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ABSTRACT

This paper is concerned with recent developments in the style of Balinese Gamelan known as Tabuh Kreasi Gong Kebyar. Specifically, the focus is on the repertoire of new compositions performed at the annual Bali Arts Festival in the last twenty years. The first section will explore the many influences that have played a role in crafting the form and function of the music as it is today, namely the institutionalization of the arts, national cultural mandates, the competitive performance context of the festival and other aspects of modernization in Bali. The second half will be an analysis of a selection of pieces through this time period, focusing on development of formal structure and the emergence of new textures as well as harmonic and metric relationships.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Topic

This paper is concerned with recent developments in the style of Balinese Gamelan known as Tabuh Kreasi Gong Kebyar. Specifically, the focus is on the repertoire of new compositions performed at the annual Bali Arts Festival in the last twenty years. The first section will explore the many influences that have played a role in crafting the form and function of the music as it is today, namely the institutionalization of the arts, national cultural mandates, the competitive performance context of the festival and other aspects of modernization in Bali. The second half will be an analysis of a selection of pieces through this time period, focusing on development of formal structure and the emergence of new textures as well as harmonic and metric relationships.

A product of monumental social transition, Gong Kebyar was a new type of gamelan orchestra in Bali, born just under a century ago at the onset of Dutch colonial rule. Through the many changes Balinese society has gone through since then, it has developed along with them, a litmus test of social development. Tabuh Kreasi (literally “creation piece”) stood as the most emblematic departure from classical tradition, a new form of composition arising from the possibilities of a new ensemble. It was a free instrumental form, secular, untied to ritual and unencumbered with adherence to traditional forms of dance or dramatic works. Tabuh Kreasi were vessels for the radical new kebyar texture of unmetered, virtuosic flourishes, intertwined with cyclic passages from classic repertoire.
The first performances of this new style were in the form of inter-village competitions, and while the Gong Kebyar has since become the predominant gamelan ensemble in Bali, filling a host of ritual and secular roles, arguably the largest forum for new composition is still a competition, though on a much larger scale. The centerpiece of the annual month-long Bali Arts Festival is the Pesta Gong Kebyar, in which nine groups from each of Bali’s nine administrative regencies compete two at a time, “battle of the bands” style, on the main stage at the Bali Arts Center and at regional venues, vying for first place and regional pride. Thousands pack the outdoor amphitheater well beyond capacity, erupting with cheers of approval at a well executed or novel passage, and the even more enthusiastic cheers of derision at the slightest perceived mistake. Tens of thousands more will watch subsequent television broadcasts and purchase recordings.

Directly in front of the stage sits the jury, comprised of senior faculty from the arts academies and a selection of elder musicians from different regions. In the months leading up to the festival, the jurors have visited each group, suggesting improvements to their repertoire, and in performance score them on a number of criteria ranging from the quality of the composition and musicianship to presentation and musician choreography. Though the most prestigious and visible venue for new music, there is no question in the minds of the composers that the primary goal is to win.¹

The pressure to create a championship Tabuh Kreasi calls into question the sources of qualitative criteria by which they are judged. Within a few short decades after its initial appearance, the Gong Kebyar ensemble spread rapidly throughout Bali, and was soon the primary gamelan form on the island. By the very nature of its wide distribution,

¹ A sentiment universally echoed in personal interviews with composers as well as in other sources.
different interpretations developed, and some came to dominate. After Indonesia gained independence following World War II, regional arts became a primary tool for crafting national identity, and through the cultural ministry, a number of programs were instituted to promote and direct local arts to support nationalist ideologies. In Bali, this included the creation of a local arts ministry as well as academies and an arts festival complex in the capital city of Denpasar. Through the support of government initiatives, authority was centralized in the academies, as was the perspective of the early faculty. Though a multi-faceted process, this essentially led to a standardization of many practices within the Balinese performing arts.

As a result of these factors, Tabuh Kreasi was no longer the “no rules” free-for-all of the early 20th century. In the late 1960s Wayan Beratha, pre-eminent composer and senior faculty member at the academy, created a more or less standard four-part formula for the style, which to this point was still largely an amorphous medley of melody cycles interspersed with kebyar passages. Since then, it has been the role of the composer to balance adherence to that form, a constructed tradition, with innovative ideas in just the right proportion.

Today, the sources of inspiration for new ideas have expanded from that of composers thirty years ago, and are beginning to blur the definition of Beratha’s Tabuh Kreasi form. The avant-garde movement in Indonesia known as kontemporer has been embraced at the academies, and young composers have begun to show willingness to incorporate inventive textures and structural innovations into new Tabuh Kreasi compositions. Many academy graduates and faculty have been continuing their education.

---

2 Various perspectives view Tabuh Kreasi as adhering to a 3 or 5 part model, but the 4 part perspective will be used throughout for the purpose of clarifying analysis, as will be explained in section II.
studying abroad, and along with collaborations with western musicians, have increasingly been exposed to foreign musical concepts. Western composers’ compositions for Balinese gamelan have contributed to the expansion of western influence as well. New techniques and textures have begun regularly appearing in Tabuh Kreasi that were unheard of in Beratha’s day. The purpose of this paper is to explore the intricacies of this modern landscape in which Tabuh Kreasi is born today, and without drawing explicit causal relationships, to observe how the identity of the music itself has changed in the past two decades in the face of these influences.

1.2 Literature Review and Methodology

The first half of this paper focuses on the historical, social and institutional developments that directly effected the Tabuh Kreasi form. In Bali, this is a narrative of traditional musical values, centered squarely in village ritual practice and pre-colonial court systems, developing to suit new contexts brought on by modernization. This resonates, though, on a global scale, as the 20th century saw similar scenarios occurring throughout the world, where European colonies gained independence and adopted nationalist policies towards traditional arts.

Within Bali, a magnet for social theorists and ethnomusicologists since as far back as the 1930s, many of these aspects of modernization have been explored in recent studies. Ramstedt (1993) explored the evolution of Indonesian cultural policies through different regimes, focusing on their effect on Balinese music and dance. Heimrark (2003) devotes half of her study on the Balinese shadow play tradition to the role of the academy in crafting modern discourse and development. McGraw’s 2005 dissertation on the \textit{musik kontemporer} movement in Bali explores, and draws connections between
composers' experiences with kontemporer at the academy and subsequent influence on their Tabuh Kreasi compositions. Michael Bakan's 1999 book on Balinese beleganjur music provides an account of the politics involved in the tradition of musical competitions. David Harnish's 2001 article on modern composition practice took stock of these and many other factors, including the influence of interaction with foreign musicians. An example of this, a collaboration between a Balinese and American composer, was described in detail in Humphreys (2001).

I draw heavily on these sources in creating a portrait of this social landscape from which modern composers work. Of primary focus, though, is the Gong Kebyar competition held at the Bali Arts Festival, about which fairly little has been written explicitly. In order to bring focus to this event, as well as to include Balinese voices into the discourse, I will draw on a series of interviews I conducted with composers in Bali during the summer of 2007, and in North America during the spring of 2008. Representing two generations of academy trained musicians, their perspectives provide insight into perceived challenges of working within the festival context, as well as first hand corroboration of conclusions drawn by the texts cited above.

The second half of this paper is in the form of an historical formal analysis. Using a timeline-based model focused on sectional repeat structure and textural sequence adapted from Tenzer (2000) I will first establish the core identifying features of Tabuh Kreasi as established in the late 1960s. Then, using a selection of 21 pieces ranging from 1988 to 2007, I will trace the development of the formal structure throughout that period, which has been maintained in name and principle, but has also evolved in many ways.
beyond recognition. Finally, I will highlight a number of textural, harmonic and metric
devices, unseen before this period, which have become nearly ubiquitous today.

Within recent Balinese music scholarship, there have been many works focused
on detailed music analysis. Most notable is Michael Tenzer's *Gamelan Gong Kebyar*,
published in 2000, devoting entire chapters to traditional approaches to melody,
elaboration, meter and form among others. Andrew Mcgraw's 2005 dissertation on
*musik kontemperer* details a series of avant garde compositions, and Peter Steele's 2007
master's thesis focuses specifically on new approaches to traditional elaboration practices
in modern Tabuh Kreasi. The type of analysis used in this paper, though, is a more
specific look at musical form on a broad scale. By relying on a wide sample of
compositions and a simpler analytical model, the intention is to show general features
common among modern Tabuh Kreasi repertoire. In the growing body of literature
analyzing Balinese music, I see this paper as providing a different perspective to
compliment analyses focusing on different musical aspects.

Before proceeding, I believe it is important to ask the question, "Why Tabuh
Kreasi?" The social and political developments of the 20th century effected every aspect
of the Balinese arts, but Tabuh Kreasi represents the focal point of the largest clash
between tradition and modernity. Dance compositions are informed by a different set of
guidelines, and new compositions for more traditional styles are less bold in their
exploration. Kontemporer compositions, on the other hand, exist almost entirely in the
experimental realm, and are not expected to have any ties to tradition. Tabuh Kreasi
stands between, at the breaking point between Balinese aesthetics and the onslaught of
modernist and foreign influence. New compositions are expected to perfectly balance these two sides, on the festival stage under the intense scrutiny of Balinese society.

Personally, the value of exploring Tabuh Kreasi lies simply in its beauty. I approach this paper unabashedly with a great love of the material, and believe that while it is essential to understand the context in which this music has grown in recent years, exploring the development of its mechanics and the beauty of its construction is where my interest lies. My analysis is not, then, intended to function as a case study exemplifying the outcome of the influences described in the first section, nor as the playing out of cultural theories with global implications. The fundamental contribution of this paper is in clarifying the development of a rich, diverse orchestral music tradition. I take a cue from Tenzer (2006:205), in saying that analysis is “an end in itself.”
2 SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1 Early Kebyar

The Gong Kebyar was born in North Bali sometime in the early 1910’s, amidst massive social transition. The first public performance is said to have taken place in December of 1915, less than ten years after the final step in the Dutch colonial takeover of Bali. The new ensemble was a radical departure from traditional music to that point, and paralleled a shift in social values and new contexts for gamelan music.

The arrival of the Hindu-Javanese Majapahit dynasty in the late 15th century marks what many consider to be the origins of modern Balinese identity. Under pressure of the encroaching influence of Islam, this ruling body took refuge in neighboring Bali, predominantly Hindu and already claimed as a vassal state. Here it established a court system as the center of authority, and over the next four centuries developed the social organization and cultural framework that identifies Bali today. In a bid to establish prestige, the courts enthusiastically supported the arts, which led to the recasting of their Javanese influences into new styles. While music existed in a multitude of forms prior to the arrival of the Majapahit (many surviving to the present), most modern Balinese music can be traced to genres that originated during this period.

The earliest cited genre of post-Majapahit Bali is the Gamelan *Gambuh*. It is a dance form derived from East Javanese court entertainment from the 10th century, accompanied by several large flutes, drums, gongs, spike fiddle and other small metallophones. It depicts stories from the *Panji Cycle*, a collection of legends from

---

3 This section is adapted from an earlier unpublished paper entitled “Lemayung: Tradition and Innovation in a New Composition for the Balinese Gamelan Semarandana, Loyola Marymount University, 2005.
medieval east Java, and is considered to be the source of almost all later Balinese dance forms. The flutes of the Gambuh ensemble, which play an elaborated melody along with the rebab (spike fiddle), are tuned to the seven pitches of the pelog scale. The music itself, however, operates almost exclusively in five tone subsets, each of which carries stock traits (strong, refined) that determine for which characters’ scenes they are appropriate.

The direct descendant of the Gambuh tradition is the gamelan ensemble Semar Pegulingan, intended to provide sweet background music for the king’s bedchamber. Unlike the light and woodwind-based instrumentation of Gambuh, however, Semar Pegulingan includes many bronze bar metallophones and a row of gong chimes (trompong, lead solo instrument), along with drums, gongs and spike fiddle. The seven tone scale was carried over to the new metallophones, but the music itself still operated largely in five tone sets. From the Semar Pegulingan also developed the gamelan Pelegongan, restricted to five tones and including two gender, bronze bar metallophones replacing the trompong as lead instrument. This ensemble accompanied the popular Legong dance, gaining popularity in the waning years of the court system. The instrumentation and the music’s polyphonic texture now resemble that of the later ensembles.

The gamelan Gong Gede was another of the court ensembles to carry a pentatonic tuning, taken from the subsets of pelog. Like the gamelan Pelegongan and later Gong Kebyar, this genre was tuned to the five-tone selisir, considered the most refined of the pelog modes. The Gong Gede was a massive ensemble, requiring fifty people to play and

---

7 Gold (2005) p. 75-6.
consisting of much larger versions of Semar Pegulingan metallophones, large cymbals (ceng ceng kopyak) and two trompong (gong chime rows, precursor to the reyong). This ensemble fulfilled ritual functions in the courts, and accompanied topeng mask dances. Later in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, smaller versions of Gong Gede ensembles were being crafted known only as gamelan gong, requiring fewer musicians, making them more affordable. Now, villages without the resources of the courts could maintain an important ritual ensemble for their own use. During this time, the slow, plain texture of the instrumentation was experimented with, and the first signs of the defining kotekan texture (interlocking elaboration style) of later Balinese music appeared. It was this period of development that directly preceded the historical events that led to the advent of the Gong Kebyar.\textsuperscript{8}

Dutch influence in South East Asia goes back to the early seventeenth century, with the official establishment of a colony in 1799, encompassing much of what is now Indonesia. It wasn’t until the mid eighteenth century, though, that the Dutch occupied Bali. Dutch control spread from outward from Java, and in 1856 the first major military campaigns were set upon Bali. After taking control of the kingdoms of Buleleng in the North and Jembrana in the west the Dutch made puppets of many of the Balinese courts: the final blows were struck in the first decade of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Dutch control was total, and the traditional courts held only symbolic importance. They could no longer afford a strong sponsorship for the arts, and instruments were sold or given to village

\textsuperscript{8} Tenzer (1998), p. 87-8.
banjars, the new seats of local culture and government. Within just a few years, a centuries-old musical tradition had ended, and a new era had begun.\footnote{Tenzer (2000), p. 152-3.}

Under Dutch control, the courts were either dissolved or their rulers made into figureheads answering to the colonial administration. Their wealth and power slowly declined, and they lost the ability to support the lavish court lifestyle and the appearance of relevance. Social order to this point had be characterized by loyalty to one’s puri (palace/court) and responsibilities to one’s pura (temple). In the highly ritualized culture of Bali, a community was defined by the desa adat, or village custom, which included a dense genealogical network of ritualistic connections to a series of temples in an area. Within this community, a banjar functioned as a village council, making administrative decisions. In the name of cultural preservation, the Dutch attempted to follow this format in instituting their village-level bureaucratic structure known as desa dinas, and made laws based on Dutch scholars’ interpretations of Hindu texts. It was in this way that traditional practices were officialized, maintaining somewhat of a continuity while establishing allegiance to the colonial administration\footnote{Warren (1993), pp. 22-28.}. Once they established the bureaucratic structure in Bali, the Dutch utilized a policy of indirect rule, withdrawing to the administration centers in Singaraja and Denpasar. The regional figureheads acted as tax collectors and enforced Dutch mandates, and the villages continued to function largely as they had before. On the surface, not much had changed in the daily life of the Balinese, but the impact of redefined locuses of power fundamentally changed the social hierarchy, creating an uncertain identity within the culture.
It was within this period of great social upheaval that music in Bali went through a similarly monumental transition. The predominant form of music at that time, as it is today, was that of the gamelan percussion orchestra, which was maintained by the courts and used for sacred ritual functions. As the courts declined, they were no longer able to maintain the gamelans, which were either sold or divested to the increasingly important village banjars. For the first time, the villages became the centers of this music, which began being used at temple ceremonies of the common people. The sharp and almost immediate transition between these two distinct periods was symbolized by the literal destruction of older instruments to create new ones. Virtually all of the old Semar Pegulingan, Pelegongan and Gong Gede instruments were melted down to create a new and increasingly popular type of ensemble speed, known as the gamelan Gong Kebyar.

