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Abstract

This study combines classification and paradigmatic analysis of drum (*kendang*) stroke patterns, used in the Balinese dance-drama genre *arja*, with an examination of the musicians that play them. The heart of the work is an analysis of the interlocking *kendang arja* improvisations of various master drummers from different villages across Bali, each of whom draws influence from a style of playing that developed in the village of Singapadu in the early-to-mid 20th century. Patterns are evaluated and categorized in an effort both to understand the divergent paths that the Singapadu style took as it was diffused to various areas, and to create a grammar: a set of inherent rules that govern *arja* playing. These analyses are tempered by existing Balinese discourse on *arja* and other genres as well as by the ideas and opinions of various Balinese musicians.

The study begins by tracing the historical development of *arja* and its musical features, with a focus on the role of the *kendang* within the genre. It then considers Balinese techniques of learning and teaching and surveys the extant Balinese discourse on *kendang arja*. Next, it introduces the original Singapadu style of *arja*, and discusses how this style came to be transmitted broadly across Bali where other equally famous styles did not, as well as presenting some of the reasons for and manifestations of regional variation in *kendang* patterns. The study proceeds with a deep analysis of patterns taught to me by various master drummers, including a discussion of how these may be seen as musical embodiments of the Balinese oral theory on *arja*. These patterns then become the basis for an examination of hundreds of improvised patterns from various recording sessions. The penultimate chapter delves more deeply into the distinctive experiences and ideologies of each of the drummers under examination, exploring the possible reasons behind their differing transformations of
the Singapadu style with concepts adapted from linguistics as an investigative framework. The work concludes with a discussion of the place of music analysis within the field of ethnomusicology and its metatheory, and addresses the importance of cross-disciplinary collaboration in the field.
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Glossary

**Adri.** A pre-composed piece used in *arja* to express either grief or extreme refinement. In certain village styles it is also the piece used for the Galuh’s *pepeson.*

**agem.** A dancer’s basic stance.

**anak buah.** Disciple, student.

**anak pukulan.** (see counting strokes).

**angkat.** (see ngeseh).

**angsel.** A strongly articulated dance movement cued by a special drum pattern that leads to a sudden increase in volume before a rhythmic break.

**angsel bawak.** Short *angsel.* Used to underline a quick dance movement that requires little preparation.

**angsel dobel.** A loanword from English meaning “double *angsel,*” it is simply two *angsels* back-to-back, the second one generally being a short *angsel* or *angsel bawak.*

**angsel kekliwasan.** In *arja* performance, this is generally a special hand gesture in which the dancer touches his/her headdress before extending the arm out in front. It may be accompanied by a special *kendang* pattern or done while the drummers are not playing, depending on village style.

**angsel lantang.** Long *angsel,* usually involving a dance movement that requires lengthier preparation to execute.

**arja.** Balinese sung dance-drama that tells a love story often based on the Panji tales.

**Arja Bon.** (“invited” *arja*). Professional *arja* troupes made up of performers from various different villages.

**arja doyong.** The earliest incarnation of *arja,* beginning in the early 1900s, it was an unaccompanied, all-male form of street theatre.

**arja gode.** (lit: Grand or great *arja*). The third and most prolific period in *arja*’s history, it marks the beginning of consistent standardization of characters and performance arcs and is characterized by much longer and more professional *arja* performances.

**arja geguntangan.** The middle period in *arja*’s history (ca. 1915-1940) it saw the incorporation of the *geguntangan* ensemble into *arja* performance as well as the addition of women singer-dancers.
**arja gong.** *Arja* performance that uses *gamelan gong kebyar* instead of *gamelan geguntangan*. Begun in the late 1960s.

**arja negak.** Seated *arja*. A recent development, and now the more common way to see *arja* being performed.

**asli.** Original. Thus “*kendang arja asli* Singapadu” means “the original Singapadu style of *arja* drumming.”

**Arja Sebunan.** (lit: *Arja* from one nest). *Arja* troupes made up of members from a single *banjar* or a single village.

**balé banjar.** Community meeting hall, generally outdoor, for a *banjar*.

**banjar.** Balinese ward or neighborhood. A small community of people who share certain obligatory collective tasks.

**Baliology.** A discourse on Bali, largely consisting of published writings, which established a romanticized stereotype of the place and its people.

**Baliseering.** The “Balinization” of Bali. An official colonial Dutch policy in the early 20th century to create an image of Bali as being a peaceful paradise and of the Balinese as being a people only interested in art and ceremony.

**batel.** The shortest cyclic structure in *arja*, it is two beats long and features *klenang* strokes at the half-beat level. (Also sometimes referred to as *batel biasa* – normal *batel*).

**batel marah.** Also called *batel penasar*, this is a more intense variation on the *batel* cyclic structure, usually used to express anger or in fight scenes.

**buduh.** Balinese word for *keras*. Unrefined.

**bulé.** Balinese term for Westerner. Like “gringo,” but without the negative connotations.

**cengceng.** Small set of five or six cymbals mounted on a wooden plate-like frame and struck with two small hand-held cymbals. (Also called *ricik*).

**cocok.** Appropriate, suited to.

**Condong.** The middle-aged maidservant to the Galuh in an *arja* drama.

**counting strokes.** Softer drum strokes, sometimes called *anak pukulan* (“child strokes”) that are played in between the main strokes to kinesthetically maintain running quarter-beats at almost all times in *kendang arja* performance.

**Dag (D).** A low open stroke played with the right hand on the *wadon*. Often paired with *Tut* (T).

**dasar.** Basic, foundational.
Desak. The Limbur’s coarse (keras) maidservant in arja dramas.

diam. To be quiet and still.

drama gong. A spoken drama, based on the Panji tales and accompanied by gamelan gong kebyar that has slowly replaced arja in popularity since the 1970s.

full pattern. The term I use for a taught pattern in its original form, which may be longer than the four-beat “variants.”

Galuh. The beautiful young refined princess character in an arja drama.

gambuh, gamelan. A 15th-century court genre, believed by many to be the precursor to arja, it was used to accompany lavish theatre productions. Included are huge suling and kendang krumpungan.

gamelan. A collection of either Balinese or Javanese instruments, usually built as an inseparable set, and generally consisting largely of various rhythmic and melodic percussion instruments.

gangsa. Bronze metallophone of the gamelan gong kebyar and other gamelan ensembles. Often used to play fast, interlocking figuration called kotekan.

ganjil. Odd.

ganjil/genap dichotomy. The complementary roles of lanang and wadon where lanang will generally emphasize the beat and the half-beat with its rim-strokes while the wadon emphasizes the other quarter-beats with its rim-strokes.

geguntangan, gamelan. The small ensemble traditionally used to accompany arja performance.

gelungan. Headdress in arja costumes.

genap. Even.

gong kebyar, gamelan. A twentieth-century genre of Balinese gamelan known for its virtuosity and flashy “kebyar” sections.

gong pulu (G). Two bronze or iron bars strung up over a box resonator, this instrument is struck just once per cycle in arja geguntangan performance, marking the end/beginning of the cycle.

guntang (t). A one-stringed idiochord bamboo tube-zither that keeps a steady beat in the geguntangan ensemble. Vocalized as “tuk.”

half-beat. For the purposes of this study, the equivalent of a Western 8th-note in a simple meter like 4/4 time. There are two half-beats for every mat.
halus. Refined (of character, for instance).

ISI (Institut Seni Indonesia). “Indonesian Arts Institute,” the arts university in Indonesia (with several campuses including one in Denpasar). Has previously been called STSI and ASTI.

Kap (K). A sharp slap stroke played with the left hand on the wadon. Generally used in arja drumming as part of an angsel. Often paired with Pak (P).

kajar. A small hand-held gong which is sometimes used to keep a steady beat, but in arja most often improvises rhythms that complement the kendang.

Kawi. Old Javanese language used by certain refined characters in arja and other Balinese performance genres.

kendang. Drum. (see also lanang and wadon).

kendang krempengan. Small drums used to accompany arja with geguntangan ensemble. The high-pitched left-hand rim strokes – called peng on the higher lanang drum and kom on the lower wadon – give the drum its name. Also called kendang arja.

kendang krumpungan. Slightly larger and lower than kendang krempengan, but using the same collection of strokes, these drums are used to accompany genres such as legong and gambuh.

keras. A word with many meanings, depending on the context it can signify loud, harsh, coarse or unrefined.

klasik. (lit: Classic). A term used to describe a style of playing or version of a piece understood to be older, more traditional.

klenang (n). A small, high, ringing bossed gong that emphasizes an “off-beat” feel in the geguntangan ensemble’s cyclic structures.

kom (o). A high ringing stroke played with the fingertips of the left hand on the rim of the wadon. Often paired with peng (e). Sometimes called tong or kem.

lakon. Story, generally for a play or drama.

lanang. (lit: Male). The higher-pitched of a pair of instruments, particularly drums.

langsé. A colorful curtain centered upstage in an arja performance, and from behind which all the performers enter onto the stage.

legong. A genre of dance pieces generally danced by two young girls. Its ensemble is accompanied by kendang krumpungan.

Liku. The mad princess character in arja performances, often the Limbur’s daughter. A coarse (keras) character, she is very funny.
Limbur. The coarse female character opposing the Galuh in arja drama, often as a mean stepmother figure.

_madya period_. The middle period in Balinese musical history, it was characterized by a strong court presence and court patronage for the arts. Many of the so-called “classical” Balinese performing arts genres, including gambuh, developed during this period.

_manis_. Sweet, but also refined. Synonymous with halus in terms of arja characters.

**Mantri Buduh.** The unrefined prince character in arja dramas.

**Mantri Manis.** The refined prince character in arja dramas, he is usually the love interest of the Galuh.

_mat_. Beat, as it is defined by strokes on the guntang. This is what I refer to as the “beat” throughout this study, and may be thought of as the equivalent of a quarter-note in simple Western meters such as 4/4 time.

_metacyclic pattern_. A kendang pattern that does not ngegongin at every gong stroke but instead is made up of several cycles leading to a final ngegongin. These patterns can be any number of cycles long, and thus will not be regularized within a single piece.

_ngegongin_. To reinforce the gong cycle, particularly by emphasizing the arrival of the gong. Theoretically this is the role of the wadon in kendang arja.

_ngematin_. To provide the beat (mat.) Theoretically this is the role of the lanang in kendang arja.

_ngeseh_. An increase in dynamics and intensity, generally preceding an angsel, which is cued by increased movement from the dancer and often a lowering (turun) of his/her body.

_Pak (P)._ A sharp slap stroke played with the left hand on the lanang. Generally used in kendang arja as part of an angsel. Often paired with Kap (K).

_Pangkur._ The song generally sung for the Condong’s pepeson.

_Panji Tales._ A legend of an East Javanese prince named Panji (and his lover, the princess of Daha) that forms the basis for many arja stories as well as most gambuh performances.

_pasangan_. Pair, set, or partner. Often used to refer to the long-established partnership required for two drummers to improvise kendang arja effectively together.

_passage_. The term I use for all the drumming between two angsel, from introductory gestures through to ngeseh.

_patokan_. Rules or guidelines. Also called pakem.
pelestarian. Preservation.

pembukaan. An instrumental piece used to open an arja or other performance.

penasar. Servant characters in arja and other dramas, and the only characters still played by men in modern arja performance. There are a pair of refined (halus) penasar – Penasar Manis, and a pair of unrefined (keras) penasar – Penasar Buduh. Both pairs of characters are humorous.

Penasar Cenikan. The younger brother in each pair of penasar characters for arja dramas. Also called Kartala or Wijil.

Penasar Kelihan. The older brother in each pair of penasar characters for arja dramas. Also called Punta.

peng (e). A high ringing stroke played with the fingertips of the left hand on the rim of the lanang. Often paired with kom (o). Sometimes called teng.

penutup. An instrumental piece used to close an arja or other performance.

pepeson. Opening song or exposition of an arja character.

PKB (Pesta Kesenian Bali). A yearly month-long music and dance festival that takes place in Bali’s capital city of Denpasar.

pukulan. Pattern played on the drum. Also means “stroke.”

pung (U). A piercing stroke played with the fingers of the left hand on the lanang to give a cue.

quarter-beat. The equivalent of a Western 16th-note in a simple meter like 4/4 time, this is the density at which most kendang arja playing occurs. There are four quarter-beats for every mat.

rasa. Feeling.

revitalisasi. Revitalization. A common practice in Bali these days of attempting to breathe new life into old traditions.

reyong. Gong-chime used in gamelan gong kebyar and other ensembles that is played simultaneously by four people. Particularly known for its interesting improvisations in a style of elaborating figuration called norot.

ricik. (see cengceng)

RRI (Radio Republik Indonesia). Indonesia’s national radio station.

rumus. (lit: Formula). A term used by Madé Hood to refer to kendang arja patterns that partners will develop together.
SMKI (Sekolah Menengah Karawitan Indonesia). Formerly called KOKAr, it is a government-sponsored high school for the performing arts in Indonesia.

*suling.* Bamboo end-blown flute. The sole melody instrument, traditionally, in the geguntangan ensemble.

tabuh dua. A mid-speed 4-beat cyclic structure in arja performance.

tabuh empat. This is the term Pak Tama of Singapadu uses to describe what other arja drummers call tabuh telu. Thus, while in other genres these two terms have different meanings, for arja, they are interchangeable.

tabuh telu. The longest and slowest cyclic structure for improvised drumming in arja performance, it is eight beats in length.

tawa-tawa (pu). In the geguntangan ensemble, a medium-sized bossed gong that plays its strokes in regular alternation with the gong pulu for every cyclic structure type.

tabuh. A composition.

tembang macapat. A collection of poetic forms with fixed structural elements. These forms have become the basis for arja songs.

tukang. Generally a term used to refer to a skilled laborer or craftsman, for musicians it is the equivalent of the English term “player.” The tukang kendang, for instance, is the kendang player.

*Tut* (T). A mid-range open stroke played with the right thumb on the lanang. Often paired with *Dag* (D).

variant. The term I use for the 4-beat units freely mixed and matched in kendang arja improvisation. Different than “full pattern.”

wadon. (lit: Female). The lower-pitched of a pair of instruments, particularly drums.

wayah. Deep, great or complex, this term is often used to refer to a particularly complex or satisfying drum improvisation.
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Introduction

My arms are feeling exceptionally rubbery in the wake of a long drum lesson – a good indication that they will be very sore tomorrow – and I can feel my sweat slowly drying in the light breeze. I had never known until this summer that you could actually sweat on your stomach! Sitting in the cool shade on the balé,¹ the porch of my teacher Sudi’s² house, I gratefully sip the strong sweet kopi (coffee) that his mother has brought us on a tray with some Balinese jajan (snacks). Yesterday she fed us bags of peanuts and shrimp chips with our post-lesson coffee; today the small serving dish is overflowing with pieces of banana wrapped in a sweet, sticky rice flour dough. I suspect she’s trying to fatten me up! Our good friend Gus Dé³ has just dropped by for a visit, and he and Sudi are merrily exchanging funny stories. Leaning back against the wall, my coffee in one hand and a kretek clove cigarette slowly burning down in the other, I watch contentedly as the two of them abandon their story-telling, pick up Sudi’s drums (kendang), and begin to jam.

Sudi has been teaching me the drumming to accompany Legong Lasem, one of Bali’s most famous dances. Like all the Balinese kendang playing I have encountered thus far, kendang legong is pre-composed. Two drums play complementary parts that interlock – like-stroke following like-stroke, though not always in completely strict alternation – to create a carefully crafted composite. There is in certain places some room for variation, but the music is mostly fixed and memorized. The wild rhythms that Sudi and Gus Dé are busting out in the increasingly hot July morning are something completely otherwise. I have never heard Balinese drumming like this before.

¹ Usually a word used to describe an open-air public building, balé is also used to describe the large open porches often built outside people’s homes in Bali.
² I Wayan Sudirana of Ubud.
³ Ida Bagus Made Widnaya of Tulikup, Gianyar.
“What are you two playing?” I ask, entranced and flabbergasted in equal measure. They laugh and pick up the pace a few notches. I sit watching in silence for awhile, and they occasionally smile knowingly at me when they think they’ve played a particularly cool rhythm, what they might call wayah.\textsuperscript{4} When they finally stop in a fit of laughter – from a mistake or just the joy of playing together, I’ll never know – I ask again: “What WAS that?!”

“It’s kendang arja,” Gus Dé answers simply, implying an association with the genre of Balinese sung dance-drama known as arja. “We’re improvising. We can play whatever we want.”

Having studied Balinese improvisation before – on a melodic instrument called the reyong\textsuperscript{5} – I suspect that the meaning behind the statement “we can play whatever we want” is more nuanced than that, however. They are playing at lightning speeds, each producing up to 800 drum strokes per minute. Their hands move far too fast for them to be consciously aware of what the other is playing in time to react accordingly – and yet their two parts interlock as though they had been planned in advance. I imagine in that moment that kendang arja, like much improvisation, must be based on a set of guidelines, known, perhaps passively only, by the musicians – that while an arja drummer does have freedom when playing, it is possible to play “wrong.” And that were I to have picked up a drum that day to play with Sudi and Gus Dé, playing whatever I wanted to play, I probably would have played nothing “right.”

\textsuperscript{4} Some Balinese terms do not have simple English translations, and wayah is one of these. My first Balinese teacher I Dewa Ketut Alit translates wayah as “great”; the Balinese dancer and scholar I Madé Bandem has used the term “venerable” for wayah; and preeminent Bali scholar Michael Tenzer translates wayah as “deep or profound” (personal communications 2003-2011). When talking about improvised patterns I understand wayah to be a pattern that is more complex than the basic patterns we learn at the beginning, one that often subverts our expectations in some way, perhaps by subtly breaking an inherent rule governing improvisation. When comparing a wayah with a non-wayah pattern, Sudi has said that the non-wayah pattern makes the drummer sound “seperti anak kecil” (like a small child), implying that a wayah pattern is one that would be played by a more advanced musician.

\textsuperscript{5} Tilley 2003.
Aim and Overview

This study combines classification and paradigmatic analysis\(^6\) of *arja* drum stroke patterns with an ethnographic consideration of the musicians that play them. The heart of the work is an analysis of the *kendang arja* improvisations of various master drummers from different villages across Bali, each of whom draws influence from a style of playing that developed in the village of Singapadu in the early-to-mid 20\(^{th}\) century. Patterns are evaluated and categorized in an effort both to understand the divergent paths that the Singapadu style took as it was diffused to various areas, and to create a grammar: a set of inherent rules – formulated consciously by me alone – that govern *arja* playing. These will be tempered, wherever possible, by Balinese discourse on *arja* and other genres. I will also draw heavily from the ideas and opinions of my various Balinese teachers and friends, who together represent a multi-generational, multi-village cross-section of some of the genre’s most knowledgeable and respected practitioners. These ideas were garnered through lessons, interviews, and casual conversations over countless cups of *kopi* and forgotten *kretexes* slowly smoking themselves down on tile floors.

Chapter 1 traces the historical development of *arja* – the dance-drama genre for which *kendang arja* is used – and outlines its musical features, with special focus on the role of the *kendang*. In Chapter 2 I consider Balinese techniques of learning and teaching and how these have shaped my research methods, and I survey the existing Balinese discourse on *kendang arja*. I also introduce the original Singapadu style of *arja*, and discuss how it came
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\(^6\) As will become evident in chapters 3 and 4, I use the term “paradigmatic analysis” somewhat differently than scholars like Simha Arom (1991) and Nicolas Ruwet (1966). Like them, I seek to compile and compare a large corpus of culturally equivalent or interchangeable musical patterns. However, where in Arom’s study of Banda Linda horn music, for instance, each set of paradigms traces to a single identifiable composition set in a rigid periodic structure, in *kendang arja*, there is no such composition, only the period. Thus rather than identifying common aspects between patterns and seeking their generative models, as does Arom, my goal is to discover both the consistency and the diversity of the musical vocabulary at play.
to be transmitted broadly across Bali where other equally famous styles did not, as well as presenting some of the reasons for and manifestations of regional variation in kendang patterns. Chapters 3 and 4 are the centerpiece: the analysis of my teachers’ patterns. Taught patterns and how they relate to the Balinese discourse on kendang arja are discussed in Chapter 3 before expanding the analysis to include the hundreds of played patterns from various recording sessions in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 delves more deeply into the distinctive experiences and ideologies of each of the drummers under examination, exploring the possible reasons behind their differing transformations of the Singapadu style with concepts adapted from linguistics as an investigative framework. The brief concluding chapter points to two major current dialogues within the field of ethnomusicology: the place of music analysis within the field and its metatheory, and the importance of cross-disciplinary collaboration. I finish by addressing how this study and its future expansions may contribute to those dialogues.

**Research Context**

Approaching a Balinese drumming genre from a music-analytical perspective that also borrows from linguistics, this work trespasses on a network of fields. These include the study of Balinese music and the Baliology that subsumes it, as well as ethnomusicology, music theory, and linguistics. This introductory chapter, then, will survey what has been said in print about arja to this point and will situate the study within this web of discourses that constitutes its intellectual backdrop.
Existing Literature on *Arja*

Balinese music has received a fair bit of attention in the ethnomusicological world, from Colin McPhee’s mid-twentieth century magnum opus *Music in Bali* (1966) and Michael Tenzer’s intricately detailed *Gamelan Gong Kebyar* (2000) to Michael Bakan’s rich *Music of Death and New Creation* (1999) and Andrew McGraw’s illuminating *Musik Kontemporer* (2005) and forthcoming *Radical Traditions*, many of which are discussed below. However, there are relatively few written sources available on *arja*, and practically none that are in-depth studies.

Probably the first scholarly mention of *arja* is a short chapter in *Dance and Drama in Bali* (1938), where Walter Spies and Beryl de Zoete outline the genre’s stock standard characters and elegantly describe the narrative of one specific *arja* drama. McPhee (1966) also devotes a short preliminary chapter to the genre in his book, briefly introducing the instruments of the *arja* ensemble before then focusing on some of its song forms. Neither of these sources addresses the genre – or the place of the *kendang* within it – in any depth. Most of the Indonesian-language sources on *arja* are similarly introductory.

More recent English-language sources do become increasingly detailed. These include, most significantly, Edward Herbst’s beautifully written *Voices in Bali* (1997), a deep study of Balinese vocal music that includes examination of the songs and singing styles used in *arja*; and Natalie Kellar’s work (2000, 2003, and 2004), much of which addresses concepts of gender identity and gender-bending in *arja* performance. By far the most comprehensive work on *arja* to date is I Wayan Dibia’s 1992 PhD dissertation, “*Arja: A Sung Dance-Drama of Bali,*” which gives a full account of the genre’s performance aspects, cultural context, and history and describes its stock characters and storylines, dance,
language use, costumes, and so on. An estimable work, it nevertheless only relatively briefly touches on the musical facets of *arja*, and most of this discussion centers on the song forms, cyclic structures, and other instruments in the *arja* ensemble (Dibia only addresses the drumming in passing). Japanese scholar Ako Mashino (2011) has written about modern *arja* performance, yet though she has studied drumming with Singapadu *arja* master I Wayan Tama, she has yet to address this topic in her English-language work.

The one scholar who has focused on *kendang arja* technique and patterns in any depth is Madé Mantle Hood. In both his 2001 M.A. thesis and 2002 article “Improvised Paired Drumming,” Hood analyzes ten short interlocking patterns from I Wayan Tama of Singapadu as a way to begin to identify their structural characteristics. He frames his analyses with a thorough review of the existing literature on *arja*, drawing from Dibia most particularly, much as I do. But what Hood’s study lacks are the voices and perspectives of his teachers, something that a more intensive ethnographic study might have provided. My work seeks to expand upon and deepen Hood’s research, aspiring to the level of detail on *kendang arja* that Dibia has attained on *arja*’s social, cultural, and theatrical aspects. I hope to achieve this through the examination of a much larger corpus of patterns than those available to Hood, and an ethnographic approach to research that takes into account the diverse theories and perspectives of my many teachers and drumming friends, thus creating a “polyphony” of voices on *kendang arja*.7

My analyses here have largely drawn inspiration from the paradigmatic approaches of several Francophone scholars, including Simha Arom and Jean-Jacques Nattiez (discussed in
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7 This concept of a polyphony of voices I have taken from McGraw; he cites the idea as “Foucault after Bakhtin.” (Mcgraw 2005: xvii).
more depth below). But existing analytical works on other Balinese drumming genres have also informed my own work. These include a long chapter on kendang patterns in Tenzer’s *Gamelan Gong Kebyar*, and works on kendang tunggal (solo drumming) by I Wayan Sudirana (2009) and kendang gambuh (a 15th-century genre putatively the prototype for all Balinese drumming lineages) by I Ketut Gdé Asnawa (1991).

**Baliology**

In many ways this dissertation is a limited study of musical structures and improvisations, but it is also inescapably more than that. To discuss Balinese music is to place ourselves in a legacy of anthropologists and musicologists who, along with colonial officials, tourists, and missionaries, have created a mythos about Bali and the Balinese people. And from this mythos – and further perpetuating it – has sprung a discourse about Bali, largely in published works, that we call “Baliology.” It seems, at this point, almost beyond *de rigueur* in any study of Bali or Balinese music to unpack the various tropes of Baliology’s history. This has been done very thoroughly by a number of scholars, including Boon (1977), Vickers (1989), Robinson (1995), and McGraw (2005: 19-48). I do not wish here to get caught up in the thicket of power relations and myth-creation that is my field’s academic legacy in Bali at the expense of the larger goals of this study. That being said, avoiding engagement with these issues is perhaps equally irresponsible, and so I address them briefly here at the outset before self-consciously setting them aside.

Beginning in the early 20th century, writers and colonial officials presented an image of Bali as a “rare jewel” (G.P. Rouffaer quoted in Robinson 1995: 41), timeless and unchanging, and of the Balinese as peaceful, happy, traditional people, with no thoughts or worries for their futures: “a utopian image of a paradise on earth, populated by a noble
people whose smiling, titillating women were perpetually topless” (McGraw 2005: 13-14). This image was contrary to the “wild,” violent Bali of the 19th century, where “a fierce, savage, perfidious, and bellicose people, loath to do any work” were constantly “running amok” and practicing widow burning (Vickers 1989: 2). But around the turn of the 20th century the Dutch saw in Bali’s colorful ceremonies, picturesque scenery, and beautiful mocha-colored women an opportunity to capitalize on their “possession” as a tourist destination. What followed was the conscious and concerted manufacture of “Balinese culture,” the Baliseering or “Balinization” of Bali. As Geoffrey Robinson says of this colonial policy: “By the 1930s, the bureaucratic memoranda of Dutch colonial officials had, with a tedious uniformity, begun to describe the people of Bali as more interested by nature, in art, culture, and religion – dance, music, painting, carving, ceremonies, festivals, and so on – than in ‘politics’” (Robinson 1995: 6). Coming to Bali in the mid-twentieth century, anthropologists like Margaret Mead, Jane Belo, and Gregory Bateson were already steeped in the Dutch propaganda of Baliseering; everything they saw and wrote about was shrouded in this simple, unchanging, apolitical paradise image:

Observing Balinese behaviour and ‘character’ within the narrow, and historically atypical, confines of the colonial order, [these anthropologists] and others took the ‘harmony and stability’ of Balinese society as an ethnographic given. They appear not to have reflected seriously on the political and historical conditions within which they were making their observations, nor did they consider how changes in those conditions might influence the way the Balinese ‘character’ might manifest itself. [...] The assumption appeared to be that ‘politics’ could somehow be factored out of the ethnographic picture, that there was an essential Balinese character which transcended politics and history. (Robinson 1995: 6-7)

Within this pre-established, readily accepted trope, Gregory Bateson and Clifford Geertz after him introduced us to a Bali devoid of climax, competition, or rivalry: a “steady state,” where balance and stability were prized (Bateson 1970: 398). To Bateson, Balinese culture, due to its continual focus on cycles of ceremonies and artistic endeavors, was static,
unchanging, and “ultimately undevelopable” (McGraw 2005: 21). This Bali was a spiritual, ancient, village-based culture, floating happily forever in “a motionless present, a vectorless now” (Geertz 1973: 404). Geertz extended that metaphor to encompass every aspect of Balinese life, from its complex circling calendars to its cyclical naming systems. Through these representations, Bateson, Geertz, and others effectively denied to the Balinese people the possibility of individuality, personal development, innovation, or a linear life trajectory.

