religious attitudes in dealing with the supernatural (see section 4). The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* can be conceived in either way. Even though the song embodies no explicit petition, people in central Java today lean towards the second. This is more in accordance with public religious doctrine in Indonesia. Being “prescribed”, the text provides the leeway necessary for such shifting perceptions. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* moves towards the shift from “magical” to “religious” internally. Stanza 9, with its reference to God’s will, is close to the second attitude. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* ultimately qualifies the almost continuous assertion of its efficacy by adding that it becomes operative “if God so wishes”.

In section 4 I glossed “cogency” as the “compelling intimation of efficacy”. That the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* intimates its own efficacy – intimates not just in the sense of “imply” but even in the sense of “announce” – is by now abundantly clear. But how is it compelling?

9. Cogency of the Song : Situated Discourse Processing. I have sketched the somewhat fickle contours of the diegesis that the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* represents. This is not the same, however, as investigating how it works as a prayer, in what way its cogency may come about. Even for a commentator like Wiryapanitra, who explains the text as a body of mystical teachings in order to be able to account for it as credible and persuasive, it is only in its discourse processing that the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* can take effect.

Discourse processing is by necessity situated. It takes place under particular circumstances and follows prior events, which themselves were partly constituted through discourse. Since the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is dedicated to remedying potentially or actually precarious states of affairs and such conditions are also represented by the song itself, it seems sensible to seek its compelling qualities in the interaction between the circumstances

surrounding the discourse and the diegesis evoked through the discourse.

This diegesis is a “textual world”, to be sure, but it does not project itself, like much fictional narrative, as a world that stands apart from the situation in which the discourse takes place. The song contains expressions that may be understood as referring to particulars of the performance situation, particulars that do not derive from the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*. The text is thus linked to the situations of its use. These expressions anchor the physical situation into the diegesis, or viewed from the opposite direction, anchor the diegesis into the situation.

There is nothing fundamentally extraordinary about this. Life takes place not merely in physical circumstances, but also in what one could call contexts, which incorporate both discursive representation and information accessed by other means than the lingual (cf. Bauman and Briggs 1990). Prior to a performance of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* there has been earlier talk and there have been other performances. Thus there is already a context incorporating diegeses of earlier discourse. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*’s diegesis presents participants with the opportunity to modify, to renew this context.

It is the song’s references to persons and times that enable this modification of context, and in particular its deictic references. It is a property of deictics that they require specific referents. The first person pronouns in lines 3i–5g strongly suggest the identification of the addressor represented in the text with the actual reciter or writer, or – in a generic interpretation such as Wiryapanitra’s – mankind. There are several other explicit references to users elsewhere the text, but these refer to hypothetical users. Expressions referring to the song and to the night (1a) can also be understood as reflecting particulars of the event : in most cases the song is indeed sung and it is indeed night. As shown earlier, the temporal deictics *mangké* ‘now’ in 4c and 5c, *sampun* ‘already’ in 5i, and *reké* ‘now’ in 9a may be taken as references to the actual discourse event.

The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, then, represents a diegesis, a “discursive world”, linked to the situation of the discourse processing by means of deictics and other referential expressions that may be understood as references to particulars of the performance situation or other possible performance situations. This homology of intra- and extradiscursive worlds stimulates the

mapping of the situation onto the diegesis represented in the discourse or vice versa, so that together they may become an integrated context.

This context incorporates particular elements of the situation in which it is used. But elements of the situation which are not reflected in the song text may also become part of the context. These include, for instance, the concentration of participants on a patient's recovery. The teacher who told me about the event in which the first five stanzas were sung forty times for a sick friend, commented that he did not know why he recovered. It might have been because of the *kramat* 'prodigiousness' of the song, the concentration of the participants on the man's recovery, or coincidence. At any rate it is in the context modified by the use of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi that the problematics that prompted the use of the song in the first place may become neutralized.

10. A Person-Centred Text. The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is a highly person-centred text. It abounds in references to individuals: not only actual and potential participants in the song's use, but also praeternatural beings (spirits, magic, pests, etc.) and potent personages known from religious and legendary narratives. While, as stressed earlier, it is well known that the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is a text with a history, where these potent personages are concerned the diegesis is timeless and placeless (with one exception, to be discussed shortly).

To extend the argument of the previous section, these references allow components of the song's diegesis that may lack perceptible counterparts in the physical situation also to become part of the context which is created through the discourse. Such components of the diegesis include the evil forces and unlucky states of affairs listed in the text, but also what happens to them according to the text. In this respect the diegesis is a "closed system". In all types of application that it describes, the song specifies the evil as well as asserting its neutralization.

The potent personages are, in the progression of discourse, linked to the users of the text (the equation and location of prophets and other Islamic figures in the user's body in lines 3g–5j), to the effects of the text's use (God in 7h–i and 9f–g), and to the beneficial

properties of the text (Sunan Kalijaga's knowledge in 9i-j). Paraphrasing Keeler, I noted above that potency does not originate in people but exists in the world. It may be acquired from God through asceticism, or from spirits (Keeler 1987 : 121, 123). But Javanese have a mythology with more *dramatis personae* than God and certain guardian or malevolent spirits. There is also a body of narrative in which the prophets etc. and the *walis* stand central. This Muslim mythology, too, "exists in the world". The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi taps it as a source of power.