Developed in the northern village of Singaraja, Gong Kebyar quickly became the dominant ensemble throughout the island. The instruments were larger and projected more powerfully than the petite Pelegongan, but were smaller and fewer in number than the massive Gong Gede. Instrumentation included the standard bronze bar metallophones, two gong chime rows (reong and trompong), flutes, spike fiddle, small cymbals, gongs and drums. It was the music itself, though, that set the gong kebyar apart. The playing style had become virtuosic, often fast paced, textured with dense interlocking patterns and punctuated by free standing, meterless statements that ring out like thunder, which by no coincidence translates into Indonesian as “kebyar.”

The widespread popularity of this ensemble was in part also due to its functionality. Traditional repertoire from older styles was carried over into performance on the new instruments, allowing these to fulfill necessary ritual functions. At the same
time new compositions and dance forms were developed that brought the first conceptions of secular performance for bronze ensembles. Aside from rural bamboo genres, gamelan music had to this point been almost exclusively ritual in context. A new social order under colonial rule as well as wide popular access to instruments allowed for new and broader definitions of musical expression. This was in part due to a Dutch policy of indigenous art preservation, partially in support of a growing tourism economy. Yet in both realms of the sacred and the secular, music of the gong kebyar continued to develop a rich style unto itself.

2.2 Indonesian Independence and Cultural Policy

During World War II, most of Indonesia was occupied by Japanese forces, driving out the Dutch. As part of their campaign, they appealed to anti-Dutch factions within Indonesia to rally support among the people, made up of those who sought to declare the former colony as an independent nation free of foreign control. Though the Japanese greatly exploited natural resources and brutalized much of the population during their occupation, they were in support of the independence movement, and towards the end of the war began plans to hand over conditional sovereignty to an initial governing body. Before they could do so, however, they surrendered to allied forces, and Sukarno, leader of the nationalist movement, unilaterally declared the independence of Indonesia on August 16th, 1945.

After the withdrawal of Japanese forces, the Dutch, rejecting the claim of independence, returned with military force to reclaim their colony. Though they successfully gained control of many areas, after four years of fighting and under international pressure, they finally acknowledged the sovereignty of the Indonesian
government, and all of what had formerly been the Dutch colony became the territory of the new nation. Sukarno became the first president of Indonesia, and his time in power, lasting until 1965, is now known as the *Orde Lama* (old order).

Sukarno approached the formation of national ideology from a philosophy that he called *Marhaenism*, which was a combination of Marxism, fierce nationalism and elements of Islam. This was expressed in the *Pancasila* (five pillars), a set of five qualities that were established as the very core of Indonesian identity. They were nationalism (national unity), humanity (Indonesia as a member of the world community), democracy (representation of all groups/perspectives), social justice (equal distribution of welfare to all peoples of Indonesia) and theism (belief in one God). In the climate of growing factionalism in the government’s developmental stage, these principles sought to appease the major competing ideologies: obligatory monotheism (within one of five approved religions) appealed to the Islamists who sought a theocracy; social justice spoke to the strong communist contingent; those pushing social democracy were promised equal representation; humanity, representing Indonesia’s right to self determination, of primary importance for the strong anti-colonial sentiments.

The final principle of the *Pancasila*, that of nationalism, was of utmost importance as a means of rallying effort for domestic development as well as for the establishment of a national image, both for international observers and among the people of Indonesia. In both realms, the adoption of a new identity at the expense of traditional values was intended to streamline society. This was important for infrastructural and economic development in that, as Geertz observed, traditional culture in Indonesia was

---

considered to be an obstacle for social change.\textsuperscript{12} In order to implement the necessary changes, a dense bureaucracy was developed to link the central government to individual communities. In terms of identity, nationalism was important in creating the idea of a unique Indonesian culture, in order to present the new nation as a unified entity, justifying its existence. In practice, this involved the framing and/or alteration of the many diverse cultures within Indonesia to resonate with national ideologies. The general sentiment was that, "...the national culture of the independent Indonesian society has to be a totally new culture, which has to be clean of any influence of the feudal culture as well as of any indication of archaistic tribalism or any other kind of ethnocentrism."\textsuperscript{13}

Bali's rich arts tradition, its communal nature and popularity in the west made it a perfect candidate for nationalist framing. As Tenzer observed, "[Sukarno] used the glorified, collective image of Balinese culture that was already in place to further promote and symbolize Indonesia to the world, giving the island an enduring sense of national significance that is out of proportion to its size and population."\textsuperscript{14} Sukarno himself was half Balinese, and took special interest in the molding of Balinese music. He supported the creation of dance pieces of a social realist nature, depicting common activities such as farming and fishing. Classic repertoire as well as early kebyar pieces had been focused on mythology, religious themes or expressive material, so these new dances, largely unpopular among Balinese, became standard for public performances. Sukarno also suggested alterations to classic pieces to appeal to a wider Indonesian

\textsuperscript{12} Geertz (1984), p.11.
\textsuperscript{13} Ramstedt (1993), p. 72.
\textsuperscript{14} Tenzer (2000), p.94.
audience, such as the dramatic shortening of half hour or hour long pieces to ten minutes\textsuperscript{15}.

Other aspects of national ideology took effect in less direct ways. In general, the classic genres of gamelan music from the court period were discouraged as glorifying the old feudal system, looked down upon from the progressive social democratic standpoint. Likewise, the relatively new \textit{kebyar} genre, born from the common people in the modern era, was prized as an excellent example of populist art. Kebyar's ability to cross over between sacred and secular contexts spoke further to its universal appeal, and government support unequivocally contributed to the acceleration of its secularization\textsuperscript{16}.

In 1962 The Commission for Evaluating and Promoting Culture (LISTIBIYA) was established to "supervise and direct the development of culture and art." This included the creation of awards for artistic achievement, and later the establishment of a Bali-wide gamelan competition and festival\textsuperscript{17}. It was about this time that the first academy of traditional arts was opened in Denpasar, as part of a chain of similar schools opened elsewhere in Indonesia. Over time, the academy became the center of authority on virtually all aspects of Balinese music, a colossal shift from traditional village authority.

Aside from direct mandates, the political climate in the \textit{Orde Lama} led to further politicization of Balinese music. A political divide was growing in Indonesia between the nationalist (PNI) and communist (PKI) parties, and in Bali, organizers from both parties would use gamelan music at rallies and other events, incorporating partisan rhetoric into the performances. Political songs were also included, which, like the nationalist songs

\textsuperscript{15} Tenzer (2000), p. 95.
\textsuperscript{17} Ramstedt (1993), p. 69.
they were based on, were in a western style. Together with the establishment of the national radio station, this brought western music into the ears of Balinese in a present, personal way. By the mid sixties, virtually every aspect of Balinese art was politicized, foreshadowing the chaos that was to come.18

Throughout these early years of Indonesian independence, government ideologies played a significant role in the development of Balinese music. The strong drive for populist art forms contributed to the dominance of kebyar, and the rejection of the past contributed to the near extinction of classic genres of the feudal era. The early establishment of the arts academies and cultural organizations assured the transmission of nationalist sensibilities, and fostered the standardization and secularization of gamelan music. While significant changes took place with the eventual restructuring of power in Indonesia, the Orde Lama left its indelible mark, and established a relationship between the government and Balinese music that largely remains intact today.

The last years of Sukarno’s presidency were marked by rising factionalism within the government and the move to a more autocratic power structure. The two major political parties at the time, the PNI and the PKI, had grown immensely powerful and mutually antagonistic, while elsewhere some sought to secede from the republic. In 1959, after a series of attempted rebellions within Indonesia, Sukarno proclaimed the Manipol-USDEK, a political manifesto that effectively abolished parliamentary democracy. Under the auspices of “guided democracy,” he granted himself greater direct control over the government and a lifetime term extension. The manifesto also included a provision to reinforce Indonesia’s economic autarchy, maintaining an absence of western trade

18 Ibid.: pp. 69-72.
influence. His attempt to centralize authority and therefore alleviate conflict was ultimately unsuccessful, and tensions grew further through the early sixties.

On October 1st 1965, a failed coup attempt by members of the communist party spread a panic throughout Indonesia. Though arguably organized and backed by only a small group, a massive campaign against communist party members was organized by General Suharto, which led to the slaughter of untold thousands all over Indonesia, with estimates of 100,000 killed in Bali alone. Amidst the chaos, Suharto forced Sukarno to hand over control of the government in order to establish peace. Through his control of the military and international support of his anti-communist stance, Sukarno was able to solidify his control and in 1967 became the second president of Indonesia, and his time in power came to be known as the Orde Baru (new order).¹⁹

After the violence died down, Suharno set about to restructure the government in such a way as to prevent future conflicts. He framed the communist uprising as a threat to the principles of the constitution, and stressed stability as the most important goal in securing the country’s future. Ideological and political conflict were seen as the biggest threat to Indonesia, and a policy of “de-emphasizing ideology”²⁰ was adopted. In practice, this involved not only banning communism, but also greatly diminishing the influence of partisan politics. Suharto established a single political party known as the Party of Functional Groups (GOLKAR), which was effectively unchallenged, and was to be representative of unification and cooperation within the government. To this end, a policy of strict media censorship was also applied, deeming critical views of the government to be revolutionary. The enforcement of these new policies was made

possible by the fact that Suharto’s government was one of military rule, himself acting as head of state and the military. Elections were held, but functioned primarily as a ritual symbolizing democracy. GOLKAR’s strict control over the political process and “mensukseskan” (fixing election results) guaranteed that Suharto would remain in power indefinitely. Though a strict regime, a new economic policy including the opening of the country to foreign investment brought rapid economic growth, and as such brought it popular support.

In light of these new ideological developments, the framing of indigenous Indonesian culture was again restructured. The use of cultural expression to represent nationalism was maintained, but as the rest of national discourse was de-politicized, social realism and other styles linked to old communist ideologies were discouraged or banned. Instead of Sukarno’s goal of emphasizing new and universalized forms, Suharto supported the cultivation of individual traditions as unique possessions of Indonesia. This was partially intended to use traditional values to fill in the ideological void left by the disillusion of previously important political ideologies, and to avoid assimilation of ideas from the west.

In Bali, the new arts policy effected music in a number of ways. While operating under general cultural mandates, Bali was given a degree of autonomy in the development of the arts, which led to the emphasis of concerns important to the Balinese. Among these was the desire to strengthen the security of the Hindu religion, which in terms of the arts had been diminished by the drive to nationalize and secularize artistic expression. A seminar was held that expressed this concern, and Balinese performing arts

21 Hooker (1993), pp. 5-6.
were given a three part classification, clearly distinguishing sacred from secular forms and contexts, so as to allow for both profitable public performance (for tourist audiences) and for the preservation of the sanctity of ritual performance. New and purely secular styles were allowed to develop unfettered, and the classic court genres which were virtually extinct by the end of the Sukarno era were restored as important elements of Balinese identity.

Government-supported arts organizations such as LISTIBIYA grew in influence during this time, developing a number of Bali-wide programs designed to bring together artists from around the island. Primary among them was the Bali Arts Festival, held regularly since 1979 at a large complex adjacent to the academy in Denpasar. It showcased traditional and modern performing arts from around Bali as well as elsewhere in Indonesia, and included the final rounds of the Bali-wide gong kebyar competition. This period also saw a growth in influence of the academy, and the opening of a higher level arts school as well.

As part of Suharto’s economic recovery plan, tourism, already an incredibly profitable industry in Indonesia, was energetically developed in ten major areas, Bali primary among them. Since the 1930s, North American and European visitors to Bali had contributed to its allure as an exotic paradise, and since then foreign visitors continually increased in numbers, eventually becoming the island’s biggest source of income. In 1971, The Indonesian Ministry of Tourism held a seminar on “cultural tourism,” a concept that held indigenous culture and arts as the primary attraction to tourists, and supported the development of regional traditions to that end. In Bali, this drive was held as both an economically important concept and an opportunity to strengthen Balinese

identity. In practice though, professional musicians continually adapted their performances to suit tourist audiences, shortening pieces, secularizing important religious rituals, creating aspects to further “exoticize” performance and generally redirecting the values of Balinese music. To this day tourism remains a very powerful force in Bali, and its effects remain a controversial issue among the Balinese as well as to outside observers.

Though Suharto effectively monopolized political power throughout the orde baru, opposing parties existed on a limited level, particularly strongly in Bali, and this led to a new type of politicization of Balinese music. Bakan (1998) conveys one particular instance in which gamelan groups not aligned with the dominant GOLKAR party were discriminated against. In 1992, a gamelan beleganjur (marching gamelan genre) competition was held in which the results were disputed. Judges for this and all other competitions are drawn from full-time government employees, and are expected to make their decisions based on the groups’ quality of performance, as well as to expression of nationalist ideologies. In this particular case, the competition was sponsored by GOLKAR and many of the judges were allied with GOLKAR, but first place was awarded to a group from a region supporting another party. When the results were presented to the GOLKAR committee, they were changed, and another group with stronger allegiance to that party was deemed the winner. Though a minor discrimination on the surface, the importance of competitions for prestige and opportunities for music groups makes this a significant event, one that Bakan suggests is representative of a general trend.

---

The orde baru brought about many changes to the world of Balinese music which had both positive and negative effects. Government influence became more pervasive through the growth of arts institutions, and the development of festivals and the academy system created greater standardization of practice while also strengthening cultural identity. The national development of tourism brought Bali a threat to its musical heritage while at the same time providing great economic growth. While many ideological perspectives on traditional arts had been reversed, the general nationalist trends carried over from the orde lama, and continue to the present.

2.3 The Academy System

The central arts institute in Denpasar, Institut Seni Indonesia, is unquestionably the most influential official force in Balinese music today. Just as the fall of the courts moved the center of musical innovation to the villages, so did the founding of the academies, with the support and resources afforded by the government, move the center of Balinese music to the institution. Tabuh Kreasi, along with other forms of new music, were primarily developed through the second half of the twentieth century in a single physical space by a relatively small number of musicians and composers in positions of power.

As mentioned in the previous section, the first educational arts institution in Bali was KOKAR (Konservatori Karawitan – Conservatory of the Arts, later renamed SMKI), founded in 1959 under the Orde Baru. It was under the direction of the national Ministry of Education and Culture, and was one of a chain of similar arts schools opened up all over Indonesia at this time. Well known musicians were recruited from around Bali to make up the early faculty. After the mass killings in 1965, in which whole villages along
with their gamelan traditions were wiped out, the purpose of the school was seen to be preservation of disappearing classical styles, also threatened by modernization. Learning and rehearsing classical pieces had made up virtually all of the curriculum, and soon the early faculty saw the need for another school with a broader focus.\textsuperscript{27}

ASTI (Akademi Seni Tari Indonesia – Art and Dance Academy of Indonesia) was founded in 1967, a university level institution modeled on similar schools in Java. Its curriculum was structured under the official mandate of the Education ministry for all national institutions, a three-part mission statement known as \textit{Tri Dharma Peguruan Tinggi}, which included learning, research and community service.\textsuperscript{28} The curriculum included a wider range of classes beyond practical musicianship, including courses in theory, composition and field research, sending students to villages to document local traditions. In 1988, ASTI was upgraded to a higher level institution, its name changed to STSI (Sekolah Tinggi Seni Indonesia – Indonesian High School of Art), which expanded its curriculum even further to include courses in music from elsewhere in Indonesia and the West.

Though the authority and perceived significance of the academy grew slowly, today attendance is virtually mandatory for musicians aspiring to professional employment.\textsuperscript{29} Though religious performances continued relatively unchanged at the village level, those with an STSI degree were employed at hotels, chosen for official or government positions and became teachers and music advisors throughout Bali. As local village music organizations began to recognize ASTI's authority while more and more

\textsuperscript{27} Mcgraw (2005), pp.124.
\textsuperscript{28} Heimarck (2003), p.149.
\textsuperscript{29} Tenzer (2000), pp.99-100.
young musicians began attending and becoming indoctrinated into academy perspective, the center of innovation and tradition began to move from villages to the capital. Village gamelans also began retuning their instruments to match that of the academy’s gamelans, and new repertoire that gained the widest distribution came from student and faculty composers.