In his discussion of Balinese birth order names, for instance, Geertz asserts:

> for all procreating couples, births form a circular succession of Wayans, Njomans, Mades, Ktuts, and once again Wayans, an endless four-stage replication of an imperishable form. Physically men come and go as the ephemerae they are, but socially the dramatis personae remain eternally the same as new Wayans and Ktuts emerge from the timeless world of the gods […] to replace those who dissolve once more into it. (Geertz 1973: 371-372)

While Geertz’ studies were by no means based in fiction – the Balinese certainly do have cyclical aspects to their calendars and naming practices – his representations of these Balinese realities constructed a Balinese culture that was at least partly a figment of his fantasy. This perspective became a prominent lens through which foreign observers peered; we only discussed Balinese art and the unchanging aspects of its religion. What this created was a discourse in which Bali could only be approached from an aesthetic standpoint, denying, as Robinson reproaches, the dynamic (and sometimes violent) politics and history of the island, not to mention its philosophies and the diverse points of view and innovations of its people.

Baliology’s house of cards began to slowly crumble in the late 1970s, when scholars started to question Geertz’ writings. In particular, Bloch (1977) and Crapanzano (1986) paved the way for a more nuanced study of Bali. Most of the anthropological offerings on
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8 It was most particularly the articles “Person, Time and Conduct in Bali” (referenced above) and “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight” (both reproduced in Geertz 1973) that caused offence in the scholarly community.
Bali since then, like Robinson’s *The Dark Side of Paradise* (1995), have made a concerted effort to work actively against the prevailing anthropological romance of Baliology; in fact, it has become a near-requirement in modern Bali scholarship. For his part, Robinson has sought to reclaim Balinese history from the peaceful, steady-state cliché, injecting into our romanticised images the behind-the-scenes reality of conflict, turbulence, political violence, fierce opposition to colonization, and the devastating so-called Communist massacres of 1965. Of the works in this new vein of inquiry, Adrian Vickers’ 1989 *Bali: A Paradise Created* is perhaps one of the most comprehensive in that it not only attempts a retelling of the history of Bali but also deconstructs and “anthropologizes” the scholars, tourists, and paradise seekers who created and perpetuated the common Bali images.

Most scholars since Geertz, each in his/her own way, present images of Bali that resist the clichés of cyclicity, simple peacefulness, and stasis. And this is one of the post-colonial dialogues that my study of *kendang arja* seeks to join, albeit in a slightly less conventional manner, refuting Balinese changelessness by an examination of musical innovation. Similar to the ways in which “contemporary Balinese composers have in fact strengthened Balinese musical identity through the equal exploration of indigenous […] and foreign materials” (McGraw 2005: 24), the drummers that I will examine here walk a tightrope between tradition and innovation, maintaining and respecting the old while often creating something new through self-reflexive innovation and improvisation.

This balance between tradition and change has come to the centre of many studies on Bali from the last two decades. Where mid-twentieth-century writings on Bali focused on the aesthetic and the traditional at the expense of the political and the dynamic, many from the last twenty years are attempts to reconcile the two, to situate Balinese culture and
tradition within the context of the island’s fast-moving modernization and globalization.

Two prime examples of this current trend in Balinese scholarship are Vickers’ *Being Modern in Bali* (1996) and Rubinstein’s *Staying Local in the Global Village* (1999). Each of these is a compilation of essays addressing, through the exploration of numerous aspects of Balinese life, the Balinese reconciliation between the modern and the traditional – a struggle undoubtedly compounded by Balinese self-identification with the romantic, artistic, traditional tropes of Baliology and *Baliseering*. Michel Picard’s writings, too, from his compelling book *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture* (1998) to his chapter in the above-mentioned Rubinstein volume and his more recent “From ‘Kebalian’ to ‘Ajeg Bali’” (2009), have deepened this dialogue, integrating the place of tourism into this history and thus breaking the glass panel between observer and observed. In an effort to contend faithfully with these various tensions, these newer works seek a polyphony of voices, placing ultimate value on Balinese perceptions and points of view.

A study of *kendang arja* grapples with these same questions in a very different way. In some respects I am not equal to the task of representing a Balinese point of view to the extent that someone like Adrian Vickers is. Though I am fluent in Indonesian, I do not speak any of the many levels of Balinese, the language in which most of the truly personal, open, friend-to-friend communication on Bali happens. And I have never been one to engage in drama, to ask the difficult questions, to get underneath the easy answer, or to welcome the conflict that comes from these things. Vickers, Robinson, Picard: these are scholars who can and have plumbed those depths for their research. My contribution to their dialogue will be something quite different.
Kendang arja is an interesting style of drumming for sociological analysis because in its very nature it straddles the line between tradition and cosmopolitanism. As will be discussed in Chapter 1, the dance-drama from which the drumming itself stems is in many respects a dying art. The great arja musicians that I have studied with and interviewed are all in their 50s, 60s, and 70s, and there are very few musicians from the younger generation waiting to take their place. These days arja performances predominantly reside in the nostalgic memories of the older generation. That being said, in the minds of young drummers, good kendang arja players are among the most respected performing artists on Bali, and the drumming patterns of the great ones, like my teachers, are spoken of reverently and with longing. These men are considered to be the equals of the gender metallophone players that accompany shadow plays with their intricately difficult and contrapuntal music.

In this respect, for young drummers like Sudi and Gus Dé who play kendang arja out of its original context as simple jamming music, the drumming becomes something of a badge of authenticity. It strengthens their identity as Balinese musicians in the face of modernity and the fast-moving changes they see in their own romanticized images of Bali. This becomes infinitely more important in a new cosmopolitan Bali where many of these young musicians are not only composers and innovators within their own culture, but also international in their careers as they teach and study throughout the world. This is a generation of Balinese artists perhaps unprecedented in the scope of their aspirations. And in this more pluralistic reality, as Tenzer has said, ‘‘arja grounds them, like kissing their bibles […] before they go off to fight the wars.’’
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9 Personal communication, Jan. 21, 2013.
Yet *kendang arja* is also a living, improvised tradition. And for a young drummer who can create new, complex, interesting patterns within the existing idiom, the drumming also becomes a badge of innovation. Sudi, for instance, after teaching me several quite traditional *kendang arja* patterns was very proud to pull out a new one of his own creation, longer and more complex – more *wayah* – than any of the patterns of his teachers. His ability to create this pattern represented to him, on the one hand, his profound understanding of and indoctrination into the tradition, and on the other, his depth of creativity within its idiom. Together these two facets of *kendang arja* allow young musicians to engage musically with the wider world while still being grounded in the stability of the familiar. My study engages with the dialogue of tradition in modernity by paying homage, through musical analysis, to both the authenticity and the innovation of *kendang arja*.

**Ethnomusicology, Analysis, and Balinese Music**

In the last 60 years, ethnomusicology has not been a field that really focuses on music analysis. Analysis is where we began, of course, where the late 19th- and early 20th-century comparative musicologists cast their focus. But since the mid-twentieth century the majority of work published in the field—particularly the book-length ethnographies that increasingly comprise its central canon—has taken more of an anthropological bent. Yet any separation that exists between music theory and ethnomusicology – and, perhaps more importantly, between music theorists and ethnomusicologists – is not a universal one. It appears to be a product of Anglophone, and, perhaps more specifically, of North American, English, and Australian music scholarship. Many of the paradigmatic analyses that have influenced my
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10 Several scholars have discussed, in depth, the history and diverse directions of the field, including Nettl (2010 and 2005) and Myers (1992). And, in my M.A. thesis (Tilley 2003) I address the anthropology/musicology divide at length.
work come from Francophone scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. The first musicologist to conceive of a paradigmatic analysis of music was Nicolas Ruwet (1966), and he and his successors worked almost exclusively with notated music from the Western tradition. Yet Jean-Jacques Nattiez, though largely focusing on Western music, has also used the technique to study Inuit vocal games (1983) and, more recently, other oral traditions including music from the Ouldeme people of Cameroun (Nattiez and Fernando 2012). Nathalie Fernando (1999 and 2010) has studied the musical heritage of the extreme north of Cameroun more deeply, applying to it a rigorous classification. And it was Simha Arom, in his studies of the polyphonic traditions of the Central African Republic (1991), who developed these techniques of classification and paradigmatic analysis most fully. In the Francophone world, therefore, we see an academic atmosphere where similar analytic techniques can be aptly applied to both Western and non-Western musics. These Francophone music scholars had [and have] broad interests that usually went far from the study of non-Western and traditional musics. They were also music historians, theorists, and composers. They avoided separating the European from the non-European, and they tried to find ways of looking at music as a unitary phenomenon rather than interpreting the world of music as a series of discrete musics. (Nettl 2010: 26)

This is the kind of music scholarship I have striven for here; and, as will be discussed in the conclusion, an approach that I hope will receive more attention from the field at large in the future. And while Arom’s 1991 African Polyphony and African Polyrhythm is certainly not preoccupied with cultural context and ethnographic perspectives – a limitation of the work, perhaps – its rigorous application of classification and paradigmatic analysis techniques to a non-Western genre of music have earned it an enduring international reputation despite the fact that few Anglophones (and not all Francophones, to be sure) have emulated its method.
Yet, despite the relative scarcity of music theory and analysis in the field of ethnomusicology in general, a large percentage of the work being done specifically on Balinese music is analytical. Though most of this work does not approach the music from the paradigmatic angles of Arom and myself, analysis has been, from the beginning, an integral part of Balinese music research and publication. McPhee, Tenzer, and McGraw have been at the center of this trend, but others cited in the bibliography, including Wayne Vitale (1990), Lisa Gold (1998), and Nicholas Gray (2010 and 2011) have all done substantial music analyses in their studies of various Balinese musics. I wonder sometimes why this should be so. Is there something innately categorizable in the construction of Balinese music – more so than in other music traditions – that steers the academic mind to musical analysis? Certainly Balinese musical structure and the complex relationships between the various parts in a gamelan ensemble are topics well suited to in-depth musical analysis. But as we have seen, musical analysis has been – and can be – applied to many kinds of music. Thus perhaps the reason for such a large concentration of music analysis work being done in Bali is simply the result of chance: the fact that the first significant work on Balinese music, written in a time when the aestheticization of Balinese culture reigned supreme, was not done by an anthropologically-trained ethnomusicologist.

Colin McPhee, I think in many ways, set the stage for the manner in which music scholars have chosen to talk about Bali. A composer and musicologist first, he looked at the subject of Balinese music through his own familiar glasses and those of his era. Though he lived in Bali for many years in the 1930s and was an early field ethnographer on the island, his interest was in the organizing principles of the music and, by extension, how these might influence his own compositions. His seminal *Music in Bali* (1966), then, comprises the
transcription and structural examination of various different genres of Balinese music – particularly the classic genres, in which he saw “perfect balance” (Ibid.: 111).

McPhee’s study is both a product of and contributor to the tropes of mid-twentieth-century Baliology. An almost purely aesthetic examination of Balinese music, it does little to address the complicated histories of the genres or to engage much in a positive discussion of musical innovation and change, thus supporting ideas of Balinese restraint and changelessness. It also lends credence to the “steady-state” image by presenting a cyclic music that “has no climax.” This misleading reading of Balinese music, as McGraw has noted, is supported by McPhee’s use of Western notation with little thought for the extreme tempo variations and other temporal transformations inherent in the music. Such a representation, McGraw criticizes, flattens to strict repetition an otherwise dynamic and changing piece of music. And, because the “temporal and gestural flexibility which McPhee found so irresistible is obscured once captured within Western staff notation […] it is largely absent in his analysis” also (McGraw 2008: 136). Once again we are given a one-dimensional image of Balinese music, like Balinese culture, as something static. With Western notation and Western techniques of music analysis (including a use of the cents
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11 Several scholars including Tenzer (2000) and McGraw (2005 and 2008) have addressed this issue in some depth; here I present simply an overview.
12 “The lineage of this thought seems to have flowed thus: Kramer 1988, quoting Geertz (1973) referencing McPhee” (McGraw 2008: 140). The concept certainly pervaded scholarly thought in both music theory and ethnomusicology well into the late 1980s (see Kramer 1988 and Maceda 1986). Yet the fact that McGraw 2008 is largely a refutation of this simpler concept of Balinese cyclicity speaks to its continued hold on writings about Balinese music.
13 The power dynamics created by representing one culture’s music through the system of another is an equally real aspect of this question.
14 See also Tenzer’s analysis of the famous gong kebyar piece Oleg Tumulilingan for an in-depth look at the through-composed aspects of Balinese cyclic construction (2006).
15 McGraw goes on to reveal the dangerous precedent set by this: “Since McPhee, Western ethnomusicologists have favoured for analysis those elements of Balinese music which are more easily represented in Western staff notation and for which they already have a systemized vocabulary and ready-made methods of analysis” (McGraw 2008: 136).
system to analyze tuning), the music in McPhee’s book is presented as a playground for composers and music scholars from the West, not as an active, dynamic tradition that Balinese musicians are free to comment on.

More recent theory and analysis work on Balinese music, like Andrew McGraw’s 2005 dissertation “Musik Kontemporer,” is careful to take into account a multitude of Balinese voices and perspectives. Though McGraw’s in-depth study is a largely Western-style analysis of contemporary Balinese compositions, all transcribed using Western notation, the outlook on these works is not his alone. As McGraw states:

In an attempt to avoid the imposition of completely Western perspectives, I have included the voices of other Balinese and Indonesian researchers, even and especially when their opinions differed from mine, or worked at odds with the conclusions I make. I present a “polyphony” of voices (Foucault after Bakhtin) meant to contextualize the reader within the sometimes cacophonous swirl of often conflicting and clashing discourses surrounding new music and ideas about tradition and innovation. In this way I hope to avoid essentializing the Balinese and or flattening their discourse into a monophonic drone. (McGraw 2005: xvii)

What’s more, though McGraw is essentially writing aesthetically about Bali, much as the mid-century Baliologists did, this study is framed in the cultural rhetoric of modern Bali and enriched by discussions of the many complicated politics of patronage and foreign influence on Balinese contemporary composition. Though *focusing* aesthetically, then, McGraw *writes* culturally, socially, and politically as well.

Probably the most influential recent work on a Balinese music genre is Michael Tenzer’s *Gamelan Gong Kebyar* (2000). Like McPhee’s and to some extent McGraw’s work, the heart of this book is an in-depth musical analysis relying largely on Western (or Western-derived) theoretical models and Western staff notation for its execution. Meticulous in its detail and presentation, the book seeks to uncover the underlying system of compositional rules and organizational practices governing *gong kebyar* composition and aesthetics. As McGraw has said in his review of the book, in these analyses “Tenzer is
dealing, unabashedly, with art for art’s sake, suggesting that ethnomusicology’s ‘ban’ on the discussion of ‘so-called autonomous structural processes in isolation from the context in which the music is learned and performed’ (13) has become a hardened cliché” (McGraw 2002: 147). Yet, despite this disclaimer, and despite the fact that many of his “discoveries” about Balinese music might never be corroborated by a Balinese musician, unlike McPhee Tenzer spends almost the first 1/3 of his book discussing the music in its cultural context, information gleaned from his over two-decade romance with Bali. Thus, like McGraw after him, Tenzer seeks a multiplicity of perspectives and angles from which to frame his own analyses.

Still, studies such as these have fallen prey to post-colonial critique. Katharine Wakeling, for instance, worries that regardless of careful contextualization the relative disconnect between ethnography and analysis in works like Tenzer’s ensures that “Balinese gamelan music-making [is] decontextualized from Balinese performance as a whole, disengaged from its social and political context, and/or dislocated from the practices and accounts of Balinese musicians themselves” (Wakeling 2010: 12). She accuses the structuralist approach to analysis taken by many scholars, including Tenzer and potentially to some extent myself, of being incongruous with Balinese methods of learning and teaching. Our stripping down of gamelan music into its component parts in order to understand its underlying structure, she levels, runs counter to the more holistic, ensemble-based, big-picture Balinese approach. What’s more, she decries our talk-heavy Western learning approach as standing in opposition to the more physical, imitative Balinese teaching method, discussed in more depth in Chapter 2 of my dissertation (Wakeling 2010: 13-17).
Wakeling is not wrong in her assessment. It is true that most Balinese teachers – at least those from the old generation – either cannot or do not choose to break a piece up into smaller sections, slowing down and isolating segments with which a student may be struggling. Nor do they prefer teaching a single instrument in isolation when other musicians can help provide a musical context, or talking about a pattern when playing it could be just as effective a way to communicate their thought processes. Yet I disagree with Wakeling’s argument that this reality somehow “challenge[s] the claim that Balinese musicians might highlight, or indeed even conceive of, the notion of hierarchical strata in musical works” (Wakeling 2010: 16). I have often seen *gamelan* musicians practicing on their own – though of course the act of playing together is infinitely more satisfying. And watching a *calung* metallophone player deftly derive his slow-moving part from the fast-moving line of a *gangsa* metallophone, or the second player on the *reyong* gong-chime determining his notes from those of the first player, implies a deep-seated understanding of the hierarchical and structural connections between these parts, whether or not that is a component of the *spoken* discourse or *traditional* teaching methods. Further, that composers are constantly writing new pieces that appear to follow the “rules” laid out in studies by Tenzer and others belies their supposed ignorance of these structures and hierarchies.

Finally, I wonder if Wakeling would be so concerned about this supposed disconnect when reading the works of Balinese scholars on Balinese music – scholars like Dibia, Bandem, and particularly Sudirana (my teacher, referred to more familiarly as Sudi in this chapter’s scene-setting opening) who also sometimes discuss their music in non-traditional ways in an effort to get underneath structures they may not fully understand at a conscious level. Sudirana, for instance, is currently completing a PhD in ethnomusicology with a focus
on the ancient *gong luang* genre. A Balinese genre that he did not learn to play as a child, he has had to approach it from both the inside and the outside and has resorted to some of the more structuralist analytic methods in order to uncover hidden elements in its construction. That Sudirana’s research supervisor is Michael Tenzer complicates the question, of course, but does his Balinese heritage negate concerns of power relations in an etic (“outsider”) approach to research? Do we allow the Balinese to take ownership of these methods of analysis if they prove fruitful or reveal interesting connections not noticed by other means, much as Kofi Agawu (2003) encourages African musicians to become empowered by absorbing these same cosmopolitan influences? Does “insider” use make this style of analysis more allowable? More authentic? And if so, why then can we not also allow amazed, respectful outsiders to use it? Outsiders who spend their lives living and breathing Balinese music, flying to Bali whenever cash flow and time allows to study and talk about music and hang out with their teachers, in an effort to become as emic as an outsider can? And will we ever allow ourselves to be ever-so-slightly less shackled by these concepts of insider and outsider, emic and etic? I suspect that it is not possible to answer these sticky questions to every scholar’s satisfaction, and perhaps Wakeling and I would never find a comfortable middle ground between our two perspectives.

Yet I still find value in the kind of analysis that Tenzer, Sudirana, and I have undertaken. “Western” though these methods may be, aesthetically-focused as our studies may be, they are always informed by the theories and opinions of our many teachers and Balinese friends. We approach the music on their terms, from a place of respect, aware of the mistakes made by the scholars who came before us and dedicated to attempting an analysis that does not fall prey to them. Yet, in the spirit of dialogue, we also approach the
music on our own terms, thus perhaps noticing connections and symmetries that our teachers do not, as one might find new meaning in a poem or see an unplanned shape in the clouds of a painting. So long as we are both forthcoming about the source of our ideas and willing to engage in dialogue about them with our teachers, informants, and other scholars – both Balinese and Western – each new analysis can only serve to add to the multiplicity of voices and perspectives on Balinese music.

There are many different methods that ethnomusicologists can use to increase our knowledge base on a music tradition. This is one of them, imperfect and incomplete as any of them are. Yet, as Gold says of Tenzer’s work (but which might equally be said of McGraw’s work, and one day, hopefully, of mine), such a cross-disciplinary study “adroitly dipping into current scholarly discourse of multiple disciplines (ethnomusicology, music theory and analysis, musicology, composition, and anthropology) renders distinctions between these disciplines immaterial, and is an example of ethnomusicology at its finest” (Gold 2004b: 274). I am drawn to this idea that ethnomusicology “at its finest” could be an unapologetic conglomeration of theories and methods from each of its many parent disciplines. And this is what I hope to achieve in this study of *kendang arja*, with respect, humility, and an incorrigible desire for discourse.
Chapter 1 An Overview of Arja

1.1 The Performance

The balé banjar is packed to overflowing. It seems that the entire village of Pengosekan has come out to watch tonight’s arja performance. Children clamber to get a good seat at the front of the building, wide awake and rowdy although it is nearly 10:00pm and the show will last well over 3 hours. A handful of sarong-clad men have stepped off to the side of the balé to smoke their sweet clove cigarettes and exchange pleasantries. What is missing, I suddenly notice, is the young generation: the teenagers and 20-somethings that I see lounging on their motorbikes offering “transport” to the tourists by day. Their absence is a testament to the decline of arja’s popularity in recent decades; thirty years ago, they would all have been here.

We have been sitting on the floor waiting for the show to begin since just after 8:00pm, thanks to a more flexible attitude toward scheduling here. None of the Balinese seem the least bit perturbed by the long wait, however, and the excitement in the open-air room is palpable; an arja in Pengosekan is a rare thing nowadays. Many of my teachers talk fondly of the golden years of arja, when a good arja troupe would have work almost every night of the year in villages across the island.¹ For Pengosekan arja masters like my kendang teacher Pak Dewa² and his long-time drum partner Pak Cok of Peliatan,³ most of these performing

---

¹ Interviews in 2011 with Pak Dewa, Pak Tama, Pak Cok, Bu Candri, Bandem, and Dibia, and countless casual conversations with both musicians and non-musicians all support this. Dibia notes the same of the musicians in his own family: “In the early 1960s, during the months of the dry season (from April to September) my parents had at least fifteen performances per month. […] Some of the districts they performed in most frequently were Gianyar, Klungkung, Badung, and Buleleng” (Dibia 1992, 18).
² I Dewa Nyoman Sura of Pengosekan. He is also often called Gung Aji or Gung Kak. Over the years, he has taught me arja wadon and kendang tunggal.
³ Cokorda Alit Hendrawan from Peliatan. Often called Cok Alit.
opportunities dried up in the 1980s and 90s. Tonight’s is part of the arja revitalisasi (revitalization) that has been taking place in Bali in recent years – a new generation of singer-dancers and musicians from Pengosekan just beginning to gain proficiency in the genre, though many are well versed in other more widely popular traditions like gong kebyar. This young group has been fortunate enough to be learning arja from two master musicians who often performed together through the 1960s and 70s: the famous singer-dancer, Bu Candri, and Pak Dewa himself.

I look up to the stage and see my good friend Komin sitting comfortably cross-legged next to Pak Dewa’s youngest son Rai. Cups of half-drunk kopi at their feet, they are surrounded by the handful of instruments that make up the accompaniment section for a traditional arja performance, an ensemble called geguntangan (see Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1. Geguntangan ensemble (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)

5 Ni Nyoman Candri, of Banjar Mukti in Singapadu. Bu Candri is one of the best-known singer-dancers of the older generation, because of her skill, her prolificacy as both a performer and teacher, and her resulting inclusion in various academic sources on the topic of arja and other Balinese dramas, including Herbst 1997 and Kellar 2004. In her youth Bu Candri was known for her performances of Mantri Manis (the good prince) and later for the Condong (maidservant) character, but she is fluent in all the songs and character types, and is incredibly active as a teacher throughout south Bali, helping to maintain/revive the Singapadu style in the young generations. While her new shows are often innovative to some extent, she is also a stickler for proper technique and for maintaining many of the traditional elements of arja overlooked by other revitalisasi shows.
6 I Gusti Nyoman Darta of Pengosekan.
7 I Dewa Putu Rai of Pengosekan.
They are smoking and laughing together, Rai gesticulating wildly to emphasize the point of some obviously hilarious story. For tonight’s performance, these two musicians will be playing the kendang – double-headed conical drums, ubiquitous in traditional Balinese music. In many ways, the two of them make a comical pair. Like his father, Rai is tall and gangly, with wide eyes like the Bhoma demon whose face always sits above temple doorways, guarding the entrance from malevolent forces. His enormous, genuine grin couldn’t exactly be called handsome, but you can’t help but smile when he laughs, as he is doing now. Komin, by contrast, is a short man, his long curly hair – slowly dreadlocking from neglect – flying out from under his traditional udeng headscarf. Below sharp, angular cheekbones, the often serious appearance of his heavily bearded face (a rarity in Bali) belies a dark, sardonic wit. I’ve never seen the two of them play together. Tonight, Rai will be leading the ensemble on the higher pitched kendang lanang; Komin will take Rai’s father’s traditional place on the interlocking wadon drum.

This will be my first arja performance ever. I have been studying kendang arja for several months, but never really given much thought to the dance drama it is used for. The recent decline in arja’s popularity has meant that I have not had the opportunity to see it performed live, and thus have learned about the drumming entirely removed from its original context. I don’t even have the most basic understanding of the connections between singing, dancing and drumming in arja. And I haven’t cared to. To me, this is jamming music – something a group of musicians will casually take turns playing during a late-night game of ceki after a long rehearsal, passing around the communal glass of arak – Bali’s infamous moonshine – through a thick haze of kretak and Marlboro smoke. I have grown to love my kendang teachers, and become somewhat unhealthily obsessed with the drumming, but do not share the general excitement over this evening’s performance. I have never really liked the thin, nasal quality of Balinese vocal music (though years later, being brought to tears on first hearing Bu Candri perform the song of grieving, Semarandana, I realize this was because I had never yet heard a
truly skilled Balinese singer), and I am not enthused about the prospect of sitting through four hours of strident, wobbling vocals on an uncomfortable concrete floor, without the Balinese language proficiency to understand the apparently gut-busting improvised humor that can keep Balinese audiences engaged until the wee hours. What’s more, I am still, at this point in my studies, a scholar who is only truly comfortable transcribing and analyzing music; dissecting and writing about cultural context has always felt sticky and complicated for me, and with potential misrepresentations that I haven’t the stomach to grapple with. Give me a drum and some patterns to analyze, and I’m happy. Where it came from was not my concern.

At a gesture from backstage, Rai slowly raises his left hand and plays a single slap stroke – called Pak – on his kendang. In response to that short, piercing sound, the whole balé banjar instantly quiets; conversations end abruptly and children settle into their mothers’ laps. Komin lifts his kendang onto his lap, six instrumentalists pick up their own unique mallets or cymbals, a half dozen other musicians bring end-blown bamboo flutes called suling up to their lips, and the play begins.