Koentjaraningrat (1980) contrasts the relations between man and two distinct classes of supernatural beings :

The relationship of man to the Hindu-Buddhist gods, the heroes of the wayang epics, the nature deities, the ancestral spirits, and the spirits of local saints is conceived of by the Javanese as a relationship to senior but intimate kin, whereas the relationship to the Allah of Islam, to Muhammed, Allah's prophet, and to the other prophets, the walis, and the Muslim saints is considered as one to powerful but distant beings. . . . [T]he Javanese associate Allah, the prophets and the saintly Muslim missionaries with high office, high rank, and power. (Koentjaraningrat 1980 : 132-133)

The threatening factors represented in the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi are also supernatural beings, but their "status" in this hierarchy is even lower than the first class discussed by Koentjaraningrat (see Keeler 1987 : 117 note). The benevolent individuals represented in the song are thus much more powerful than their malevolent opponents.

The veiled attribution of authorship in the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is particularly important in connection with the idea of its efficacy. To substantiate this I must indulge in a partly speculative diachronic excursion. In lines 9i-j, the "I" states that he composed a *ngèlmu* 'science, knowledge' when he was at the river Jaga. This *ngèlmu* may be understood as the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi itself. This follows from the preceding text and is indeed the interpretation given by many Javanese commentators.

The statement in 9i-j alludes to a significant episode in Javanese historical tradition. According to the Surakarta court chronicle *Babad tanah Jawi*, the nobleman Said, son of an official of the *buda* kingdom

of Majapahit, performed asceticism near a river (*kali*) Jaga in the vicinity of Cirebon (north coast of western Java), acting on the instructions of the *wali* Sunan Bonang. Having completed his asceticism he assumed the name Sunan Kalijaga (Olthof 1987 : 22), the name under which he is well known as one of the apostles of Islam. The statement in the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi implies that he composed the text at this time of his life.

The final stanza exhibits a piety which is quite different in character from the preceding stanzas. In stanza 9 the efficacy of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is not simply stated. It is attributed to the *sawab* 'beneficence' (from Arabic *ṭhawāb* 'merit/credit arising from a pious deed') of Sunan Kalijaga's composition. It must be supported by a devout disposition, and takes effect only if God so wills. The other reference to God, in lines 7h–i, is an unqualified assertion that He repays someone's debt. There are precedents for this in Javanese Islamic literature, but these apply to God's beloved, not just anyone who sings a song or pronounces a prayer.³⁹

Now a comparison of several dozen written and printed versions of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi from various times and places shows that this particular stanza appears only in the standard central Javanese kidungan book. Other manuscripts of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi contain a stanza advertising the use of the song as a talisman.⁴⁰ In MS Arps [a] it reads :

<i>a</i>	Lamun nora bisa maca kaki	If you cannot read, young man
<i>b</i>	winawera kinarya jajimat	it should be rolled up, used as a talisman
<i>c</i>	teguh ayu panemuné	steadfast, unharmed, is what is met
<i>d</i>	lamun ginawa nglurug	if taken along into battle

³⁹ See, for instance, the *lontar Yusup* in which God refills the king of Egypt's coffers after the latter has exhausted them to buy the prophet Joseph from a merchant, and a similar case concerning the prophet Muhammad's companions Ali and Usman (Arps 1992 : 167–168).

⁴⁰ Versions of this stanza are found in manuscripts from Surakarta (such as that transliterated in Seh Amongraga 1981, which contains the date A.D. 1820/21 ; LUB Or 10849 ; Or 1796), Yogyakarta (Or 11642), west Java (Or 8592), and Bali (Or 9258). Tanojo included it in most of his editions (s.a.[1] : 4 ; 1965 : 8 ; 1966 : 6), though not in s.a.[2]. It is likewise absent in the Surakarta texts of Serat Kidoengan 1929, Serat Kidungan 1979, MS Soesilo, and Wiryapanitra 1979.

<i>e</i>	musuhira datan ana wani ⁴¹	none of your enemies dare
<i>f</i>	luput saꦤꦗꦠꦤ꧀ tawa	weapons miss their mark, are harmless
<i>g</i>	iku pamrihipun	that is its purpose
<i>h</i>	sabarang pakaryanira	for all your activities
<i>i</i>	pan rineksa déning Hyang kang Mahasukci	are guarded by God the Most Holy
<i>j</i>	sakarsanya tinekan	all one's wants are met

I suspect that the stanza with the attribution was written to replace or complement this stanza. The main basis for this suspicion is the fact that lines 9f–g are almost identical in wording (though not in diegesis) to lines h–j of this stanza.⁴²

The earliest datable text containing stanza 9 which I have been able to trace is the publication that I have used for this essay (Serat Kidungan 1919). All manuscripts with this stanza which I have inspected date from the twentieth century and originate from Surakarta. While a thorough investigation into the manuscript sources is required for a more definitive conclusion, it may provisionally be assumed that this stanza was composed as a conclusion to the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi with a view to modifying its tenor. At any rate it transforms it from a text asserting its own efficacy throughout into one that qualifies this claim in an important way.

But of course the tenor of the earlier stanzas remains discernible, as Sunarno Sisworahardjo's reservations about Sunan Kalijaga's authorship demonstrate. Some thus reject the song because it can be understood as magic. Sunan Kalijaga is such an important personage in current central Javanese religious discourse that the attribution can give rise to vehement discussion.

The final stanza modifies the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi's religious tenor, but it does more than drawing divine disposition

⁴¹ This line contains one extrametrical syllable.