This ascension of the academy largely aided by the resources afforded to the academy administration by the government. For one, opportunities such as international tours, regulated by the government, were given to the academy over village groups. The academy was also given a large role in organizing the performances for the Bali Arts Festival, and had access to recording companies and radio.

At many levels within the administrative hierarchy, individuals were given the authority to grant these opportunities to specific groups or composers (and ergo, their particular regional styles), which led to the selective promotion of certain styles over others. Mcgraw (2005) describes how relationships between academy directors and prolific composers led to the canonization of their work. According to Mcgraw, Wayan Beratha, an early faculty member at ASTI, maintained close ties with Panji, the director at the time. Beratha’s was given priority for commissions and performance opportunities, and his compositions were taught to all incoming students, and performed at academy events. It was Beratha’s early experimentation with a new structure for Tabuh Kreasi compositions that came to define the genre, through the sheer magnitude of visibility. A similar relationship developed with ASTI’s second director, Made Bandem, and composer Nyoman Windha, whose works were equally elevated to canonical status.31

This is not to diminish the talent of either composer, but to show how the system of support and promotion tremendously expands the influence of a select few.

The academy is unquestionably the center of Balinese music today, in both the creation of new music and in the framing of older forms. With every passing generation, more musicians are brought up with an academy education, universalizing perspective and spreading standard versions of repertoire and style. The resources of the academy and the support of the government have given it a tremendously influential role in guiding the development of new music. For Tabuh Kreasi, it was in the academy's system of influence that it gained the form which it holds today.

2.4 Influence of Foreign Music

2.4.1 Pan-Indonesian music and Musik Kontemporer

The Suharto-era policy of multiculturalism encouraged the promotion of regional traditions, which included the spread of awareness and education in different traditions among different cultures. In Bali, this meant exposure to types of music from elsewhere in Indonesia, primarily Java. From the early days of the academy, Javanese musicians were members of the faculty, and Javanese ensembles were housed on campus. After ASTI was upgraded to a higher level institution (STSI) in 1988, curriculum expanded to include practical and theoretical courses on the music of Sumatra, West Java, Central Java and Lombok to name a few.32 Before this point, since ASTI was initially unqualified to grant high level degrees, many Balinese musicians, largely current or prospective academy faculty members, attended arts schools in Java, and were exposed to not only Javanese academic and theoretical models, but Javanese music as well.

Among other influences imported from Java, a radical new musical form known as *Musik Kontemporer* appeared in the 1970s. In part a reaction to the Suharto government’s stated goal of creating a modern, national Indonesian music, and at least conceptualized as relating to European avante-garde movements, Kontemporer came to encompass a wide range of experimental music practices around Indonesia. The music ranged from freeform improvisations with found instruments to adventurous diversions from classic forms. Ideologies varied as well, and included everything from nihilism to proud cultivation of tradition.\(^{33}\)

In Bali, one of the earlier forums for experimental music was *sendratari*, long form dramatic dance pieces. These were usually very large productions, and composers began using multiple types of gamelans on one stage, or even western instruments such as military drums for dramatic effect. Balinese composers were commissioned to create sendratari initially for festivals in Java, but eventually became common at the Bali Arts festival.

Since the early days of the Academy, composition has been a central component of the curriculum, and musik kontemporer has become a common source of inspiration for student composers. Each year, graduating music and dance students must create a new choreography or composition. In the early 1980s, this often included collaboration with faculty on a large sendratari work. Other faculty members who began composing kontemporer works often drafted their students. Combined with the pressure to innovate, these influences have made academy students plainly aware of musik kontemporer, and many graduate compositions over the last several years have shown its influence.

---

\(^{33}\) Mcgraw (2005), pp.4-7.
In terms of Tabuh Kreasi, this represents an important source of many of the changing textures and structural developments that have appeared in the form since the 1980s. Far more accepting than the very competitive, public setting of the Festival Gong Kebyar, composers at the academy are free to experiment with traditional forms. Both young and old composers alike who later compose Tabuh Kreasi for the festival will incorporate ideas from their Kontemperorer works.\textsuperscript{34} With the academy as a testing ground, and the general acceptance of Kontemperorer as a valid form, experimental modifications to Tabuh Kreasi have been gradually becoming more accepted, changing the face of the music.

2.4.2 Western Influence

The degree of explicit influence of Dutch colonial presence on Balinese music is debatable. While the Dutch presence created the environment in which Gong Kebyar could develop, some think that western orchestral music that they brought with them directly guided the large orchestration and rondo-like form of early Gong Kebyar compositions.\textsuperscript{35} Other early western influences are well documented, such as the role of visiting western artists in creating forms such as kecak in the 1930s, and the development of sandhya gita, multi-part choral arrangements accompanied by gamelan, and played annually at the Festival Gong Kebyar.

It wasn't until the latter quarter of the twentieth century, though, that explicit encounters with western music and musicians began to show their influence on Balinese composition. For one, North American Universities began purchasing gamelan ensembles for ethnomusicology programs, and would commission Balinese musicians to teach in

\textsuperscript{34} Mcgraw(2005), p.111.
\textsuperscript{35} Interview with Wayan Dibia. from Barkin(1991), p.13.
residence for varying lengths of time. Beginning in the 1970s, current or aspiring academy faculty from Bali began seeking degrees at Western universities as well, often supported by these programs. This exposed many influential Balinese to not only western traditions, such as jazz and European Art music, but also music from elsewhere in the world since gamelan, both physically and academically, often shared the same space with African, East Asian or other “world musics” as represented at universities. Paul Humphreys (2001) provides an account of a collaboration with Balinese composer Dewa Putu Beratha (then in residence at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles) on a piece combining Ghanaian Anglo-Ewe drums and Balinese gamelan Angklung. Humphreys introduced the basic cross-rhythmic principles of the Ghanaian music, and Beratha expanded the gamelan orchestration upon them.36 Four years later in Bali, Beratha composed a new piece which exhibited cross rhythm, which he claimed was directly influenced by his collaboration with Humphreys.37 This is one of many examples of the effect of Balinese composers’ experiences abroad.

On the other hand, Western composers traveling to Bali had a different impact. Beginning in the 1980s, western musicians who had been studying in Bali began composing for Balinese Gamelan, working largely within Balinese idioms but bringing their unique perspectives. Among the most notable early western gamelan composers are Michael Tenzer and Wayne Vitale, whose pieces were received warmly, and subsequently distributed on cassette as well as broadcast on TV and radio.38

---

36 Humphreys (2001), pp.6-14.
37 Personal communication with Dewa Putu Beratha, October 5th, 2005.
38 Mcgraw (2005), pp.177-178.
composers have since shown explicit influence of these and other composers, which will be discussed in more detail in section 3.3.3.

Also, at the 1988 upgrade of the academy from an ASTI to a STSI, western music and theory was one of the curriculum additions. This is likely the source of the recent appearance of devices such as canon in recent Tabuh Kreasi, and in some way may also be responsible for the experimentation with polyphonic texture.\(^{39}\) A proud cliché of Balinese culture is the simultaneous openness to new ideas and the steadfast preservation of tradition. Through various sources outside of Bali, new musical ideas and practices have emerged that are increasingly being incorporated into new compositions. Much different than the more open-minded, experimental setting of the academy concert hall, though, Tabuh Kreasi compositions must more sensitively balance tradition and new ideas, as their venue is on stage before a jury and and a screaming audience of thousands.

2.5 The Bali Arts Festival and the Festival Gong Kebyar

The Bali Arts Festival (Pesta Kesenian Bali) was first held in 1979. The governor of Bali at the time was Ida Bagus Mantra, who had previously held the position of Director General of Culture, during which time he had founded arts centers elsewhere in Indonesia. After the construction of the arts complex in Denpasar (adjacent to the new campus of ASTI), the festival was created to give it a purpose.\(^{40}\) It was held annually from mid June to mid July. It was conceived as a special opportunity for artists from around Bali to perform together, and featured all forms of Balinese music, from relatively rare classic forms to experimental komtemporer compositions. It was also an opportunity

\(^{39}\) For more on polyphony in Balinese Music see Peter Steele’s 2007 master’s thesis, University of British Columbia.

for large scale performances, such as *sendratari* works created by academy faculty and students, to gain a larger audience.

The central event of the festival, however, is the *Pesta Gong Kebyar* (Festival Gong Kebyar), a competition between Gong Kebyar groups from each of the nine regencies of Bali. The tradition of competition in the history of Gong Kebyar goes back to its birth in North Bali in the 1910’s, and similar competitions were held on a smaller scale throughout the mid-twentieth century, often sponsored by Dutch administrators. In the late 1960s, the government arts administration LISTIBYA began holding competitions on a Bali-wide scale, in the interest of highlighting reputable groups from different regions, as well as encouraging enthusiasm in less active areas.41

Since 1979, the finalists have faced off on the main stage at the Arts Center in Denpasar. Two regencies’ groups at a time appear on stage, alternating pieces between them “battle of the bands” style, before a panel of judges and an enthusiastic crowd often ballooning past the 6000 seat capacity of the outdoor amphitheater. Though repertoire may vary slightly from year to year, each group is usually expected to prepare four pieces: A *kreasi lelambatan* (new composition in the classical lelambatan style), a Tabuh Kreasi, a sandhya gita (choral arrangement with gamelan accompaniment) and a *tari kreasi* (new dance composition). Omissions/substitutions in recent years include a presentation of a classical dance or a *fragmentari*, a smaller scale dance drama in the tradition of *sendratari* (but no less high-budget).

Each piece is given a score based on a number of criteria. For instrumental compositions, these include those based on quality of composition, such as concept and

---

adherence to formal structure, as well as those based on performance, such as quality of musicianship, playing technique and stage presence (gaya). Dance and dramatic pieces include other criteria such as choreography. The average score of all the pieces together is tallied, and a winner is chosen after the last performance. Results of the festival are often hotly debated, as victory represents a strong point of regional pride among the Balinese.

The jury presiding over the competition is appointed by LISTIBIA, and usually consists primarily of academy faculty, with a selection of respected older generation musicians from different regions. Before the festival, the jury acts as an advisory board for groups in preparation, and visit each in rehearsal to give feedback on the progress of their programs. The makeup of the jury is often blamed for the perceived bias in judgement of the competition. With few exceptions, one of the three regencies with closest ties to the academy, Kodya, Badung and Gianyar, almost always win.

Though other contexts exist, the Festival Gong Kebyar is unquestionably the primary venue for the creation of new Tabuh Kreasi compositions. Besides negotiating the balance between traditional values and the expanse of modern influences on composition, new works must be created for a highly formalized setting under intense scrutiny. This brings a whole new set of priorities into the creative process, not the least of which is to create a piece that will win, serving the role for which they were selected. The following section will address some of these concerns and their perceived effects on Tabuh Kreasi today.

---

42 personal communication with Ketut Gde Asnawa, May 20th, 2008.
2.6 Composers’ Voices: Artistic Challenges of the Festival Setting

While most Balinese composers today see the Festival Gong Kebyar as a positive force in supporting the performing arts, most also have qualms about its effect on artistic freedom and diversity, citing factors such as judgment criteria, favoritism and economic motivations. What follows is an exploration of some of these factors as framed by the perspective of Balinese composers.

Southern Bias and Cultural Homogeneity

Before, there were different regional styles. Gianyar, Tabanan, Singaraja, they were all clearly different. Now they’re almost all the same. Gianyar and Denpasar style spread like a virus. Why? Because they always win the festival. Everybody just wants composers from Gianyar or Denpasar.

- Made Subandi

If [our group] was not representing Gianyar at that time, with new composers and an unknown group, we would not win. It was because of the name of Gianyar that we won. Even if they don’t like the pieces, still, if the players are good and from Gianyar, they will win.

-Wayan Sudirana

An often echoed sentiment, the above quotes represents a perceived bias of the mostly southern Balinese, academy faculty dominated jury, in consistently awarding first place to either Gianyar, Badung or Kodya/Denpasar’s groups. Though this plays out in the Festival Gong Kebyar competition, it is part of a more far-reaching process of homogenizing Balinese music into the Southern style, primarily driven by the primacy of the academy. As described above, the resources of the academy allowed it to widely distribute select repertoire and styles of the faculty, indoctrinating students into the southern style as well. With the festival, however, the favoritism towards southern regencies is much more active and apparent. In the high-stakes battle for regional pride, other regions of Bali go to lengths to adjust instruments, playing techniques and importing composers to satisfy southern tastes.

43 Personal communication, August 1st, 2007.
44 Personal communication, August 24th, 2008.
Others, less critical of the unchallenged domination of southern regencies, cite the greater degree of activity in the south, particularly Gianyar, where a greater degree of musical activity (including for both ritual and tourist performance).\textsuperscript{45} Regencies such as Buleleng, the birthplace of Gong Kebyar, have a struggling economy and players have fewer opportunities to pursue music professionally. Others, such as Jembrana in the remote west, have less of a history with Gong Kebyar, as well as fewer Kebyar groups and musicians, and are consistently ranked poorly in the competition. In the interest of Bali-wide unity, however, they are expected to continue to participate.

As part of a larger system of homogenization, the perceived bias among the jury for the Festival Gong Kebyar represents a significant influence on new composition. Not only are older regional styles being slowly dissolved, but these regional styles are being discouraged from contributing to the development of new music. Though various government programs in Bali are supporting regional arts groups, the bias in the festival continues to insinuate the superiority of the south.

The Advisory Process

We [the advisory board] never tell them what structure to use. New kreasi can be anything, but composers automatically put a good structure. All the triangga form is still there. But now you can buy “makeup” anywhere, because there’s a lot of stuff to add. And maybe they can adopt some concepts from different music, western music, counterpoint, chord, whatever. We’ll say “this part is too long, the genderan is too crowded, gong structure is strange, change that.” We also ask about the theme, about what the composer wants to say. We have a dialogue with the composer.

- Ketut Gde Asnawa\textsuperscript{46}

What is the difference between Tabuh Kreasi and Kontemperor? Why do they make a difference like that? So they can control it. They come to the village and change the piece. Change this, change that, I’m the biggest one, I’m the best one, like that.

- Dewa Ketut Alit\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45} Personal communication with Wayan Sudirana; August 24\textsuperscript{th}, 2008.
\textsuperscript{46} Personal communication, May 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2008.
\textsuperscript{47} Personal communication, July 31\textsuperscript{st}, 2007.
When I composed for Karangasem, They said, “ah, I can’t sense the structure, its too new.” “where is the gegenderan? Where is the pengawak? Its very blurred.” They asked me to change it but I just leave it because I believed that I won’t get first place. Gianyar always gets first place. The community there supported me, because they knew they wouldn’t get the prize.
-Wayan Sudirana

Every composer of Tabuh Kreasi for the festival I spoke with has had qualms with the advisory board system. For months before the final competition at the festival, jury members visit groups in their home regencies, and provide feedback on the progress of the rehearsals. This often involves suggestions on improving formal structure or in simplifying sections considered too modern. While there is no explicit enforcement, composers are usually expected to take the advice of the jury. Even beyond judgment at the competition itself, this is an even more active form of external control over Tabuh Kreasi composition.

The Pressure to win

I’m happiest when I have artistic freedom. But I’m scared, because of the group I’m composing for, because of Gianyar, because of the government. They just want the championship. But if given the opportunity, I want to challenge, to be different.
-Made Subandi

I tried to combine kebyar and slendro gamelan from North Bali. But because of the criteria, I had to change it. The leader of the ministry of culture said to me, “this piece is not for you, but for the state!”
-Dewa Ketut Alit

I work not just for me, and not just for the audience. Because the role is to get the winner!
-Nyoman Windha

Despite the degree to which composers appreciate the advice of the jury or care about the outcome of the competition, there is a general feeling of responsibility for serving the group that commissioned them. The Festival Gong Kebyar, at least among regencies thought to have a chance at winning, represents an important point of regional

48 Personal communication, August 24th, 2008.
49 Personal communication, August 1st, 2007.
50 Personal communication, July 31st, 2007.
51 Personal communication, August 1st, 2007.
pride. As described by Subandi above, every level from the performing group to the regional government has a stake in the success of the composition, which further effects the priorities of the composer.