Like most arja performances, this one opens with a pembukaan – an instrumental prelude. I expect this to be the highlight of the show for me. The kendang players lead, carrying the ensemble through cyclic melodies with subtle changes in tempo and dynamics, Rai seamlessly interspersing both gestural and aural cues into his lanang patterns. His complex combinations of low open strokes, high ringing strokes and dry slap strokes interlock exquisitely, like perfect puzzle pieces, with Komin’s complementary wadon playing; one would never guess that, much of the time, they are both improvising. Next to them, a younger musician I have not met before – his eyes closed – improvises fast complementary patterns on a little handheld gong called kajar. The suling make up the sole melodic component of the

---

8 The word pembukaan stems from the word buka, meaning “to open.” According to I Wayan Tama from Singapadu, arja performances do not have specific pembukaan associated with them. Troupe leaders can choose from a large repertoire of pieces that exist in associated genres of music, including gamelan semar pegulingan and gamelan gambuh, or they can compose new works in these older styles. The same is true of the penutup, or closing instrumental piece.
small geguntangan ensemble. Cheeks puffing out to accommodate circular breathing, jaws opening and closing to create vibrato and other timbral effects, the six flute players weave heterophonically through the pembukaan’s sweet five-tone melody. Like many Balinese gamelan genres, geguntangan music is cyclical, and most of the remaining instruments mark various important points within the cyclic structure, including the basic beat, the end of the cycle, and its midpoint.

After about ten minutes of playing, Rai leads the musicians through a dramatic deceleration, and the pembukaan draws to a close. The balé banjar erupts into enthusiastic applause, cut short moments later by a single alto note piercing through the din from behind the langsé, a colorful curtain centered upstage. The disembodied voice unhurriedly unfolds her short opening phrase, shimmering through notes that never seem to hold a single pitch for more than a moment. At her first pause for breath, there is more applause, louder this time. Balinese audiences do not hold their applause until the close of a piece; they clap whenever they feel moved by something they see or hear onstage. What’s more, they will just as happily jeer, laugh or even heckle when something goes wrong onstage – a misplaced gong stroke, for instance, or a dancer’s accidentally dropped fan. These are exceptionally educated spectators; most of them, even the “non-musicians” know the traditional stories and pieces incredibly well, having heard them countless times since infancy. This time, the applause comes from a sense of anticipation. They know whose bright ornamented voice this is, because although every arja drama is unique in its storyline, each uses the same stock characters. This is the

---

9 The preferred timbral aesthetic of Balinese singing, like in traditional Indian singing, is one of constant movement and nuance. Vibrato and tremolos, glottal stops, strong chesty projection, soft sweet sounds, some nasal affects and often extreme ornamentation on a skeletal melody are all prized techniques. Furthermore, Bu Candri teaches her students that each pitch resonates in a different part of the body, from the heady upper tones to the deep lower tones centered in the stomach, with those tones in the middle resonating in nose bridge, throat, chest, and the highest tones resonating – conceptually at least – above the singer’s head (Lesson with Bu Candri, July 2011). Moreover, timbre is highly influenced by emotion. Each song has an associated feeling or rasa – from happy to angry to crying – and any given melody will be sung quite differently for each rasa (Lesson with Bu Candri, Aug 2011). Thus, the range of expected vocal timbres and inflections in an arja performance is very broad. For an in-depth discussion of the range of Balinese vocal qualities, see Herbst 1997: 25-37.
Condong, the maidservant, who always begins the narrative, setting the mood of the play, and giving the audience necessary background information. She is a commoner, middle-aged, and servant to the beautiful young princess Galuh (see Figure 1.2).

As the applause dies down, the Condong begins singing again, still from behind the langsé. At a short cue from the kendang, the cycle-marking instruments join her, playing a pattern called batel. It is a 2-beat cyclic gong structure associated with Pangkur, the Condong’s opening song or pepeson (CD Track 1). After another line of text, the langsé begins to shake, eliciting yet more applause. The Condong is teasing the audience, stoking their enthusiasm before she finally emerges to dance for them. The kendang enter in response to her movement, playing a loud syncopated gesture before falling into more delicate, steady improvised playing. At last, still
singing, she slowly opens the langsé, and dances in its doorway for awhile before stepping onto the stage and tracing a pattern of choreography that takes her right, left, and up the centre of the stage. This performer is slightly older than the other singer-dancers I have seen practicing in Pak Dewa’s home, and not classically beautiful – a physical contrast to the Galuh, who will join her onstage later in this opening scene. Traditionally, dancers were assigned characters based on their physique and personalities. Bu Candri’s husband complains (with only slightly veiled disgust) that this casting practice has waned in recent years – that a girl who is suited to the Condong might be permitted to play the Galuh instead, simply because she wants to. Candri, he notes proudly, would never allow it.

Like those of most Balinese dancers, the Condong’s movements range from barely perceptible shifts in head position to broad walking with swinging arms. She dances with every part of her body: fingers trembling, eyes suddenly shifting to the side to emphasize a gong stroke, toes lifted and engaged, arms sketching patterns in the air, knees sometimes bending low to the ground, all the while singing and accompanied by the geguntangan ensemble. The cycle-marking instruments maintain a steady batel under her seemingly wandering and metrically-free melodies, and the suling follow her melodic contours in their own unsystematized heterophony. The kendang improvise fast interlocking patterns – the reason I have come here tonight – but later they will drop out while the Condong sings lengthier passages unaccompanied by dance. Komin and Rai play in time with the cyclic structure, improvising patterns appropriate to the strong, upbeat feeling evoked by batel and the happy mood associated with Pangkur. Yet what I notice most – truth tugging at my ignorance and arrogance like Salome at her veils, revealing something more

---

10 Kellar notes this as well: In the “artists that play these roles, one finds a broad range of distinct personalities. An actor must be cocok [suited to, appropriate] with their character. [...] The standard convention in arja circles is to typecast artists on the basis of an initial assessment of their personality type” (Kellar 2004: paragraph 34). But physical characteristics also play a role in matching actors to characters. Of course we can see parallels to this in the casting of Western operatic performances as well.


12 Lesson with Pak Tama, July 2011.
enticing underneath – is that their eyes never stray from the Condong. Her singing
dictates where they start and stop, and her subtlest movements cue loud rhythmic
accents (see Figure 1.3).

And suddenly the treasure trove of *kendang arja*’s complete story – the drumming
un-divorced from its context – is thrown open, as I realize for the first time that this
web of relationships to singer-dancer for cues, cyclic structure for feeling and
timing, and one another for complementary, simultaneous, real-time improvisation
is what defines the challenges of *kendang arja*. Until this moment, I have not truly
been learning *kendang arja*... only drumming. And it is no longer enough for me.
1.2 The Development of Arja: Background\textsuperscript{13}

As a form of Balinese sung dance-drama, \textit{arja} is often colloquially called “Balinese opera.” Yet more appropriate, perhaps, is the term “total theatre,” which better encapsulates the integration of vocal and instrumental music, dance, drama and improvised humor, all as essential elements of \textit{storytelling}.\textsuperscript{14} The stories (\textit{lakon}) of the genre come from Javanese, Balinese, Indian and Chinese legends and epics, but are adapted to suit the needs and tastes of a modern Balinese audience.\textsuperscript{15} The majority of \textit{arja} stories derive from tales of the \textit{Panji Romance}, a legend of the East Javanese Prince Panji and his lover, the princess of Daha, which is full of lessons on family and social values. \textit{Arja}’s stories are personal domestic narratives, generally tales of love in one of its many forms, and though they are staged for community entertainment, they are also vehicles for “instilling cultural values through the presentation of a diverse range of character models” (Kellar 2004: paragraph 29). The stock characters presented in each \textit{arja} drama represent good and bad archetypes in human society, playing out a story where there is struggle between the two sides – exploring issues of karma and faith – and where good ultimately triumphs. In all these tales, we also see some of the themes of duality so central to Balinese Hinduism: good juxtaposed with evil, wealth with poverty, happiness with sadness, coarseness with refinement, tradition with modernity, high class with low class, and so on.\textsuperscript{16} We also see this duality in the performance elements themselves: gravity alongside humor, sung vs. spoken dialogue, the alternation of dance and


\textsuperscript{14} Dibia advances this term used by Michael Kirby and others (Dibia 1992: 2 and 16).

\textsuperscript{15} For more details on the origin of various \textit{arja} stories, see Dibia 1992: 152-154.

\textsuperscript{16} A dichotomy known as Rwa Bhineda, it is similar to the idea of \textit{yin} and \textit{yang}. 
drumming with song or spoken dialogue, and the mixture of high caste and low caste
languages – Kawi (Old Javanese) and high Balinese next to everyday Balinese, Indonesian
and, these days, the occasional bit of English for humor. Yet, although the themes and
plotlines of arja dramas are age-old, each performance, in both its individual story elements
and its improvised humor, also reflects an attempt on the part of the performers and
choreographers to stay relevant to the ideas and fashions of contemporary Balinese life. The
increasingly grey-haired audiences in attendance at arja performances, however, speak to the
limited success of these efforts.

The term “arja” stems from the Kawi word “reja” or “areja,” meaning “beautiful,”
but in Bali it is now exclusively used to refer to this very specific dramatic form that depicts
stories of romantic love through song. While there is some mention of the term in sources
dating as far back as the 15th century (Dibia 1992: 1-2), and various speculations as to its
development in the 19th century,17 arja as we know it now is a relatively recent development
that went through several distinct evolutionary phases over the course of the 20th century.

---

17 While other sources, including Bandem 1981 and Bandem 1983 speculate that arja emerged in the early
1800s, as a genre called dadap, Dibia believes – and I agree – that these assertions still require deeper
examination (Dibia 1992, 59). Dibia and I also discussed this at length in an interview in 2011. As he points
out, “please keep in mind, about the origin of arja, still two kinds of dates are mentioned. The first was during
the reign of Dewa Agung Gede Kusamba, in Klungkung, around the mid-19th century, 80-something. But I
have a feeling that was not arja, but rather some kind of gambuh. [...] At that time, a gambuh group from
Badung and Gianyar put their dancers together to perform for this highly respected king, in Klungkung. And
that was the kind of event that many scholars in Bali refer to as the first time, the emergence, the creation of
arja. But it could be called ‘singing dance drama,’ because gambuh also does these kinds of melodic things.
But in my research, I found that around here, in the west part of Gianyar, 1904 was the time where a solo actor-dancer […] performed a kind of arja dance drama acted by one actor, a male actor, doing all kinds of
characters. And there was no musical accompaniment used there, but already a lot of singing was being
utilized in that. So only later, it developed into arja geguntangan. [...] So, for me, I tend to look at arja as a
cultural production of the early 20th century instead of earlier, because the earlier form could be just a
modification of gambuh. Because, again, in arja you see the expression of spontaneity of the villages, instead
of the formality of the palace. [...] Although the story is very feudalistic in nature, it is not about the life of the
palace, but it’s really commenting on the social life, but using the story of the Panji romance as a base.
Because it’s about family, conflict, all of these things are very, very common in our village life, but they used
the Panji romance to comment on that” (Dibia Interview, Aug 15, 2011). Furthermore, though dadap was a
humorous theatrical satire pitting good against evil – like arja – the music was a sung poetry called lelawasan,
ot the tembang macapat of even the earliest arja forms (Hood 2001: 12).
Until the end of the 19th century, many Balinese genres of music and dance were developed in the royal courts, only later trickling down to the common people. This included theatrical genres like gambuh, which also dramatizes the Panji tales and is thought by many scholars and most Balinese musicians to be the precursor to arja. The late 19th century, though, saw a weakening of the courts, as the Dutch strengthened their colonial foothold in the area and the island’s political structure shifted away from the old court system. Colin McPhee writes of early 20th-century Bali:

A deep cultural change now began to take place. One by one the leading palaces relinquished their traditional formality and display. Court theaters were discontinued and gamelans were sold to neighboring villages or given as payment for what were once feudal services. (McPhee 1966: 5.)

The waning power of the courts, and this growing sense of grassroots democracy that accompanied it, stimulated a move away from courtly aesthetics in the Balinese performing arts. This socio-political atmosphere fueled the creation of several new genres not patronized by the courts – including, most famously, gamelan gong kebyar. And new village-based performance troupes were formed to play them.

---

18 Dibia to some extent opposes this viewpoint, arguing that, although arja uses the same source material as gambuh, the major differences between gambuh and early arja (including early arja’s lack of gamelan accompaniment and its greater focus on character portrayal through singing and acting as opposed to the intricate coordination between music and dance so prized in gambuh) indicate a desire to create something new – a folk genre – not simply to imitate a court genre with less resources (Dibia 1992: 26-31).

19 The Dutch were in full control of North Bali by 1848, and solidified their power in South Bali in the first decade of the 20th century. While in many cases the raja or kings were permitted to maintain power over their areas, it was as Regent, not raja, “and they functioned largely as puppets of the Dutch colonial administration” (McGraw 2005: 15). One of the factors that led to a weakening of court power at this time was the general policy of the Dutch administration on the island to maintain “traditional” Balinese culture (as they saw it) – the Baliseering of Bali discussed in the introductory chapter. Shifts were made in state structure to support the theory – championed by Dutch civil servant Frederick Albert Liefrinck – “that the real Bali lay in his village republics,” that “villages functioned as egalitarian and autonomous units, that they were the real basis of Balinese society, and that the aristocracy was primarily an oppressive imposition” (Vickers 1989: 89-92, quotes on 92 and 90).

20 The fall of the courts was not the sole catalyst to the development of these genres – early arja emerged in Gianyar, for instance while the local king was still in power, and courtly forms like gambuh were still an important aspect of Gianyar’s musical landscape at that time. However, the weakening of the courts and the
1.3 *Arja Doyong*: The Incorporation of *Tembang Macapat*

“*Arja* was one of the first Balinese *theatrical* forms to develop outside of the courts, and it was meant to create light, informal entertainment of a secular nature.” (Dibia 1992: 3. Italics not in original.) It began as an amateur street theatre called *arja doyong* – travelling troupes of all-male performers enacting the *Panji* stories. Extant historical accounts of *arja doyong* suggest that it was only performed in a small pocket of the regency of Gianyar in south Bali. Older performers and community leaders in the village of Singapadu – later to become a hub of *arja* performance – report the existence of a small *arja doyong* troupe (about 10 men) beginning in 1904 (Dibia 1992: 10). Like all the forms of *arja* to follow, *arja doyong* incorporated elements of humor and improvised dialogue into its performance. Yet, unlike subsequent *arja* forms, it was unaccompanied, and performed entirely by men. Furthermore, the stories of *arja doyong* did not yet make use of the stock standard characters we see in the more developed forms of the mid-20\(^{th}\) century, and the actors used modest everyday ceremonial dress and performed only simple dance movements as they sang (Dibia 1992: 26).

*Arja doyong* uses a poetic meter for its songs – common in Balinese *popular* songs of the day – called *tembang macapat* (McPhee 1966: 303). This is a collection of poetic forms each with fixed structural components. Although text and subject may vary considerably between them, each song written in the same *tembang* form must have the same number of lines, and in every line, rules govern the number of syllables and the final vowel sound.

---

Dutch colonial push to “preserve” village autonomy can certainly be said to have helped stimulate the creation of *arja* and other village performing groups.
used. Furthermore, when these poetic forms are sung, regardless of how the melody moves in a given version of the *tembang*, each line of poetry must end on a pre-determined scale degree (Herbst 1997: 38-39). For instance, any song in the *Sinom* form has 10 lines, with numbers of syllables and final vowel sounds as shown in figure 1.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Syllables</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Vowel Sound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.4.** The structural “rules” of Tembang *Sinom*

However, there are several standard *Sinom* songs, each with its own lyrics, melodies, and extramusical associations. *Sinom Wayah* is regal, meant for the dance of a king; *Sinom Lawé* is often used for giving advice; *Sinom Lumbrah* is used for romantic scenes, although it can also be used for the entrance or exit of a character (Herbst 1997: 40-41). A different *tembang* will have a different number of lines and syllables and different final vowel sounds and pitches. The Condong’s pepeson or opening song, described above, is in another *tembang* form called *Pangkur*, which follows its own strictures. Every version of *Pangkur*, regardless of lyrics and themes, will always consist of seven lines of poetry, each with 8 syllables (except the 2\(^{nd}\) and 5\(^{th}\) lines, which have 12), whose final vowel sounds must be a-i-u-a-u-a-i (Dibia 1992: 353).\(^2\) New songs are often created in these traditional *tembang* forms, generally for *arja* performances – either pre-composed or improvised – but sometimes for other purposes as well. Bu Candri, for instance, has written new lyrics in the

---

\(^1\) See Bandem 2009 for an in-depth discussion of *tembang macapat*, including a complete transcription of various songs, organized by type.

\(^2\) Although this will not be discussed in depth here, there are two tuning systems at play in *tembang macapat*, both based on traditional Javanese modes: *pêlo* and *siendro*. *Pangkur* is composed in the *siendro* mode, whose pitches may be conceived of, in cipher notation, as 1-3-4-5-7. For more information on mode in *tembang macapat*, see Herbst 1997: 32-37 and 41-50.
Semarandana form as a pedagogical tool for explaining the various song forms (Bandem 2009: 35-36). Her famous father, I Madé Kredek,\(^{23}\) often wrote personal letters in the traditional *tembang macapat* structures while his son Bandem was away from home.\(^{24}\)

These *tembang* song structures are still used in *arja* today, and are thus arguably the most important legacy of the *arja doyong* period.

### 1.4 *Arja Geguntangan*: Instruments and Women Come to *Arja*

Between 1915 and 1940, *arja*’s popularity across Bali grew exponentially. Thanks to improved roads and public transportation, the genre spread to every regency on the island except the westernmost district of Jembrana (Goris 1930: 7). This proliferation of the genre was accompanied by several major shifts in performance practice, all of which helped to transform it from an informal street entertainment to a more formal theatrical production.

First of all, through the 1920s, women began to perform *arja* alongside men, playing not only female characters but eventually many of the male characters as well. Furthermore, the increased participation of performers versed in classical court genres like *legong* and *gambuh* catalysed the formalization of many aspects of *arja*. Actors began to differentiate characters by their clothing, wearing distinctive costumes and headdresses (*gelungan*) as opposed to generic ceremonial garb. These highly trained performers also began to incorporate more formalized dance movements into *arja* (Dibia 1992: 35-36), which eventually led to the development of an “exposition of each character, called *papeson* […] as a focal point [in the drama]” for both singing and dance (Hood 2001: 15).\(^{25}\)

---

\(^{23}\) A very important *arja* singer and performer discussed in more depth in Chapter 2.

\(^{24}\) Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011

\(^{25}\) See Hood Ch. 5 for an in-depth analysis of the Condong *papeson*, *Pangkur*. 
through this period became longer to accommodate these new elements: three to four hours, where earlier arja doyong performances had generally lasted less than two (Dibia 1992: 58).

1.4.1 Instrumental Accompaniment: Cycle-Marking Instruments

Many of these changes to arja performance practice were made possible by the adoption, in 1915, of the small geguntangan ensemble, whose underlying cyclic structures and rhythmic accents helped to shape and contextualize arja dancers’ movements. Aside from the suling, often the only melodic instrument in the group, the basic role of the geguntangan ensemble is to maintain a cyclic structure for dance. Holding the group together is a one-stringed idiochord bamboo tube-zither called guntang – the instrument for which the ensemble is named. The tukang guntang plays the role of a metronome, defining a beat by striking his instrument regularly with a spindly rubber-tipped mallet. Unlike a metronome, however, his beats are somewhat flexible, changing pace, often quite subtly, at the whim of singer-dancers and drummers.

In the analyses to follow, whenever I use the term “beat”, I shall be referring to this particular beat-stream, often transcribed in Western notation as a quarter-note. For reasons discussed in section 1.4.4.4 below, I avoid Western notation and its associated terminology in all my analyses. The beat stream running at the level of the tukang guntang, therefore, I call “beat.” The metrical level running at twice that density, I call “half-beat,” and that

---

26 In the late 1960s, the resident arja trope of Bali’s RRI (Radio Republik Indonesia) began to incorporate a pair of gender metallophones into their ensemble (Dibia 1992: 186), and many more modern arja troupes, such as the arja revitalisasi troupe from Singapadu that performed in the annual Bali Arts Festival (PKB – Pesta Kesenian Bali) in 2011, use one or several pairs of gangsa metallophones from the gamelan semar pegulingan ensemble. But these are all newer additions not part of the original geguntangan line-up, and still not widely pervasive in geguntangan ensembles throughout Bali.
running at four times the density of the guntang (the most common density of the kendang) I call the “quarter beat.” Figure 1.5 below should help to clarify this system:

![Figure 1.5. Metrical hierarchy dot notation](image)

Each instrument, in addition to being played, can also be vocalized onomatopoetically for the purposes of both pedagogy and memorization. The guntang is vocalized as ‘tuk’, a short, mid-range vocable used to imitate the dry bamboo attack of the instrument. For transcription purposes, I abbreviate this stroke on the guntang as ‘t’ (see Figure 1.6).

![Figure 1.6. The guntang (t) (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)](image)

---

27 Readers familiar with Western music notation should be careful not to confuse these terms with “half-note” and “quarter-note.” Each beat or mat or guntang stroke contains two half-beats and four quarter-beats.

28 For this dot notation system, and other metrical details of transcription, I borrow heavily from Lerdahl and Jackendoff, 1983.
The gong pulu (G)\(^{29}\) player sounds his instrument just once per cycle, coinciding with the final beat, (what is often perceived by Western gamelan players as the first beat).\(^{30}\) The two large iron or bronze bars of the gong pulu are strung up over a box resonator. These two bars are carefully tuned so that, when struck simultaneously with a special Y-shaped padded mallet, the difference tone in their two frequencies creates the characteristic pulsating quality essential to the sound of any good Indonesian gong (see Figure 1.7).\(^{31}\)

---

\(^{29}\) Gong pulu, though a traditional Balinese instrument, is actually a fairly recent addition to the geguntangan ensemble. Best known for its use in the Joged Bumbung ensemble, it was first included in geguntangan by the arja group from STSI (now ISI) Denpasar in 1984, as a replacement for the quieter large guntang (bamboo “gong”) that used to mark the ends of cycles in arja (Dibia 1992: 187). This has become a virtually complete replacement; to my knowledge all extant arja ensembles in Bali now use gong pulu instead of large guntang.

\(^{30}\) Traditional Balinese music features an end-weighted conception of both meter and beat, which can no doubt be linked to stress patterns in both Balinese and Indonesian languages, where the final syllable is often the stressed syllable. End-weighting in music means that, in a four-beat gong pattern for instance, what in Western music would be perceived of as the “downbeat” is referred to in Balinese music as beat 4. The cycle then begins on the following, weak subdivision (what a Western musician would call the second subdivision of beat 1). While beyond the scope of this study, it bears mentioning here that this discussion raises philosophical problems regarding the nature of meter and time-points – discussed in depth by music theorists such as Christopher Hasty – with more at stake than a simple dichotomy of West vs. Bali. Hasty asserts that “our [Western] concepts of meter, although useful in many ways, detract from the temporal nature of those feelings we call metrical and that, as a result, our concept of meter comes to be separated from our intuitions of rhythm as something fully temporal and processive. […] In this, the layman unfamiliar with the dichotomy of meter and rhythm may have more wisdom than the schooled musician, whose introduction to this dichotomy usually takes place at a tender age with the demands of learning to read music” (Hasty 1997: 5). Indeed our notation system creates separations or discontinuities between sounds that we do not actually perceive. A metrical accent – like a strong downbeat accented by harmonic change in a Western classical piece, or a gong stroke in a Balinese gamelan piece – actually occurs at an instant delineating a boundary between two time spans. Whether it is perceived as ending the prior span or instantiating the subsequent one depends a great deal on allied aspects of musical structure and (cultural) listening habits.

\(^{31}\) Technically this is accomplished by differentiating the two pitches by a few hertz. However, the instrument makers will not use frequency-measuring instruments, but rather the pulsating quality itself, to determine the correct distance between the two pitches. This “paired tuning” is widespread in most Balinese gamelan genres. In the well-known gamelan gong kebyar, for instance, each metallophone has a partner, and these partner instruments are tuned slightly apart so that, across the full spectrum of pitches in the gamelan, the difference tone between them produces the same number of beats per second – a unified shimmer across the full ensemble. The wave-like quality that paired tuning produces is a very prized aesthetic in traditional Balinese music, and can be seen not only in the construction of the bossed gongs used for gong kebyar and other gamelan genres, but in the playing techniques of suling and in the constantly pulsating vocal quality of the best arja singers.
A medium-sized bossed gong called *tawa-tawa* (pu)\(^{32}\) (Figure 1.8) is held vertically in the player’s lap, his fingers touching its face to damp the sound. The *tukang tawa-tawa* (*tawa-tawa* player) plays single damped strokes with a padded mallet held in his right hand. These are played in alternation with the *gong pulu* strokes, at the mid-point of each cycle.

\(^{32}\) I abbreviate this as “pu” because many of my teachers, when vocalising the *tawa-tawa* part, will say “pung.”
A high clear stroke on a much smaller bossed gong called klenang (n) (Figure 1.9) emphasizes regular time intervals between the gong and tawa-tawa strokes. In slower, more expanded gong cycles, the tukang klenang will play with every second guntang stroke (those that do not align with gong or tawa-tawa); in faster, more intense cyclic structures, he will play at the half-beat between each guntang stroke. Whatever their density level, however, my impression is that these klenang strokes are felt as “off-beats”, filling the spaces between the more structurally important gong and tawa-tawa strokes.

Figure 1.9. The klenang (n)  (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)

1.4.2 The Cyclic Structures

Together, these four instruments – guntang, gong pulu, tawa-tawa and klenang – create the cyclic backbone of geguntangan music. With the exception of some pre-composed pieces featuring longer gong cycles, there are only four cyclic structures used in arja performances, all of which are accompanied by improvised kendang playing. Each of these is played at a different pace (with, of course, the subtle tempo flexibility characteristic
of much classical *gamelan* music), and each is associated with specific character types, moods, *tembang*, and moments within the plot. These gong cycles do not influence the structure and pacing of the singing in any way; *arja* singers perform metrically freely and at their own pace. Their structures, instead, are meant to govern the atmosphere of the drama and to guide the dance.