⁴² Nevertheless both stanzas are found in a number of manuscripts and printed texts : Or 8622b, MS Arps [a], Kidungan s.a.[2], Tanojo s.a.[1] (=1965), Tanojo 1966. It is possible that the stanza was reinserted later. After all the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi was widely known, so that a "missing" stanza could easily be added. In view of their similar wording it seems less likely that both stanzas initially coexisted and this stanza was subsequently dropped.

into the picture. It also links the song – not merely in commentary but within the text itself – to a prominent personage in the history of Javanese Islam. While, from one perspective, this stanza dilutes its claim of efficacy, it strengthens this claim by another route. The unconditional assertion of a prayer's effectiveness is objectionable to many twentieth-century Javanese. If, on the other hand, one does accept the attribution to Sunan Kalijaga and does conceive the song as an invocation of God (both of which my teachers did), it is indeed imbued with great authority.

Efforts to associate the Kidung Rumeksa in Wengi with potent historical figures were not limited to early twentieth-century Surakarta. In a manuscript from Pasuruhan (east Java) it is implied that the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi was composed by another legendary Muslim saint, Susuhunan Ratu Giri. If readers comply with it (*ngèstoken*), they will receive his *sawab*, and readers and copyists will be *slamet* in whatever they do (MS LUB Or 6575a ; a copy dated 1908). Other alleged authors are Kyai Ageng Séla (Andjar Any s.a. : 71), an ancestor of the central Javanese royal dynasty who is supposed to have been Sunan Kalijaga's contemporary (De Graaf and Pigeaud 1974 : 30–31) and who is customarily invoked in a formula for protection against lightning ; Pangéran Karanggayam (Suroto [1971], Sunarno [1972]a : 18), the legendary court poet of Pajang in the second half of the sixteenth century (De Graaf and Pigeaud 1974 : 216–217) ; and the famous ruler of Surakarta from 1788 to 1820, Paku Buwana IV (Suroto [1971], Sunarno [1972]a : 18). There is also an origin myth in which the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi is said to be a gift from the (Hindu) gods for chasing away pests (Cohen 1902 : 157–160). This myth is probably from Surabaya, east Java, and was not referred to in Surakarta and Yogyakarta.

Attributions and origin myths are known for other kidung too.⁴³ They occasionally occur for prose spells, and they are a common feature of the validation of Arabic prayers. These attributions to historical figures reveal what could be called an author-focused conception of textual efficacy that is now quite widespread in Java.

⁴³ The *Kidung Bonang* (which is not part of the kidungan book) is attributed to Pangéran Bonang in its opening line (Drewes 1968 : 78). See further the myth from Banten concerning the *Kidung Artati* (H. Djajadiningrat 1921 : 312) and that from Surakarta concerning the *Kidung Pangléla-Léla* (Padmosusastra 1980 : 217–218 ; Suwarni [1973]).

Besides the active involvement of a revered historical personage, stanza 9 contains an further important element, namely the allusion to the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as a *ngèlmu*, a mystical science. Calling the song a *ngèlmu* implies that it has a deeper meaning than at first apparent. This allows users of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi to probe the text for a diegesis that reaches beyond the immediately obvious. To those who understand the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi as a mystical text, it is a reference to God's power and – inasmuch as some people succeed in attaining union with God – man's power.

The Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi, then, contains not only references to manifest particulars of the performance situation, but also to supernatural forces and potent personages known from other religious and legendary narratives. Factors represented in the song yet not perceptible in the situation, are also part of the context pertinent to the interpretation of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi. As situation and diegesis merge, these factors, not perceptibly part of the context, become conceivably part of the context. It is this that makes the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi cogent to its users, provided, of course, that they allow themselves to be pulled along by the representation, and integrate their understanding of situation and diegesis. There are two main ways in which this may happen, depending on the kind of diegesis that one finds represented in the song. In both cases the addressor in the first five stanzas is equated with the user. One form of cogency comes from the identification of the addressor in the first five stanzas with the prophets and the properties they symbolize. A more reflective cogency follows from mystical speculation.

11. Cogency and the Allure of Performance. The case of the Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi demonstrates the weaknesses inherent in two approaches that have long remained distinct in the academic study of prayer. Working with texts alone, some Western scholars have drawn inferences that agree only in part with the significance of the same texts for those who actually recite, hear, write, and keep them. Basing one's analysis on ethnographic research, on the other hand, should not preclude attention to the lingual and textual makeup and the discursive representation of prayers. I hope to have made it

plausible that the text of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, or more precisely its situated processing, is of fundamental importance for the efficacy that Javanese attribute to it.

The grounds for cogency explored in this paper are a peculiar manifestation of the allure that is the characteristic goal of all performance. This allure can take many shapes : it can be a matter of presentation, the formal facets of the discourse, but also representational, a matter of diegesis. The diegesis can be fictional or factual in various degrees and manners. If it is factual and anchored to the we, here, and now of processing – if it is understood as a “situational diegesis”, so to speak – the discourse is thereby cogent. Certain states of affairs exterior or prior to the discourse are problematic or potentially so. The text-in-discourse may neutralize the problems in question, integrating extradiscursive elements with discursive ones – provided that the discourse manages to entice participants into merging their understandings of the diegesis with their understandings of the situation. The *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* contains elements that stimulate such a merging. It is pertinent for many goals due to its reference to a whole range of situations. The pervasive “self-referentiality” links the song to its alleged author, thus imbuing it with authority, and also links it (in the course of its performance) with other instances of use in which it is said to be efficacious.