**The Pressure to Innovate**

I don’t like that gong kebyar competes every year. That’s a lot of pressure for composers. They’re not pure ideas. I hope The Bali Arts Festival will only be every two years. You need a long time to think about what you’re going to do. But, this is bad for business people. They want the festival to be all the time.

-Ketut Gde Asnawa\(^{52}\)

The composers are sometimes displeased as well, since they may run out of creative ideas. In the beginning they may come up with something every year, but eventually they will not be able to come up with something, and our audience always expects something new. Some of the [tabuh kreasi gong] kebyar remains, but only the best - the pieces that are performed alot right after the first performance and that other groups learn. But usually if you ask the composer a few years later what they did, they have forgotten. It isn't like what we did with Beratha in those early years.

-Nyoman Sumandhi\(^{53}\)

Personally, you know, for economic and tourism reasons, its good to have the festival every year, but its better to have every two years, so we have more time to prepare. I remember how unprepared every regency is every year, because once the festival is finished in July, they start right again preparing. Before the festival, there are months of preliminary competitions and regional festivals. That’s why tabuh kreasi is so monotonous. Its just copy, paste. It would be better if it was every five years if you really think about it. But its good for tourism. If only every five years, the hotel owners will be complaining.

-Wayan Sudirana\(^{54}\)

The swift pace of development and change within new Tabuh Kreasi compositions is a point of concern for traditionalists. While criteria and advisors continually seek to keep new music within traditional boundaries, the expectation of innovation every year is nonetheless driving Tabuh Kreasi into more and more experimental realms. This also decreases the significance of compositions beyond their first performance as they are soon out of date, and many are never played again after the festival. Despite these concerns and complaints of composers, the more popular of whom

\(^{52}\) Personal communication, May 20\(^{th}\), 2008.
\(^{54}\) personal communication, August 24\(^{th}\), 2008.
are asked to compose for years at a time without a break, the festival and the gong kebyar competition continues on its annual schedule for a number of reasons.

For many artists and performing groups, the Bali Arts Festival is one of the best performance opportunities they have available, whether from remote regions or practicing uncommon musical types. With the funding made available, the frequency of the festival helps preserve arts activity that would likely otherwise fade. As mentioned in the quotes above, however, the most likely reason that the festival will continue to be an annual affair is its economic impact. The festival is held in high tourist season, and draws many tourists from Java and abroad. The festival grounds are overcrowded with food stalls and merchants as well, and represents an important boost for the local economy.

There have been recent signs, however, that at least the Gong Kebyar competition may begin to be held less frequently, addressing the concerns mentioned above. In both 2006 and 2008, Tabuh Kreasi were not part of the prepared repertoire for the competition. In 2008, the criteria called for the preparation of Tabuh Kreasi more than five years old, in the interest of canonizing the best pieces from the recent past, most of which are quickly forgotten.

The preceding discussion has been an attempt to illustrate the multi-faceted environment in which new Tabuh Kreasi are composed in Bali today. Composers must work in a system dominated by the governmentally supported academy perspective, and further compose in a competitive setting, balancing a myriad of pressures and responsibilities. What follows is a discussion of the music itself, and a view into how these factors play out on the creative stage.
3 ANALYSIS

3.1 Selected Repertoire and Analytical Format

The purpose of this section is to show how Tabuh Kreasi has developed in the past two decades within the environment and spheres of influence described above. In the early days of the academy, senior faculty member Wayan Beratha began composing Tabuh Kreasi that brought together many streams of influence at the time, creating a simple formal structure that set it apart from the diverse and sometimes unwieldy nature of the earlier “no rules” kreasi. Due to Beratha’s influential position at the academy, his pieces were distributed throughout the island, through commercial recordings, radio, regular performance at the arts festival and as standard academy repertoire. Virtually all Tabuh Kreasi after this point, particularly those featured at the Festival Gong Kebyar, were composed in this style.

This is the largest single pivot point in the history of the form. Before this time, the variety of tabuh kreasi styles were largely based on regional village tradition, and borrowing from idioms of other styles, particularly Gong Kebyar dance repertoire. Since Beratha’s innovation, composers have seldom strayed from the core model, but have gradually stretched its identity, augmenting it with features from a new generation of influence. This occurred at a time when the academy’s musical authority was being solidified, and is one of the clearest examples of institutional factors effecting musical form in Bali.

The following analysis is in two parts. First, I will focus on one of Beratha’s seminal Tabuh Kreasi compositions that defined the form. I will use it to identify the core progression of sections, their specific textures and internal melodic repeat structures.
Preceding this I will include a selection of earlier pieces to contextualize the sensibilities of Beratha’s form. The second part is the core of this paper, an analysis of 21 pieces dating from 1988 to 2007. Here I will highlight developments in the basic 4-part Tabuh Kreasi structure, illustrating the emergence of new features and the expansion or disappearance of older ones.

**Selected Repertoire**

In the early stages of formulating this analysis, I began with a basket full of 25 cassette tapes I purchased from one of Bali’s largest record labels, aptly named Bali Record. These tapes comprised 25 volumes of a series called *Peliahan Terbaik: Kreasi Gong Kebyar* (greatest hits of Kreasi Gong Kebyar), each one containing a selection of four regencies’ Tabuh Kreasi from that year’s festival. Augmented with personal recordings from the 2007 festival, I was left with 107 pieces. Regrettably, I was not able to include them all in this analysis, but features of this larger collection deserve mention. Primarily, it is important to note that certain regencies are disproportionately represented, namely Kodya (city of Denpasar), Badung and Ginayar, those that seldom fail to rank in the top three in the Festival Gong Kebyar. These regencies are said to have the best players generally, but they are also those closest to Denpasar, ergo the government, academy and record company itself. Of 107 pieces total, nearly half are from among these three regencies. I am not suggesting that their preferential placement in this anthology is due primarily to some behind the scenes nepotism rather than skill and popularity, but certainly that it enhances the exposure and influence of composers and groups from these regencies.
Of these 107 pieces, I chose a manageable 21, one from each year from 1988 to 2005 and three from 2007. I tried to represent a diversity of regencies and composers, and also to include particularly influential works. I also tried to select pieces that suggest the staggered pace of innovation, with some composers sticking to conservative forms long after the first appearances of later ubiquitous elements. I present them chronologically, and with the extra emphasis on 2007, I hope create a more detailed picture of Tabuh Kreasi today.

**Analytical Format**

My analytical model is a simple vertical timeline, adapted from that used by Tenzer (2000). It functions as a map, outlining the sequence of melodic cycles, unmetered kebyar passages and other types of sections, primarily highlighting melody length and texture sequence. Appendix A defines abbreviations used and outlines the basic analytical method. The purpose of using this type of analysis is to focus on how the core identity of individual sections moved away from Beratha’s format, through processes such as increasing length and complexity of melodies and supplanting textural uniformity with variety.

Balinese musicians and Western Bali scholars alike would likely cite melody as the most essential element of a new piece, and some might consider surface texture as the byproduct of deeper processes. Bearing that in mind, this type of analysis indeed overlooks melodic construction and innovation within elaboration types. I also abstain from discussing the material of transitions or kebyar passages. I mention these oversights to clarify the scope of this analysis.

---

55 Newly composed Tabuh Kreasi were not part of the Festival Gong Kebyar in 2006 and 2008.
I present almost all of the 21 modern Tabuh Kreasi as adhering to a four-part model, consisting of Gineman, Gegenderan, Bapang and Pengecet sections. Terminology regarding Tabuh Kreasi form has varied in the past, but in current academy discourse it is most often framed in the three-part *triangga* form of classical genres. This form consists of a vague structure of *kawitan* (introductory section), *pengawak* (slow, central section usually consisting of a longer melody) and *pengecet* (faster concluding section). By this standard, the gineman and gegenderan together comprise the kawitan, the bapang functions as pengawak and the pengecet stays the same.\(^{56}\) This is less a technical model than an ideological one, and for the sake of comparison, I will discuss the gineman and gegenderan separately, as they each, along with the other two sections, consist of independent, definitive material.

This style of analysis is well suited to revealing basic elements of earlier Kreasi, usually exhibiting short sequences of repeated melodies, but it becomes more unwieldy with modern compositions, particularly those of the last ten years. This is not just because of dissolving adherence to the basic form, but for the fact that much of the innovative material has appeared beyond the structure of melodic and textural sequences, as new takes on classic elaboration, harmonic expansion, extended playing techniques and metric devices to name a few. In a concluding section, it will suffice to describe some of these elements and take stock of their promulgation.

---

\(^{56}\) Harnish (2001) p.17.
3.2 Origins of Tabuh Kreasi Form

3.2.1 Early Tabuh Kreasi

According to Ornstein (1971), by the 1930s there were four distinct categories of composition for the Gong kebyar, including instrumentals, short dances, extended pieces and lyrical compositions. The first two were apparently interchangeable, indicating that early instrumental works, the precursors to Tabuh Kreasi, developed alongside and in mutual influence with the needs of dance accompaniment. Bearing this in mind, early dance pieces such as Teruna Jaya likely represent the earliest format of Tabuh Kreasi. Some of the earliest surviving recordings of Balinese music were made my Colin McPhee in the 1928, and among these is a Tabuh Kreasi called Kebyar Ding (appendix B), as performed by the southern Bali village of Belaluan. This piece serves as an example of one of the first explicitly instrumental Kebyar compositions, and shows the basic method by which they were constructed.

In essence, Kebyar Ding (named for its starting pitch) is a series of repeating cyclic melodies of various styles separated by passages of kebyar texture, the central identifying feature of the new Gong Kebyar ensemble. At this early point, though, these classic devices were already being altered and recombined in unique ways. For example, section IV opens with a passage in the style of the topeng masked dance genre, followed by a clearly pelegongan derived melody elaborated with the nyog cag elaboration style of pegongan.

---

Each individual section is begun and concluded by a kebyar passage, and they bear no explicit relation to one another. Sections as named\textsuperscript{58} indicate certain textures, gong cycles or other classic idioms they exhibit, including Batel (a short traditional gong cycle type), Oncang-Oncangan (an antiquated name for nyog cag style kotekan) and surapati (strong/heroic character type)\textsuperscript{59}. Certain structural features, though, show the influence of the classic three-part triangga form, and foreshadow how later compositions would handle it. Though the multiplicity of sections cannot constitute a representation of the classic model, the opening and closing sections, even if in name only, show a connection. The opening section, simply called “kebyar”, parallels the more free form nature of opening kawitan of classical genres (though broadly), as well as what would be the hallmark introductory material of later compositions. The final section “pengawak and pengecet”, lumped together and brief compared to classic counterparts, may suggest how the long, slower melody section common to classic pengawak (usually the middle section) transfer into the pengecet in later Kreasi. Though this piece alone as an example cannot represent the scope of the variety of pieces composed at this time, it serves to show the basic “patchwork” form of early kreasi, as well as the diversity and antiquity of its elaboration types.

By the 1950s, while long form compositions were still common, a shorter Tabuh Kreasi style had appeared that began to show characteristics that would later define core features of the four part model. Appendix B shows four pieces in this style, two from the Central Bali village of Peliatan and two composed by Wayan Beratha of Belaluan (South Bali). Though varying in internal structure, they all consist of two primary sections: A

\textsuperscript{58} Section names as listed in the liner notes. Sections were presented (and almost certainly recorded) as separate tracks, accounting for the individual timelines.

\textsuperscript{59} Personal communication with Wayan Sudirana,
long sequence of fragmented instrument solos, Kebyar passages and short kotekan, followed by a concluding cyclic melody.

The opening passages of Kapi Raja, Swa Bhuana Paksa and Jaya Semara are all similar to what would become the opening *gineman* section of later Tabuh kreasi, consisting primarily of kebyar passages and reyong and gangsa solos. Hujan Mas, on the other hand, exhibits a first section dominated by gangsa, primarily short kotekan passages. Jaya Semara, though, one of Beratha’s early pieces, shows the closest resemblance to the opening of the form he would later define, in that it includes many gangsa solo passages, combined with kebyar and reyong passages.

The basic cycles which conclude these four pieces also anticipate conventions of later Tabuh Kreasi form in different ways. Hujan Mas, for example, has a short melody repeated at length, with an alternating sequence of textures (mainly gangsa and reyong/kendang), the basic format of the *bapang* section in the four part form described below. These sections are also linked in that they are both the first appearance of a gong cycle in their respective structures. Kapi Raja and Jaya Semara also share the basic short repeating melody cycle, though they exhibit uniform elaboration. These pieces were a step in the direction of simplifying and tightening up a basic form for Tabuh Kreasi, and showed basic features that were later expanded upon by Beratha.
3.2.2 Wayan Beratha's Tabuh Kreasi Form

Kosalia Arini (appendix B) was one of Beratha’s first compositions to exhibit the structure that would become the standard in Tabuh Kreasi. Unlike the sequence of kebyar passages and cyclic melodies of Kebyar Ding, or the long unmetered kebyar followed by a concluding cycle of 50’s kreasi, it consisted of four well defined sections. I will use the following analysis of this piece to establish the model by which compositions in the next section will be measured.

For the most part, this form consists of previously existing material arranged in a novel way, but adhering in principle to classic 3-part triangga structure. Texturally, one of the largest disconnects from early kebyar is in the absence of characteristic textures used in dance compositions, among them the norot style of reyong elaboration. Also, there is more uniformity of texture, in that as opposed to dance influenced early Kreasi, individual sections last longer maintaining their definitive texture (or sequence thereof in the Bapang), giving a greater sense of continuity. This can be seen as a classicizing of a style that was previously to highlight discontinuity and virtuosity as novelty.

The opening Gineman\(^60\) section stood apart from the explosive kebyar introductions of earlier Tabuh Kreasi and Kebyar dance compositions. Here, the gangska section alone plays a series of disjunct passages separated by pauses similar to classic kebyar, but markedly different without the full texture of the gamelan. It includes unison passages as well as short interlocking kotekan passages. Similar passages will henceforth be referred to as gangska kebyar [Gkeb].

\(^{60}\) one of a number of acceptable names for the opening section, borrowed from jelambatan repertoire. Also acceptable is kebyar, indicating the primary texture of this section, and kawitan, from the classical 3 part formula.
At 1:45 is the sole, brief appearance of full kebyar texture [Tkeb, tutti kebyar], quickly followed by a return to Gkeb, which includes brief solo passages by the two bass melody instruments calung and jegogan. Next is a short suling flute solo [Ssul., sesulingan], and the gineman is concluded with a short Gkeb here referred to as *gegenderan prep*, which briefly suggests the melody of the following *gegenderan* section, a common convention in later pieces. Including two textures here absent, the kendang solo [kndg] and reyong solo [ryng, reyongan], these are the essential building blocks of the gineman sections in Tabuh Kreasi to follow. Dominated by the Gkeb, this is primarily a solo showcase of different instrument sections and textures.

The next section is the *gegenderan*. Its name is taken from the classic gender wayang ensemble which accompanies the Balinese shadow play, and is, in its simplest form as presented in this piece, a direct transfer of the melodies and interlocking figurations of that style, played by the gangsa and melody sections. In this case, it consists of a four beat melody repeated eight times and a four beat transition, followed by the same 4x8+4 melody and figuration transposed up one scale tone(Ax8, B, A’x8, B’). These two alternate twice and the *gegenderan* is concluded with a short Tkeb and reyong solo. This is one of a myriad of standard gender wayang idioms, and subsequent as well as contemporary compositions draw on others for their *gegenderan*. The function of this section is primarily to highlight the *kotekan* skill of the gangsa players.