The shortest gong cycle – the one used in the Condong’s *pepeson Pangkur* – is called *batel*.\(^3^3\) As seen in Figure 1.10, it is a two-beat gong structure where the *klenang* plays the half-beats alternating with the *guntang*. In the transcriptions below, the beats are marked with numbers and the half-beats are represented by large dots (●):

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & \quad \bullet & & 1 & & \bullet & & 2 \\
(G) & & n & & \text{pu} & & n & & G \\
(t) & & t & & t
\end{align*}
\]

*Figure 1.10. Batel cyclic structure*

*Batel* is played at quite a fast pace, 152-190 bpm (Hood 2001: 75), and is generally associated with happy or upbeat feelings. It can also be used for *pepeson* overtures, but never for very refined characters.\(^3^4\)

A more intense variation on *batel* is used for fight scenes, to express anger, or to accompany very *keras* or unrefined characters. It is identical to *batel biasa* (basic *batel*) except that it is played faster, often 176-200 bpm or more (Hood 2001: 73). Further, it has a *tawa-tawa* stroke on each beat, not only at the mid-point but simultaneously with the *gong pulu* as well. For visual clarity, I have transcribed all the *tawa-tawa* strokes (pu) in the line

\[^{33}\text{Hood would call this pattern *tabuh besik* (besik meaning 1), not *batel*. In all of my interviews and lessons, however, I was informed that these two terms are entirely interchangeable. What Hood refers to in his study as *batel*, my teachers would call either *batel marah* or *batel penasar*.}\]

\[^{34}\text{This and other information on the extramusical associations of gong patterns was discovered through interviews, conversations and lessons with Pak Tama, Pak Cok, and Pak Dewa, summer 2011.}\]
below the gong and klenang. However it is important to note that this gong pattern, like batel, is both conceived of – and vocalized – as a quick alternation between gong and tawa-tawa (see Figure 1.11).

\[
(2) \bullet 1 \bullet 2 \\
(G) n \quad n \quad G \\
(pu) pu \quad pu \\
(t) t \quad t \\
\]

**Figure 1.11.** Batel marah cyclic structure

Pak Tama, my teacher in Singapadu, refers to this variant as batel marah (angry batel). Komin in Pengosekan calls it batel penasar, because it is often used for the exposition of the unrefined penasar characters – male servants or clowns that accompany arja’s unrefined prince. The coincidence of tawa-tawa with gong pulu in this cyclic structure is significant because “gamelan organization and aesthetics do not allow this clashing except to create tension and excitement” (Hood 2001: 75), making batel marah exceptional in Balinese music.

The mid-speed gong structure is called tabuh dua. Played anywhere from 104 to 168 bpm, it is a 4-beat pattern with just two klenang strokes in it, as follows (Figure 1.12):

\[
(4) \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(t) \quad t \quad t \quad t \\
\]

**Figure 1.12.** Tabuh dua cyclic structure

---

35 Komin in Pengosekan prefers a variation on batel marah where, because the tawa-tawa plays each beat, the guntang will only play beat 1, and be silent while both tawa-tawa and gong pulu strike together on the final beat 2.

36 I Wayan Tama, based in Banjar Mukti, Singapadu. Also the kendang arja teacher of Hood and Mashino.
This pattern is a straight 2:1 augmentation of batel, but now we see guntang strokes aligning not only with gong and tawa-tawa but with the klenang strokes between them as well. Tabuh dua can express happiness, peace of mind, or dreaminess, but is often neutral in tone, and can be used during the pepeson dances of more refined characters, or to accompany monologue or dialogue.

Tabuh telu (called tabuh empat in Singapadu)\(^{37}\) is the sparsest and slowest of arja’s cyclic structures. Played at 72-138 bpm (Hood 2001: 76), it is an 8-beat gong structure with a klenang stroke on every other beat as seen in Figure 1.13:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
(8) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
(G) & n & n & pu & n & n & G \\
(t) & t & t & t & t & t & t & t & t \\
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 1.13. Tabuh telu cyclic structure**

A very common variant on tabuh telu is to have the tukang guntang play at half his usual density, leaving acoustic space for the klenang to ring out in between (see Figure 1.14):

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
(8) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
(G) & n & n & pu & n & n & G \\
(t) & t & t & t & t & t & t & t \\
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 1.14. Tabuh telu cyclic structure variant**

---

\(^{37}\) I hypothesize that the reason for this flexibility in naming could be that these various gong structure terms are not specially suited to arja but are, instead, simply borrowed terms from others genres with longer gong structures. Their various cyclic morphologies in related genres are reckoned by the number of times a particular lesser gong (sometimes the small kajar or klentong, sometimes the medium kempur) is struck between occurrences of the large gong (see Tenzer 2000: Figure 7.2). In arja, there is only ever one tawa-tawa (pu) stroke in a gong cycle, and the different terms refer simply to the number of beats between gong and tawa-tawa, or, as Bandem would say, just to the “speed,” the tempo of the gong structure. Pak Cok calls this slowest structure “tabuh telu” because there are three beats between gong and tawa-tawa. Pak Tama calls it “tabuh empat” because it is double the length of tabuh dua. Both of them, of course, are correct. My teachers in Apuan, Bangli, I Ketut Bicuh (Pak Tut) and I Wayan Wardana – the student and son of the late arja drummer Pak Patrem respectively – actually laughed at me when I asked about the use of these gong structures in arja. Tabuh dua and tabuh telu, they assured me, were gong kebyar terms, not appropriate for use in arja, where there was only one kind of gong structure played at different tempi. I will refer to this cyclic structure exclusively as tabuh telu, but it is important to note the existence of these naming distinctions among my different teachers.
Here we see the guntang relating to the gong and tawa-tawa as it did in tabuh dua, striking together with these instruments and once at the midpoint between their strokes. In this analysis of tabuh telu as a half-as-dense tabuh dua, however, the klenang plays in-between the guntang strokes, congruent with (an augmentation of) its “off-beat” status in the batel structures.

Tabuh telu is used largely for monologue and dialogue sections, but can also be used to express mild sadness, love, and even quiet happiness. Grief and extreme refinement are generally expressed through the use of a pre-composed piece called Adri.

**1.4.3 Additional Instruments**

Alongside the cycle-defining idiophones of the geguntangan ensemble, two additional idiophones fulfill a rhythmic function. The cengceng (Figure 1.15), also sometimes called ricik, is a set of five or six small cymbals mounted on a horizontal frame. These are played by two hand-held cymbals, in a combination of running quarter-beats and more complicated rhythmic patterns that mirror either kendang rhythms or suling melody.

**Figure 1.15.** The cengceng (carved by Pak Tama of Singapadu) (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)
The remaining idiophone in the ensemble, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, is the *kajar* (Figure 1.16). It is a flat-bossed hand-held gong that may fulfill either a cycle-marking or a rhythmic function. In a cycle-marking role, the *kajar* will parallel the *guntang*, playing every beat. Much more frequently in *arja*, however, it improvises syncopated rhythms of damped and open strokes that attempt to mimic the *kendang* patterns.\(^{38}\)

![Figure 1.16. The *kajar*, played by Pak Tama (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)](image)

1.4.4 The Kendang

The final instruments in the *geguntangan* ensemble – and the focus of this study – are the two *kendang arja* – the higher-pitched *lanang* and the lower *wadon*. As suggested above, *kendang arja* is best understood in the context of *gambuh*, a genre antedating *arja* by several centuries.\(^{39}\) Hailing from the *madya* period of Balinese musical history, when the

\(^{38}\) The *kajar* will not be addressed in depth in this dissertation. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 2 in reference to the *kendang*, a *tukang kajar* (*kajar* player) develops the ability to mirror improvised *kendang* patterns by playing for a long time with the same *kendang* players and developing an idiom that complements theirs. At the height of their *arja* careers, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok were often accompanied on *kajar* by Komin’s father, and he developed patterns to suit theirs – this was the Pengosekan dream-team (Conversations with Komin, summer 2011).

\(^{39}\) For more information on the genre in general, see McPhee 1966:113-39, Spies and deZoete 134-43, Ariyanto 1985, Susilo 1997, and Bandem and deBoer 1978. For more information on *gambuh* drumming in particular, see Asnawa 1991. For more details on the connections between *gambuh* and *arja*, see Widjaja 2007.
royal courts were strong and many genres were developed for courtly entertainment as well as for ceremonial purposes, this is the genre most often understood, both within Bali and without, to be the direct predecessor of arja. Like arja, it is a dance-drama based on the Panji tales. Because of this common narrative basis, arja borrows its cavalcade of stock characters and their costumes from gambuh.40 Arja’s geguntangan instrumentation, also, seems to have been largely modeled on the gambuh ensemble, which uses mainly percussive and cycle-marking instruments, with suling (flutes) as the only melodic instrument. However, the large haunting suling so characteristic of the gambuh sound were replaced with smaller suling for arja performances. Bandem speculates that this was done to better accommodate the singing voice – creating a lighter sound that the voice could both pierce through and blend with more easily.41 Most relevant to this study, gamelan gambuh also features a pair of kendang krumpungan, which, though slightly larger than kendang arja, use the same arsenal of drum strokes as the latter (discussed below, section 1.4.4.2.)

In terms of the drumming itself, there are some similarities between gambuh and arja (and here we can also see connections to the drumming in semar pegulingan and legong, both of which descended from gambuh). However, musical similarities are subtler than narrative ones, and there are many differences also. First of all, unlike in arja, most gambuh pieces are based on slow melodies with quite subtle, pre-composed kendang accompaniment. And “when it comes to tabuh gangsaran (gangsaran means fast piece) they use less interlocking figuration; it’s more simple in gambuh.”42 As previously mentioned, arja plays

40 In many cases, however, a gambuh cast is far more extensive than an arja cast, and this probably had as much as anything to do with funding – gambuh was patronized by the courts while arja was village-based entertainment.

41 Interview, Aug 3, 2011.

42 Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011.
often do draw directly from gambuh for their pre-composed pembukaan and penutup, but even these are generally taken from the fastest part of a gambuh piece: the pengecet or closing section. The gambuh piece Tabuh Gari, for instance, is frequently used to open or close an arja performance. And the common palette of drum strokes between kendang arja and kendang krumpungan means that these pieces and their drum patterns can be directly transferred from a gambuh to an arja ensemble. However, the kind of fast, improvised paired drumming in short cycles so central to arja is not found in most gambuh pieces. Thus, while improvisation – both musical and verbal – “continues to be given a special place in all arja plays, in […] gambuh or legong, […] such improvisation is not desired” (Dibia 1992, 22).

I have asked many teachers and drummers where the patterns for kendang arja originated, and none has been able to give a satisfactory answer. Most say simply that arja came from gambuh, and cannot elucidate further. Certainly there are some sections in gambuh as well as in legong – two-beat batel gong structures and eight-beat bapang structures – which do make use of the sort of fast improvised paired drumming used in arja. When I asked teachers and drummers about the connection there (and most speak

---

43 Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011.
44 Lesson with Pak Tama July 2011.
45 Susilo agrees: “there is a wide vocabulary of movement for the dancers, but the movements are tightly choreographed and allow little room for improvisation on the part of the artist. This is true also of the dialogue and other spoken parts of the dance-drama, which are not improvised. The penasar, the servant characters in other forms of dance-drama such as prembon and calonarang, have quite a bit of freedom and are almost required to make a long series of lewd jokes and tales. However, gambuh penasar are much more limited in the scope of their dialogue. This is due to the fact that these performances were originally sponsored by the king and the courts and were usually for court occasions and ceremonies. It was risky to allow the actors too much freedom. Thus, both the choreography and spoken texts are restricted and rehearsed” (Susilo 1997: 14-5).
46 This very common cyclic structure, which can also be expanded to a16-beat or 32-beat cycle, is played with two gongs in legong, the large gong ageng (G) and the small klenong (t), as follows: (G)_ _ _ t _ _ _ G. In other genres, like gong kebyar, a medium-sized kempur (P) is also added, to make the following pattern: (G)_ P _ t _ P _ G.
primarily of *legong*, not *gambuh*, when discussing these similarities in drumming), the
majority of them claimed that *arja* was the genre to influence *legong* in these patterns,
though in fact *legong* is the older genre. In a music culture without a strong tradition of
written music notation, it is difficult to discover the truth of the history there. What I have
observed, however, is that, while there is certainly a parallel to be drawn between *kendang*
*arja* improvisations and the drum patterns used in *gambuh*’s *batel* and *legong*’s *batel* and
*bapang* sections, it is an imperfect one. Patterns used for either of these *legong* or *gambuh*
gong structures appear to be virtually interchangeable with many of the patterns used for
*tabuh telu* and some *tabuh dua* in *arja*. Patterns from Pak Tut and Pak Tama, discussed in
Chapter 3, are prime examples of these. However, the more *ramé* (dense or busy) patterns
used in *arja*’s *batel* and *batel marah*, and many of the more right-hand-heavy patterns used
by Pak Cok are considered *tidak cocok* (inappropriate) for *legong*, even in its *batel*
structures.\(^{47}\) I suspect that this may stem from the fact that *legong* is considered to be a very
refined (*halus*) dance genre (and *gambuh*, too, is, on the whole, more *halus* than *arja*), while
in *arja*, there are also very coarse (*keras*) characters and situations that can handle a busier
drum accompaniment. Thus, while some of the patterns explored in this dissertation may
have stemmed from *gambuh* or *legong* (or vice versa, and most likely the drumming in all
these genres has developed from a continuous cycle of influence) it is clear that *arja*
drummers have developed these fast, small-cycle, paired improvised patterns – which make
up the bulk of the drumming in an *arja* drama – far beyond what we see in their occasional
use for *legong* or *gambuh*.

\(^{47}\) Conversation with Sudi, fall 2009.
1.4.4.1 Kendang Size and Playing Position

Like most Balinese drums, *kendang arja* are two-headed conical drums held in the lap and played with bare hands on both heads. Balinese hand drums come in various sizes, and *kendang arja*, or *kendang krempengan* as they’re sometimes called, are among the smallest. An *arja lanang* is generally about 50cm long, with the diameter of the larger head around 20cm and that of the smaller head about 18cm. The *wadon* is slightly larger, at 51x21x19 (Hood 2001: 38). Figure 1.17 below shows the *kendang* from several angles.

![The kendang arja, shown from various angles. Played by Pak Cok of Peliatan (top left), Pak Dewa of Pengosekan (top right) and Pak Tama of Singapadu (bottom). (Credit: Photos by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)](image)

**Figure 1.17.** The *kendang arja*, shown from various angles. Played by Pak Cok of Peliatan (top left), Pak Dewa of Pengosekan (top right) and Pak Tama of Singapadu (bottom). (Credit: Photos by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)

See Asnawa 1991: 5-13 and Hood 2001: 36-40 for more in-depth discussions on *kendang* construction.
Although there is some crossover, traditionally each size of Balinese drum is used for its own specific genres of *gamelan*, and each has slightly different playing techniques, holding positions, and repertoires of drum strokes. All two-headed Balinese hand-drums are played in the lap, legs crossed, with the larger drumhead facing right. Pak Tama of Singapadu insists that, regardless of the size of the drum, the right drum-head dictates playing position: a *kendang* should always be positioned so that, when the player’s hand is resting on the right drum-head, his arm is almost flush against his body. This, he says, is done for several reasons:

Whether the *kendang* is long or short, the right hand must be precise. If you play like this” [he moves the right drum head farther to the right, elbow comically jutting out to the side to accommodate], it’s not good; your body will get sore quickly. If your position is good, the playing will be balanced […] and] your *gaya* [style] will look good.\(^49\)

In larger drum genres like the popular *gamelan gong kebyar*, the legs are crossed with the left leg in front. The right drumhead rests on the left foot, and the body of the drum lies across the leg, balancing on the left knee. However, in genres utilizing smaller drums, like *gengtangan*, drummers will generally play with the right leg crossed in front. Most of my teachers play with the right drum-head balanced in the calf muscle just below the right knee, and the body of the drum laying across the lap, as can be seen in the photographs in Figure 1.18.

---

However, Komin and his brother Ketut\textsuperscript{50} in Pengosekan both prefer to sit in a half-lotus, with the left foot crooked gently in the right calf muscle, and the right drumhead nestled into the sole of the left toes. They believe this makes the drum more stable; I believe it makes your knee feel like it might pop off.

\subsection*{1.4.4.2 Kendang Strokes}

Just as larger and smaller drums have slightly different playing positions, so, too, do they have slightly different collections of drum strokes or \textit{pukulan}. In all Balinese paired drum genres, each \textit{lanang} stroke has a sister stroke on the \textit{wadon}, and these like strokes are often played on successive quarter-beats to create the characteristic interlocking patterns of Balinese paired \textit{kendang}. As previously mentioned, \textit{arja’s kendang krempengan} share their palette of drum strokes with the somewhat larger \textit{kendang krumpungan} used in both \textit{gambuh} and \textit{legong}. There is only one main stroke played by the right hand: a low open stroke called \textit{Dag} or \textit{Deg} on the \textit{wadon} (abbreviated as D) is partnered with a mid-range stroke on the

\textsuperscript{50} I Gusti Ketut Muliawan.
higher lanang called Tut (T). Generally Dag and Tut are played by striking the full length of the thumb into the center of the drumhead. Except in rare cases on the wadon – at the ends of important cadence phrases for instance – these strokes will always be immediately damped in the following quarter-beat, either by brushing the fingertips against the drumhead or by pressing the thumb into it. Figure 1.19 shows two slightly different versions of Dag thumb technique during performance:

![Figure 1.19. Dag (D) and Tut (T) playing technique in action. Pak Dewa (top) and Pak Cok (bottom). (Credit: Photos by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)](image)

The first technique is far more widespread. The second was taught to me by Komin in Pengosekan as a way of preserving energy through smaller movements in fast passages.

---

51 The first technique is far more widespread. The second was taught to me by Komin in Pengosekan as a way of preserving energy through smaller movements in fast passages.
Though this thumb stroke is the norm, a wadon player may occasionally choose to employ an alternate playing technique – that used in larger drum genres – to give more power to an important Dag (D) at the end of a phrase. For these strokes, the drummer aims the middle of the palm to the rim of the drum, striking the skin of the drum fully from finger-tips to mid-palm and as quickly bouncing away, leaving only the mid-palm touching the rim (see Figure 1.20).

Pak Tama actually uses solely this technique in his kendang arja wadon playing, believing that, in his particular case, it gives a warmer tone than his thumb stroke, which he claims to sound too much like a drum mallet. Pak Dewa, by contrast, prizes the mallet-like strength of his thumb strokes, and he, along with most of my other teachers and drumming friends, maintains that there are only a few specific moments where the stronger full-hand Dag stroke is cocok or appropriate. As preeminent Balinese music scholar Ketut GdÉ Asnawa has said: “If the drummer can’t utilize his thumb this will be a severe disadvantage for him because

52 Lesson June 2011.
of the sheer speed of arja drumming. Not to mention the sound of the drum will be different and won’t sound like an arja drum.”

Regardless of which technique is used, wherever possible, each Dag stroke should, in actuality, be played as a double stroke – the same technique played two quarter-beats in a row, with emphasis on the second stroke. I will often abbreviate this technique as “d D”. Quite difficult for beginning bulé (Western) drummers to master, this end-weighted Dag technique raises interesting questions about how the phenomenal accent of Dag’s arrival is timed with respect to associated metrical accents. These issues of timing will be discussed further in Chapter 3. While this double stroke technique is sometimes used on the lanang’s Tut (T) strokes as well (“t T”), it is a far less common technique.

Several different playing techniques are used in the left hand. In kendang arja, like in kendang krumpungan, the most common is a high ringing stroke produced by striking the rim of the drum with the tips of the pinky, ring and middle fingers while holding (and thus damping) the larger drumhead gently with the right hand. These high-pitched strokes are commonly called kem or kom on the wadon and peng on the lanang – the onomatopoeic sounds that give kendang krempengan its name. However, some of my teachers also use the term tong for the lower wadon stroke and teng for the very high lanang stroke, as they would with the larger kendang krumpungan. While Hood abbreviates tong and teng or kom and peng as ‘k’ and ‘p’, I will instead use ‘o’ and ‘e’ for wadon and lanang strokes respectively, as this allows them to be more easily visually differentiated from the ‘K’ and ‘P’ used for the slap strokes discussed below. The typical three-finger technique for these rim-strokes is shown in Figure 1.21:

Some drummers, like Pak Cok, prefer a two-finger technique, shown in Figure 1.22.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{Figure 1.21.} Kom (o) and peng (e) playing technique, Pak Tama (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)

\textbf{Figure 1.22.} Kom (o) and peng (e) two-finger technique, Pak Cok (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)

\textsuperscript{54} Komin in Pengosekan claims that using only the pinky and ring finger looks more “cantik” (beautiful), so he has trained his hands to make a strong enough sound with just those two fingers. Pak Tut in Apuan, like his teacher Pak Patrem before him, uses just the ring and middle fingers. It is rumoured that the famous Peliatan musician Pak Lebah had such strong hands that he used only one finger – the ring finger – when playing kendang krempengan (Conversation with Komin, August 2011).
As we can see in the above photographs, to produce a pure, clear, strong tone in these rim strokes, the left hand should be rigid, and the fingers extended as wide as possible. Movement comes from the wrist. Furthermore, the player should strike the drum so fiercely that, should he wish to, he could actually pick up the left side of it with the power of his fingertips.\(^5^5\)

The other main left-hand stroke used by both *lanang* and *wadon* players is the slap stroke (Figure 1.23). Called *Kap* (K) on the *wadon* and *Pak* (P) on the *lanang*,\(^5^6\) it is achieved by slapping the center of the left drumhead with the fingers while damping the larger drumhead with the right hand. Some drummers will also incorporate the left palm for a stronger slap stroke.

\[\text{Figure 1.23. Kap (K) and Pak (P) playing technique, Pak Cok (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)}\]

\(^5^5\) While most teachers say that the hand should stay flush with the drumhead while playing these strokes, Pak Tut in Apuan maintains that the hand should actually follow through past the drumhead (toward the body) with the fingers gripping as though holding on to the edge of a cliff.

\(^5^6\) This is the general rule. However, often drummers will interchange these terms for ease of vocalisation. For instance, when there is a passage with several interlocking K and P in a row, drummers will almost invariably vocalise with *Pak* on the downbeat – (P)\(\text{KP KP KP P} –\) regardless of which drum begins the run. This is simply done because it is more difficult to say (K)\(\text{PKP KP KP P}\) in fast vocalisation. I have also very occasionally seen this flexible switching with *kom* and *peng* stroke vocalisations. It is never done with *Dag* and *Tut*.  

---

56
While Pak and Kap are very common strokes in larger drum genres, in kendang krempengan, as we shall see, they are used sparingly, generally reserved for use with coarse characters, or as part of rhythmic accent gestures.

The lanang, as the leader of the ensemble, also has one additional left-hand stroke used almost exclusively for giving cues. This stroke, called pung (U), is a resonant mid-high stroke meant to cut through the texture of the ensemble. It is realized by striking the left drumhead between rim and centre with the meaty part of the pinky, ring, and sometimes middle fingers (see Figure 1.24). The proper tone can only be achieved if the right hand simultaneously touches the right drumhead softly with just pinky finger, thumb, and the outer edges of the palm.

Figure 1.24. Pung (U) playing technique, Pak Tama (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)
While this same stroke does exist on the wadon as well, and both wadon and lanang can make similar strokes on the right drumhead, these are seldom if ever used in kendang arja.\textsuperscript{57}

1.4.4.3 Notation of Patterns

As with the cyclic structures above, I have chosen to notate all drum patterns using abbreviations for their mnemonic syllables as opposed to Western notation, for three reasons.\textsuperscript{58} First of all, I would like to encourage the reader to vocalise the patterns in the analyses to follow, and I find that, for those unaccustomed to reading it, the visually disjunct nature of Western drum notation makes it difficult to perceive a smooth rhythmic line. Secondly, I have yet to find (or come up with) a version of the Western notation system that satisfyingly represents the end-weightedness of Balinese gamelan, and have decided to avoid this can of worms by not using Western notation at all.\textsuperscript{59} Finally, I would like to notate these patterns in a

\textsuperscript{57} Pak Cok does occasionally use this right hand stroke in combination with the pung (U) stroke. A slightly different technique that does not really affect the analyses in this dissertation, in appendices, I notate this stroke as “C” from the cung stroke used in gong kebyar and other large drum genres.

\textsuperscript{58} Other Balinese music scholars, including Asnawa (1991), use an almost identical system. It is something close to the Javanese kepatihan (cipher notation) system, also called nut angka. Like every other notation system, this one, too, is imperfect. Though appropriately end-weighted, and avoiding the potential pitfalls of the Western staff system (discussed below), the kepatihan system uses typographical spaces between groups of four beats (following a strong beat). While this eases reading, it can also be misleading, assigning a Western concept of regular meter that may not always be relevant at this level. Sumarsam suggests that the inclusion of these spaces is entirely of Western origin (as, in fact, all Javanese notation is; the tradition began in Western staff notation) (Sumarsam 1995: 106-7): “One of the characteristics of early nut angka is the absence of the division of metric phrases into units of four basic beats […] The main markers of musical phrases in nut angka are kenong and gong [two cycle-marking instruments in Central Javanese gamelan. …] When the Western solfège system was introduced at the beginning of the twentieth century, nut angka adopted a designation of metric units” (Sumarsam 1995: 113).

\textsuperscript{59} Most Balinese music scholars who attempt staff notation – myself included – essentially use an unaltered Western notation system, but, in concession to the Balinese concept of end-weightedness, put the first gong-tone in parentheses, implying that it belongs to the previous cycle, and end the transcription with the last gong-tone – a $16^{\text{th}}$-note standing by itself. An example of this notation style can be found in Tenzer 2000: 245. The problem with this system, of course, is in its beaming. If a two-beat $16^{\text{th}}$-note gesture is meant to be conceived of as leading toward the next slow melody tone (in this transcription, the eight $16^{\text{th}}$-notes between D (e) and F# (u) in the pokok do not belong with the D, but are leading to the F#), should not the new melody tone be beamed with them? And yet that would be utterly confusing from a Western transcription standpoint. Lisa Gold in her 2005 Music in Bali attempts a novel approach at the end-weightedness of cycles, if not of beats: she places the full beat of the gong tone before the repeat sign. An example of this notation style can be found in Gold 2005: 61. The problem with this approach, however, is that the three $16^{\text{th}}$-notes following the gong tone are not considered by Balinese
way that is easier for my Balinese teachers and friends to read as well, so that I can continue to receive their feedback in this process. There are certainly many precedents for a mnemonic transcription of *kendang* patterns, including notations in extensive studies by Hood, Tenzer and others. It is only in my conscious avoidance of Western notation that I differ from these scholars.

A simple example will clarify my notation method. Figure 1.25 below shows one very basic pattern for a *tabuh dua* gong structure. And here, the quarter-beat becomes relevant for the first time. In these patterns, as above, each numbered beat represents one stroke on the *guntang*; the large dots (●) represent the half-beat, and each horizontal dash in both the meter and the drum parts represents a quarter-beat. I notate the *lanang* first, and then one possible *wadon* pairing:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n   pu   n   G
(_)_ _ _ _ e _ _ e _ _ e _ e T _
```

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n   pu   n   G
(_)_ _ o _ _ _ o _ _ _ o _ _ _ o D _ o o
```

Figure 1.25. Sample notation, *lanang* then *wadon*

Looking at the two parts next to one another in Figure 1.26, we can see how they interlock:

________

musicians to be part of the old cycle; they are the beginning of the new cycle. The Western notation system itself seems incapable of being bent to an end-weighted concept of meter and beat. This is made even more complicated by the fact that, in a rhythmically stratified music like *gamelan* – where different instrument groups move at different rhythmic densities – each instrument group could be said to “begin the new cycle” at a different point: the first time they articulate a pitch that does not belong to the old cycle. While the musicians, of course, do not think of the music in this way, these different density strata create yet another notational challenge, as can be seen in the Gold example, where she has had to tie the gong tone over the bar line at an artificial point in order to fit into the system. I have attempted to avoid these pitfalls by avoiding the need to beam notes together at all. Of course my system has its problems as well, particularly the fact that the reader is forced to gain fluency in a new system before being able to understand my analyses.
When notating the two drum parts as a single line in order to examine their interlocking qualities, there are inevitably some subdivisions where the two drums coincide. Interlocking simply means that like strokes on the two drums generally fall one after the other as opposed to simultaneously. A Dag (D) stroke, for instance, is not meant to coincide with a Tut (T) stroke. It is, however, quite common for peng (e) to fall together with Dag (D) and kom (o) with Tut (T), particularly in denser patterns. In these cases, I notate the more structurally important strokes (D or T where they exist, U wherever it occurs in a cueing capacity) in the main notation, with the subordinate stroke written below.\(^60\) In instances where kom (o) and peng (e) strokes coincide (as they often do, particularly when double rim-strokes are used), consistent with Hood’s analysis, I consider the second of a double rim stroke to be more important than the first.\(^61\) With these limitations of notation in mind, the lanang and wadon patterns notated above combine to create the composite pattern in Figure 1.27:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(_)_ _ _ _ e e _ _ e e _ _ e e T _ \\
(_)_ _ o _ _ _ o o _ _ o o D _ o o \\
\]

Figure 1.26. Sample notation, *lanang* and *wadon* together

---

\(^60\) The question of structural importance will be addressed in more depth in Chapter 3.