What is needed to account for the cogency of prayers such as the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* is attention to the circumstances of its use as well as the ways in which the text contributes to a pertinent context through adding to and shaping the perception of those circumstances. Such an approach allows one to state (1) that the text does not create a pertinent context for certain participants if it is not interpreted by them or if it is interpreted fictionally only ; (2) that it creates a fragmentary context if it is incompletely interpreted or interpreted situationally only in part. Moreover, since a diegesis is more often than not a highly complex construct, the relation between diegesis and situation is not necessarily a homogeneous one from beginning to end. This relation can partly be exemplaric or paradigmatic. The enumeration of evil forces in stanzas 1–3 of the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*, for instance, will often be irrelevant to the circumstances at hand, and same applies to the instructions for use in stanzas 6 and following. The relation of diegesis to situation can partly be metaphorical, as in the equations and localizations of

stanzas 3–5 according to Wiryapanitra's exegesis.

Thus my conclusions do not imply that belief in the efficacy of magical language is necessarily based on a naive identification of word and thing which makes the word capable of influencing reality (as I phrased it above). The phenomenon of context-building through discourse processing *per se* does not make the Song Guarding at Night efficacious, or even cogent. But it may make it cogent for its users. It can provide grounds for cogency.

Bernard Arps
Rijksuniversiteit Leiden

Acknowledgements

Much of the information on which this article is based was gathered in Surakarta and Yogyakarta during the summer of 1981, the academic year 1982/83, and April to December 1989. I am grateful to my teachers Mrs. Soesilo, Ng. Suratno, S. Probohardjono, the late Mrs. Ng. Mardusari and Gunawan Sri Hastjarjo, all of Surakarta, and R. B. Pranasmar and Wahiman of Yogyakarta, for their willingness to discuss *kidungan* with me. The *macapat* society *Mawar Werdhaswara* of Patangpuluhan, Yogyakarta, received me with great affability in 1989. Drs Ulrich Kratz and Nigel Phillips of SOAS, University of London, made useful suggestions on the translation. I thank the other contributors to this volume for their comments during the workshop «Anthropologie de la prière» at the Institut de Recherche sur le Sud-Est Asiatique, Aix-en-Provence, 28–30 June 1994. Stephen Headley, who organized this *atelier*, has been extraordinarily supportive of my over-ambitious project and incredibly patient in waiting for the results.

Appendix : the songs in *Serat Kidungan* 1919

The titles of the sections, and of the *kidung* they contain, derive from Tanojo s.a.[2].⁴⁴ Most titles are reflected in the initial lines.

⁴⁴ Tanojo's editions of the *kidungan* book all contain more songs than *Serat Kidungan* 1919. Variant names and slightly different divisions of the text

Canto I (Dhandhanggula, 46 stanzas), called *kidungan* (proper)

- A Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi ‘Song Guarding at Night’ (stanzas 1–9), first line *Ana kidung rumeksa ing wengi* ‘A song exists guarding at night’, last line *duk anèng kali Jaga* ‘when at the river Jaga’
- B Kidung Artati ‘Song Artati’⁴⁵ (stanzas 10–26), first line *Ana kidung reké angartati* ‘A song exists in Artati now’, last line *tumpes tapis sadaya* ‘all are exterminated’
- C Kidung Angidung ing Wengi ‘Song Singing at Night’ (stanzas 27–37), first line *Ana kidung angidung ing wengi* ‘A song exists singing at night’, last line *kèdhep wedi maringwang* ‘submissive and fearful towards me’
- D Kidung Paksi Mangku Bumi ‘Song of the Bird Encompassing the Earth’ (stanzas 38–40), first line *Ana paksi mangku bumi langit* ‘A bird exists encompassing the earth and sky’, last line *ing gunung Manikmaya* ‘on Mount Manikmaya’
- E Kidung Akadang Premati⁴⁶ ‘Song of Having Eminent Siblings’ (stanzas 41–46), first line *Ana kidung akadang premati* ‘There is a song of having eminent siblings’, last line *tamat ingkang kidungan* ‘the kidungan is finished’

Canto II (Sinom, 24 stanzas), first section of *padhanghyangan* ‘the guardian spirits’

- F Kidung Baureksa ing Nusa Jawa ‘Song of Those Who Guard the Island of Java’ (stanzas 1–23), first line *Apuranen sun angétang* ‘Forgive me as I enumerate’, last line *nungsa Jawa paugeran kang rumeksa* ‘the island of Java, the register of those who guard it’
- transition into next canto (stanza 24), first line *Gantya ingkang winursita* ‘Another matter is spoken of’, last line *kang jumeneng Paku Buwana ping gangsal* ‘who reigns as Paku Buwana V’

are found in other sources.

⁴⁵ *Artati* is usually glossed as ‘sweet [of taste]’. It is the proper name of a character mentioned in the song and also an alternative name of Dhandhanggula.

⁴⁶ Tanojo s.a.[2] : 8 gives the title *Kidung Akadang Mar Marti* after the first line of his version.