After the short Tkeb, reyongan transition, the *bapang* begins, named for the short, repeating gong cycle that plays throughout. It begins with a long kendang solo, harkening

---

61 bearing in mind the transposition from the slendro scale of the gender wayang to the selisir scale of the gong kebyar.
62 Tenzler cites gamelan *gandrung* as one of the other classic ensembles borrowed from for creating *gegenderan* (2000-p.369)
back to Beratha’s Swa Bhuana Paksa a decade earlier. This is followed by an 8 beat
melody (matching the 8 beat gong cycle) repeated 21 times. Over this cycle a sequence of
solos by different instruments plays out, primarily reyong, playing kiletan figuration
[reykil] and kendang, with brief gangsa passages. The section is concluded with a Gkeb,
Tkeb transition. The core identifying feature of the bapang here is the texture sequence
over a repeating melody. Though the bapang of later tabuh kreasi is often the first section
to exhibit experimentation, this basic format maintains.

The piece is concluded with the pengecet section, at a slower tempo than the
bapang. Much like the simple alternating structure of the gegenderan, it consists of the
alternation of two repeating 8 beat melodies, each with a 8 beat transition (Ax6+8,
Bx6+8). The texture here is gangsa kotekan with reyong kiletan, but in the distinct style
of the classic gamelan gambang. The regularity with which this type of elaboration
appeared in this section of kreasi at the time meant it was often referred to as gambangan.
Though the explicit gambang style is not an essential aspect of later pengecet, the basic
texture of kot/reykil maintains. The piece is concluded with a short Tkeb.

While Kosalia Arini was a colossally influential piece and largely representative
of the emerging Tabuh Kreasi dogma at the time, it should not be seen as the singular
origin of the form. Beratha’s piece a year earlier, Palguna Warsa, as well as
contemporary pieces exemplify some core elements missing in Kosalia Arini that would
later show up as standard. This example suffices, though, to provide the basic picture of
the form.
3.3 Selected Tabuh Kreasi: 1988-2007

The time period in question begins twenty years after Beratha composed Kosalia Arini, and about ten years after the Festival Gong Kebyar began occurring regularly. Most of the composers now were academy graduates. Though at a staggered pace, strict adherence to Beratha’s form was already disappearing by the late 1980s, through the increasing appearance of small deviations from standard practice in elaboration, and the general rise in complexity of melodies.

Since that time, the move towards complexity has continued, and a new generation has appeared, drawing influence from modern sources such as music kontemporer. Perhaps oversimplifying slightly, the past 20 years of festival Tabuh Kreasi can be seen as a history of gimmicks, of small innovations gradually sprinkled in by composers year by year, enough to stand out but not so much as to displease the generally conservative jury. Some, though, threw caution to the wind and created completely radical works, often to the distress of the older generation. A daring section of a piece approved of by the jury will likely pop up the next year in one or more other composers’ Tabuh Kreasi. This explicit borrowing was standard practice among composers through the 20th century, and creates an environment in which snippets of melodies, elaboration patterns or even entire sections appear in multiple pieces. This tradition, combined with the pressure of the festival to innovate year by year has fostered a rapid pace of innovation marked by the embrace of wholly modern conventions. Tabuh Kreasi composed today, so stacked with new features born in just the last several years, bear an ever fading resemblance to those of the 1960s and 70s.
The first few years represented in this analysis, the late 80s through the late 90s, show a more or less loyal adherence to Beratha’s form. As more new musical conventions moved into the realm of acceptable through the late 90s and 2000s, many of the rules that had defined the form became obscured. I will divide my analysis into these two time periods, in each focusing primarily on individual sections. It is important to keep in mind that this selection of pieces is intended to represent a microcosm of the whole repertoire of festival compositions through this time period, and that while particularly influential pieces may have been overlooked, these serve to show general trends over this period of time. Structural outlines of all pieces to be discussed are in Appendix C, listed chronologically and cited by date.

3.3.1 1988-1998

Gineman

The Gineman through this period maintained the most static structure of all the sections, closely resembling that of Kosalia Arini as well as each other. This consists of an interplay between Gkeb with short kotekans, Tkeb, kendang solos, reyong solos and sesulingan solos. The first modification that begins to appear is a lengthening of kotekan passages, which for the most part seldom lasted more than a few beats, falling more into the Gkeb category. This is the first sign of what would later become a standard practice: inclusion of long, pulsed melodies with full instrumentation. Jagra Parwatha (1991), has a 66 beat kotekan after the initial Gkeb, longer by far by the kotekan fragments of the three earlier pieces in the selection. The piece from the following year, Ocak Prawerti (1992) shows the first inclusion of the gongs in a 32 beat kotekan. Lebur Saketi (1995), a radical piece on all fronts, has two longer passages with full instrumentation, including gong
cycle, kendang, gangsakotekan and reyong. While Tkeb sections exhibit this full texture, these longer pulsed melodies, usually withheld until later sections, represent a new allowance within the Gineman, largely the realm of short solos by different instrument groups. The final three pieces in examined in this time period exhibit either extended kotekan (Grening Parwata and Gora Mantik) or full texture passages (Jengah Erang).

Another uniform characteristic of the Gineman is the transition to the Gegenderan (gegenderan prep). This consists of a short quote of the gegenderan melody, almost always preceded by a sesulingan solo. Two pieces show unique takes on this device. In Jagra Parwatha (1991), the A section of the gegenderan is played in full once through, but without the kempli (beat keeper), and with staggered entrance of the kotekan and reyong elaboration. The gineman of Gora Mantik (1997), fairly conservative in other sections, concludes with a slow, independent 32 beat melody repeated twice. Though in a position of specific transitional function, these extended sections represent another move towards the inclusion of longer, more stable passages in the Gineman.

**Gegenderan**

More than the gineman, the gegenderan section during this time shows more development away from convention, particularly melody length, sequential repeat structure and textural uniformity. Like Kosalia Arini, most of this period’s melodies draw on idioms of gender wayang repertoire, but gradually begin to show a greater variety of types. The A section of Danu Giri (1988)’s gegenderan, though 64 beats long, is made up three smaller segments, exhibiting two levels of the classic internal repeat structure of “AAB”. This consists of an 8 beat melody repeated once followed by a transitional 8 beat melody. Next, the melody, slightly modified, is transposed up a scale degree, and the 24
beat unit is repeated. After this is a unique 16 beat transitional melody. Therefore, this section can be represented as “A(aab)A'(aab)B. This section is repeated three times, followed by a short transition and part 2 of the gegenderan, with a similar repeat structure of A(aab)A'(aab).

Kembang Ceraki (1989) shows another classic repeat structure. Here a short 8 beat melody is repeated six times for a total of 48 beats, followed by a 24 beat transition, which in terms of beat proportion matches the 2:1 ratio of the first section of Danu Giri. The second section shows a similar parallel, with a 12 beat melody repeated 4 times for a total of 48 beats, the same proportion as section 2 of Danu Giri (A,A').

These simple internal repeat structures remain the basis of individual sections within the gegenderan to the present. In terms of sequence of sections, however, the two examples above represent the middle ground between the simplicity of Kosalia Arini and the variety of later Tabuh Kreasi. Kosalia Arini exhibited just a single type of melodic rhythm, a four beat melody, followed by its transposition up a scale degree. Danu Giri’s first section was similar, but includes a second area with a contrasting melodic rhythm and internal repeat structure. The two sections of Kembang Ceraki, though both based on multiple repeats of shorter melodies, have different melody lengths (8 and 12), and in the transitions exhibit longer sections of continuous melody.

The pieces in the selection following those described above show even greater quantities of individual sections with unique melody lengths and melodic rhythms, as well as longer continuous melodies. The first section of Paksi Ngelayang (1990) is 89 beats long, and with the exception of a short opening melody segment, there are no repeats. The two sections of Ocak Prawerti (1992) are 33 and 78 beats respectively with
no internal repeats, though as they repeat individually (AAABB), they can be seen as an elongation of shorter sectional repeats from earlier pieces. Among other sections, Jengah Erang (1998) includes a 71 beat melody devoid of repetition. Ombak Ing Segara (1993) and Grehing Parwata (1996), on the other hand, exhibit long chains of shorter repeated melodies and (aab) structures, each unrelated motivically, and are also devoid of larger sectional repeats. Increasingly towards the late 1990s, the pieces in this period combine these features in various ways, resulting in more discontinuous geger dan.

The most noticeable textural development to occur during this time is the inclusion of reyong in the geger dan which, to this point, was by definition solely the showcase of kotekan played by the gangs sa section. This first appears as a short 16 beat passage in Jagra Parwatha (1991), and soon becomes a regular occurrence, present in four of the subsequent seven selected pieces through the 1990s, and is virtually ubiquitous in the 2000s. The appearance of reyong did not effect form, however, as it usually supplanted the kotekan for a short section of the melody.

Beat continuity, another definitive aspect of the geger dan, was also disrupted in a number of pieces. With the exception of occasional beat skipping and asymmetric meters (common in gender wayang repertoire), geger dan usually maintained a fixed tempo, kept by the unflinching kempli. Dwaja Ujuwala is the first piece to exhibit a pause in the geger dan, here a brief gesture functioning cadentially just before the final few beats of the conclusion. Lebur Saketi (1995) presents a wholly different beat disruption, where the kempli abruptly drops and a sesulingan solo appears (D), followed by a short Gkeb. Next is a short repeating melody exhibiting a unique interplay of kotekan and reyong kiletan, together comprising a transitional section before subsequently returning
to the beginning of the gegenderan. Jengah Erang (1997) has a similar breakdown, here consisting solely of an extended sesulingan solo.

**Bapang**

The bapang though this period largely maintains its basic structural identity, but melody length and sequence develop in much the same way as the gegenderan. Recalling Kosalia Arini, the basic formula consisted of a short melody repeated continuously as a sequence of different textures play over it, primarily consisting of kotekan, reyong kiletan and kendang with ocak-ocakan This most basic indication remains at the core of bapang today. As melodies became longer, regular textural sequence remained, but instead of changing with each repetition of a shorter melody, they would change within a single melody.

The first three pieces in this selection represent three different approaches to melodic sequence common to this period. Danu Giri (1988) is the most traditional, consisting of a single 16 beat melody repeated 25 times, alternating between kotekan and kiletan/kendang textures. Kembang Ceraki (1989) has two longer melodies of 32 and 80 beats, repeated once and twice respectively, alternating between kotekan and ocak-ocakan within each. Paksi Ngelayang has three repeating melodies of increasing length; 4, 16 and 32 beats, each exhibiting uniform textures(ocak-ocakan, kotekan, ocak-ocakan).

Structural variety was achieved through modifications of melody length and number. Later pieces began taking these two to the extreme. Gerhing Parwata (1996) began with a repeated 12 beat melody, but its second half is 187 beats with only small internal repeats. Lebur Saketi (1995) was similarly through composed, with only two short melody segments repeating once each in the total 303 beats of the bapang. Starting
with Lebur Saketi there was also an almost immediate disappearance of sequential repeats, meaning that a sequence of melodies, repeated or not, comprising the whole or large part of the bapang would not be repeated, as all bapang before this were.

Aside from the gradual melodic expansion taking place, the most significant innovation to appear in bapang sections during this period was ternary meter, traditionally absent from virtually all Balinese music. First appearing in this selection in the piece Ombak Ing Segara (1993), this new metric realm not only presented a novel new gong cycle, but it also called for completely new takes on all forms of elaboration, including kotekan, reyong kiletan and kendang patterns. The bapang of Gerhing Parwata (1996) and Gora Mantik (1997) both included ternary gong cycles, and forshadowed experimentation with other asymmetric bapang meters throughout the early 2000s.

**Pengecet**

The pengecet of Kosalia Arini and other contemporary kreasi were primarily derivative of gamelan *gambang*, with its particular elaboration type played on the reyong. By the 1990s, the explicit gambangan elaboration is not apparent, but the texture of reyong kiletan and gangsa playing melody, juxtaposed with ocak-ocakan passages, is maintained in the first seven pieces of the selection for this period. Danu Giri (1988) is the only piece to show classic pengecet style, with gambang style kiletan, as well as a long kendang solo, harkening back to 1950s kreasi. Another notable texture standard by this time is kotekan played by the *kantilan*, the four higher octave gangsas, a convention that continues to the early 2000s.

From the late 80s, the pengecet exhibited the longest continuous melodies of all the sections, and with varying inclusion of repeated melodic segments, this section,
formally and texturally, remained largely uniform through the 90s. Among notable exceptions is Ombak Ing Segara (1993), which includes an opening 24 beat ternary melody (connecting thematically to the piece’s ternary bapang), as well as a central break, followed by an unpulsed suling solo. The latter also appears in Lebur Saketi (1995). Sequential repeat structure is uniform throughout the selected pieces from this period, in that the pengecet is repeated verbatim in all but one (Lebur Saketi).

This period of the late 1980s through the late 1990s, as represented by these eleven pieces, shows a staggered but steady development away from the basic structure of Wayan Beratha’s Tabuh Kreasi form. Each section began to include new or expanded textures, and there was a steady rise in length and complexity of melodies in all sections. Already in a new realm, the drive to innovate saw composers in the 2000s pushing the boundaries of the form even further.

3.3.2 1999-2007

The past decade of Tabuh Kreasi is characterized by a greater increase in experimental textures and the solidification of certain sectional additions that had already begun to appear. Particularly adventurous innovations in the 90s would usually appear locally within an otherwise conservatively structured section, highlighting its novelty and giving the piece a token of individuality. Those from this period, however, began occurring simultaneously and in great number within a single composition, ever clouding the characteristic textural and formal qualities of Kreasi since the late 60s.

This time period also exhibits the emergence of a younger generation of composers. While some regencies continued to commission works by prolific well known composers (such as Nyoman Windha in Gianyar), others, particularly Kodya (Denpasar),
began giving recent academy graduates the opportunity, and still other more marginalized regencies imported young composers from South and Central Bali. Many of the older generation had by this point spent time abroad, and along with the younger generation had experimented with music kontemporer.

It is more difficult to represent the scope of compositions in the 2000s with a small sample of pieces, as experimentation is more diverse. It is also difficult to separate out sections, as they are more connected within a piece than in the past, usually by a particular feature or sometimes a theme. I will discuss some pieces in detail, but for the most part stay focused on sectional developments.

Gineman

The core identity of the gineman as a series of fragmented instrument solos has remained the dominant feature of the section, and with three exceptions in this selection, pieces still largely begin with a Gkeb. However, the emerging practice in the 90s of including a full, densely textured extended melody or cycle has become nearly ubiquitous, often making up more than half the length of the gineman. Jati (2000) includes first a short, repeating melody with kotekan and kiletan elaboration, followed by a slow melody dominated by suling, evoking the feeling of a classical pengawak section, and finally a fast melody with ocak-ocakan, creating through suggestion of triangga structure, a self contained piece in miniature. Maskumambang (2007) is simpler in structure, with just a single repeated 8 beat melody following a conservative opening, but unlike the straightforward elaboration used in Jati, there is a cornucopia of new devices used: the melody section plays independent lines in polyrhythm, the suling plays a 48

---

63 Three young members of the well known Cudamani arts collective of Pengosekan in Gianyar have composed Tabuh Kreasi for three different regencies in the last several years: Wayan Sudirana for Tabanan (2003), Dewa Made Suparta for Buleleng (2002) and Dewa Putu Rai for Bangli (2007).
beat melody over the cycle in a different mode than the standard *selisir* tuning of the gamelan.\(^{64}\)

Other composers opt for simpler cycles or to forgo them all together in favor of experimenting within the more classic fragmented passages of the gineman. Waskita (2005) uses passages of canon-like instrument entrances as well as a uniquely sharp, stacatto playing technique in Gkeb and Tkeb sections, and is lacking an extended melody or cycle. Two years later, Bhara Duaja (2007) and Canda Klang (2007) both exhibit variations on the stacatto playing technique, and have relatively short, simply elaborated cycles. Finally, Kuda Mandara Giri (2002), which uses *kocok* bamboo rattles throughout the piece, includes a series of solo passages of *kocok* playing, with an otherwise straightforward fragmented gineman.