\(^61\) As discussed below, this is a somewhat problematic interpretation, and I only transcribe these rim-strokes as such when forced to choose between two colliding strokes.
1.4.4.4 Counting Strokes

Almost invariably, an improvising kendang arja player will play a drum stroke on every quarter-beat. Yet, because the aesthetic ideal of Balinese paired drum genres is one of the interlocking of two drums, a drummer must also create space in the texture between his strokes where his partner’s strokes may emerge, as we can see in the example above. Thus, in addition to these main strokes is a collection of softer strokes, called anak pukulan, which translates as “child strokes,” or “subsidiary strokes,” but which Hood refers to as “counting strokes.” The most common counting strokes are accomplished simply by lightly tapping the fingers of either the right or left hand on its drumhead while the other head is damped by the opposite hand. However, a Dag (D) or Tut (T) motion may also be done with minimal sound to effect a counting stroke with the right thumb. Hood also regards the first of two strokes in a double Dag (D), a double Tut (T), and even a double kom (o) or peng (e) as counting strokes. To some extent, I disagree with his assessment, particularly as regards kom (o) and peng (e). While double Dag (D) and Tut (T) strokes are both played and taught with a weaker stroke followed by a stronger one, in my experience, drummers will generally play both strokes in a double rim-stroke gesture at the same volume. And, when asked, all my teachers claimed that the two strokes should be played with equal weight. However, some of my analysis in Chapters 3 and 4 support Hood’s claim as well, and there appears to be no cut-and-dried answer to this question. In reality, the gestures will generally occur too quickly for a drummer to vary the weight between the two strokes, even should he wish to. In my transcriptions, however, I will always include both strokes in a double kom (o) or double peng (e) gesture, thus treating them as main strokes, not counting strokes.
*Anak pukulan* are used by players to fill in the spaces, kinetically, between their main strokes, and, in many cases, they help to either prepare or complete the surrounding main stroke gestures. For instance, as mentioned above, a *Tut* or *Dag* stroke must be damped after playing; this can be done with a counting stroke in the fingers of the right hand. Further, a *Pak* (P), *Kap* (K), *kom* (o), *peng* (e) or *pung* (U) stroke can only be achieved with the right drumhead damped. A right-hand counting stroke preceding any of these strokes can be used to achieve this as well.

In his analyses of *kendang arja* patterns, Hood does not take into account these various counting strokes, as he claims that they “do not contribute to the fundamental understanding of paired improvised drumming patterns” (Hood 2001: 50). While there is some validity to his claim – counting strokes are not necessarily essential to a basic understanding of the paired aspects of *kendang arja*, particularly in dense passages – I will sometimes include them in my analyses for a number of reasons. First of all, while counting strokes are certainly subordinate to the main strokes, they are almost always meant to be an audible part of the texture. Some of my teachers, particularly Pak Cok, insist that many counting strokes should in fact be played quite loudly.  

Asnawa claims that “counting strokes are ‘the overtones of drumming’ and in this genre in particular, ‘sangat menentukan keindahnya,’ which means [they] clearly determine the beauty of *arja* drumming” (Hood 2001: 50-51). Moreover, when teaching patterns, all of my teachers were both specific and consistent as to whether I should play a given collection of four counting strokes as right-left-right-left, right-left-left-right, or right-left-right thumb-right, for instance. Whether this differentiation was purely for kinesthetic purposes or whether these diverse combinations of counting strokes each created a different *rasa* (feeling) for these

---

62 I have often heard these louder counting strokes vocalized as “tep”.

---
musicians, the mere fact of their conscious differentiation by all the musicians I worked with attests to their importance. What's more, not all counting strokes are given the same weight in a pattern. While some may simply be used to kinesthetically maintain running quarter-beats, others fill a vital role in the overall rasa of a given rhythm, thus creating something of a hierarchy of stronger and weaker “subordinate” strokes. I consider those counting strokes that are played at a slightly louder volume and consistently verbally articulated when drummers vocalize a pattern to be structurally important.

I transcribe the various counting strokes as ‘r’ and ‘l’ for right and left hand taps respectively, and ‘t’ and ‘d’ for counting strokes played with the thumb of the lanang and wadon respectively. A full notation of the lanang and wadon parts above would then be, for the lanang:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G\]
\[(r)l \ r \ l \ r \ e \ e \ t \ r \ e \ r \ l \ r \ e \ e \ T \ r\]

Figure 1.28. Sample notation with counting strokes, lanang

And for the wadon:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G\]
\[(r)l \ r \ o \ r \ l \ o \ r \ o \ r \ o \ d \ r \ o \ o\]

Figure 1.29. Sample notation with counting strokes, wadon

---

63 Questions such as these raise issues of structural salience in drumming, i.e. which strokes do the drummers consider to be important to the integrity of the pattern, and which are simply played for kinesthetic purposes? Perhaps these questions cannot be answered – many of them are still a mystery to me, despite raising them time and again with my various teachers – but I still do not feel comfortable omitting this information when I cannot prove that it is irrelevant to the musical structure of the patterns.
Because this study seeks to analyze not only the coordination between *wadon* and *lanang* but also the range of variation within each individual drum part, I consider counting strokes as part of a complete analysis. Though paired *kendang* patterns are almost always thought of as composites, the fact that, in *arja*, a single *lanang* pattern can be paired with numerous quite distinct *wadon* patterns demands consideration of these two components as individual elements with their own rules for variation, not only as composites. And, since *anak pukulan* can make up 30-50% of the strokes in *kendang arja* (Tenzer 2000: 292), I include all of them in the transcriptions in Appendix 4.

That being said, for my analyses, I have tried to find a balance between the accurate but cumbersome prescriptive notation of my appendices and Hood’s potentially under-detailed descriptive notations. Thus, in the body of the paper, I generally transcribe only those counting strokes that I consider to be structurally important in order to expedite visual comparative analysis. I have used my teachers’ playing and vocalising as well as my own drumming experience as a guide, and hope that the prescriptive notations in the appendices will dispel any concerns about corner-cutting.

### 1.4.5 Formal Structure: Singer-Dancer/Drummer Relationships

The *kendang* players – and particularly the *lanang* – are the leaders of the *gugunungan* ensemble. The *tukang lanang* (*lanang* player) takes cues from the singer-dancers regarding tempo changes, dynamic shifts, the placement of accent gestures, and the beginnings and endings of pieces and sections of pieces. He then transfers these cues to the rest of the ensemble, both visually – through hand gestures and upper body movements – and aurally.

---

64 The *lanang* is the leader in most *madya* or middle period *gamelan* genres – those from the court traditions such as *gambuh*, *legong* and *semar pegulingan*. Most 20th-century (*baru* or new) genres reverse the roles of the drums, having the *wadon* as ensemble leader.
1.4.5.1 Pepeson

As previously mentioned, the incorporation of cycle-marking instruments and kendang into arja performance during the arja geguntangan period, as well as the emergence of more formally trained singer-dancers at this time, facilitated the formalization of several structural aspects in arja performance. Chief among these was the development of a pepeson or exposition, a formal entrance introducing every new character to the stage. Each pepeson has a specific tembang associated with it; the Condong’s, for instance, is generally Pangkur. Each also involves a semi-choreographed dance with a specific series of movements or physical signposts that must be completed in a prescribed order. Described in-depth in Dibia (1992), these movements include opening the langsé curtain (mungkah lawan), dancing in the doorway while playing with the langsé (ngigelin langsé), walking from langsé to center stage in four steps (tindak pat), walking in a slow, dignified manner (called nayog for male dancers; female dancers will sway extended arms while walking, which is called ngalikas), and dancing half-circles to the left and to the right in a fast walk or majalan (also called malpal). Each of these movement sequences will end with a significant point of articulation or disjunction in both music and dance, called angsel (discussed below, section 1.4.5.2), and may be separated further by dancing in one spot in a characteristic stance called agem. When the dancer is ready to end the pepeson s/he becomes centered quite far downstage. At this point, a female dancer will perform a stylized hand gesture (matantangan); a male dancer will lift one side of his split robe (nyelubit.) After these movements, the dancer will turn his/her back to the audience, zigzag back upstage to face either the langsé or the musicians, and await the next part of the drama (Dibia 1992: 195-205 and 244-246). A diagram of this floor pattern is shown in Figure 1.30:
Figure 1.30. Floor pattern of basic pepeson dance framework (from Dibia 1992: 246)

Thus, the basic framework of every pepeson is fixed; each must outline this choreographic structure, relying on the form of its specific tembang for the placement and timing of movements within the song. Yet the singer-dancer actually has quite a bit of freedom in terms of timing in both singing and dance, vocal ornamentation, movements that happen between the basic signposts in the choreographic structure, and personalized development of his/her character’s affects, both vocal and physical.

“The musicians, and especially the drummers, must follow closely the individual interpretation of the dance and song by the performer. In professional practice, it is the
performer on stage that leads the musicians and not the reverse” (Hood 2001: 56). This fluid relationship between song, dance and instrumental music, however, is not generally a specific, small-scale rhythmic relationship, but rather a large-scale structural one. Arja singer-dancers perform the rhythms of their tembang completely independently of the cyclic structures that regulate the kendang and other rhythmic instruments. The timing of their singing and the basic movements discussed above will have little to no effect on which kendang improvisations are played from one cycle to the next. Yet, through dance, these performers command moments of textural change called angsel. These are “strongly articulated dance movement[s],” such as a quick change of direction or a series of suddenly abrupt movements in an otherwise smooth sequence, which are accompanied by a disruption in the surface movement of the music, generally a sudden increase in volume cued by the kendang lanang and followed by a break in the drumming, cengceng, and kajar playing.

1.4.5.2 Angsel

The successful musical execution of the angsel rests almost entirely with the lanang player – he is responsible for transferring cues from the dancer to the rest of the ensemble, both by increasing volume and by using his pung (U) and Pak (P) strokes at appropriate moments. The wadon player, by contrast, is generally free to continue improvising without restrictions throughout. His only absolute angsel-related responsibilities are to follow the dynamic changes outlined by the lanang, and to insert a Dag stroke on the beat preceding gong at the very end of the angsel. Thus, in the following examples, we will be looking almost exclusively at the lanang part alone.

65 Lessons and interviews with all of my teachers corroborate this.
In *arja* performance, as in many Balinese *gamelan* genres, there are two main types of *angsel* for every cyclic structure. Each of these *angsel* types has its own *lanang* cue at a very specific point in the cycle, and its own unique responding *kendang* pattern, and each is associated with different dance movements. The *angsel lantang* or long *angsel*, as its name suggests, is a somewhat lengthy loud section followed by a rhythmic break. It is used to accompany dance movements “that require longer preparation such as a fast walk or an arm-swaying gait” (Hood 2001: 135). In the 2-beat *batel* structure, an *angsel lantang* begins with a double *pung* (U) cue on the half-beat following gong, though sometimes it will be delayed by a fraction of a beat, seeming to fall somewhere between the half-beat and quarter-beat following. I have attempted to show this slight delay in the transcription in Figure 1.31 below. The *angsel* pattern itself occurs over the next two cycles, as follows (CD Track 2, just *lanang*):

![Figure 1.31. Angsel lantang, batel structure, Singapadu style](image)

Yet most *angsel*, and particularly *angsel lantang*, also require a lengthier preparation before the *angsel* itself. The dancer will first cue an increase in dynamics – called *ngeseh* or *angkat* – by lowering her body (*turun*) and, if she is walking, by lengthening her stride. The *lanang* will transfer this cue to the other instruments, often with a loud *peng* (e)-heavy pattern, after which the full ensemble will maintain an increased volume until the dancer cues the *angsel* itself. At this point, the *lanang* will immediately play his *pung* (U) cue, then both drums will

---

66 Note: this and other *angsel* examples in this chapter were played by Pak Tama in Singapadu with Bu Candri dancing. Other musicians in different villages play different variants on them. See Chapter 2 for details.

67 The term *ngeseh* generally refers to a localized increase in both tempo and dynamics. In *arja*, however, there is often no acceleration in the *ngeseh*, or it is so subtle as to be virtually imperceptible.
play the special angsel pattern (which always features their slap strokes – P and K), and finally dancer and drummers will diam – cut off, becoming silent and still – together. The kajar and cengceng follow the drums; cycle-marking instruments continue throughout and do not diam.

Each angsel is cued with its own unique dance movement. For the angsel lantang in batel, for instance, the lanang’s double pung (U) cue comes in immediate response to a subtle raise of the dancer’s left heel following a back kick with the right foot. In the transcription below, and in the accompanying video clip (clip 1) we can see this full progression of events unfold. The drummer is vamping on his improvised patterns waiting for the dancer to give a cue. Measured from the beginning of this clip, this happens for three full cycles. Then, the five steps of the angsel proceed as shown in Figure 1.32:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The dancer does ngeseh.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At the next gong stroke, the lanang initiates a loud peng (e)-heavy pattern to cue the other instruments to ngeseh. This is often a virtually immediate reaction, although in the current example there is a small delay between the dancer and drummer’s ngeseh, because of the place in the gong cycle that the dancer chooses to ngeseh (directly after a gong stroke, as opposed to just before it – she has some freedom here.) Following the lanang’s ngeseh, the full ensemble plays loudly until the angsel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dancer’s pre-angsel cue: The dancer raises her right heel, kicks her right foot behind her to the left, then places it gently on the floor to the right. This warns the drummer that her angsel cue is imminent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Angsel cue: The dancer raises her left heel just after a gong stroke, accompanied simultaneously by the drummer’s double pung (U) cue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Angsel: The dancer lifts her left foot and places it back next to the right, while doing a special eye movement – called seledet – where she snaps her eyes to the side in anticipation of an important rhythmic or metric accent (in this case, the wadon’s Dag stroke that ends the angsel on a tawa-tawa stroke), and snaps them back to center in line with said accent. The lanang drummer plays his angsel pattern. The wadon joins for the final (PKTD) gesture. [Note: there is no wadon drummer in the video clip.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.32. Details of contextualized angsel lantang for batel, dance and drumming, Singapadu style
In the transcription below, I have only transcribed those moments in the drumming that are relevant to the *angsel*; the “……” in the transcription indicate places where the *lanang* plays his improvised patterns. Relevant *wadon* strokes are marked with a ‘w’. Numbered asterisks above the transcription indicate moments where each of the above-listed events occurs:

**Improvising...**

\[ (2) - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 \]

\[ *1 \]

\[ (G) n\ pu\ n\ G n\ pu\ n\ G n\ pu\ n\ G n\ pu\ n\ G \]

\[ (……... e _ _ r e r e r e r e Tr...) \]

**Figure 1.33.** Transcription of contextualized *angsel lantang*, Singapadu style

The second *angsel* type is the *angsel bawak* or short *angsel*. This is an abrupt break in the rhythmic flow of *kendang*, *kajar*, and *cengceng*, and is used to underline a quick movement – a shift of the head or eyes or a brief hand gesture or side step, for instance. One of the most common places that an *angsel bawak* is found in *arja* performance is directly following an *angsel lantang*. If the dancer abruptly moves again after the *angsel*, she is cueing the drummer to immediately play another *angsel* – this time an *angsel bawak*. This practice, known by the borrowed English expression *angsel dobel* (double *angsel*), can be seen in the following transcription and video clip (clip 2). Notice that in this example, the dancer and drummer
*ngeseh* almost simultaneously. The transcription begins with event 5, the *angsel*. The dancer’s cue to *angsel* again is labeled 6, and the almost immediate *angsel bawak* in dance and drums, 7:

*5*  
(2) – ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 1 – ● – 2  

*6*  
(G) n p u n G n p u n G n p u n G n p u n G  

*7*  
(r) l r U U _ _ P K T D _ _ _ r l r e e _ e _ e K P T D  

**Figure 1.34. Angsel lantang leading into angsel bawak, Singapadu style**

In this video clip, the dancer does not instantly move again following the *angsel bawak*, indicating that there will be no more *angsel* at this time. Thus, the drummer is momentarily *diam*, waiting for her to begin dancing again. In this case, she starts halfway through the next cycle. However, she can choose to stay still in her *agem* stance for much longer, and the drummer must follow her, staying silent until she begins again, at which point he resumes his soft-dynamic improvised vamping and continues in this way until her next cue.

While *angsel bawak* often occur in this double *angsel* context, they can also stand alone. In these cases, the *angsel* will generally occur quite suddenly. Directly after the ensemble does *ngeseh*, the dancer will cue the *angsel bawak*, the *lanang* will immediately transfer that cue to the ensemble, and the full company will as quickly stop at a prearranged point in the cycle. As can be seen in the *angsel dobel* above, the whole *angsel bawak* will generally only last a few beats.

A special kind of *angsel bawak* played at a soft dynamic (and thus not preceded by *ngeseh*) is cued when the dancer extends her arm out in front of her body with the index finger pointed upward. She will watch the finger with the eyes, then, at the moment of *diam*, will
subtly snap her finger back and her head up. These types of surprise angsel will generally occur at pre-arranged points in the tembang.  

**1.4.5.3 The Influence of Tembang on Musical Structure**

The precise placement of the pung (U) cue and the angsel pattern within an arja performance is bound to the cycle – each cyclic structure has rules regarding the execution of its two angsel types (examined in more depth in Chapter 2), and within the improvised kendang playing of arja, the angsel are completely pre-composed elements. Yet their general placement in the overall form of the piece is determined by the structures of the tembang themselves, and tempered by the tastes of individual singer-dancers. How many cycles there will be before the ngeseh, how many cycles of ngeseh before the angsel, and whether the angsel played is single or double, bawak or lantang, are all choices made by the singer-dancer and in association with the specific tembang form being used.

Thinking about arja from a macroscopic level, as in Figure 1.35 below, we can see the irregular occurrences of short and long angsel, ngeseh, and so on, over the course of a full passage. This visual representation will hopefully help the reader keep perspective on the larger musical gestures while delving into the micro analyses to follow – giving a sense of the proverbial forest before zeroing in to scrutinize the gnats crawling on the birds in the trees.

---

68 Pak Tama differentiates between this and the regular angsel bawak by calling it angsel kado. However, other teachers, including Sudi, often use the term angsel kado completely interchangeably with the terms angsel bawak and the Indonesian-language angsel pendet all to mean “short angsel.” I have occasionally heard Sudi use the term angsel kado to refer to those short angsel in the Baris warrior dance that come without ngeseh before gong, such as those when the dancer reaches his fingers to his forehead just after the gong stroke. In this, he uses the term to mean “sudden” angsel. However, deeper research with a wider selection of informants is required to really tease out the meanings and limits of these various terms.

69 In Pak Tama’s Singapadu style, one place that this surprise angsel kado happens is early in the Sinom form that is used for the pepeson of various characters (including the Limbur). The angsel kado occurs after the dancer has emerged from behind the langsé and done an angsel lantang – often around the third or fourth line of text.
this figure, each box represents one gong cycle of tabuh dua. The white boxes represent cycles in which the drummer does not play (is diam), yellow indicates improvised drumming, red indicates ngeseh, green indicates angsel lantang, and blue indicates angsel bawak (CD Track 3).

Figure 1.35. Overall structure of an improvised tabuh dua lanang passage from Pak Cok (improvised drumming = yellow, ngeseh = red, angsel lantang = green, angsel bawak = blue, silence [diam] = white)

To a very large extent, the song directs these important structural aspects of the music. The drummers, therefore, must know each tembang well in order to know when to enter and when to stop throughout the course of a given piece, particularly while the dancer is still behind the langsé and thus not giving visual cues. For instance, in Tembang Pangkur, there are seven lines of poetry. The kendang will generally enter during the second one, coming in with an angsel to begin with, and continuing with soft playing. The line will end with the kendang increasing volume, playing an angsel, and then stopping. For each subsequent line, the kendang will start softly shortly after the singer begins, increase in volume just before the line draws to a finish, and end with an angsel after the singer has completed the line. In longer forms, like Sinom, there may be entire lines where the kendang stay silent, or lines where special hand gestures – called angsel kekliwasan – are to be expected. Therefore, in order to know when to

---

70 There is some freedom here, depending on the particular preference of both drummer and dancer (Lesson with Pak Tama, June 2011). Some singers, like Bu Candri, will often sing only the first few notes of the opening line of this or any pepeson song, and then pause. In this case, a drummer will play very briefly in the break, and stop again for the singer to finish her first line.

71 For an angsel kekliwasan, the dancer brings one hand up to his/her headdress (gelungan), and then slowly extends it out in front of him/her. The kendang are generally diam before the angsel kekliwasan occurs, and many drummers do not articulate it with a special pattern. However, Pak Tama in Singapadu insists that a good player in

73
play loud, where to stop playing, and when to expect specific angsel types, among other things, the tukang kendang (kendang player) must be familiar with the tembang repertoire. This becomes infinitely more important in the arja negak performances discussed in section 1.7.

1.4.5.4 Concluding Remarks on Formal Structure

Thus, through ngeseh and angsel, and guided by the tembang structure, a singer-dancer shapes moments of contrast – dynamic and textural changes – into the almost continuous drumming of the pepeson.

In a section of the drama that is heavy with dialogue, dance controls musical structure in a very different way. In these sections, the drummers (along with kajar and cengceng) will often cut out altogether, leaving just the accompanying, cycle-marking instruments to play softly in the background. They will enter again only when the actors stop speaking or singing to dance, or as aural accompaniment to brief movements (a single Dag stroke accompanied by cengceng when a character humorously trips over his sarong, for instance, or when one character strikes another.)

These many details of performance interactions mean that, of all the drumming traditions in Bali, often “traditional arja drumming is considered to be the most complex and subtle, relying on spontaneity and nuance between the two interlocked but fluid drummers and

---

the traditional Singapadu style must recognize the angsel kekliwasan and mark it with a special pattern. For the batel structure, his angsel kekliwasan is very lanang-heavy, with the wadon only playing the last stroke:

(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2

(G) - n - pu- n - G - n - pu- n - G

T _ _ r P _ T _ T _ D

In tabuh dua, the angsel kekliwasan is quite different:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4

(G) - - n - - pu- - n - - G - - n - - pu- - n - - G

D _ P _ D _ T D _ D T _ T _ D T D
the dancer” (Herbst 1997: 102). Like a solo drummer improvising with a *Topeng* (masked) dancer, *arja* drummers must rely on the timing and feeling of the dancer to create their improvised patterns. Bu Candri explains that it is the responsibility of both dancer and drummer to be exact in their performance; if a dancer gives a sloppy cue or does her *ngeseh* in the wrong part of the cycle, the drummer will inevitably make a mistake also. Yet the drummer is equally responsible for knowing the full structure of the *tembang* and being quick to read the often subtle cues of the dancer. Of the potential pitfalls inherent in these responsibilities, Bu Candri exclaims “sering terjadi begitu! (it often happens like that!” The interplay between dancer and drummer requires both intense individual training and practice together, and, she laments, the perfection of this art is by no means a given among Balinese *arja* performers.

Asnawa describes similar challenges in solo *kendang* playing for *Topeng* dancers:

> The… genre demands full participation and dialogue with the dancer, you can’t be distracted because you must become one with the bayu or energy of the dancer. The challenge in the drama is not to simply play the patterns but to *mengembangkan pikiran* or to develop the patterns using thought and intention. (As quoted in Hood 2001: 57).

> He goes on to say, “when I think of *arja* drumming, the challenge is even more complex” (Hood 2001: 57). This is because, alongside the spontaneous improvised dialogue that must exist between dancer and drummer, *kendang arja* involves an equally complex spontaneous improvised and interlocking dialogue between *lanang* and *wadon*.

> These connections between dance, *tembang* and instrumental music, so central to *arja* performance, are all legacies of the *arja geguntangan* period.

---

72 There are many kinds of drumming in Bali, each complex in its own way, but *kendang arja* is physically taxing as well as providing these numerous cognitive and coordination challenges, and this appears to be the kind of musicianship that Balinese musicians prize as most particularly complex. The same reverent pedestal is reserved for exceptionally gifted *gender wayang* players and those *reyong* players who can improvise especially *wayah norot* figuration in *gong kebyar* pieces.

73 Bu Candri in a joint dance/*kendang* lesson with Pak Tama and myself, July 25, 2011.
1.5 *Arja Gede*: Standardization and Professionalization

The mid-20th century saw several major changes in *arja* performance, all of which led to a further professionalization and standardization of the art form, as well as its extremely widespread popularization. In this period, we see the emergence of *arja gede*: grand *arja* performances that would often last all night (*gede*, in Balinese, means large or grand), where character types and performance arcs became fixed, and All-Star performing troupes were established.

1.5.1 The Popularity of *Arja*

“By the 1940s, *arja* had become the most popular dramatic art form on the island” (Hood 2001: 15). Bu Candri remembers hearing young girls singing *tembang arja* – entirely from memory – while taking their daily baths in the river near Singapadu.74 *Arja* performances had become such a common occurrence, and their music such an integral part of Balinese cultural consciousness by this time, that the songs were known by everyone. While often not directly associated with ceremony, it could still be used in religious contexts – temple ceremonies, cremations, and weddings – as well as village fairs and national fairs.75 In fact most of my older informants76 claim that each of these ceremonies or events would have seemed incomplete without at least one *arja* drama in the *kalangan* – the designated

---

74 Conversation with Bu Candri’s husband, I Ketut Asmara (nicknamed Pak Kecor), July 2011.
75 See Dibia 1992: 64-105 for details on the various performance contexts and functions of *arja*. Dibia 1992: 289-337 discusses changes in these contexts and functions in “contemporary Balinese society” at the time of its writing.
76 Interviews and conversations with Pak Cok, Pak Dewa, Pak Tama, Pak Tut, Bandem, Dibia, Bu Candri, and others.
performance space.\textsuperscript{77} What’s more, people would attend \textit{arja} performances not only in their own \textit{banjar} – their own ward or neighborhood – but in other villages as well, and each of my teachers and friends from this generation has countless stories of walking two or even three hours – one way – just to watch an \textit{arja} performance. As Pak Tama says, people back then were \textit{haus} – thirsty – for it.\textsuperscript{78} During this time, it seems that, as long as the performance was good, this thirst for \textit{arja}’s intricate music, delicate dance, and ever-developing humor was virtually limitless; performances during the \textit{arja gede} period could last six to ten hours – beginning at 10:00 or 11:00 at night and often continuing, with a full, engaged audience, until the sun came up. As a \textit{kendang} player in these all-night mid-century shows, Pak Dewa claims that as long as someone in the village brought some smoked chicken, and the dancers were of high quality, and the coffee and cigarettes kept flowing, he would never feel the weight of exhaustion, no matter how long or how late they played. It was enough to play good music among friends.\textsuperscript{79}

This growth in the genre over the course of the \textit{arja gede} period occurred despite the fact that the mid-twentieth century was fraught with political turmoil in Indonesia. The 1942-45 Japanese occupation and the subsequent Indonesian Revolution, as well as the so-called attempted Communist coup of 1965 and the violence that followed it, all stilted development of the arts in Bali in various ways.\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Arja} stories were questioned for their potential political defiance, and many \textit{arja} troupes chose to avoid trouble by simply closing up shop during these

\textsuperscript{77} The use of a \textit{kalangan} for \textit{arja} performances began in the 1930s, before which they would have simply taken place in informal public spaces. Elevated stages, the kind we see now, only began to be used for \textit{arja} in the 1960s (Dibia 1992: 57-58).