Canto III (Asmarandana, 10 stanzas), continuation of *padhanghyangan*

- G Kidung Para Baureksa ing Surakarta ‘Song of Those Who Guard in Surakarta’ (stanzas 1–9), first line *Kasmaran ingkang pinuji* ‘Passion⁴⁷ is prayed for’, last line *pamanguning padhanyangan* ‘the fashioning of the guardian spirits’
- transition into next canto (stanza 10), first line *Gantya kang pinurwèng kawi* ‘Another matter is addressed in the poem’, last line *kinanthi kalis ing sawan* ‘in Kinanthi, free from convulsions’

Canto IV (Kinanthi, 30 stanzas), called *pangléla-léla* ‘lullaby’

- H Kidung Pangléla-Léla ‘Lulling Song’ (stanzas 1–29), first line *Yèn anangis laré iku* ‘If the child weeps’, last line *si jabang amales becik* ‘the infant will requite with good’
- transition into next canto (stanza 30), first line *Gantya mangké kang winuwus* ‘Now another matter is spoken of’, last line *mamrih rahayuning urip* ‘striving for well-being in life’

Canto V (Pangkur, 12 stanzas), first section of *pepujiyan* ‘praises’

- I Kidung Sesingguh ‘Song of Disposal’ (stanzas 1–12), first line *Singguh singguh kala singguh* ‘Begone begone, demons begone’, last line *agantya manising puji* ‘turn to the sweetness of praises’

Canto VI (Dhandhanggula, 7 stanzas), continuation of *pepujiyan*

- J Kidung Sipat Iman ‘Song of the Qualities of Faith’ (stanzas 1–6), first line *Sipat iman wamantu bi-Lahi* ‘The qualities of faith, I believe in God’, last line *tan ana kara-kara* ‘there is nothing harmful’
- transition into next canto (stanza 7), first line *Gantya malih murwani pupuji* ‘Yet other praises are begun’, last line *dadya wasane^{<ng>} Durma* ‘it might end in Durma’⁴⁸

Canto VII (Durma, 22 stanzas), continuation of *pepujiyan*

- K Kidung Waringin Sungsang ‘Song of the Inverted Banyan Tree’ (stanzas 1–10), first line *Wringin sungsang wayahira tumaruna*

⁴⁷ *Kasmaran* ‘passionate, infatuated’ signals the verse form.

⁴⁸ *Durma*, the name of the following verse form, is usually glossed ‘tiger’; it connotes anger (Arps 1992 : 89, 91–93, 423).

‘The upside down banyan in the first quarter’,⁴⁹ last line *ayu sarira mami* ‘unharmed is my body’

- L Kidung Balé Anyar ‘Song of a New Building’ (stanzas 11–22), first line *Ana kidung sun angidung balé anyar* ‘A song exists, I sing of a new building’, last line *rampas papas wus titi* ‘shorn, cut off, it is finished’

References

Abbreviations

DepDikBud	Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan
IOL	India Office Library and Records, Oriental and India Office Collections, British Library
KITLV	Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde
LUB	Leiden University Library
MS	manuscript
SOAS	School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Manuscripts

- IOL Jav. 8. Miscellaneous texts, including *Kidung Artati* (under the title of *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi*) (See Ricklefs and Voorhoeve 1977 : 58–59).
- LUB CB 141. *Babad Talaga, Majalengka* : legendary verse narrative preceded by *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 782).
- LUB Or 1796. Mystical texts, including *kidungan* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 28 ; Vreede 1892 : 315–316).
- LUB Or 4000. *Kidung* (See Brandes 1903 : 60–62 ; Pigeaud 1968 : 180).
- LUB Or 6575a. Miscellaneous texts, including *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 395).
- LUB Or 7847. The story of the god Kala, ending with the *Kidung Rumeksa ing Wengi* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 471).
- LUB Or 8592. Mystical texts and kidung including *Kidung Bonang*, *K. Nabi*, *K. Artati*, *K. Prasi* (Romanized copy of Javanese MS Bataviaasch Genootschap no. 383 ; see Pigeaud 1968 : 488 ; Poerbatjaraka *et al.* 1950 : 166–168).
- LUB Or 8622b. Miscellaneous texts, including *serat Kidungan* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 494).
- LUB Or 9258. *Adji Belias* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 545).
- LUB Or 10849 (no. 14.2). Miscellaneous texts, including *serat Kidungan* (See Pigeaud 1968 : 675).
- LUB Or 11642 (no. 7). Miscellaneous texts, including *serat Pujian (Kidungan)* (See Pigeaud 1970 : 124).
- MS Arps [a]. *Serat Kidungan* (Prob. early 20th century. 34 pp., last folio

⁴⁹ An inverted banyan tree is traditionally perceived in the moon.

- missing. Javanese characters. Acquired Surakarta, 1989).
- MS Arps [b]. *Tedhakan serat Kidungan* (Photocopy. 31 pp., Javanese characters. Copied in the 1970s or 1980s in Yogyakarta from the third impression of a book in Javanese characters published by Tan Khoen Swie, Kediri, in 1942. Acquired Yogyakarta, 1989).
- MS Soesilo. Miscellaneous texts, including *serat Kidungan* (In private collection Mrs. Soesilo, Surakarta ; a photocopy is in the author's possession).
- SOAS 231240 (B). *Kidung* (See Ricklefs and Voorhoeve 1977 : 86).

Audio cassette

- Mocopat gayeng*. Recited by Panji Hartanto and Ny. Soegimin S., with Karawitan Gondobudoyo. Jakarta : Purnama Record, PL-1096.

Publications and dissertations

Akip Prawira Soeganda

- 1982 *Upacara adat di Pasundan*. [Bandung], Sumur Bandung.