The diverse approaches described above in developing the gineman section represent an important relationship between experimental textures or devices and structure. Among these examples, the degree of structural complexity is inversely proportional to the amount of textural innovation; that is, one is simplified to highlight the other. As this is in effect in other sections as well, this marks a distinctly new structural indicator, unique to a time when radical textures and novel devices are the norm.

It is important to note, though, that still other pieces show general disregard for balance or restraint, developing gineman almost beyond recognition. Most extreme in this case is Sruti Laya (1999) by Wayan Gde Yudane. Yudane, of the older generation (that of Windha, Widia, Wiwa) and schooled in composition in Java, was a controversial

\(^{64}\) Modality will be discussed in more detail in the next section.
composer from his academy days. When his radical composition Lebur Saketi of 1995 won first place at the festival, it marked a significant shift in acceptance by the jury of bolder experimentation. Sruti Laya was his last festival composition before moving from Bali, and stands alone in its degree of departure from convention. The gineman begins with a syncopated interplay of gangsas and reyongs, and while exhibiting approximations of fragmented solo passages, the elaboration types used are almost exclusively non-traditional, simultaneously utilizing contrapuntal patterns between instrument groups, harmony, and cross-rhythm among others.

Later pieces follow suit in terms of textural ambiguity. Semayut (2003) begins with suling and harmonized melody, followed by a nine beat cycle exhibiting melody instruments playing a bichord in asymmetric rhythm as the suling plays in a scale foreign to the tuning of the gamelan. From another direction, Palu Gangsa (2004) begins with a fairly traditional series of kebyar fragments, but merges the gineman and gegenderan into a series of melodies and cycles of shifting length and texture. These include a one beat harmonized melody pattern, a 25 beat suling melody over a one beat kotekan pattern in the melody instruments and simultaneous contrasting gangsas kotekan to name a few, constantly shifting until the Bapang. Aside from the structural/textural complexity relationship, the most prominent feature of modern gineman is variety.

Gegenderan

Gegenderan of Tabuh Kreasi in the 2000s exhibit a similar relationship between structural and textural innovation as is present in the gineman. Recalling the 90s, the basic identity of solely gangsas elaboration was first challenged by the inclusion of reyong, while structurally melodies increased in length and breaks in the steady beat
appeared. These trends became standard, along with the general increase of density of experimental textures.

The diversity of approaches to gegenderan within the selection of pieces from this period make it difficult to identify universal trends, though similarities between pieces suggest a few common practices. Yudane's two pieces, Lebur Saketi (1995) and Sruti Laya (1999) both exhibit non-traditional multi-layered kotekan elaboration, as well as fairly simple repeat structure, involving two or three shorter repeating melodies repeated sequentially (ie. Ax5, Bx1, Ax2, Bx1, etc.). The clarity of the melody and reliance on repeats brings the elaboration to the forefront, and also allows for different processes to play out, such as multi-cycle periods of shifting dynamics or modified elaboration patterns. Later pieces exhibit this same pairing of complex kotekan elaboration and simple melodic repeats, such as Semayut (2003) and Canda Klang (2007).

Other pieces show a more linear development from the melodic and cyclic expansion of the 90s. The gegenderan of Jati (2000) and Palu Gangsa (2004) are both comprised of a long series of short cycling melodies and longer melodies, with constantly shifting elaboration and no sequential repeats. Jati is the first of the selection to include ocak-ocakan texture in the gegenderan, usually withheld until the bapang, and also incorporates a more regular distribution of reyong sections, suling solos and kantilan kotekan, virtually erasing the hierarchical importance of standard kotekan. Four years later, Palu Gangsa's gegenderan was similar in its tireless progression through melody cycles and textures, but showed a greater density of modern techniques. Cycles here included a repeated one beat harmonized melody pattern, a repeating kotekan pattern in one melody strata (calung) while another (jegogan) played a continuous melody with
suling, and another with cross rhythm kotekan and harmonized melody. Though structurally the pacing is the same as Jati, Palu Gangsa showed many new approaches to constructing individual cycles.

Still other pieces in the last few years have been relatively conservative in the gegenderan section. Bhara Duaja (2007) consists of three sections, the first two of which are straightforward gangsakotekan and melody. The third is a 16 beat syncopated suling passage repeated once, similar to the pauses emerging in the 90s, and among its contemporaries, appears a fairly tame technique. Dlod Bawah (2001) is even more straightforward, made up of a 16 beat repeated melody and a 64 beat melody, with a sequential repeat, and with no derivation from kotekan elaboration. Maskumambang (2007) takes the novel approach of inverting the position of the gegenderan and the bapang. Here, the gegenderan is unusually short (40 seconds) and straightforward, but highlights the signature technique throughout the piece of constant, abrupt pauses. At this point, the gegenderan is created in a multitude of ways, clouding its original identity. Though a few approaches are shared among composers, there is no sign of a particular new form appearing.

Bapang

The core characteristics of repeating gong cycle, high speed and alternating textural sequence have maintained the identity of the bapang, while the complete disappearance of sequential multi-sectional repeat structure and metric development most significantly effect its modern form. Similar to the development of the gegenderan, recent bapang now exhibited longer melodies and series of cycles through composed. The spectrum ranges from two short repeated melodies (Waskita (2005):32x5, 26x3) to seven
(Jati(2005)), and even fragmented textures, more closely resembling gineman structure (Canda Klang(2007)).

Also first to appear in the 90s was the use of a ternary gong cycle in the bapang, which has developed into the standard use of non-traditional meters. With one exception, all of the selected pieces from the 2000s utilize some form of asymmetric meter for the core cycle or cycles of the bapang. These ranged from 13 beat, used in Jati(2000) and Semayut(2003), to 10, 17 and 26. Combined with rapid sectional shifts, each often with a different meter, the bapang has become a jagged metric landscape, wholly different than the single, standard bapang cycle of Beratha’s form. Combined with increase of new devices similar to other sections, this metric instability is another example of the continual move towards discontinuity.

Pengecet

The pengecet in the 2000s followed suit with the trends of growing discontinuity and textural variety in other sections, but also showed some unique sectional additions. Most notably, there began to appear long, slow sections dominated by suling and sparse, innovative textures in the gangs, reyong and melody sections. This can be seen as a ideological expansion of the slower, more stately character of the pengecet from earlier years. Within the sample, this first appeared in Yudane’s Sruti Laya (1999), in which the last two minutes of the pengecet is a 36 beat sulingan melody repeated three times. There are only occasional interjections of gangs, syncopated harmonized melody, and no kempi. Unlike later examples of this type of section, the piece ends without a final kebyar, but was possibly the source of inspiration for those later pieces. Similarly, Jati (2000) includes a long suling melody incorporating a syncopated melody part and
kempli. Dlod Bawah exhibits the same slow tempo and syncopated kempli, but includes fuller gangs and reyong parts. Semayut (2003), Palu Gangsa (2004) and Waskita (2005) all exhibit variations on the long, slow suling section, with Waskita most closely resembling Sruti Layah, but as opposed to Sruti Layah, still include an energetic kebyar passage to conclude the piece.

Other material of the penget sections from this period exhibit a wide array of structures, mostly variations on long and short repeated melodies with shifting texture. To the present, however, basic aspects of the textural identity of the penget remain, such as the primacy of reyong kiletan and kantilan kotekan. Most clearly, though, the penget, as with the other sections, suggests that the 2000s have been a transitional period, where consistently more complicated and experimental structure and texture has become the norm.

**Composition-Level Unifying Characteristics**

As simplicity in one section balanced radical material in another throughout the 1990s, the 2000s saw other types of relationships between sections, such as the constant use of a particular device throughout a piece, unifying it. Kuda Mandara Giri (2002) featured bamboo *kocok* rattles in different ways in each of its four sections, creating a unique flow between regular instrumentation and *kocok* passages. Waskita (2005), Bhara Duaja (2007) and Canda Klang (2007) all exhibit different takes on a non-traditional stacatto playing technique which is used throughout each piece, largely in kebyar transitions. Maskumambang (2007) is consistently dotted with unexpected pauses, which gives the pieces a unique character as a whole. Finally, one instance of melodic continuity across sections is present in Dlod Bawah (2001), in which the main 17 beat
bapang melody reappears in the first cycles of the pengecet, as well as in the sectional repeats.

With the exception of Dlod Bawah, the above examples don’t represent specific thematic unity between sections and there is no sign of the thematic unity claimed by Harnish (2001). There are, however, examples of thematic development within sections. A melody appears in the gineman/gegenderan of Palu Gangsa (2004), first as a fast 14 beat suling melody in AAAB form, with kotekan elaboration. Following a reyong transiton, and then at a slower tempo and half time kempli, the AB section of the melody is repeated with an extension, bringing it to 20 beats (ABC). The new version of the melody is then played again at a faster tempo with new kotekan elaboration. Finally, after a Tkeb transiton, the melody returns a final time (suling and melody only), in a third version, totaling 21 beats (ABD). Waskita (2005) has a similar melodic development in the gegenderan. The 26 beat repeated melody that makes up the first half large portion of the gegenderan is repeated at half speed after a short reycng transition, with new elaboration. Finally, the melody is played a final time by only the higher register melody instruments, with a quick new kotekan pattern, unaccompanied by the beat of the kempli. Maskumambang (2007) similarly repeats the first melody of its bapang at half time with new elaboration.

3.3.3 Other Modern Developments

Throughout the previous analysis, I have withheld discussion of certain features not explicitly related to the structural development of Tabuh Kreasi. Beyond structure though, there has been many developments on other levels, mostly unheard of before the

---

65 Harnish (2001), p.13. Melodic transcriptions I conducted as part of my structural analyses showed no signs of motivic unity throughout sections, but that is not to say that they don’t exist.
1990s, that deserve mention, as they have significantly changed the sonic landscape of Tabuh Kreasi.

**Modality**

The Gamelan Gong Kebyar ensemble is tuned to a five tone subset known as *selisir* of the seven tone *pelog* scale. Some classic genres, such as the Gamelan Semar Pegulingan, included all seven pitches of this scale, and commonly modulated between various five tone subsets, including selisir. Though the fixed pitch instruments of the gong kebyar restricted to their five tones, the suling flute and rebab spike fiddle have the capability of playing the other two non-selisir pitches of slendro, and composers in the 1990s began experimenting with including them in gong kebyar compositions.

The first appearance of this technique in Tabuh Kreasi for the Festival Gong Kebyar was in two pieces in 1991, Jagra Parwatha and Gora Merdawa, both composed by Nyoman Windha. In the former (see appendix C), this occurred during a suling solo, accompanied by melody instruments. The non-selisir tone fell on a weak beat, when the slower stratum instruments were not playing, and that strata that was simply silent for that one beat. This created a small but incredibly noticeable color to the otherwise uniform scale. Other composers quickly began utilizing this technique, and within the 17 later pieces in the selection analysed above, it was used in 12, and is nearly standard practice today.

Windha’s two compositions of 1991 included these non-selisir tones (traditionally referred to as *pamero*) sparingly, functioning mainly as coloristic passing tones. Later works, however, used the tonal flexibility of the suling to suggest other specific 5-tone

---

66 Though Windha had been experimenting with 7-tone music for years previous in other genres, part of a resurgance in awareness of classic forms in the 1980s. for more, see Vitale (2002) p.32-36.
modes of pelog in extended passages. Probably the most extreme example is Semayut (2003), which includes sections throughout the piece in the modes *slendro alit*, *tembung* and *lebeng*. As opposed to the example in Jagra Parwatha, this and later pieces also began using fuller textures during modally diverse suling passages. The gineman of Windha’s 2007 composition *Maskumambang* includes a long melody in the *slendro alit* mode, which shares three common tones with *selisir*. Therefore, the fixed pitch instruments of the gamelan play elaboration patterns using only these three pitches.

**Meter**

As mentioned in the analysis above, the clearest departure from tradition metrically was in the inclusion of ternary bapang sections in the early 1990s. A year before this first appeared in the festival kreasi (Ombak Ing Segara – 1993) American composer Wayne Vitale premiered his composition for the Gong Kebyar entitled *Khayalan Tiga*, which had a ternary bapang as well. Ombak Ing Segara, composed by Wayan Widia, shows many similarities to Vitale’s piece, which was possibly the source of this convention. However, short sections of ternary pulsation were present in the gineman of two earlier pieces, namely *Kembang Ceraki* (1991) by Nyoman Windha and *Paksi Ngelayang* (1992) by Komang Astita. While the explicit use of a ternary bapang gong cycle could have come from Vitale, ternary pulsation was likely already being experimented with at the academy, and certainly familiar to Windha. The proliferation of other odd-metered bapang cycles in later compositions have firmly characterized the section.
Expanded Instrumentation

The criteria for the Festival Gong Kebyar is usually explicit in requiring traditional Gong Kebyar instrumentation. In 2002, however, the festival advisory board allowed for the incorporation of other instruments or ensembles into Tabuh Kreasi. This was explored in a number of ways, including the simultaneous use of Gong Kebyar and tonally compatible Gong Gede, a gegenderan played by Gamelan Angklung and the use of kocok bamboo rattles (See Kuda Mandara Giri (2002) Appendix C). Many older generation festival administrators were displeased with this departure from tradition, and criteria again became strict67. For example, in 2005, a composition for the children’s Gong Kebyar competition was rejected for incorporating angklung instruments. Whether criteria have since loosened or composers have grown bolder, a few subsequent pieces have begun to include small additions to instrumentation, mainly small, handheld instruments playing kotekan figuration. These included small Sumatran hand drums (rebana), cengceng kopyak cymbals played with gangsa mallets, and even pieces of sheet metal in Made Sue’s piece Mangrove Pantai Selatan. Though not an instrument per se, Nyoman Windha’s 2007 “Maskumambang” concluded with a section where the players clapped interlocking rhythms. Whether these instrumental expansions represent a developing characteristic of Tabuh Kreasi or a short-lived trend is too unclear, but seem to show the continual search for crowd pleasing novelty.

---

67 Personal communication with Ketut Gde Asnawa, May 20th, 2008.
3.4 Conclusion

With kreasi you have the basic pattern. But here’s the problem. If somebody is good looking and you put makeup on them, they look bad. This is what Tabuh Kreasi is about. The basic structure you already have, and you just put makeup over it. This is very tricky and you need experience and sensitivity.

-Ketut Gde Asnawa 68

We still follow the structure like Pak Berata’s structure. It has a body, head, legs. But for me I still use that, but how to make a face?

-Nyoman Windha 69

The thing about gong kebyar for competition…the first pieces were in north bali. If you see the first piece like kebyar ding, kebyar legong, you can see how kontemporer it is. You can feel it. There are no rules. Each time they play is different. So why do they make new rule or idea like “Tabuh Kreasi”. Maybe it come from Pak Beratha or Pak Windha or Pak Asnawa. Why? Why they claim gong kebyar for themselves?

-Dewa Ketut Alit 70

The three quotes above represent the changing conceptions of Tabuh Kreasi today, the conflict between desire to preserve its traditional identity, or break free of its constraints. Building on the model created by Wayan Beratha in the 1960s, composers have created a repertoire that has given it an identity. The pressure to innovate for the festival year after year, however, is continually pushing its boundaries.

Through the 1990s, Tabuh Kreasi showed a gradual move towards greater melodic length and internal structural complexity, and the emergence of new techniques from a variety of sources outside traditional Balinese music. In this decade, the first of the 21st century, though the basic form maintains, compositions are being filled to the bursting point with radical new textures and devices, and by Beratha’s standards are almost beyond recognition. This appears to be a transitional period, unstable in its goals, and the future of the form is unclear. Tabuh Kreasi was born as a radical departure from tradition along with the Gamelan Gong Kebyar, but historical developments in Balinese society have continually formalized it. Variously effected by government cultural

68 Personal communication, May 20th, 2008.
69 Personal communication, August 1st, 2007.
70 Personal communication, July 31st, 2007.
mandates, transferred to a centralized, academic setting and ideology, and in its primary venue a competitive pursuit, Tabuh Kreasi composition has had to strike a balance between creativity and this host of social pressures.