\textsuperscript{78} Interview with Pak Tama, June 7, 2011.

\textsuperscript{79} Lesson with Pak Dewa, June 2008.

\textsuperscript{80} There are several in-depth discussions of this phenomenon in sources listed in the bibliography. See Robinson 1995 and Vickers 1989, 155-173, for information from a political perspective. See Dibia 1992: 41-54 for a discussion of the direct effects of these political events on \textit{arja}.
Performers and audiences who chose to continue supporting the arts through these upheavals did so at their own risk. Pak Tama remembers gathering a large group of friends together to walk to *arja* performances in other villages during the 1960s. Even at the shows, they stuck closely together for safety. They would never walk home before sunrise and all of them carried knives for self-defence. Yet despite these set-backs, the 1940s-1960s were years of extreme growth in *arja*’s popularity, and this is marked by a stark increase in the number of *arja* performances that a village would host over the course of a year, as well as the increased performance times discussed above.

### 1.5.2 Standardization of Characters and Performance Structure

Part of the reason for the expanded length of *arja* performances through the *arja gede* period was the standardization of a general story arc, and an increase in the number of characters presented – each of which needed a formal entrance and exit as well as a monologue/dialogue section. The 1930s saw the beginnings of stock standard characters in *arja* performance – archetypes that could be used for any number of different stories – and, in the 1940s, these characters and the structure of their entrances and interactions were formalized (Dibia 1992: 57-58). These developments were also accompanied by a further complexification of *arja*’s vocal and instrumental music, a much more stylized dance vocabulary for each character, and the creation of more elaborate costumes.

As mentioned above, *arja* stories are tales of love and human relations, and vehicles for teaching audiences about karma, faith, and traditional Balinese values.

---

81 This was especially true during the 1940s (Dibia 1992: 46).
82 Lesson with Pak Tama, July 2011.
The central theme of *arja* stories is love intrigue or romantic love. This theme covers ninety-five percent of *arja* stories. The most common themes of *arja* stories are true love, a love triangle, family revenge upon love’s rejection, and the greedy mother with blind love. The other five percent are about faith or loyalty to one’s lord (Dibia 1992: 155).

While each of these themes demands slightly different relationships between the stock characters – discussed in depth by Dibia (1992) – many generalizations can be made. A typical *arja* performance has several character archetypes. These are divided into principals, or *ratu*, and servants, or *penasar*. While the principals – all played by women – are the ones who largely enact the story, creating conflicts and resolutions, it is the servants who carry the bulk of the responsibility in terms of the drama itself. Aside from providing most of the oft-improvised humor of the play, these characters are permitted to break the so-called fourth wall of theatre, translating the sung words of the various *ratu*, and explaining to the audience their philosophical meanings and implications. In accordance with a Balinese taste for duality, *arja* characters represent a balance between serious and comic as well as coarse – *keras* or *buduh* – and refined – *halus* or *manis* – personalities. These contrasts influence the language use and dance styles of each character as well as the mood of individual scenes.

As part of the formalization of performance structure through the *arja gede* period, each character in the drama was given a *pepeson* or exposition, a monologue or meeting scene – called *penyarita* for monologues or *petemon* for dialogues – and a formal exit or *pekaad*. And, as previously mentioned, these began to be enacted in a prescribed order, with each of four official scenes (and two optional additional scenes) having its own associated moods and functions.

The opening scene introduces the beautiful, charming young princess, the Galuh, and her middle-aged maidservant, the Condong. The Galuh, a very *manis* – refined – and generally sympathetic character, is almost always the subject of the romantic intrigue of the story. The
Condong – seen at the beginning of this chapter – is her “mature, wise, and loyal servant. She functions as a confidante, who is always seen in the company of her mistress” (Dibia 1992: 160). Seen as a character that upholds morality, she can also be nurturing. The Condong, though not quite as refined as the Galuh, is also generally regarded as a halus or manis character. Kellar, however, maintains that the Condong, in fact, straddles the line between halus and kasar because “she displays quite a propensity for slapstick and often quite rough behavior in her defense of the Galuh against the predations of unwelcome men” (Kellar 2004: paragraph 36). Their opening scene, which is serious in nature, “provides all of the basic information necessary for the audience to understand the play, and gives the audience a hint of the conflict yet to come. This scene is one of exposition” (Dibia 1992: 173).

The second scene introduces the opposing female characters. The Limbur may be a queen, good mother, or – very often – mean stepmother to the Galuh. A buduh – or coarse – character, though, like the Condong, she sometimes wavers the line between manis and buduh (Kellar 2004: paragraph 40), she is something like Fricka, Wotan’s demanding wife in Wagner’s Ring: large, strong-willed, deep-voiced, overbearing. Her strong characteristics made the Limbur one of the last roles to be relinquished by men once women had begun to perform arja (Kellar 2004: paragraph 40). The Limbur is generally not a sympathetic character; she is frequently the cause of the conflict in the story, often seeking to hurt the Galuh in various ways. She is attended by her servant, the Desak, who is a contrast to the Condong in several respects. A young woman from the 3rd caste, 83 she is depicted as a buduh character, funny and eccentric,

83 There are four basic castes in the Balinese caste system, which is based on the Indian system but without the Dalit or untouchable caste. The highest caste – the Brahmans – are the priests, and can be recognized by the prefix “Ida Bagus” (for men) or “Ida Ayu” (for women) before their names. The second caste – the Ksatriya – were traditionally the warriors and princes, identified by the prefix “Dewa” for males and “Dewi” for females. This is also the caste from which royalty were drawn, with prefixes “Anak Agung” and “Cokorda” (or Cok, like Pak Cok) for different classes of royalty. The third caste – the Wesia – were originally the merchants, identified with the
who often talks – with improvised humor – behind the Limbur’s back. These two are also very often accompanied by the Limbur’s eccentric, unattractive daughter, the Liku.

Liku may be a princess or the daughter of a respected family, but she is a selfish and jealous woman. In most cases, she is the Limbur’s daughter, the step-sister of the Galuh. At first, Liku appears likeable, but as the play develops she becomes more and more like her mother, who makes the Galuh to suffer [sic.] Though a humorous character, the audience tends to hate her (Dibia 1992: 162).

The Liku is often played with uproarious physical humor – in both dialogue and dance – to the delight of Balinese audiences. In stark contrast to the opening scene, this second scene is comic in nature, and functionally outlines the conflict of the plot. “Since this is the place for the Limbur and her daughter to set their objectives; i.e. what she wants to do with Galuh or Mantri Manis, the scene marks the rising action of the play” (Dibia 1992: 173). Thus, these first two scenes create a juxtaposition of balanced elements among the female characters – dualities of keras versus halus, funny versus serious, good versus bad, sympathetic versus unsympathetic, beautiful versus ugly, and so on.

The third and fourth scenes do the same for the male characters in the plot. The third scene, though not as serious as the first one, is the sober, refined male scene that introduces the Mantri Manis – the hero or protagonist of the story. The Mantri Manis, as his name suggests, is a halus or manis character: young, handsome, loving, charming, refined. Played by a woman since the 1920s, in various stories he may be a wise prince, a young king, or the son in a respected family. Yet, while he is well loved, and set to be the leading man in the story, the Mantri Manis is often a poor man.

Each of the Mantri, or prince, characters is accompanied by two penasar, or servants, the only characters in arja still consistently played by men. Both pairs of penasar consist of an

prefix “Gusti.” The bottom caste – the Sudra, the commoners – do not have a special name prefix, and will often be referred to simply by their birth order names: Wayan or Putu for first-born, Made or Kadek for second-born, Nyoman or Komang for third-born, and Ketut for fourth-born children. (Other variants also exist in different regions of Bali).
older and a younger brother. The older brother, known as the Penasar Kelihan or Punta, is a strong middle-aged man, but unsophisticated and not terribly intelligent. His younger brother – the Penasar Cenikan, also called Kartala or Wijil – is the intelligent, diligent, crafty brother. This brains vs. brawn opposition is yet another carefully balanced duality in arja. The two Penasar Manis are very compatible partners. Like their master, they are halus characters, and fairly serious men; although they do sometimes use intellectual humor, they almost never resort to slapstick humor or vulgar jokes. This third scene “reveals further developments, complications, or crisis in the play. By this time the audience knows what has happened to the Galuh, or what the hero intends to do in order to overcome his obstacles; i.e. to win the Galuh” (Dibia 1992: 174).

The fourth and final of the standard scenes in an arja performance introduces these men’s opposites: the Mantri Buduh – also played by a woman – and the two male-acted Penasar Buduh. A keras or buduh character, the Mantri Buduh is often depicted as a king or prince, but can also be the son in a wealthy family. Unlike the Mantri Manis, he is middle-aged, arrogant, rich, and selfish. The Mantri Buduh is generally portrayed as less intelligent than the Mantri Manis, and, like the Limbur, his role is to create obstacles for the Mantri Manis, the Galuh, or both. The Mantri Buduh is always accompanied by his two servants, the Penasar Buduh. Like the Penasar Manis, these are a clever-vs.-strong brother duo, but unlike the Penasar Manis, they are not a well-matched pair, and often make fun of one another. These are the true clowns of the arja performance, buffoons employing slapstick, physical, and often quite vulgar humor. And, like the Desak, they regularly either ridicule or completely ignore their master. This fourth scene is by far the funniest in the play, with improvised humor that can last an hour or
more. Functionally, it “provides further plot complications and leads to the climax of the play, which usually occurs after this scene” (Dibia 1992: 174).

Depending on the lakon (story), there are often one or two supplementary scenes in addition to these four basic ones. Generally placed either before or after this fourth scene, or both, these are times for the various characters to come together, for the purposes of either fighting – between the two Mantri for instance – or romance – generally between the Mantri Manis and the Galuh. As each character has already been officially introduced, these additional scenes will only have a penyarita/petemon and pekaad, not a pepeson (character exposition.)

While every arja storyline is unique, since the 1940s, each follows this same general framework or performance structure, allowing audience members to judge each character’s actions and words appropriately, to understand the trajectory of quite complex plots lasting up to ten hours (even anticipating general events before they arise), and to grasp the underlying ethical and philosophical lessons inherent in each story.

1.5.3 Arja Bon: Professionalization of the Genre

The other major development of the arja gede period was the establishment of professional troupes of carefully-selected arja performers. Through the arja doyong and arja geguntangan periods, an arja group’s membership was limited to a single village or banjar (village ward); these groups were known as Arja Sebunan. The late 1950s, however, saw the emergence of All-Star groups – called Arja Bon, “invited” arja – featuring the best performers from various different Arja Sebunan ensembles. Suddenly great drummers like Pak Dewa from Pengosekan and Pak Cok from neighboring Peliatan would be invited to play with singer-

---

84 Literally means “arja from one nest” (Mashino 2011: paragraph 4). See Dibia 1992: 110-118 for a discussion of the social organization of these Arja Sebunan in comparison with that of the Arja Bon troupes.
dancers like Bu Candri in Singapadu, a village 20 minutes to the south by car (and thus quite a bit farther on foot.) Particularly among singer-dancers, these Bon groups were not fixed, and a host could invite any combination of artists he chose for a given event.85

One of the very significant side-effects of this free mixing of artists, of course, was the inevitable blending of village styles as musicians and dancers with previously differing styles began adjusting their performances in order to play smoothly together. Of particular relevance to this study were interactions between the contrasting village styles of Keramas and Singapadu – the two most important arja centres of the twentieth century. As Bandem recalls:

> Two styles of arja that were famous at that time began to merge, becoming Arja Bon, and by the time of their amalgamation for the Arja Festival in 1975, there was no difficulty for arja Singapadu and Keramas to become the best arja in Bali at that time.86

These two villages managed to blend their styles so seamlessly together to perform in Arja Bon groups that, as we shall see in the next chapter, the original arja Keramas style was essentially lost.

With the establishment of these All-Star Arja Bon groups, “one begins to see the growth of professionalism, as well as the rise of a ‘star’ system in this art form” (Dibia 1992: 48). Singer-dancers began to specialize in a single character for the full length of their careers (Hood 2001: 17). Bu Candri, for instance, became known as one of the preeminent Condong specialists, though earlier in her life she had also danced Mantri Manis (Kellar 2004: paragraph 51). These celebrated singer-dancers also demanded the best musicians, and a ‘star’ system

85 Through the 1980s and 90s, some Arja Bon groups became fixed entities, making “the procedure for inviting an Arja Bon group […] much easier” (Dibia 1992: 115-116, quote on 116).

86 “Dua gaya arja yang terkenal saat itu mulai bergabung menjadi Arja Bon, dan ketika terjadi penggabungan pentas untuk Festival Arja tahun 1975 tak ada kesulitan bagi arja Singapadu dan Kramas untuk menjadi arja terbaik di Bali pada saat itu” (Bandem, 2011: paragraph 20).
equally developed among arja instrumentalists, particularly among tukang kendang and suling players (Hood 2001: 18).

One of the other very significant side-effects of the development of these Arja Bon groups was that they created an ever more discerning Balinese audience, capable of differentiating mediocre from good from excellent performers in the genre. Beginning in the late 1950s, Arja Bon companies were hired to perform in villages across Bali, and most of my teachers from that generation remember playing more nights of the year than not through this period. Renowned as the best, they would receive higher pay than an Arja Sebunan group presenting a comparable show, and hosts would generally treat Arja Bon performers with a higher level of respect, providing lavish buffet meals before performances, for instance (Dibia 1992: 117). And suddenly musicians were hired to play not just in their own regencies but all over the island. Pak Tama – centered in Singapadu – often tells of his trips to Buleleng regency in north Bali, where his troupe would be invited to perform in different banjars night after night for the span of a month or more.

The villagers [in this period] quickly took advantage of the popularity of arja, especially of the “All Star” group. They began to present arja as nightly performances without any relation to a religious ceremony. In most cases, arja performances would be held in conjunction with public gambling, such as cockfighting. […]most every major temple ceremony or other village celebration included at least one “big” cockfight. The cockfight might start at nine in the morning and last until four in the afternoon […] Frequently in the evening the villagers, under the sponsorship of the gamblers, would invite art groups to perform. […] Arja, which may go on all night long, became a perfect attraction to prolong the gambling time (Dibia 1992: 48-49).

These and other performance opportunities kept Arja Bon musicians very busy through the arja gede period.

87 Interviews and casual conversations with Pak Dewa, Pak Cok, Pak Tama, Bu Candri and others, 2008-2011.
88 Interviews and conversations with Pak Cok, Pak Dewa, and others corroborate this.
89 Casual conversations with Pak Tama, June 2011.
1.5.4  Arja RRI: Media Popularization and Effects on Performance Practice

Coinciding with the formation of Arja Bon groups was a growing commitment to arts programming on Indonesia’s national radio station, RRI (Radio Republik Indonesia). Founded in Jakarta in September of 1945, RRI quickly established regional stations in major cities on the other Indonesian islands, including, in 1950, stations in Bali’s capital city of Denpasar and northern city of Singaraja. RRI Denpasar eventually formed a dedicated station gamelan group and, though the 1960s, presented daily broadcasts of karawitan – traditional gamelan-based music – that were “avidly followed by listeners all over the island” (Tenzer 2000: 106). At that time, RRI also appointed a handful of master musicians from throughout the island to be responsible for presenting various different traditional performing art forms. I Madé Bandem – son of arja master I Madé Kredek, brother to Bu Candri, prominent Balinese scholar, chronicler of performing arts histories on the island, former rektor at Denpasar’s Arts Academy (ISI), and a musician and dancer in his own right – remembers:

Gusti Kompiang Gelas from Bona […] was the master of kecak. You know, kecak and singing kekawin. And then Sengken from Kesiman was a gong kebyar master; Saplug from Lebah was gong kuno [ancient gamelan forms]. All of those masters, you know, worked in the RRI. And the famous Topeng dancer, my father’s teacher, his name was Ida Bagus Bode, the legong teacher and also Topeng teacher, [was] also brought to RRI to become a master in legong, doing tandak.90

And, beginning in 1956, Bandem and Bu Candri’s father, Pak Kredek, became responsible for RRI’s arja presentations.91 Two years later, RRI began presenting live arja radio performances every Sunday from 10:00am-1:00pm. Bandem remembers these Sunday mornings, when the streets would suddenly empty just before 10:00, as everyone went home to

---

90 Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011.
91 Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011.
sit next to their battery-operated radios and listen to the best arja performers on the island. Then, in 1968, several of the better established RRI performers, including Bu Candri, founded a dedicated radio group called Arja RRI Candra Metu. This group’s artists, like those in the Arja Bon troupes, came from various different villages, and thus needed to develop common styles of playing, singing, and cueing.

Arja RRI concerts also catalysed two other lasting developments in arja performance. First of all, because the radio spot for arja was only three hours long, lakon or stories began to be shortened to accommodate that. This eventually became true not only on radio and television performances but, increasingly, in live performances as well. Today an arja performance that lasts any more than three hours is dubbed “too long.” The second development was a shift in instrumental accompaniment. While geguntangan remained – and still remains – the most common ensemble for arja performance, Arja RRI Candra Metu began using the popular gamelan gong kebyar – with solo kendang – to accompany its arja presentations. And this became a growing trend in several villages, such as Pinda, already known for their great gong kebyar ensembles. The new sub-genre became known as arja gong. Arja scholar I Wayan Dibia argues that, while arja gong performances may have, to some extent, revitalized arja in the public eye, the change was problematic from an aesthetic standpoint:

WD: There was a strong movement for arja gong in 1972. That is a very strong indication that, at that time, arja was trying to catch the energy of kebyar into arja, to make this arja more dynamic. But at the same time, it stopped, or restricted the dancers from singing songs in the slendro mode, because gong kebyar is only pélog. I mean, it is only offered in one scale. So it’s really killing the beauty of the arja itself.

---

92 Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011.
93 Interview with Pinda’s main kendang player from the old generation, Pak Kumpul, Aug 6, 2011. The increasing popularity of gong kebyar in arja performance was also partially an influence of the drama gong and sendratari genres discussed below.
LT: I see. And why did this happen at that time?

WD: Cause at that time, an arja group from the radio station in Denpasar started to use gong kebyar to accompany arja performance. That was a strategy to revive or to revitalize arja in the modern Balinese culture.

LT: OK. But in your opinion it didn’t work?

WD: Well, aesthetically, no. But theoretically maybe yes. Because the music itself attracted more people who at that time were in favor of kebyar. So whenever they heard kebyar, this attracted more, attracting a larger audience, instead of just the simple sounding chamber-like music. But for the feeling of the performance, it’s geguntangan, the chamber-like music that’s the best. Because it’s basically prolonging and supporting the vibrations of the vocals. ⁹⁴

Regardless of its success – aesthetic or otherwise – the development of arja gong was a direct influence of Arja RRI Candra Metu.

Arja RRI presents an interesting dichotomy of influences on arja’s popularity. On the one hand, “Candra Metu’s sophistication and level of complexity solidified arja’s place among the Balinese audience” (Hood 2001: 19), yet “local arja groups have become fewer and fewer partly as a result of being devalued when held up against the superstardom of Radio Republik Indonesia’s ensemble, bolstered by broadcasts and tours throughout Bali” (Herbst 1997: 117). Arja’s eventual decline, however, stemmed from completely different sources.

Thus, through the arja gede period, we see arja performances become much longer (and subsequently much shorter again), we see a standardization in both the stock characters presented and the performance structure itself, and, through Arja Bon groups and Arja RRI, we see an increased professionalization of the genre, in terms of both its costumes and its playing, singing, and dancing techniques. All of these elements led to an increased popularity of the genre through the 1940s, 50s, and 60s.

⁹⁴ Interview with Dibia, Aug 16, 2011. Nowadays, most singing with gong kebyar is done using microphones. The balance is a difficult one to achieve, and often unsuccessful. Geguntangan music is so light that it can easily support a singer without overpowering him/her.
1.6 The Decline of *Arja*

The different genres of performing arts in Bali, as Bandem has put it, are “like a *musim*, season. During the 40s and 50s, *arja* was very great, formidable. But you know, after that time, maybe it sleeps for a little while […] and then it comes back. All of these things. Season.” And several political, social and artistic developments of the late 1960s brought an end to *arja*’s mid-20th-century “season.”

Whenever I ask Balinese people – old and young alike – what caused *arja*’s fall from grace in the 1970s, 95 I am always given one of two answers: TV and *drama gong*. Television was introduced to Bali in the 1970s. At that time, single television sets were given to banjar organizations by the government, “who monopolized the airwaves with Jakarta-based programming and standard American re-run fare” (Tenzer 2000: 107). It became an instant phenomenon. Pak Dewa remembers crowding around the banjar’s one television set, speechlessly watching Sinetron – Indonesian soap operas – with his neighbors. 96 Suddenly this was the most exciting thing to do of an evening. Bu Candri’s husband claims that, as television was establishing a foothold in Singapadu, people stopped going to *arja* performances in other villages. If there were one in Singapadu itself, many people would still attend, but they were *malas* – lazy – to walk to faraway villages when there was such a ready source of entertainment in their own balé banjar. 97 Through the 1980s, as private homes began acquiring their own television sets, this phenomenon ballooned exponentially all across Bali. And as a new

---

95 While the 1970s is understood by most *arja* scholars to be the decade where it began to decline, some of my teachers, including Pak Dewa, mentioned 1990 as a date they felt things changed for *arja*. When I asked Dibia about this, he emphatically contradicted them, but *arja* scholar Ako Mashino – although not yet in Bali in the 1970s, and thus, like me, unable to confirm or deny his findings first-hand – states that “it seems that *arja* tenaciously persevered even in the late 1990s” and, while she doesn’t go too deeply into it, asserts that “there are diverse opinions about when and why it actually started to lose popularity” (Mashino 2011: paragraph 8).

96 Lesson with Pak Dewa, July 2008.

97 Conversation, June 2011.
generation grew up without the older concert-going habits of their parents, arja’s place as an evening entertainment genre waned even further. People’s attention spans shortened; they wanted funnier, more immediate entertainment. Many of my teachers also link this need with changing lifestyles of the Balinese in a new modern world. Pak Tama notes that people who must work a 9-to-5 job are understandably uninterested in a slow-moving drama that runs half the night.98 Sudi, also, has posited that, were people in today’s more modern, fast-paced, high-stress Bali to watch a traditional performance, they would prefer a Topeng clown troupe or a wayang shadow play – something that could make them laugh, or just entertain them – rather than an old classical dance drama like arja.99 And, more often than not – except during village temple ceremonies where these performance forms are still well-attended – many Balinese people in the 1970s, and still today, prefer to stay home and watch soccer on TV.

Yet, perhaps even more instrumental to the decline of arja through the 1970s was the development of another theatrical genre – drama gong – and its history is a more complex one. Drama gong, like arja is a genre whose lakon are based on the Panji tales. It uses the same stock standard characters as arja and often the same general performance structure, but though it is accompanied by gamelan – the popular gong kebyar ensemble – the drama is spoken, not sung.100 What’s more, the language for drama gong is everyday Balinese, and thus, it requires none of the “internal translation”101 so central to arja, which uses both Kawi and high Balinese as well as everyday Balinese. Actors also wear traditional everyday Balinese costumes, as opposed to the ornate specialized costumes developed for arja through the arja geguntangan

---

98 Lesson with Pak Tama, Aug 2011.
99 Conversation with Sudi, June 2007.
100 Because of this, drama gong is sometimes referred to as “spoken arja” (deBoer 1996: 166).
101 See Zurbuchen 1987 for more information on the use of this internal translation in various genres.
and arja gede periods, and the rare moments of dance are always pre-choreographed and with a focus on physical humor.

1.6.1 Drama Gong

The development of drama gong was brought about in large part by the political turmoil that rocked Indonesia in the mid-1960s. At that time, Indonesia was ruled by President Sukarno with very strong support from the powerful communist party, PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia.) When, in 1965, Indonesian communists became the scapegoat for the military coup that eventually overthrew the government, a veritable witch-hunt followed. Suspected communists across Indonesia were arbitrarily arrested and detained without trial (some for the next thirty years), and so-called communist killings were rampant:

The military coup of 1 October 1965 in Indonesia was the prelude to one of the largest massacres of this century. In less than a year, somewhere between 500,000 and one million people – most of them alleged members of the PKI or one of its affiliated organizations – were killed. […] In terms of the proportion of the population killed […] Bali was arguably the province hardest hit. There, between December 1965 and early 1966, an estimated 80,000 people – or roughly 5 percent of the population of under 2 million – were shot, knifed, hacked, or clubbed to death (Robinson 1995: 273).

Many of Bali’s most gifted veteran artists and musicians were among those suspected, and were either killed or went into hiding to avoid capture. Thus, during these years, it was difficult to find enough suitably trained and experienced performers for many of the more challenging theatrical genres. Enter Anak Agung Gede Raka Payadnya, a graduate of KOKAR, the government-sponsored high school for the performing arts now called SMKI. In 1966, in his home village of Abianbase in Gianyar regency, he was tasked with staging a production of the lavish Sendratari Jayaprana, a new theatrical form sometimes referred to as Balinese

\[102\] KOnservatori KARawitan Indonesia, now called SMKI, Sekolah Menengah Karawitan Indonesia.
ballet. “Aware that his village did not possess dancers sufficiently talented and experienced to handle the very demanding choreographic requirements imposed by sendratari,” A.A. Gede Payadnya came up with a fresh concept: “mixing favorite traditional elements from a number of different genres with modern realistic drama as known in the West” to create a spoken dramatic form (deBoer 1996: 165). And drama gong was born.

Drama gong, along with sendratari, came to overshadow older theatrical genres like arja almost immediately. This happened for several reasons. First of all, the continued popularity of the flashy, modern gong kebyar ensemble meant that theatrical genres – like sendratari and drama gong – that were accompanied by gong kebyar naturally had more cachet with Balinese audiences than those that weren’t. As previously mentioned, while some gong kebyar groups – like the celebrated Pinda group – began accompanying arja dramas, the older, more subdued geguntangan ensemble has always been the most widely-used ensemble for arja, and this was less appealing to young Balinese audiences. Along these same lines, as mentioned above, the introduction of televisions as well as shorter for-radio productions of various theatrical genres shortened the attention span of the average Balinese concert-goer.