Andjar Any

- s.a. [1986] *Upacara adat perkawinan lengkap*. Penyunting : Moch. Nursyahid P. Surakarta, Pabelan.

Arps, Bernard

- 1992 *Tembang in two traditions : performance and interpretation of Javanese literature*. London, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

forthcoming "De kwestie van het Javaanse kerkgezag." (To appear in 1995 in a volume on Protestant and Catholic missionary activities and Indonesian studies, edited by W. van der Molen and B. Arps.)

Bambang Sularto, Gatut Murniatmo, Jumeiri Siti Rumidjah, Soepanto & S. Ilmi Albiladiyah

- 1981/2 *Upacara tradisional Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*. [Yogyakarta,] Proyek Inventarisasi dan Dokumentasi Kebudayaan Daerah, DepDikBud.

Bauman, Richard & Charles L. Briggs

- 1990 "Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 : 59–88.

Behrend, T. E.

- 1987 *The serat Jatiswara : structure and change in a Javanese poem, 1600–1930*. [Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University.]

Brandes, J.

- 1903 *Beschrijving der Javaansche, Balineesche en Sasaksche handschriften, aangetroffen in de nalatenschap van Dr. H. N. van der Tuuk, en door hem vermaakt aan de Leidsche Universiteitsbibliotheek*. Vol. 2. *Ghaṭotkatjaçaraṇa–Putrupasadji*. Batavia, Landsdrukkerij.

Cohen Fzn., S.

- 1902 “Wajang Dampoe Awang”, *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 45 : 144–167.

Dapperen, J. W. Van

- 1934 “Het Tegalsche roewat (het verlossen, bezweren van kwade invloeden)”, *Djåwå* 14 : 223–230.

Darsiti Soeratman

- 1989 *Kehidupan dunia kraton Surakarta 1830–1939*. Yogyakarta, Penerbit Tamansiswa.

Djajadiningrat, Achmad

- 1936 *Herinneringen van Pangeran Arya Achmad Djajadiningrat*. Amsterdam and Batavia, Kolff.

Djajadiningrat, H.

- 1921 “Iets over Banten en de Banteners”, in *Handelingen van het Eerste Congres voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Java, Solo, 25 en 26 December 1919*. Weltevreden, Albrecht : 309–324.

Drewes, G. W. J.

- 1925 *Drie Javaansche goeroe's : hun leven, onderricht en messiasprediking*. Leiden, A. Vros.
- 1968 “Javanese poems dealing with or attributed to the saint of Bonai”, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 124 : 209–240.
- 1969 *The admonitions of Seh Bari : a 16th century Javanese Muslim text, attributed to the Saint of Bonai, re-edited and translated with an introduction*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff (KITLV, “Bibliotheca Indonesica” 4).

Florida, Nancy

- 1993 *Javanese literature in Surakarta manuscripts*. Vol. 1. *Introduction and manuscripts of the Karaton Surakarta*. Ithaca, New York, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University.

Gon Sastrosoediro

- 1983 “Macapatan para empu”, *Djaka Lodang* 543 (12 Feb.) : 14–15.

Graaf, H. J. De & Th. G. Th. Pigeaud

- 1974 *De eerste Moslimse vorstendommen op Java : studiën over de staatkundige geschiedenis van de 15de en de 16de eeuw*. 's-Gravenhage, Martinus Nijhoff (KITLV, “Verhandelingen” 69).

Hardjowirogo

- 1952 *Paṭokaning njekaraken*. Djakarta, Balai Pustaka. [2nd edition.]

Hefner, Robert W.

- 1985 *Hindu Javanese : Tengger tradition and Islam*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Hooykaas, C.

- 1974 *Cosmogony and creation in Balinese tradition*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff (KITLV, "Bibliotheca Indonesica" 9).

Jakobson, Roman

- 1960 "Closing statement : linguistics and poetics", in Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Style in language*. Cambridge, MA, The M.I.T. Press : 350–377.

Kartomi, Margaret J.

- 1973 *Matjapat songs in Central and West Java*. Canberra, Australian National University Press (Faculty of Asian Studies, "Oriental Monograph Series" 13).

Keeler, Ward

- 1987 *Javanese shadow plays, Javanese selves*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Kidung Tetulak

- [1973] "Kidung tetulak (wawarahe Maling Bangsasekti)", *Kunthi* 3 (5 ; Mulud A.J. 1905) : 11–12.

Kidungan

- s.a.[1] *Kidungan warni-warni*. Solo, Sadu-Budi. [2nd impression.]
s.a.[2] *Kidungan*. Solo, Cendrawasih.

Koentjaraningrat

- 1980 "Javanese terms for God and supernatural beings and the idea of power", in : R. Schefold, J. W. Schoorl, and J. Tennekes, eds., *Man, meaning and history : essays in honour of H. G. Schulte Nordholt*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff : 127–139 (KITLV, "Verhandelingen" 89).
1985 *Javanese culture*. Singapore, etc., Oxford University Press.

Kunardi Hardjoprawiro

- 1985 *Kajian bentuk dan lagu kidungan Jawa Timuran*. [Yogyakarta,] Proyek Penelitian dan Pengkajian Kebudayaan Nusantara (Javanologi), Direktorat Jendral Kebudayaan, DepDikBud.

Mukhsin Ahmadi, Widodo Hs, Mujianto & Imam Syafi'ie

- 1987 *Aspek kesastraan dalam seni ludruk di Jawa Timur*. Jakarta, Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, DepDikBud.