Unlike more experimental forms such as kontemporer, or traditional forms still strongly maintained in ritual use, Tabuh Kreasi stands on the edge of the Balinese aesthetic, the most forward looking music still based in traditional idioms. It appears, however, as if the formlessness of its original manifestation a century ago is returning.
WORKS CITED


Berata, Dewa Putu. Personal interview. October 5th, 2005


Appendices

Appendix A

Analysis Terminology and Abbreviations

Gineman – section I, consisting mainly of fragmented passages of Kebyar texture and instrument solos

Gegenderan – section II, primarily a series of melodies with gangsakotekan elaboration

Bapang – section III, consisting of a repeating bapang gong cycle with one or more melodies of various lengths, usually with rotating sequence of elaboration types.

Pengacet – section IV, slower concluding material of usually longer melodies

Gkeb – “Gangsa Kebyar”, usually occurring in the Gineman. Any extended solo passage played by the gangsasection, usually staggered like a kebyar

Tkeb – “Tutti Kebyar”, definitive kebyar texture of staggered, unmetered unison statements played by all sections of the gamelan. Usually occur in the Gineman or function as transitional material.

Kotekan/kot. – standard interlocking elaboration in the gangsasection of the gamelan.

Reyongan/ryng – reyong section of the gamelan; a solo passage or texture within a melody as indicated

Reykil – kiletan, a standard interlocking reyong figuration

Ockn – ocek-ocakantexture, involving coordinated syncopated rhythms on the reyong and kendang

Sesulingan/Ssul. – bamboo suling flute; solo passage or texture within a melody as indicated

Kendang/kndg – kendang, the two lead drums of the gamelan. Solo passage or texture within a melody as indicated

Kant.kot – interlocking kotekan figuration played only on the higher-octave kantilan instruments of the gangsasection

Mel.kot – modern texture of melody instruments (jegogan, calung, penyaca) playing interlocking kotekan figuration common to the gangsas.

Harmonized.mel/harm.mel – modern convention of harmony occurring within the melody section

Cross.kot. – modern texture of two or more simultaneous kotekan patterns played among the gangsas.

Mel. – melody, most often used indicating lengths of sections by melody length measured in number of beats. IE.: “64 beat mel. x4” = 64 beat melody repeated four times

Transition/trans – usually short section functioning primarily as a transition between two longer or repeating melodies, or large sections

“/” – simultaneous textures or sections

“,” – subsequent textures or sections

Basic format

Melody length, number of repetitions, texture  IE.: 32 beat mel. x2: kot/ockn

Melody length, number of repetitions:  IE.: 8 beat mel. x11

Number of repetitions with texture A  x4 kot.

Number of repetitions with texture B  x4 reykil

Etc.  x3 kot/reykil
**APPENDIX C**

*Putu Sarjana, Buleleng*

*Danu Giri (1988)*

- Gineman
  - 0:00 Gkeb
  - 1:00 Tkeb, Knng, Tkeb
  - 1:08 Sul.
  - 2:00 Gegenderan prep

*Nyoman Windha, Karangasem*

*Kembang Ceraki (1989)*

- Gineman
  - 0:00 Gkeb, Kot
  - 0:20 Tkeb, reyongan, Tkeb
  - 0:48 Kot, Tkeb
  - 1:00 Sul. Solo
  - 1:25 Gegenderan prep

*Komang Astiia, Badung*

*Paksi Ngelayang (1990)*

- Gineman
  - 0:00 Gkeb, Kot, Gkeb
  - 1:03 Kot
  - 1:17 Tkeb, reyongan
  - 1:45 Gegenderan prep

*Gegenderan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Gkeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Tkeb, Knng, Tkeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:08</td>
<td>Sul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Gegenderan prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gegenderan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Gkeb, Kot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>Tkeb, reyongan, Tkeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:48</td>
<td>Kot, Tkeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Sul. Solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25</td>
<td>Gegenderan prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pengecet*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:50</td>
<td>PGCa - 48 beat mel.: gns.mel/reykil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:38</td>
<td>Repeat PGCa x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:02</td>
<td>PGCb - Knng solo: - 10 short bapang gongan (80 beat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:43</td>
<td>PGCa x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:52</td>
<td>PGCb x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>PGCa x1, decel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:56</td>
<td>Final gong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pengecet*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:44</td>
<td>PGCa - 16 beat x2 gns.mel/reykil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44</td>
<td>PGCb - 19 beat ockkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44</td>
<td>PGCc - 16 beat ockkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44</td>
<td>Repeat PGCa, PGCb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:17</td>
<td>PGCd - 45 beat:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:43</td>
<td>24 beat gns.mel/reykil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:13</td>
<td>12 beat ockkn (w/ternary beat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:13</td>
<td>8 beat ockkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:34</td>
<td>Repeat a, b, c, a, b, d x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>Tkeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:57</td>
<td>Final gong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pengecet*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>16 beat reykil (ride on pitch i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>16 best gns.mel/ReyKil A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:11</td>
<td>16 best gns.mel/reykil B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:27</td>
<td>13 beat ternary ockkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:27</td>
<td>32 best gns.mel, 12 beat ockkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:27</td>
<td>18 beat ternary kot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:27</td>
<td>28 best kot/ockkn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:34</td>
<td>Repeat all x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:58</td>
<td>Repeat initial 16beat reykil (pitch j) x1 decel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:21</td>
<td>Final gong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Jagra Parwatha (1991)

**Gineman**

0:00 Gkeb, ryng, kot, Gkeb
1:27 Tkeb, kndg solo, Tkeb, ryng
2:26 Gegenderan prep

**Gegenderan** (kot unless indicated)

2:52 24+11.5 beat mel.
   16beat reyongan +16 beat mel (kot)
   16 beat mel x2 (syncopated mel.)
   8 beat mel. trans.
   64 beat mel.
5:08 repeat all x1
6:15 trans.: kot, ryng, Tkeb

**Bapang**

6:32 16 beat kot, 24 beat ockn
   BPGa – 64 beat mel:
   32 beat kant.mel/ockn
   16 beat kant.mel/ReyKil
   16 beat kot/ockn
   repeat BPGa
7:09 24 beat trans.: kot/ockn decel.
7:32 BPGb - 64 beat mel.:
   Sul.(pamero)/kndg.
7:42 32 beat mel.: kot/reykil
   8 beat trans.
   Repeat BPGa x2, 24 beat trans,
   BPGb x1, BPGa x1
8:26 Trans.: kot, Tkeb decel.
10:32

**Pengecet**

PGCa – 48 beat ockn.(decel.last 8)
   11:00 PGCb - 100 beat mel:
   11:24 52(34+4+16) kant.mel/reykil
   48 beat kot/ockn
   repeat PGCb

12:12 PGCa x1
13:00 PGCb x2
13:30 PGCa x1 (decel) to final gong
15:05 Final gong
15:38

### Ocek Prawerti (1992)

**Gineman**

0:00 Gkeb
1:02 Kot, Tkeb, reyongan
2:07 Gegenderan prep: Ssul/mel.

**Gegenderan**

2:22 GNDa = 33 beat mel. (8+8+8+9)
   Repeat GNDa x2
   16 beat trans. mel.
3:13 GNDb – 78 beat mel (32+32+14)
   Repeat GNDb x1
   12 beat trans., pause
4:30 GNDa x3 + trans.
   GNDb x1 + trans.
6:40 Tkeb trans.

**Bapang**

6:54 BPGa – 96 beat mel.:
   32 beat kot/ockn
   32 beat reykil
   32 beat kot/ockn
   7:29 BPGb – 32 beat mel. x3
   kant.mel/reykil,ockn alternating
   24 beat ockn. trans
   BPGc – 32 beat mel. x3
   Kot.
8:49 Repeat all verbatim(BPGa,b,c)
10:48 Trans.: kot/ockn .Gkeb. ryng

### Ombak Ing Segara (1993)

**Gineman**

0:00 Gkeb, Kot
0:55 Tkeb, reyongan
1:41 Gegenderan prep

**Gegenderan**

1:55 44 beat mel. (12+12+8)
   Repeat x2
3:08 30 beat mel (8+8+8+6)
3:20 29 beat mel (8+8+6+7)
24 beat mel.
3:44 4 beat mel x8 +6beat trans.
   8 beat mel. x4
4:16 32 beat mel. (9+7+8+8)
   16 beat trans. mel.
4:36 Tkeb, reyongan

**Bapang**

5:00 Reyongan: 8 beat bapang cycle x17
5:45 BPGa - 12 beat mel. (ternary) x 14:
   x6 ReyKil/Kndg
   +trans.
   x2 ockn
   x2 kot
   x4 add kant.mel.
6:52 BPGb - 2 beat mel. x12; ockn/kot
   14 beat mel. trans.; ryng, kot/ockn
7:10 repeat BPGa x4; *new kot/ockn
   repeat BPGb, 14 beat trans.
7:43 24 beat Tkeb trans.

**Pengecet**

11:28 (a)28 beat mel. kot/ockn
   (b)4 beat mel gns.mel/reykil
   (c)64 beat mel gns.mel/reykil,ockn
   (d)53beat mel.gns.mel/reykil,ockn
   (e)48beat kot/reykil,ockn
   (a’):28 beat modified (a)
   repeat b’= a
13:34 kot, ockn/keb conclusion
15:26 Final gong
15:43 Final gong

**Pengecet**

7:53 24 beat trans (ternary):
   melody-kotekan/ockn/kot
8:22 64 beat mel.: gns.mel/reykil,ockn
9:00 unpulsed seulu. Solo
9:36 28 beat mel. (16 kot, 12 ockn)
9:52 64 beat mel
10:13 16 beat ssul. (pamero)
10:22 repeat pengecet verbatim x1
12:42 8 beat mel x7 (kot/reykil), decel.
13:16 Final gong
Gineman
0:00 Gkeb
1:16 Kot, reyongan
1:50 Tkeb
2:04 sesulingan solo
2:56 Gegenderan prep

Gegenderan
3:32 34 beat mel:
(18 beat mel, repeat altered to 16)
24 beat mel, decel
31 beat mel (harmonized mel)
3:55 1 beat, switch to rey kil for 24 beat return to kot: 20 beat mel
40 beat mel, short pause
4:46 27 beat mel:
8 beat, 7 beat rey kil,
12 beat return to kot.
5:00 repeat gegenderan x 1
6:45 16 beat kot; accel.
Tkeb, reyongan
7:18 32 beat kot/ockn

Bapang
7:30 16 beat mel; x 4; kendg/rey kil
14 beat mel; x 4; kot (3+4+3+4)
16 beat mel; 8 ockn/kot, 8 rey kil
24 beat kot/ockn
8:27 repeat all x 1
9:26 trans.: Gkeb, ryng, Gkeb

Pengecet
9:47 34 beat mel.: gns.mel/rey kil, ockn
48 beat mel: gns.mel/rey kil, ockn
32 beat mel.: kantil.kot/ockn
24 beat mel. ockn.
11:00 Repeat pengecet verbatim x 1
12:16 Tkeb
12:22 Final gong

Wayan Gde Yudana, Kodya
Lebur Saketi (1995)

Gineman
0:00 Gkeb, Tkeb, kendang solo
0:57 Tkeb, Gkeb, ryng, Tkeb, Gkeb,
Sul, Gkeb, ryng, Gkeb, ryng,
Sul (pamerlo), ryng

Gegenderan
3:06 (A) 18 beat mel. x 5
Cross.kot throughout
3:44 (B) 13 beat mel x 2
(C) 30 beat mel.
4:08 repeat A x 4 (new dynamics sequence)
B x 2
C x 1
5:03 (D) 8 beat mel, beat drops,
Sul. solo, Gkeb
8 beat mel. x 5; kantil.kot/rey kil
6:04 repeat A x 5
B x 1
C x 1
7:02 (A') 16 beat modified A mel x 3
(w/pamero suling)

Bapang
7:21 16 beat mel. ockn
36 beat mel. reyongan
7:40 60 beat mel. kot/ockn
24 beat mel. reyongan, ockn
8:09 34 beat mel. reyongan, ockn x 2
11 beat trans. mel.
8:36 16 beat mel. x 2 kot/ockn
46 beat mel. Tkeb/ockn/kot, pause
60 beat mel. Tkeb/ockn/kot, pause
9:28 Short reyongan

Pengecet
9:31 (A) 12 beat kot/ockn
16 beat suling solo
16 beat ockn
9:52 16 beat kant.kot/ockn
10:00 (B) 80 beat; kot/rey kil, ockn
10:35 80 beat mel; Sul.
32 beat Sul. w/rey kil
48 beat Sul. w/kant.kot
11:13 24 beat ockn
11:24 repeat (B) x 1
12:37 short kot, ryng, ockn/kot, sul., Tkeb
13:00 Final gong

Ka. Japa/Nym. Cenik Wijana, Karangasem
Greihing Parwata (1996)

Gineman
0:00 Gkeb, Kot alternations
0:58 Tkeb, reyongan
1:29 Gkeb
1:42 Sesulingan solo
2:08 Gegenderan prep

Gegenderan
2:10 (A) 25 beat mel. x 2
(B) 72 beat; 8 beat mel. x 4,
8 beat mel. x 4 + 8
3:08 (C) 13 beat mel. x 2, 20 beat mel
3:28 (D) 22 beat mel. reyongan
(E) 27 beat mel.
(F) 11 beat kant.kot x 3
4:05 (G) 16 beat mel, 16 beat ryng/kot
4:20 repeat gegenderan A-F
6:09 46 beat kot/ockn

Bapang
6:26 12 beat mel.(ternary) x 15:
x6 kendg/rey kil, x3 kot, x3 add ockn
7:33 30 beat mel. ockn
7:44 48 beat mel. rey kil
8:00 54 beat mel. kot/ockn
8:19 55 beat mel. kot/ockn, decel.
Short mel.harmonized

Pengecet
8:48 16 beat mel. x 3 kot/rey kil, kot/ockn
16 beat mel kot/rey kil
9:19 8 beat mel. kant.kot/rey kil x 4
9:35 56 beat mel. ockn
16 beat mel. rey kil
10:09 44 beat mel. ockn
10:29 repeat pengecet x 1
12:09 Tkeb
12:17 Final gong
### Made Suatrika, Badung

**Gora Mantik (1997)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Gkeb, kot, Tkeb, Gkeb, Tkeb</td>
<td>Add melody, add ryng, gangsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Sesulingan (pamero)</td>
<td>Gegederan prep: 64 beat mel x2 melody/sul/gns (no kempti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Add melody, add ryng, gangsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Komang Sukarya, Klungkung

**Jengah Erang (1998)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>melodyKeb,Gkeb,reyongan,Gkeb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>Sool (pamero), reyongan, Tkeb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Ockn, Gkeb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>Sesulingan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:46</td>
<td>Gegederan prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Weyan Gde Yudana, Kodya