Dibia laments how, during the 1970s and 1980s, Balinese audiences actually forgot how to understand arja dramas, because their stories were told through lengthy sung passages:

If people are interested in the Panji stories, they can just go to drama gong without being bothered by the use of singing. Because they can speak in a plain kind of verbal dialogue. And people can follow that easier. With arja, you have to learn the song. You have to – at least – you have to familiarize yourself with the singing, and it’s sometimes not easy for you to follow the lines of the song, because it drags, or sometimes they put it into a melismatic kind of thing, so the word for “king” is not “king” maybe, but [sings a long, ornamented “kiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiing”], like that. So as a result, you might lose that meaning. So that’s only one very simple thing. But, if a whole dialogue is performed in that way… [He pauses

103 See deBoer 1996: 159-163 for information on sendratari and 165-6 for information on the founding of drama gong.

104 Interviews and conversations in 2011 with dozens of teachers and friends – both musicians and non-musicians – young and old, support this claim.
for effect, to prove his point. So if you don’t understand the words, you don’t understand the structure, because the structure, the meter of the song will give you some kind of emotional reference. If the dancer sings Durma, for example, this is an expression of anger. If it’s Sinom, it’s an expression of love. So, when you know these song meters, then you will be able to associate the words, the text of the song, with the right feeling. But in drama gong you don’t need it. So because of this, people tend to leave arja, and raise drama gong. So drama gong is getting more and more popular.105

Bandem agrees:

Drama gong has a presentation that is more straightforward than arja. That art form eliminates the tembang macapat that is used in arja. Tembang macapat, which has many varieties, is a bit difficult for people these days to understand. Audiences are also impatient waiting for the long strains of the tembang, and waiting for the translations that are done by the penasar and maidservants in arja, in order to understand the path of the story. Drama gong was very popular at that time, even to the extent that the fame of those dance-dramas that were its source – like arja, gambuh and prembon – faded.106

Yet, politics, once again, also played a hand in arja’s virtual replacement by drama gong through the 1970s. The late 1960s saw the establishment of a new political system in Indonesia, under then-president Suharto, dubbed the “New Order” (Orde Baru). Among the many programs of Suharto’s New Order regime was a cultural policy that stressed nilai-nilai tradisional: “traditional values” (Pemberton 1994: 9). Yet, like every authoritarian regime (which Suharto’s inevitably became, holding control of Indonesia from 1965 to 1998), the New Order carefully chose which traditional values and cultural artifacts best supported their own “sanitised, reified version of ‘culture’” (Kellar 2004: paragraph 10). Bandem notes: “After the occurrence of the G30S coup (30 September Movement), the political party that won against the PKI simultaneously rose together with the people to preserve and develop various forms of Balinese arts including drama gong” (Bandem 2011: paragraph 5).107

105 Interview with Dibia, Aug 16, 2011.


107 “Setelah terjadinya Kup G30S (Gerakan 30 September), partai politik yang menang melawan PKI serentak bangkit bersama masyarakat untuk melestarikan dan mengembangkan berbagai bentuk kesenian Bali termasuk
This government support included large government subsidies for extravagant, government-approved productions, and multi-day government-sponsored festivals and seminars devoted entirely to *drama gong*, as well as government-sponsored weekly broadcasts of *drama gong* on radio and television beginning in the 1970s (deBoer 1996: 162 and 168-170). But, perhaps most influential, was the creation, in the 1960s, of several government institutions designed for the preservation and promotion of the Balinese performing arts. These included KOKAR (SMKI) and ISI (originally ASTI, and then STSI), as well as LISTIBIYA, the Consultive and Promotional Council for Culture, or Arts Council. These government-run organizations, to a large extent, would come to “dominate the creation of styles and the establishment of norms for their execution […] deliberately centralizing, normalizing, and decontextualizing the Balinese performing arts” (Picard 1996: 140). Then, approved standardized genres like *drama gong* could be used as vehicles for instilling and reaffirming official “cultural values” (deBoer 1996: 176).

Thus, for these diverse reasons, the popularity of *arja* waned through the 1970s in the wake of more fashionable entertainment mediums like *drama gong* and television programming.

### 1.7 A Revival of *Arja*

As Bandem has stated, the arts in Bali are like seasons. Sometimes they “sleep” for a while before “waking up” again, and, in recent years, *arja* has begun a shift toward the other end of this opposition. Although it has never again reached the heyday it enjoyed in the mid-twentieth century, and young audiences – particularly non-musicians – are still thin on the

*Dr. G. G.* See Kellar 2004 for a discussion of some of the possible gender politics reasons behind the New Order’s preference for *drama gong* and *sendratari* over older traditional genres like *arja.*
ground, beginning in the 1990s there was something of a resurgence of *arja* in Bali. This *arja*, though, is different in several respects from the *arja* of the mid-twentieth century. First of all, *arja* performances for temple ceremonies are increasingly done in a style, popularized in the early 1980s, called *arja negak*. Translated as “seated *arja,*” this is a variant on the art form where actors wear simple ceremonial dress instead of ornate costumes, and a shortened version of the *arja* play is performed completely seated, with no dance. A throw-back to the earlier *arja doyong* form, which also did not include dance, this has become a less expensive option for villages wishing to have *arja* performed at their temple ceremonies, but without the means to hire a full troupe with singers trained in dance. The shortened performance time, also, appeals to modern Balinese audiences. When I was studying with Pak Tama in the summer of 2011, over a three-month period he performed in perhaps a dozen or more *arja* shows throughout south Bali; all of them were *arja negak*.

In terms of the rare full *arja* performances seen in Bali these days (many of them at the annual Bali Arts Festival), most of the differences from the *arja gede* style – such as an increased use of *gong kebyar* instruments and affects – stem from the influence of *drama gong*. Probably the most noticeable overriding difference – mentioned by every informant I asked – concerns humor. One of the reasons for *drama gong*’s widespread popularity through the 1970s

---

108 Bandem traces the emergence of *arja negak* to a group from Negara invited to perform *arja* at the PKB in 1980. This group performed a show called *Arja Siwa Gati* where the performers remained seated for the duration. Other groups began following suit afterward (Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011).

109 Very often in *arja negak*, the Limbur scene is cut to expedite the performance somewhat. Even so, most *arja negak* performances still last 2-3 hours.

110 Even more than that, usually an *arja negak* group will perform at temple ceremonies free of charge, as a form of *ngayah*, or worship. Full *arja* performances are almost never free. As Mashino has observed, these *arja negak* performers are often considered to be (and thus allowed to be) more amateur – in both the way they are treated by their hosts and the quality of their performance – than *Arja Bon* invitees. Quite often these performers will reference a text with songs and dialogues during the course of performance, and in many cases, they are considered more as “background music” than primary entertainment (Mashino 2011: paragraphs 22-24). My own observations during my fieldwork in 2011 back these claims as well.
was that it was funnier, and with more overtly vulgar humor than any theatrical genre that had come before it. Traditionally, the lelucon or jokes in arja were “more refined, more covered. […] Sometimes you laughed when you left the performance; you didn’t necessarily laugh right away.”\(^{111}\) This was because much of the humor was done through subtle wordplay. Though, of course, there was physical humor among the buduh characters, it was always done “in good taste.” As arja competes with genres like drama gong today, the humor has become much less refined.\(^{112}\) Even so, most of my young non-musician friends in Bali claim that arja is still “tidak lucu” (not funny) or “tidak keren” (not cool.)

Another recent change in arja performance practice – no doubt fueled by the increased desire for a sense of professionalism that arts academy standardization encouraged (discussed above) – was something of a regimenting of drum patterns to create a tighter-sounding interlocking between lanang and wadon. While exact interlocking is desired in other genres of gamelan, like legong or gong kebyar, Bandem complains that this “perfecting” of the sound in arja in fact makes it less authentic, that kendang arja needs more flexibility in its interlocking:

> It sounds good you know, but now everything must be perfect. While arja is not like that. There must be some improvising, you know, it should be free, you know, relaxed. Now everything is structured so tightly. They count it. You know, everything is connected well, like kotekan.\(^{113}\) While the real Singapadu arja is not like that. It’s more free. And then the wadon also has a freer time to let the lanang do his part […] And sometimes they come together, you know. So, there’s a little bit, I don’t know, how would you describe it? An easy and nice feeling, you know. It’s not tense.\(^{114}\)

This relative flexibility in traditional kendang arja interlocking, of course, is part of what makes its analysis both so rewarding and so complicated. Pak Dewa’s youngest son Rai blames arts academies like ISI (ASTI) and SMKI (KOKAR) for this loss of the authentic

---

\(^{111}\) Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011.

\(^{112}\) Mashino also observes a similar shift in the early 1990s in wayang kulit (shadow puppet plays), where dalang (puppet masters) also began emphasizing the comical at the expense of the serious (Mashino 2011: paragraph 15).

\(^{113}\) A strict interlocking of two parts on melodic gamelan instruments to create a carefully composed composite.

\(^{114}\) Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011.
flexibility in *kendang arja* performance. Himself a graduate of ISI Denpasar, he complains that arts education is sanitizing and destroying the arts in Bali through the dangerous standardization and watering down of each genre learned, with subtlety and individual village styles largely glossed over.\(^{115}\)

Regardless of its quality, however, it is difficult to deny that *arja* has had something of a renaissance in the last 20 years. And much of this resurgence – in *arja* and other older performance genres – has been catalysed by a general change in attitude about the traditional arts.

### 1.7.1 Pelestarian and Revitalisasi

The New Order focus on the *pelestarian*, or preservation, of traditional Indonesian culture – though initially politically biased and limited in scope – created long-term reverberations through the general cultural consciousness of the Balinese people. The founding of SMKI and ISI, as well as the establishment of the annual month-long Bali Arts Festival or PKB (*Pesta Kesenian Bali*) in 1979, all instilled in Balinese performing artists a firm belief that their arts were indeed something worth preserving. From a grass-roots level, this began to affect the development of arts education in Bali. Pak Tama tells of *arja* groups from dozens of different *banjar* that he himself has built from scratch. Each of these were *banjar* that may in fact have had *arja* groups in the past, now defunct, whose members sought Tama’s aid in reinvigorating their own lost traditions.\(^{116}\) Bu Candri and her former student from Keramas, Ni Wayan Latri, are each central figures in the preservation of *arja* in their own respective villages,

---

\(^{115}\) Conversation with I Dewa Rai, Aug 2011.

\(^{116}\) These groups were largely from the Gianyar regency, but Tama claims to have taught in the west and north of Bali as well.
and both have been instrumental in the development of all-women groups for *arja topeng*, a fusion genre generally exclusively the domain of men (Kellar 2004: paragraph 75). And, as we saw in the opening of this chapter, Bu Candri and Pak Dewa have, in the last few years, created a revival group in Pengosekan as well. While many of these new *arja* groups are comprised of young adults with the occasional ringer – like Tama – from the old generation, there has also been an increasing trend, since the 1990s, for children’s and teenager’s *arja* groups, known, respectively, as *arja cenik* (small) and *arja remaja*.\(^{117}\)

Yet the fires of this *revitalisasi* (revitalisation) have been fanned at the official as well as the grassroots level. The *Ajeg Bali* or “Stand Strong for Bali” movement, catalysed by the 2002 Bali bombing, is a prime example of this. Initiated by Satria Naradha, the director of Bali Post Media Group (which owns both Bali TV and the *Bali Post* newspaper), “*Ajeg Bali* is a cultural revival movement which reflects a desire for self-empowerment among Hindu Balinese” (Lewis and Lewis 2009: 151), and this has certainly had an influence on the arts. Cultural *revitalisasi* as instituted through official channels, however, has a yet longer history in modern Bali. In 1975, the Balinese provincial government held a three-day seminar and workshop on *arja* as part of a two-week island-wide *arja* festival (Bandem 2011: paragraph 15). Though an isolated one-off event, this seminar stimulated a discourse on the potential value of putting *tembang macapat* singing into the required curriculum at the Bali Arts Academy, then still called ASTI. In 1982, I Madé Bandem became *rektor* of ASTI, and, in 1983, he invited his sister Bu Candri to teach *tembang arja* to ASTI’s students (Bandem 2011, paragraphs 22-24). Bandem still speaks with pride about the positive effects this had on *arja’s* place in Bali:

\(^{117}\) See Hood 2001: 19-21 for some details on these two genres.
Lessons on singing in the wilet system have continued to be a course [at ASTI, now ISI] and have been very successful in stimulating the revitalisation of tembang arja, a type of singing that should be done by young children these days.\footnote{Pelajaran menembang dengan sistem wilet diteruskan sebagai Mata Kuliah dan berhasil sangat sukses merangsang menghidupkan tembang arja lagi, sebuah cara menembang yang seharusnya dilakukan oleh anak-anak muda masa kini” (Bandem 2011: paragraph 26).}

In 1999, also, an arja group in Gianyar organized an arja festival “to offer opportunities for young artists to learn arja under the guidance of senior performers” (Mashino 2011: paragraph 19). This and other more recent pushes to revitalize arja have encouraged change as a way to stimulate interest in arja once more – the Gianyar group changed up the order of the play, opening with the Penasar Manis, and Dibia has written arja plays to new stories, “such as Greek myths and modern novels depicting the colonial era” (Mashino 2011: paragraph 20). And, while arja is certainly not all that popular among average young people in Bali, those studying at ISI are still learning and actively performing it today. When I was in Bali in the summer of 2011, ISI hosted an arja competition, where six young groups performed and were given commentary by three masters from the old generation: Bu Candri, Pak Cok and Pak Sidja of Bona.\footnote{I Wayan Sidja.} Furthermore, arja education at ISI has stimulated the creation of a popular new sub-genre of arja – developed by ISI graduates and performed entirely by men – called arja muani.\footnote{For more information on arja muani, see Kellar 2003 and Bandem 2011.}

This push for the revitalisasi or rekonstruksi (reconstruction) of older traditional genres at official levels can also be seen in the themes and offerings of recent Bali Arts Festivals (PKB). The 2011 PKB, for instance, was subtitled “Tampilan Kesenian Rekonstruksi, Revitalisasi, dan Inovasi,” “Showcasing Reconstructed, Revitalized, and Innovative Arts.” The month-long festival presented several arja performances, including a number of arja muani.
productions and an *arja inovasi* (innovation). Furthermore, dozens of shows in traditional styles were presented, with titles in the program including words like *reformasi, klasik, revitalisasi, rekonstruksi seni* (art reconstruction) and *tradisi*, all as selling points to the performance. Unfortunately, many groups formed for these events as quickly disband afterward.¹²¹

Western musicians and scholars have also encouraged *pelestarian* and *rekonstruksi*. *Gamelan semar pegulingan* scholar Vaughan Hatch, for instance, has established the Mekar Bhuana conservatory in Denpasar whose “vision is to revive Balinese music and dance that is rarely seen or heard.” Mekar Bhuana’s website goes on to say: “We achieve this by working with the Balinese, researching, studying, documenting and reconstructing. Then we educate people, particularly the younger generation, to encourage awareness about the beauty of these endangered art-forms.”¹²²

My own research, too, has catalysed its own small *revitalisasi*. In the summer of 2008, I recorded Pak Dewa and his long-time drumming partner Pak Cok playing their *kendang arja* patterns. Though they live only a 5-minute drive apart – and Pak Cok, at least, owns a car – they had not met or played together in at least a decade.¹²³ As we set up for the recording, several younger *gamelan* players, including my friend Gus Dé, crowded around to watch or picked up an instrument to play. Watching two masters who had played together for so long was a once-in-a-lifetime event for many of them, and they didn’t want to miss it. When I

---

¹²¹ Interviews with several *arja* musicians and dancers. Mashino has observed this as well: “These private or government efforts have recurred intermittently over these last twenty years, and they seem to have been effective to a certain degree in revitalizing or preserving “classic” *arja*. But it is difficult and takes a long time to develop *arja* specialists like the former *arja* stars, and the younger performers soon disperse after the festivals” (Mashino 2001: paragraph 21).


¹²³ Both Pak Cok and Pak Dewa independently told me this in lessons, while looking forward to the recording session with very genuine excitement.
returned to Bali in 2011, Pak Cok enthusiastically informed me that the two of them had been meeting to “jam” together on a regular basis since 2008, and had even been invited by Gus Dé to revitalize their old style of *arja* with the young musicians in his home village of Tulikup. Whether my initiative in 2008 had made him realize the importance of their traditional playing style, given him cultural permission to ask them to teach his students, or simply inspired him to do something he hadn’t thought of before, by recording two master drummers, I inadvertently created a ripple effect of *pelestarian* and *revitalisasi*. Thus, through various means, whether conscious or not, has a language of preservation been established around traditional genres like *arja*, a language which, as it falls into vernacular usage, has infiltrated Balinese cultural consciousness and self-conscious images of Balineseness.
Chapter 2 Transmission and Regional Variation

2.1 The Learning Process

Pak Dewa, father Dewa, is a man with an easy smile. He is always laughing... usually at me, of course – at something stupid I have done on the drums, at my own bulé\(^1\) inability. But it’s never a jeering mockery; it’s the laugh of an incredibly patient and contented man – a man who is genuinely, wholeheartedly amused by everything, most particularly, today, by my predictable incompetence. He says, affectionately, that my character is keras (hard or strong) that I always want to learn more, even if I’m not yet ready, even if my hands still get tired and confused when we play too long or too fast. He’s not wrong, of course. His arja improvisations are so wild, so amazing, so utterly delicious, that my brain gets impatient waiting for my hands to catch up. Always. Pak Dewa spits out his tobacco and immediately lights up a Marlboro cigarette. Or maybe it doesn’t even happen in that order. Maybe he has already lit his cigarette out of habit, knowing I need five minutes of respite from his breakneck drumming pace, before realizing he still has a ready source of nicotine stuck in his bottom lip.

In the low, scratchy voice of a man who has been smoking since birth it seems, he starts casually talking about religion. This happens fairly frequently. A one-hour lesson often ends up taking three or four. For every drum pattern I’ve learned from this man, I’ve gained a hundred insights into his perspectives on Balinese religion and culture – like how the split gate leading into a temple represents the two types of thoughts in a person’s mind, good and bad (“baik dan buruk”), and the one shrine we see straight ahead as we walk into it represents our thoughts becoming one – a single focus on prayer.\(^2\) Today it is about his experiences praying in a
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\(^1\) A slang word for white person – essentially like the Spanish “gringo,” but without all the negative connotations of that word.

\(^2\) Lesson, June 17\(^{th}\), 2008.
church in America, knowing that Christianity was far from his own Balinese Hindu religion, but feeling deeply that this church was a holy place and believing that there is but one God, only many different names for him and varied paths to reach him. I have always thought of Pak Dewa as an intensely spiritual person. This same man, of course, will use the cengceng – one of the many instruments we Western gamelan players are told never to step over, because it is sacred – as an ashtray, when there is none other to be found (Figure 2.1):

![Figure 2.1. “Sacred” ashtray. (Credit: Photo by Nicole Walker, 2003. Used with permission)](image)

Each time I think I have managed to squeeze Pak Dewa into the pigeon-hole of my own culturally imagined romantic Bali, he surprises me again. The sacred becomes profane, the mundane, elevated. I am secretly pleased at how often this happens here, how frequently I get these representational wake-up calls. I once told a Canadian friend about the Balinese belief that there are auspicious and inauspicious days to do most everything – to start building a house, to get a haircut, to have a

---

3 Lesson, July 4th, 2008.
tooth-filing ceremony, even to make love. The following day my friend noticed that one of the men at his homestay had new shoes. And, when he went to his gender lesson with Komin in Pengosekan later that day, Komin, also, was wearing new shoes. Armed with what I had told him the day before, my friend confidently asked him, “Was it a lucky day to buy shoes yesterday?” The answer: “Yeah. There was a sale.” And our romantic stereotypes of Bali get turned on their heads yet again.

Pak Dewa butts out his cigarette – this time in a makeshift bottle cap ashtray – and plays a few strokes on his kendang. “Ya, lagi,” he says. Again. My arms are still burning from the last hour of abuse, the last hour of repeating in random order, much faster than I can play with any accuracy, the four arja patterns he has taught me thus far. But there’s nothing for it; I pick up my own kendang, gingerly place it on my numb legs – kesemutan the Balinese call it, like there are ants crawling on them (something Pak Dewa never gets, of course) – and we begin again.

I have been studying with Pak Dewa for several weeks, and it has not been without its challenges. Walking into the home of a master drummer like Pak Dewa and asking him to teach me all of his coolest arja patterns for the wadon was, for me, something akin to walking uninvited into Ella Fitzgerald’s home and asking her to teach me how to scat. Both are experts in their particular genre. Both are improvisers. And each would find teaching their improvisations in an organized, codified way – the way I wanted to learn them – to be both funny and difficult. They, themselves, had learned what they knew in a traditional style of learning-without-teaching – a brand of “unpedagogic practice” that Tim Rice humorously, but aptly, calls “the traditional non-method” (Rice 1996: 4).

---

4 Conversation with Sudi, May 2007.
2.1.1 The Traditional Non-Method and Hall’s Levels of Culture

In my Western music education, I was accustomed to a very information-heavy pedagogical approach. I learned to play piano, French horn, and violin with music notation in combination with a thorough indoctrination into Western music theory and analytical concepts. And I studied opera with a teacher deeply versed in the physiology of the voice. He himself had damaged his voice as a young singer and never once sang in a lesson, even to demonstrate a concept. Thus, learning music in my experience had as much to do with discourse as it did with making music, and my teachers were generally far more inclined to transmit information to me verbally than either physically or musically. In studying Balinese gamelan, however, I discovered that this is only one of several possible approaches to learning.

Anthropologist Edward T. Hall has formed a distinction between three levels of culture – the formal, the technical, and the informal – which, he posits, universally pervade all activities, ideas, and behaviors, including methods of learning and teaching (Hall 1992: 228). Of these three levels, the two that are particularly relevant to the current discussion are the technical and the informal levels. Hall’s technical level encompasses most of my Western musical training: explicit, unambiguous information is transmitted directly from teacher to student, either verbally, or through precise system-specific symbols, such as music notation. Communication is analytical, allowing for a discussion of rules and the reasons and theories behind them, and teaching proceeds in a logical, linear progression (Hall 1980: 69–71). Most musicians raised in the Royal Conservatory system will be familiar with this methodology. Yet, outside the walls of Western educational institutions these pedagogical practices are relatively
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6 The formal level involves learning in a black-and-white, right-or-wrong scenario through generally unspoken precepts and admonitions when mistakes are made. Although some music learning is done in this formal way, it applies less to the current discussion.
rare. Certainly in traditional Balinese music, education happens in a very different way: what Hall would call the informal approach.

My first Balinese gamelan teacher, Pak Dewa’s third son, I Dewa Ketut Alit often told me stories of his early childhood music education. He fondly remembers nestling in his father’s lap as a small boy while Pak Dewa drummed. Young Alit would sit for hours of rehearsal or ceremony, placing his hands on top of his father’s as he played and eventually falling asleep to the sound of the gamelan resonating into the night.\(^7\) Because of this extended exposure to the music as a young child, by the time he began to play gamelan himself Alit had already gained an unconscious understanding of playing techniques, larger musical structures, and something of the musical relationships between various instruments. He could identify and sing (if not yet play) dozens of pieces in the repertoire. He even knew many of his father’s specific drumming patterns, though of course he could not yet produce good sounds on the kendang. Much in the same way a young child unconsciously learns the language and regional accent of his parents, the behavioral norms of diverse social relationships in his community, and the various other unspoken givens of his culture, Alit thus gained much of his early musical knowledge with no instruction whatsoever, in a style of learning that Hall labels “acquisition” (Hall 1992: 225-227). This brand of knowledge dissemination is a completely unconscious process in which “whole clusters of related activities are learned at a time […] without the knowledge that they are being learned at all” (Hall 1980: 68). Most of my other gurus have recounted similar stories, and I see the cycle repeating itself again with Sudi and his two young sons.

Particularly in children, the informal gaining of information and skills is more often acquired than learned. However, informal learning can be – and often is – something that is

\(^{7}\) Conversations with Alit, Jan-Apr 2003.
consciously sought. What makes the learning informal is not the level of conscious intent in the learner, but the method of transmission: knowledge and understanding are attained by example, through observation of a model, and with little if any direct instruction from a teacher. I remember Sudi – a fantastic drummer in his own right – eyeing me somewhat enviously when I told him I had begun taking lessons with Pak Dewa. He admitted that though Pak Dewa was one of his main influences as a wadon drummer, he had never been berani (bold) enough to ask him for lessons. He had simply observed Pak Dewa’s playing in ceremonies and learned his patterns at speed. Young Gung Raka of Saba was slightly more licik (sly) with the musicians he admired. He once bragged to me about how he would meet master kendang players at the local warung kopi, buy them a cup of coffee, and begin a casual conversation about drumming, encouraging them to recreate, through mnemonics, their own patterns. Knowing that I sometimes transcribed his patterns after my lessons with him, he grinned teasingly as he told me, “I write their patterns down inside my head, and work them out on the drum later. They don’t even realize they’ve taught me anything!”

These various informal learning methods are prevalent in most oral music cultures. Aka pygmies learn their intricate polyphonic songs through observation and imitation of their elders. There is little, if any, verbal communication regarding vocal technique or the execution of various melodies and melodic improvisations; novices learn simply through trial and error (Fürniss 2006: 168). In her various cross-cultural studies of music transmission and acquisition, particularly among children, Patricia Campbell has observed similar autodidactic practices. One particularly telling example is of a six-year-old boy who has mastered the complex coordination of breath and melody required to play harmonicas and whistles. When asked how
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he learns, he replies very simply: “I figure it out. I listen and figure it out” (Campbell 2001: 220). Marc Perlman equally describes the traditional “ethnopedagogy” of musicians in Java as one where the learner is expected to take an active role in “searching” for (nggolèki) knowledge. Musical regularities are often not explicitly articulated; students have to abstract general features or principles from the compositions and improvisations they hear and infer widely applicable techniques for interpreting or embellishing the models they encounter (Perlman 2004: 118).

Thus, in each of these informal learning situations, playing techniques and patterns are learned through observation and imitation of a master, and rules are never discussed explicitly – as they are in Hall’s technical learning environments – but must be discovered independently by each individual learner. In fact, the very existence of the unspoken rules governing informally learned skills only becomes apparent when the learner strays too far from the accepted norms of performance. In Aka vocal polyphony, for instance, there is always a “master of the song” (the kônza-lémbô) who has become skilled at the entire repertoire of songs, and has a thorough knowledge of each of the constituent parts in the dense polyphony (Fürniss 2006: 168). Yet even this musician will not discuss these techniques or melodic idioms with other performers in the group unless someone strays so far from their part in improvisation that the interlocking quality of the polyphony is lost. Only then will his knowledge be verbalized. Among Javanese musicians, too, external feedback is not offered, even in a lesson, as long as the learner’s imitation of the master’s playing is “close enough.” This, of course, inevitably leads to countless personal variations on a given piece of music, or rhythmic or melodic lick. And, in fact, in Javanese music these differences are not only tolerated, but encouraged. “A musician is not considered fully equipped if he merely imitates another in all details. His playing ideally should represent the tradition filtered through his own sensibilities, which […] are not expected to be precisely like anyone else’s” (Sutton as quoted in Brinner 1995: 135).
The same is true in Balinese traditional music, and *arja* is certainly no exception. In the fall of 2008 I attended a number of rehearsals where Pak Dewa and Bu Candri were instructing the young generation of Pengosekan drummers and dancers for a local *arja* performance. In these rehearsals, Pak Dewa never commented on the individual *kendang* patterns used by the drummers, and Bu Candri never corrected vocal ornaments or other technical details in her students’ singing. The teachers would only intervene when major structural components went awry – when the singer took the melody in the wrong direction, for instance, or when the *lanang* drummer put an *angsel* cue in the wrong place. The understanding was that their styles could be different from their teachers’, as long as the integrity of the piece itself was maintained.