Mustaka Rancang

- 1981 *Mustaka Rancang*. Alih aksara [dan alih bahasa] : Moh. Ikrom. Jakarta, Proyek Penerbitan Buku Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, DepDikBud.

Olthof, W. L., transl.

- 1987 *Babad tanah Djawi : Javaanse rijkskroniek ; W. L. Olthofs vertaling van de prozaversie van J. J. Meinsma lopende tot het jaar 1721*. Tweede herziene druk, verzorgd en ingeleid door J. J. Ras. Dordrecht and Providence, Foris.

Padmosoekotjo, S.

- s.a. *Ngénggréngan kasusastran Djawa*. Vol. 2. Jogjakarta, Hien Hoo Sing. [3rd impression, c. 1960.]

Padmosusastra

- 1980 *Tata cara*. Diindonesiakan Soenarko H. Pospito [sic]. Jakarta, Proyek Penerbitan Buku Bacaan Indonesia dan Daerah, DepDikBud. [1st edition 1907.]

Partahadiningrat

- 1980 "Titiwancine jabang bayi lahir", *Mekar Sari* 23 (22 ; 15 Jan.) : 7–8.

Pigeaud, Th. G. Th.

- 1938 *Javaanse volksvertooningen : bijdrage tot de beschrijving van land en volk*. Batavia, Volkslectuur.
 1967 *Literature of Java*. Vol. 1. *Synopsis of Javanese literature 900–1900 A.D.* The Hague, Martinus Nyhoff.
 1968 *Literature of Java*. Vol. 2. *Descriptive lists of Javanese manuscripts*. Leiden, Bibliotheca Universitatis Lugduni Batavorum.
 1970 *Literature of Java*. Vol. 3. *Illustrations and facsimiles of manuscripts, maps, addenda, and a general index of names and subjects*. Leiden, Bibliotheca Universitatis Lugduni Batavorum.
 1980 *Literature of Java*. Vol. 4. *Supplement*. Leiden, Leiden University Press.

Pink, Peter Wilhelm

- 1977 *Gathutkaca nagih Janji : Gathutkaca fordert die Einlösung eines Versprechens ; Lakon des javanischen Wayang Purwa, aufgeführt von Raden Soetrisno*. Berlin, Reimer ("Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Indonesische und Südseesprachen der Universität Hamburg" 12).

Poensen, C.

- 1869 "Bijdragen tot de kennis van den godsdienstigen en zedelijken toestand der Javanen : eene beschouwing van eenige voorname geschriften der Javaansche literatuur", *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap* 13 : 153–236.

Poerbatjaraka, P. Voorhoeve & C. Hooykaas

- 1950 *Indonesische handschriften*. Bandung, A. C. Nix.

Primbon Atassadhur

- 1980 *Kitab primbon Atassadhur Adammakna (sambetanipun Betaljemur)*. Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat, Soemodidjojo Maha Dewa. [3rd impression]

Probohardjono, S.

- s.a. *Pakem wajang purwa, isi 14 balungan lampahan rinengga ing gambar 50 iji*. Vol. I. Solo, Ratna. [3rd impression.]

Quinn, George

- 1975 "The Javanese science of burglary", *Review of Indonesian and Malayan*

Affairs 9 : 33–54.

Rama Panji Sosrohadi Kusuma

1984 *Sekar setaman (bunga rampai) : tatacara adat Jawi Surakarta (metu, manten, mati) ; wewaton kangge tiyang gadah damel*. Sala, Sri Rejeki.

Ricklefs, M. C. & P. Voorhoeve

1977 *Indonesian manuscripts in Great Britain : a catalogue of manuscripts in Indonesian languages in British public collections*. Oxford, etc., Oxford University Press (“London Oriental Bibliographies” 5).

Robson, S. O.

1971 *Wanban Wideya : a Javanese Pañji romance*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff (KITLV, “Bibliotheca Indonesica” 6)

1976 “The power of poetry”, *Review of Indonesian and Malayan Affairs* 10 : 76–81.

1979 “Notes on the early kidung literature”, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 135 : 300–322.

Schieffelin, Edward L.

1993 “Performance and the cultural construction of reality : a New Guinea example”, in Smadar Lavie, Kirin Narayan, and Renato Rosaldo, eds., *Creativity / anthropology*. Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press : 270–295. [First published in a different version in *American Ethnologist* 12 (1985) : 707–724.]

Searle, John R.

1979 *Expression and meaning : studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge, etc., Cambridge University Press.

Seh Amongraga

1981 *Seh Amongraga*. Alih aksara [dan alih bahasa] : Moelyono Sastronaryatmo. Jakarta, Proyek Penerbitan Buku Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, DepDikBud.

Serat Kidoengan

1926 *Serat Kidoengan*. Kediri, Tan Khoen Swie. [1st impression.]

Serat Kidungan

1919 *Serat Kidungan warni-warni*. Surakarta, Budi Utama.

1979 *Serat Kidungan : babon asli saking karaton Surakarta ; mawi tambahan Joko Lodhang – Sabdojati – serat Dewa Ruci*. Sala, Indah Jaya.

Serat Padhalangan

1978 *Serat padhalangan ringgit purwa II*. Oleh K.G.P.A.A. Mangkunagara VII. Alih aksara dan ringkasan oleh R. Mulyono Sastronaryatmo. Jakarta, Proyek Penerbitan Buku Bacaan dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, DepDikBud.