**Sruti Laya (1999)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Melody/reyong/gangsa/suling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:40</td>
<td>harmonic ryong/gangsa w/kendang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>Gkeb, ryng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>Sparse kndg/ockn/kant.kot texture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Gegederan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>4 beat mel. x15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:02</td>
<td>16 beat mel. x3 kot/ockn</td>
<td>Tkeb Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:27</td>
<td>12 beat mel. (ternary) x14:</td>
<td>Bapang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Bapang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:47</td>
<td>96 beat mel. kot/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>2 beat mel. kot/ockn x8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26</td>
<td>4 beat mel. x42 harmonized mel.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:23</td>
<td>52 beat mel. kot/reykil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:43</td>
<td>repeat bapang x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>40 beat mel. kot/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Pengecet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:26</td>
<td>(A) 8 beat mel x8 koto/reykil</td>
<td>Pengecet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:56</td>
<td>16 beat mel x2+14 kant.kot/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>8 beat mel x2+16 kant.kot/reykil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:09</td>
<td>16 beat mel x4 reykil/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:32</td>
<td>4 beat mel. x2+16 kant.kot/reykil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:55</td>
<td>23 beat mel. kot/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:32</td>
<td>39 beat mel. kant.kot/suling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:52</td>
<td>8 beat mel. kot/reykil/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13</td>
<td>repeat from * x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:52</td>
<td>quick 18 beat kot/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:01</td>
<td>final gong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Pengecet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:13</td>
<td>24 beat remain on pitch e:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22</td>
<td>3 beat mel. x4 ryng/kndg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>4 beat kndg/ockn trans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>16 beat harm.Sul.(pamero) x4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:08</td>
<td>50 beat mel. kot/ockn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:33</td>
<td>36 beat slow Sesulingan x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:06</td>
<td>final gong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Pengecet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Melody</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:57</td>
<td>4 beat mel.x12 koto/reykil, decel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:19</td>
<td>(F) 16 beat mel. x3 kot/reykil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>repeat A-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:37</td>
<td>3 beat mel. x28 kot/reykil, decel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:28</td>
<td>final gong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:37</td>
<td>3 beat mel. x28 kot/reykil, decel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:28</td>
<td>final gong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Wiwa, Bangli</td>
<td>Wayan Widia, Badang</td>
<td>Nyoman Windha, Kuda Mandara Giri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made Wiwa, Bangli</th>
<th>Wayan Widia, Badang</th>
<th>Nyoman Windha, Kuda Mandara Giri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Gineman
| 0:00 | Gkeb, ryng, Ssul/mel, Gkeb, Tkeb |
| 0:54 | 16 beat mel. x6 reykil/kot |
| 1:32 | Tkeb, reyongan |
| 2:03 | 38 beat mel slow sul/mel/gns/ryng |
| 2:30 | 72 beat mel. kot/ockn |
| 3:00 | Ssul. solo(pamero) |
| 3:35 | Reyongan, 12 beat kot/ockn |

| Gineman
| 0:00 | Gkeb |
| 0:25 | Reyongan/kant.mel |
| 0:55 | Suselingan, reyongan, Gkeb |
| 1:35 | 16 beat Tkeb/ockn, Gkeb |
| 2:08 | 16 beat mel. x8:1 gns elab, x1 reykil, x2 Ssul, x1 reykil, x2 Ssul, x1 gns. |
| 3:42 | 16 beat mel. x2: reykil/kant.kot/Ssul. |

| Gineman
| 0:00 | Gkeb |
| 1:35 | harmonized mel.inst. solo |
| 1:46 | Kocok, mel, kocok |
| 2:15 | Gkeb, kocok, Tkeb, kocok |
| 2:45 | Alternating ryng, gkeb solos |
| 3:24 | Gegenderan prep |

| Ggegenderan
| 3:44 | (kot. unless indicated) |
| 3:44 | -20 beat kot., 13 beat ryng, 6beat ockn |
| 4:05 | 16 beat mel. x3 (return to kot.) |
| 4:28 | 11 beat mel x2 +7 (modification of previous melody) |
| 4:43 | 17 beat trans. mel. (9+8) |
| 4:50 | 8 beat mel. x3 (kant.kot) +12 |
| 5:08 | 16 beat mel. x4 ReyKil +16 ockn. |
| 5:42 | 8beat mel.x6 kndg/ockn +16 ockn |
| 6:07 | 8 beat mel x4 (return to kot.) |
| 6:22 | 22 beat ockn. trans. |
| 6:32 | 72 beat mel. Ssul. w/melody only |
| 6:32 | 40 beat kot/ockn trans. |
| 7:12 | reyongan solo, short Gkeb |

| Ggegenderan
| 4:23 | (A) 16 beat mel. x2 |
| 4:53 | repeat A & B |
| 5:13 | repeat last 16 beats of B |
| 6:00 | (C) 64 beat mel. |

| Bapang
| 7:17 | 24 beat mel. x2: trompongKil./kot. cross rhythm |
| 7:32 | *17 beat mel. x14: trompong.kil/sul. throughout |
| 7:59 | x1 tromp.kil only, x2 ockn, x1 kant.mel. x6 ockn, x2 kot, x2 kot/ockn |

| Ggegenderan
| 3:44 | (kot.unlessindicated) |
| 3:44 | 39 beat mel.: |
| 4:05 | 16 beat mel. x3 (return to kot.) |
| 4:28 | 11 beat mel x2 +7 (modification of previous melody) |
| 4:43 | 17 beat trans. mel. (9+8) |
| 4:50 | 8 beat mel. x3 (kant.kot) +12 |
| 5:08 | 16 beat mel. x4 ReyKil +16 ockn. |
| 5:42 | 8beat mel.x6 kndg/ockn +16 ockn |
| 6:07 | 8 beat mel x4 (return to kot.) |
| 6:22 | 22 beat ockn. trans. |
| 6:32 | 72 beat mel. Ssul. w/melody only |
| 6:32 | 40 beat kot/ockn trans. |
| 7:12 | reyongan solo, short Gkeb |

| Bapang
| 7:25 | 24 beat Tkeb |
| 7:46 | 2 beat mel. x16: kndg/reykil, ockn |
| 7:59 | 60 beat mel. kot/ockn |
| 8:21 | 13 beat mel. x4: x1 kant.mel, x1 kot, x1 reykil, x1 all w/kndg |
| 8:42 | 32 beat mel. x2 ReyKil |
| 9:14 | 40 beat mel. kot/ockn |
| 10:03 | 27 beat kot/ockn trans., pause |
| 10:15 | Ssul. solo, Gkeb, Ryng |
| 10:32 | 32 beat kot/ockn |

| Pengecect
| 10:49 | Through composed melody; 328 beat.: alternating kot/ockn, reykil |
| 12:50 | 16 beat mel. x3: Ssul/syncopated kempii & melody inst. |
| 13:18 | 64 beat kot/ockn |
| 13:51 | Gkeb |
| 14:05 | Short closing Ssul/mel/kot/reykil |
| 14:07 | Final gong |

| Pengecect
| 9:16 | repeat *17beat mel. x4 kot/ockna |
| 9:39 | 44 beat kot/tromp.kil, decel. |
| 10:06 | 48 beat mel. Ssul/kant.kot/tromp.kil |
| 10:43 | slow 36 beat mel. kot/ockn trans. |
| 11:02 | repeat pengacet verbatim x1 |
| 12:52 | 8 beat mel. x4 kot/tromp.kil (decel) |

| Pengecect
| 7:33 | Kendang solo |
| 7:59 | 41 beat mel. kocok kot. |
| 8:00 | Kndg solo, Tkeb |
| 8:13 | 52 beat mel.: ockn/sul.(pamero) |
| 8:34 | 8 beat mel. x4: kocok tremolo/mel.kot/ kant.kot |
| 8:54 | 102 beat mel. kot/reykil/ockn |
| 9:43 | repeat pengacet x1 |
| 11:49 | Gkeb, Tkeb w/kocok |
| 12:15 | Final gong |
Wayan Sudirana, Tabanan
Semayut (2003)

Gineman
0:00 Ssul. (pamero) w/harmonized mel., Tkeb, ryng, Tkeb
0:49 Ssul. w/harmonized mel.
1:14 18 beat mel. x4: harm. mel/sul/ockn/kantil.kot
1:53 Gkeb, ryng, kot, kndg solo, Tkeb
2:17 Ssul., Tkeb

Gegenderan
2:31 (A)16 beat mel. x6: harmonized mel/ockn
3:13 20 beat mel. trans.
3:20 (B)32 beat mel. reykil/sul x2
3:48 Tkeb, kndg solo, Tkeb
4:08 Repeat A, B
5:25 Tkeb trans.

Bapang
5:37 16 beat mel. x5 kant.kot/reykil/ockn/kot
6:04 Tkeb
6:15 24 beat mel. kant.kot/reykil/kndg
Gkeb
6:30 13 beat mel. kot/ockn/w/pause x2
6:45 16 beat mel. kot/ockn x2
6:55 16 beat 32 beat trans. mel.
7:06 11 beat mel kot/ockn w/pause x2
7:19 32 beat Sul. w/ harmonized mel.
7:47 43 beat mel. kot/reykil/ockn, pause
8:11 Tkeb

Pengecet
8:25 Slow 16 beat mel
Ssul (pamero) wgs. no kempri
8:56 Tkeb, short Ssul., Tkeb
9:07 16 beat mel. x5: Ssul/kant.kot/ockn
9:44 16 beat mel. x2 kot/ockn
19 beat mel. kot.ockn, trans
14 beat mel. x2 kot/ockn
Gkeb/Tkeb closing
10:12 Final gong

Made Subandi, Gianyar

Gineman/Gegenderan
0:00 Gkeb, rapid alternation ryng, Tkeb
0:24 Kndg solo, Tkeb, Gkeb, Ryng, Ssul., Tkeb, kot, Ssul/reykil
1:28 1 beat pattern x8 harmonized.mel.
1:35 8 beat mel. x9 harm. mel/ockn/kot
2:06 25 beat mel. Ssul/jog/gns/beat calung pattern
2:33 4 beat jorgen pattern/sul/ockn x6
2:43 24 beat reykil/14 beat kot/20 beat reykil
3:08 10 beat mel*: slow Ssul/kot repeat x1 fast, modified
3:34 Tkeb, kndg. Solo, reyongan
3:50 21 beat mel. Sul/mel. (mod of *)
4:09 11 beat trans. kot/reykil
4:22 8 beat mel. x3 kot.
4:32 24 beat mel. reyongan, ryng solo
4:50 Tkeb, ryng, Tkeb, kndg.so., Tkeb

Bapang
5:11 (A)48 beat mel. sul/reykil, ockn
Tkeb
5:40 (B)10 beat mel. x6/2 ockn,2 reykil, x2 ocks
6:15 24 beat mel. slow Sesulingan
6:38 48 beat mel. kant.kot/reykil/sockn/sul
7:04 reyongan, Tkeb
7:12 repeat A & B
8:04 trans. kot, Tkeb, ryng, Sul.
8:11 Tkeb

Pengecet
8:36 (A)80 beat mel. kant.kot/reykil
33 beat mel. kot/ockn
9:36 (B)4 beat mel. x8 pamero Ssul/ockn trans. Sul/ockn, pause
10:14 repeat B x1
10:11 Tkeb
10:22 Final gong

Wayan Gde Arsana, Kodya
Waskita (2005)

Gineman
0:00 Gkeb (canon), mel.harmonized,
Tkeb, kndg solo
0:52 Sul. Solo (pamero), Tkeb (sacato)
1:52 Gkeb (canon),
2:06 Tkeb, Gkeb, ryng, Tkeb

Gegenderan
2:27 GNDa: 26 beat mel. x11:
1 mel only, x6 kot, x3 ryng, x1 kot/ryng
4:27 Ryng, kot/ryng (sacato)
4:43 GNDa half time x1: reykil/sul
5:01 GNDa no kempri x1: new kot.
5:10 15 beat mel. kot/ryng x1
5:17 Sul. Solo w/kantilan'
5:24 8 beat jorgen mel. x8: 64 beat
Ssul/pamero/calung mel. superimposed
5:49 Gkeb(sacato), gong solo, kant.solo
6:17 Slow Sul mel. w/immetered ryng
6:29 Gkeb/ryng canon
6:52 Syncopated mel/kot (sacato)
7:35 3 short ockn/kot fragments

Bapang
7:57 52 beat mel. x5: x3 cross.kot/ryng,
x2 add kndg
Tkeb
8:56 26 beat mel (subtractive rhythm) x3 ockn
9:16 Tkeb (sacato), mel.kot, deaf

Pengecet
9:43 Ssul (pamero) w/harmonized.mel/ryng/harmonized.kot:
Slow 32 beat mel. x2
11:30 Tkeb/kndg/mel.kot/Tkeb (sacato)
11:44 Final gong

79
Gineman
0:00 Gineman
0:37 8 beat mel. x 16: kot/reykil/harmonized.mel/ overlaid 48 beat sul. mel x2(stenlo)
1:18 Tkeb
1:30 slow 64 beat mel. sul. sparse kot.
2:12 Tkeb
Tkeb
Tkeb
2:42 8 beat mel.: kot (accel.)
3:49 Tkeb
4:29 Tkeb
5:02 Tkeb
5:44 Tkeb

Bapang
0:00 24 beat mel.(A) (ternary) x3 x 1 sul/mel., x 2 add kot.
0:38 harmonized.mel/sporadic pauses
1:07 New faster sul. part
1:44 Kot/ockn

Gegenderan
0:00 38 beat mel. x 2: kot
0:38 Sporadic pauses throughout
1:07 Kot/ockn
1:44 fragments of above rhythm

Pengecet
7:08 28 beat mel. kot/ockn, pause
7:43 20 beat mel. kot/ockn, pause
8:07 (A)29 beat mel. kot/reykil/ockn, pause
8:44 (B)14 beat mel. kot/reykil
7:50 (C)ambiguous fragments
8:07 (D)9 beat mel. pause x 2 kot/reykil
8:16 (E)17 beat mel. kot/ockn, pause
8:24 (F)12 beat mel. x 2: kot/reykil
8:35 (G)20 beat mel. kot/ockn/*clap
8:44 repeat pengecet A-G
10:00 interlocking handclaps
10:12 no final gong

Agus Teja, Karangasem
Bhara Duaja (2007)

Gineman
0:00 Gineman
0:37 8 beat mel. kot/sul solo, Tkeb, ryng, Tkeb
1:07 8 beat mel.: kot, Tkeb, Gkeb, ryng, Gkeb, sul. solo, Gkeb
2:12 slow 64 beat mel. sul. sparse kot.

Bapang
4:38 8 beat mel. (A) (ternary) x3 x 1 sul/mel., x 2 add kot.
5:02 harmonized.mel/sporadic pauses
5:44 8 beat mel. kot/ockn

Gegenderan
2:49 (A)64 beat mel. kot
3:13 (B)37 beat mel. kot
3:26 (C)16 beat mel.: stacatto sul., syncopated rhythm
+ 8 beat mel. trans: kot
3:41 repeat(C) + new 16 beat mel. trans
3:54 64 beat mel. kot (accel.)

Pengecet
7:08 28 beat mel. kot/ockn, pause
7:43 20 beat mel. kot/ockn, pause
8:07 (A)29 beat mel. kot/reykil/ockn, pause
8:44 (B)14 beat mel. kot/reykil
7:50 (C)ambiguous fragments
8:07 (D)9 beat mel. pause x 2 kot/reykil
8:16 (E)17 beat mel. kot/ockn, pause
8:24 (F)12 beat mel. x 2: kot/reykil
8:35 (G)20 beat mel. kot/ockn/*clap
8:44 repeat pengecet A-G
10:00 interlocking handclaps
10:12 no final gong

Canda Klang (2007)

Gineman
0:00 Gineman
1:00 Sul. Solo (pamero)
1:19 Add harmonized.mel
1:47 Gineman
2:07 Sul. 32 beat gegenderan mel. x1

Gegenderan
2:21 32 beat mel.(A) x 8: mel.kot/ harmonized.mel/cross.kot.
3:13 x 1 sul/mel, x 1 kant.kot,
x 1 add reykil, x 1 cross.kot.
x 1 reykil, x 1 cross.kot/reykil
x 1 cross.kot without melody,
x 1 reykil melody return
4:00 18 beat mel.(B). x 2: cross.kot.
4:13 32 beat mel.(A) x 3: x 1 reykil,
x 1 cross.kot, x 1 reykil/cross.kot
4:51 18 beat mel.(B) x 2 cross.kot
5:04 trans. Kot, ryng, sul. fragments
5:20 slow 12beat mel. x 2

Bapang
6:23 16 beat mel. x 2: kot/ockn
6:33 fragmented instrument solos, short passages

Pengecet
7:44 28 beat mel. fragmented textures, rapid alternation
7:55 38 beat mel. reykil, kot, kot/ockn
8:10 32 beat mel. alternating textures
8:26 1 beat pattern x 16: shifting pitch
8:32 77 beat mel. x 2

9:38 Tkeb, sul, , Tkeb, sul
9:58 3 short tkeb w/sudden pauses
10:09 final gong