Singgih Wibisono

1956 “Tengger”, *Bahasa dan Budaja* 4 (6) : 3–49.

Siti Kolimah Sd., A.

- 1985 "Macapat lan kridhane ing kasusastran Jawa", *Djaka Lodang* 14 (646 ; 2 Feb.) : 30–31.

Smith-Hefner, Nancy J.

- 1990 "The litany of 'The world's beginning' : a Hindu-Javanese purification text", *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 21 : 287–328.
 1992 "Pembaron : an East Javanese rite of priestly rebirth", *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 23 : 237–275.

Soedjijono, Imam Hanafi & Kusnan Adi Wiryawan

- 1987 *Struktur dan isi mantra bahasa Jawa di Jawa Timur*. Jakarta, DepDikBud.

Subagio Sastrowardoyo, Sapardi Djoko Damono & A. Kasim Achmad, eds.

- 1983 *Bunga rampai sastra-sastra ASEAN : sastra lisan Indonesia*. n.p. (Published with assistance from the ASEAN Committee on Culture and Information).
 1985 *Anthology of ASEAN literatures : oral literature of Indonesia*. n.p. (Published with assistance from the ASEAN Committee on Culture and Information).

Suhadi Tk. Cukur

- 1984 "Serat Kidungan : nepungi sang Arta Daya (I)", *Panjebar Semangat* 49 (8 Dec.) : 29–30.

Sunarno Sisworahardjo

- [1972]a "Kalidjaga – Qadli Zaka", *Kunthi* 2 (12 ; Suro A.J. 1904) : 18–19.
 1972b "Ambahas kidungan", *Djaja Baja* 26 (34 ; 23 April) : 14–16.
 1972c "Ambahas kidungan (II tamat)", *Djaja Baja* 26 (36 ; 7 May).
 1975a "Isbat ing kidungan", *Mekar Sari* 19 (6 ; 15 May) : 21–22.
 1975b "Isbat ing kidungan (II – tamat)", *Mekar Sari* 19 (7 ; 1 June) : 17.
 1976 "Sunan Kalijaga dalah kidungane", *Panjebar Semangat* 42 (6 ; 7 Feb.) : 22–23.

Sunarti, Purlansyah, Syamsiar Seman, Syukrani Maswan & M. Saperi K.

- 1978 *Sastra lisan Banjar*. Jakarta, Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, DepDikBud.

Suroto H., G.

- [1971] "Sunan Kalijaga", *Kunthi* 2 (6 ; Djumadilawal A.J. 1903) : 17–18.

Suryanto Sastroatmodjo

- 1984 "Kidunge sang nawung kidung", *Djaka Lodang* 14 (615 ; 30 June) : 30–31.

Suwarni H.S.

- [1973] "Prajanjiane si jabang bayi lan Sarab Sawan", *Kunthi* 3 (4 ; Suro / Sapar A.J. 1905) : 20–21.

Suyadi Respationo

s.a. *Upacara mantu jangkep, gagrag Surakarta*. Semarang, Effhar Publishing.

Tambiah, S. J.

1968 "The magical power of words", *Man*, N.S. 3 : 175–208.

Tanojo, ed.

s.a.[1] *Kidungan*. [Surakarta.]

s.a.[2] *Kidungan pepak jangkep*. Sala, S. Muliya.

s.a.[3] *Pakem pangruwatan Murwa Kala, miturut pakem paḍalangané Kjai Demang Reditanaja*. Surakarta, Tri-jasa.

1965 *Kidungan*. Solo, Sadu-Budi. [8th impression.]

1966(?) *Kidungan Purwajati*. Surakarta, Pelajar.

Trunarimong, Ki, & Sang Indrajati, eds.

s.a. *Kitab Mantra Yoga, saka kitab Sontèng kawuwuhan bab manunggalé mantra warna-warna dalah katerangané*. Solo, Sadu Budi. [12th impression.]

Vickers, Adrian

1987 "Hinduism and Islam in Indonesia : Bali and the Pasisir world", *Indonesia* no. 44 : 31–58.

Vreede, A. C.

1892 *Catalogus van de Javaansche en Madoereesche Handschriften der Leidsche Universiteits-Bibliotheek*. Leiden, E. J. Brill.

Widiarta

1984 "Pedhotan ing tembang macapat", *Mekar Sari* 28 (19 ; 1 Dec.) : 27.

Winter, C. F.

1911 *Javaansche zamenspraken*. Vol. 1. *Zamenspraken over verschillende onderwerpen*. Leiden, E. J. Brill. [1st edition 1848.]

Wiryapanitra

1979 *Serat Kidungan kawedhar*. Alih bahasa : T. W. K. Hadisoepapta ; alih aksara : Siswoyo. Jakarta, Proyek Penerbitan Buku Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah, DepDikBud.

Zoetmulder, P. J.

1974 *Kalangwan : a survey of Old Javanese literature*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff (KITLV, "Translation Series" 16).

1995 *Pantheism and monism in Javanese suluk literature : Islamic and Indian mysticism in an Indonesian setting*. Edited and translated by M. C. Ricklefs. Leiden, KITLV Press (KITLV, "Translation Series" 24). [1st edition, in Dutch, 1935.]

Zoetmulder, P. J., with S. O. Robson,

1982 *Old Javanese–English dictionary*. 's-Gravenhage, Martinus Nijhoff.