More skilled *arja* musicians – particularly those with a broad exposure to several different playing styles – will purposefully diverge from their teachers’ styles in certain ways. Pak Dewa, for instance, claims that his playing has changed over time as he blends the styles of his various teachers together with those of other drummers he has observed, and Pak Cok makes similar claims. Thus we see in all these diverse informal learning environments that variation from the teacher’s original model is not only accepted but very often prized when well-executed, and that only when the trial-and-error technique or personal variations of individual musicians disrupt the overall performance of a piece will any sort of direct instruction or correction take place.

---

10 Described at the beginning of Chapter 1.

11 The extent to which different *arja* musicians consciously diverge from their teachers’ styles depends on the skill-level of each individual musician, the breadth of his exposure to other musicians, and his own personal beliefs on the appropriateness of these kinds of alterations. Each of these factors varies considerably from drummer to drummer, as we will see in Chapter 5.

12 As we shall see in Chapter 5, different musicians hold different beliefs as to the appropriateness of varying their teachers’ styles, but most accomplished *arja* drummers will do it at least a little.

2.1.2 Kinds of Knowing: Tacit vs. Explicit

These contrasting knowledge acquisition methods outlined by Hall have led to the posited existence of several very different ways of knowing:

intuitively or explicitly, actively or passively, as a way of doing something, as probabilities or immutable facts, and so on. Distinctions of this sort […] are manifested in the accessibility of things that we know, in our ability to act on them or talk about them, rationalize and classify them, or trust them to work for us with little or no conscious control (Brinner 1995: 34-35).

Of particular relevance to this discussion is the explicit/intuitive dichotomy. In their studies of second language acquisition, Han and Ellis define intuitive or implicit knowledge as being knowledge of something, where explicit knowledge is knowledge about something (Han and Ellis 1998: 4-5). The technical teaching methods that pervaded my Western music education led me to have a largely explicit knowledge of those theories and skills. I am consciously aware of the internal organization of the music and the various idioms of my instruments, and I am capable of communicating that knowledge to others, both verbally – with standardized terminology – and through music notation (Brinner 1995: 36-39). In traditional Balinese music, certain knowledge is equally explicit: how to play a Tabuh Dua gong pattern, for instance.

Yet experiential, informal learning practices have ensured that much of the knowledge of a Balinese musician is intuitive or tacit. My own gurus are very fluent in the genres of their teachers and models. Yet their deep knowledge of playing techniques, instrument idioms, and the rules governing compositional and improvisational techniques (so obvious in their performances) is often something they cannot either analyze or express verbally (Hall 1980: 68). Pasek, a teacher of mine from Ubud,14 once told me that a master drummer like Pak Cok would never be able to teach me all of his arja patterns – partially because he didn’t want to give up all of his best secrets, but mostly because he didn’t actually know the patterns

14 I Wayan Pasek Sucipta. He taught me legong ISI style and gambuh Ubud style.
consciously himself. Timothy Rice says the same of the intricately ornamented instrumental music traditions of Bulgaria. “Older men who knew how to play instruments had no way to teach cognitive skills such as the relationship between fingerings and pitches, how tunes were articulated with ornamentation, and how melodies could be remembered” (Rice 1996: 3-4).

Tacit knowledge “has a personal quality, which makes it hard to formalize and communicate” (Nonaka 1994: 16); the knowledge is there, but without conscious awareness it is not accessible for transmission in an explicit way. This does not mean that these musicians – Rice’s teachers or mine – are any less accomplished than those with explicit knowledge of their music. In fact several scholars, particularly in the field of linguistics, have posited that tacit knowledge creates more fluency in a language or skill than explicit knowledge. Hall suggests that this is likely due to the fact that informally acquired tacit knowledge resides in a part of the brain where it can be retrieved completely automatically, bypassing the need for conscious thought, which is inevitably slower (Hall 1992: 225). Neurobiologists link the right hemisphere of the brain – which is commonly understood to be the “emotional” (not the “rational”) side of the brain – to implicit information processing, where the left hemisphere is responsible for explicit and conscious processes (Happaney, Zelazo and Stuss. 2004: 7).

Recent studies in neurobiology as well as psychoanalysis show that right brain implicit learning creates intuition

---

15 Conversation, June 2008.

16 It is important to note here that in no way am I drawing a line between the “West” and the “Rest.” Many Western teachers and performers, particularly those outside the academy system, also learn informally and know implicitly.

17 In a recent presentation for the “Current Approaches to the Treatment of Trauma” conference at UCLA (Mar 6-8, 2009), Schore describes the left hemisphere of the brain as “explicit, analytical, conscious, verbal, rational”, where the right is “implicit, integrative, unconscious, non-verbal, bodily-based, emotional” (Schore 2009: slide 2).

18 Of course, other recent research, including Singh and O’Boyle 2004, has nuanced or questioned this rigidly dichotomous view of hemispheric specialization. That being said, a hemispheric analysis of the distinction between implicit and explicit knowledge does offer some interesting insights.
(Lieberman 2000: 109),\(^{19}\) a form of “direct knowing that seeps into conscious awareness without the conscious mediation of logic or rational process” (Boucouvalas 1997: 7). Further, many neurobiologists believe that “the more ‘diffuse’ organization of the right hemisphere has the effect that it responds to any stimulus, even speech stimuli, more quickly and, thus earlier. The left hemisphere is activated after this and performs the slower semantic analysis” (Buklina 2005: 479). Linguist Michael Paradowski links this immediacy to fluency, stating that because explicit knowledge “can only be accessed with controlled effort […] it cannot be readily accessed in real-time interaction” (Paradowski 2008: 524).

Without wishing to be too reductive, these same generalizations might also go some way to explaining the musical fluency of Balinese arja drummers: their implicitly known drum patterns can be accessed without conscious effort, allowing easier, faster, and more fluent use of stored patterns in real time. However, without explicit awareness of their art, these very skilled musicians may still have trouble communicating their knowledge to others verbally. This roadblock became clear to me very early in the learning process. I had taken three lessons from Pak Dewa and had learned a grand total of two 8-beat patterns. That day, after cycling my two wadon patterns for 20 minutes while he improvised interlocking lanang parts, I summoned the courage to ask him to teach me a third pattern. He shook his head, apologized, and told me quite definitively that he couldn’t; these were the only patterns he used. Just these two. Having seen him play a dizzying array of arja patterns – particularly on the wadon, which was his drum of choice – I knew this couldn’t be the case. But he was quite convinced. To prove his point, he began to play beginning with just the two patterns he had taught me, cycling them over and over, alternating between them whenever he wanted, and sometimes combining them, pairing
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\(^{19}\) The Oxford English Dictionary defines intuition as “the ability to understand or know something immediately, without conscious reasoning” (as quoted in Schore 2010: 183).
the first half of pattern 1 with the second half of pattern 2 or vice versa. Eventually, though, he began adding other patterns that he had never taught to me… before stopping suddenly with a crooked grin of recognition. “Oya,” he said, and began trying to recreate a pattern he had just improvised, so that he could teach it to me. He hadn’t been deliberately trying to hide his other patterns from me, as Pasek might have surmised; he had simply never before thought consciously about what they were.

Pak Sidja from Bona had even more trouble recreating his patterns for me to learn. As usual, on our first meeting, I had explained to him that I was interested in learning his arja patterns, which, Pasek had informed me, were of a classic style quite different from Pak Dewa’s. In our first lesson together he taught me two 2-beat patterns. After cycling them for several minutes together, he stopped, thought for a moment, then with no discussion began teaching me something completely different: a pre-composed piece called Sisia, famous in Bona for its unique style. In the weeks that followed we never went back to arja, despite my many requests. In the neighboring village of Saba, Gung Raka, too, had trouble teaching me his arja patterns. He taught me only one pattern before suggesting that I learn Saba-style legong instead. Even for this one pattern he had to sit quietly noodling on his drum for several minutes until he had composed a pattern that he thought I would be able to learn – not one that he himself played in performance, but one that he thought was at my level. After that day, whenever I asked him to play his own arja patterns, he would play only this one. I had similar experiences with each new guru I sought out. Though this may not definitively establish that Gung Raka and my other teachers couldn’t communicate their patterns to me (perhaps they simply did not wish to, for whatever reason), I find the ubiquity of this seeming inability noteworthy at least.
Yet, these difficulties that my various gurus had in teaching me did not arise from the fact that they had simply never thought about their own music. These were all self-conscious musicians, very aware of the existence of different styles of playing in different villages, and adept at quickly identifying village style through *kendang* patterns alone. When I was studying with Gung Raka, for instance, if the lesson were particularly satisfying we would often hang out for several hours afterward, just listening to and talking about music. In 30 seconds or less, Gung Raka would invariably be able to identify the origin of any *legong* recording – whether the group was from Saba or Peliatan or Binoh or ISI Denpasar – often based on differences so subtle that it took me several listenings to find them. He was equally quick at recognizing musical features I showed him in my own Western classical and jazz recordings. A very bright young musician, Gung Raka is by no means exceptional in my Balinese experience. Moreover, every one of my teachers and musician friends is able to differentiate good drummers from mediocre ones, and quick to make a distinction between a *wayah*, or great pattern, a “good enough” pattern, and a non-idiomatic one. My friends in *Gamelan Çudamani* in Pengosekan, for instance, will sit around for hours after a show, dissecting at length everything that was played, though perhaps not in the same way that I, with my technical training, might do. Thus I suspect that my teachers’ inability to transfer this type of information to me had nothing to do with a deficiency in their aural musical analysis skills, but was instead a result of the tacit nature of their own informally acquired knowledge.

### 2.1.3 Some Recent Changes in the Traditional Learning Process

In recent decades, the influx of Western students and Western academic influences into these various informal-learning-based music cultures has seen a rise of *some* explicit teaching alongside the traditional “non-method.” Timothy Rice has observed that while many Bulgarian
folk musicians still learn in the informal model-based system, the post-WWII institutionalization of folk music by the Communist government in Bulgaria\(^{20}\) has led some musicians to invent new teaching styles. In his discussion, Rice particularly focuses on his teacher Kostadin. This musician, realizing “that his new role as a teacher dealing with urban students with little connection to village society and its folklore required new behaviours” (Rice 1996: 8), developed a pedagogical style more akin to Hall’s technical approach. This included the use of notation and the creation of simplified versions of his tunes for beginning students (Rice 1996: 8-9), both of which require explicit knowledge of the patterns guiding the music (Brinner 1995: 37). In Made Hood’s \textit{kendang arja} research (though not in mine) Pak Tama of Singapadu displayed equally explicit knowledge in his ability to analyze and categorize his own improvised playing for the benefit of a student who had not acquired the tradition informally.\(^{21}\) Through conversations with Hood, Tama consciously selected ten specific 2- and 3-beat interlocking patterns as being “representative of improvisation and organizing principals [sic]” in his \textit{arja} drumming (Hood 2001: 82),\(^{22}\) something a master like Pak Sidja is unable to do.

In my own fieldwork, I found that the younger generation of teachers could (and would) explicitly discuss drumming with me in a way the older generation never did. This was particularly true of those young musicians living in villages, like Ubud and Pengosekan, that have seen significant numbers of Western \textit{gamelan} students. These Westerners, whether

\(^{20}\) State efforts to create professional folk musicians as symbols of Bulgarian national identity included the establishment of professional folk ensembles run by classically trained composers as well as several high schools and conservatories to train them. Folk music was also taught in the public schools to urban Bulgarians. All this was done in an effort to create “effective new symbols of the Party’s ability to modernise the country and transform it from a poor, rural, agrarian society with historical ties to the Middle East into a modern, urban, industrial nation with ties to European civilisation” (Rice 1996: 7-8, quote on 7).

\(^{21}\) My own experience studying with Pak Tama in 2011 was quite different from this. Tama never discussed the patterns in these explicit ways, and seemed confused when I asked him to.

\(^{22}\) It is important to note here that Pak Tama taught me quite different patterns from those outlined in Hood’s thesis – all 8-beat patterns or more. In my experience, Tama did not conceive of these 8-beat patterns as collections of 2- and 3-beat patterns. They were units.
consciously or not, would have pushed their gurus to teach in a less informal way. Komin in Pengosekan, for instance, was extraordinarily strict with me about making the proper sounds on the kendang, something I had never seen in a Balinese teacher before. In our first lesson we did nothing but play Dag on the wadon for half an hour. Komin had thought very consciously about what his hand was doing to make that sound – even going so far as to teach himself to play “left-handed” so that he could experience learning the technique as an adult – and he could communicate those ideas to me both physically and verbally.

This adoption of a more technical teaching style among my younger gurus is also true of the transmission of patterns. Sudi, a young musician from Ubud with ample exposure to Western learning styles and an analytical mind of his own (he is currently pursuing a PhD at the University of British Columbia), taught his patterns to me in a much more logical progression than my teachers from the older generations. Yet, even among these younger drummers, played patterns are far more varied than taught patterns. Thus, while there is some explicit knowledge of arja patterns among my teachers, the bulk of their knowledge is still tacit (implicit). This fact is, of course, exponentially more true among the older generation, and with musicians from villages without much Western academic influence in their teaching styles. The challenge for me, then, was to gain access to patterns that my teachers did not consciously know they had.

2.1.4 Research Methodology

Because of the tacit nature of my gurus’ knowledge of their own kendang arja patterns, learning from them was a three-pronged process. The first step was always to study directly
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23 By contrast, a musician like Gung Raka of Saba, despite the fact that he was just 20 when I began learning from him, did not teach in the explicit way my young teachers from Ubud and Pengosekan did. I suspect that this is because I was his first Western student, and he was not yet accustomed to being asked to think or talk about his music consciously.
with them, to learn those patterns that they themselves consciously knew. In the case of a
teacher like Pak Sidja, this might only be one or two patterns. The lessons would progress at
the pace of the guru: I would learn a new pattern when they decided I was ready, and much of
each lesson was simply repetition and “jamming.” To my gurus, teaching me just a handful of
patterns was enough, at least until I became a more skilled drummer and a more practiced
listener. Although most master drummers have a very wide vocabulary of arja improvisations,
a performance can be just as satisfying for singer-dancers and audience members with only a
few patterns. When I was studying with him in the summer of 2011, Pak Tama invited me to
play lanang – the lead drum – in an arja performance for a temple ceremony in Batuan. He
decided I was ready, despite the fact that aside from the pre-composed pieces, the angsel cues,
and his basic tabuh telu (what he would call tabuh empat) I knew only two patterns for tabuh
dua and batel and could play only one of them fast enough to use in batel marah. What was
important to Tama and to the singers that I performed with was that the feeling (rasa) was good,
that we could play competently together, and that we were sensitive to the cues of the singer-
dancers. As Hood observed of a beginning kendang arja player also studying with Pak Tama:

It is clear from Tama’s demonstration of Degus’ part that there are numerous variations. At this stage of
learning, however, Degus has his hands full playing the two patterns [that he has learned thus far,] and
following his teacher through changing dynamics, tempo and cadence phrases. […] In the lesson, priority
is given to the fact that Degus will accompany actors on stage. His two-pattern version of the wadon
drum part is considered competent so long as the dance is illustrated. […] The] student acquires an
individual knowledge base over time as he expands his drum vocabulary (Hood 2001: 53 and 55).

Although I gathered relatively few patterns during my lessons, these were an essential
part of the learning process. They allowed me to get a sense of each teacher’s personal
grammar of patterns, which eased the transcription process, as well as to gain some insight into
those patterns that they considered to be the most basic. Simha Arom, in his studies of Banda-
Linda horn music, came to realize that the patterns a musician would teach to children – and I
was essentially a child in this process – would be the most basic patterns that a musician could play, the most unornamented (Arom 1991: 370). Thus, these taught patterns are where my analysis begins.

The second step was to record my teachers drumming with their partners and a pared down *genguntangan* ensemble (just *gong pulu* and *guntang*), with singer-dancers wherever that was possible. This is where the majority of each drummer’s improvisations occurred, and thus where I gained the bulk of the patterns for the analyses to follow.

The third part of the learning process was constant verbal dialogue with my teachers. This was often simply the informal exchange of information that took place during lessons and casual conversations, but I also did some formal interviews that helped to elucidate further each drummer’s opinions and experiences of *kendang arja*, as well as on the existing Balinese music theory on the topic. It is important to note that this local theory on *arja*, though conceptualized and executed somewhat differently in each village, seems to stem from a single *arja* lineage; each of my teachers had significant contact with masters in Singapadu, one of the formative *arja* centers of the early-to-mid 20th-century. Thus, before getting into the specifics of these various theoretical concepts, we will first explore some of the general ways that two distinct village styles of *arja* can differ from one another, and the reasons why the Singapadu style – over and above others – would eventually become the “standard”.

### 2.2 Keramas vs. Singapadu: Opposing Stories of *Arja* Transmission

#### 2.2.1 The Differences Between the Two Styles

In the early-to-mid-twentieth century, as *arja doyong* was becoming *arja geguntangan* and finally *arja gede*, two south Bali villages emerged as preeminent *arja* regions. This
regional specialization was certainly not that uncommon – before the establishment of standardizing arts academies like ISI Denpasar, regions tended, to some extent, to specialize. Peliatan was well known for its legong and janger performances, Batuan for gambuh, Saba for legong, Buleleng for gong kebyar. And Singapadu and Keramas, both in the regency of Gianyar, became famous for their arja troupes. Although performances from the two regions shared the same basic structural framework with the same stock standard characters, there were several major differences between them. And, as Pak Tama would learn when he tried to play with Keramas-trained drummer Pak Gobleg, the two styles, in many respects, were mutually unintelligible.

Many of the differences between the Keramas and Singapadu styles stem from the diverse influences of other genres that were popular in these areas at the time of arja’s development. Singapadu is quite close to Batuan, which at the time, as previously mentioned, was a hub for the classical dance-drama gambuh. Thus, like Batuan gambuh, arja troupes in Singapadu based the majority of their lakon (stories) on the Panji tales. Keramas musicians, by contrast, have long been known for their expertise in kidung and kekawin singing. Since these classical genres draw largely from the Hindu epics Ramayana and Mahabharata, so, too, did the early arja performances from Keramas.

The contrasting influences of kekawin and kidung singing in Keramas, with gambuh and other dance-drama genres like Topeng and Calonarang in Singapadu, also led to divergent

---

24 See section 2.3.3 for a more in-depth discussion of this interaction.
26 There is a temple on the ocean in the Keramas region called Pura Dalem Masceti that is renowned for its competitions in older singing styles like kidung and kekawin (Interview with Bandem, Aug. 18, 2011).
27 Interview with Bandem, Aug. 19, 2011.
28 Many of the early arja masters and teachers in Singapadu were also performers in topeng, calonarang and Sisia. (Interview with Dibia, Aug. 15, 2011).
specializations in *arja* performance practice with Keramas focusing more heavily on the singing, while Singapadu more fully developed the dancing.\(^{29}\) According to Dibia:

> There are groups that love to have very elaborate kinds of singing, like Keramas.[…] When Singapadu’s doing the dialogue, they tend to drop the melodic line to make it simple, so then the dialogue is more easy for the audience to follow, more compact. […] But in Keramas, they tend to put more kinds of elaboration, making the dialogue too long sometimes [in my opinion].\(^{30}\)

Bandem maintains that part of the reason for these more elaborate singing styles in Keramas was the language of the songs themselves: “All of the singing is more *wayah*. More venerable because of the language they use. You know, formal language.”\(^{31}\) He goes on to say that while the Keramas *arja* performers focused on the formal, the “venerable” in their song choices, Singapadu performers preferred a more popular, romantic quality to both their songs and plotlines.\(^{32}\) Many Singapadu-trained musicians allege that in traditional Keramas-style *arja*, singing became the focus at the expense of the dance elements. Pak Cok, based in Peliatan but also trained in the Singapadu style, remembers playing *kendang* for a dancer from Keramas in the 1970s. He complains that the dancer’s *angsel* cues were so unclear that it was almost impossible for him to play a good *angsel* on his *kendang*.\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{29}\) Interviews with Dibia and Bandem both corroborate this information.

\(^{30}\) Interview with Dibia, Aug. 15, 2011.

\(^{31}\) Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011.

\(^{32}\) Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011. This has since become the norm in *arja* performance practice.

\(^{33}\) Conversation with Pak Cok, Aug 2011. An important caveat to these statements is that Pak Cok is an incredibly proud (verging on egotistical) man. He is very proud of classical Balinese music, of the Peliatan style of drumming that is his heritage, and of his own ability to play it better than anyone else. In casual conversations with me, he often enjoyed comparing his playing with that of other drummers and warned me never to tell other teachers that I had studied with him, because they would simply be too *malu* (shy and embarrassed) to show me their drumming if they knew I had already learned his. As a long-time master musician who has played extensively throughout Bali, his insights into different styles are still very valuable. However, it is entirely probable that where he discusses the apparent deficiencies in other styles, he has exaggerated the truth to put himself in the best possible light. That being said, several other drummers, including Pak Tama and Pak Dewa, also told me that they found the Keramas style of *kendang arja* more like *kendang tunggal* (solo *kendang*) than like the intricately paired Singapadu style – that Keramas drummers showed less care for connections between the two drummers and between drummer and dancer than Singapadu drummers. This and Pak Cok’s complaint may both be explained by the fact that Keramas was more concerned with excellence in vocals than in dance, while Singapadu, which was more heavily focused on dance, would have more fully developed those aspects of
The *arja* actors from the Singapadu region, on the other hand, traditionally had a much stronger basis in dance technique, and they brought that to their *arja* performance. Different characters in Singapadu *arja* were portrayed through individualized movement, much more so than they were in Keramas. For instance, the Liku character (the mad princess) was often portrayed in the Singapadu-style with a great deal of physical humor (now a given in an *arja* performance), which most of the traditional *arja* Keramas artists were purported not to use. Pak Bandem also recalls a famous penasar from Keramas named Monjong: “He did not really dance, but he had a good articulation of words and making jokes to words.” The general consensus among my informants is that this was the norm as well.

Other claims to difference include Pak Dewa’s suggestion that Keramas preferred a faster performance tempo overall (interestingly, Bu Candri makes the same assertion of Pak Dewa’s Peliatan-Pengosekan style in comparison to her own Singapadu style). As for the character of the drumming itself, Pak Cok maintains that Keramas-style *arja* in general was far more *keras* (loud and harsh) than Peliatan or Singapadu-style *arja*, an influence from both *gong kebyar* and drumming for *Barong* performances:

> It’s loud there! Because it’s not smooth or soft enough. It’s harsh there! Whereas here, in Peliatan, there are patterns of many types: there are loud patterns, soft patterns. It depends on the situation, the character, yeah? But there, indeed just from the drum strokes [he makes a loud busy noise] the character is loud/harsh. It’s all loud character there. […] For example, the *lanang* players use too much *pung*.  

---

34 Interview with Dibia, Aug. 15, 2011.
35 Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011.
37 Conversation with Bu Candri, Aug 4, 2011.
He also demonstrates the other instruments – cengceng (ricik) and kajar – to show that Peliatan arja musicians (which grew partly out of Singapadu-style teachings) use a tighter, softer, less splashy playing technique throughout on these instruments as well. Furthermore, he claims that unlike the Peliatan style, which has rules or patokan governing the rhythmic relationship between wadon and lanang (explored in section 2.3 below), in Keramas, “there are no rules. They don’t care.”\(^{39}\) While I have learned that in everything Pak Cok says, there is a politely apologetic value judgment where Peliatan-style playing always reigns supreme,\(^{40}\) it is nevertheless clear that the differences between the Keramas and Singapadu (and by extension, Peliatan) styles of arja were fairly significant from the very beginning.

### 2.2.2 The Rise of the Singapadu Style

The midday sun bores into my back through my t-shirt as I ride the motorbike through the twisting side-roads of Gianyar regency. I am on a quixotic search for kendang arja asli Keramas, the original arja drumming from Keramas. It is an accepted truth among Balinese musicians that Singapadu and Keramas are the two villages most famous for arja. The name or location of any drummer still versed in the Keramas style is much less well known, however. All of my teachers – I have slowly come to realize – claim at least a partial lineage to arja asli Singapadu. All of them have opinions about the differences between the Singapadu and Keramas styles. None of them can direct me to a teacher in Keramas. Some even warn that the traditional style may already have vanished there. Pak Cok, for instance, asserts:

\(^{39}\)“Tidak patoknya. Tidak peduli dia” (Interview with Pak Cok, Aug. 13, 2011). Pak Tama has said the same when comparing the Keramas and Singapadu styles.

\(^{40}\) Much of this style-snobbery that I see in Pak Cok is likely wrapped up in both the caste system and the musical history of Peliatan. The puri (or palace) of Peliatan has long been considered a center for the arts in Bali, especially famous for legong. Peliatan performers were the first to tour internationally – in both Europe and America – in 1952 (as recounted in Coast 2004), and the village’s artistic supremacy has never truly been questioned, by either foreigners or Balinese, since that time. Pak Cok, himself a Cokorda (princely caste), and a lifelong musician and dancer, feels that he is a central part of that continuing legacy of greatness.
In Keramas, it’s already dwindled, because of this: in Singapadu, it’s still original, the dance. What’s more, Bu Candri is there, you see. My nephew41 is also an arja dancer there. [...] Indeed he’s still old-style, still original. [...] In Keramas now, it’s already fairly modern.42

I don’t have very much to go on, just the name of an old penasar who apparently lives near one of the balé banjar in Keramas, but I have been successful finding teachers with much less information before and am feeling cautiously optimistic. Bu Candri says that Pak Berata studied arja dance with her many years ago and hopes that he will know more about the local arja scene in Keramas. After many stops, turnarounds, and sometimes-helpful directions, I finally find Pak Berata’s home. He is working in the fields, and I am invited in and offered kopi Bali and jajan (snacks) while I wait.

Pak Berata finally joins me, sipping his own coffee – which gives me the unspoken permission to drink mine. After brief introductions and the obligatory music-related small talk, we get right down to it: a discouraging discussion on the state of arja in Keramas. There is no one left in Keramas who still plays the original kendang style he tells me. In fact, “the arja troupe of Keramas dispersed in the late 1970s, with a trend toward individual expertise and professionalism” (Kellar 2004: Case Study 3). There are still a few arja dancers in Keramas, many of whom – like Pak Berata and the famous Ibu Latri – have studied with Bu Candri or her father and thus are as much a part of the Singapadu tradition as they are the Keramas one. But all the instrumentalists in Keramas (and there aren’t that many anymore) play a newer style of arja now – a fusion style learned in arts academies like ISI.43 Pak Berata recommends that I seek out Pak Gobleg in the neighboring village of Medan, the only person that he knows of who

---

41 Here he is not referring to an actual nephew, but a relative by caste – a Cokorda, or prince, like him.
43 There was a young arja troupe from Keramas that performed in the annual Bali Arts Festival (PKB) in 2011 (though I do not know if it still exists, or if it was simply thrown together for the PKB alone only to disband immediately afterward, as so many young troupes do). This group, however, did not perform in the arja asli Keramas style but rather in the newer academy-trained style. According to Anak Agung Wiyat, the son of the old Keramas arja master Anak Agung Putu Gelgel, the last time arja Keramas was really active was in 1984, when they were performing the Cupak Gerantang story. As Bandem notes, “right now they are being not very active. You wait, maybe next year they’ll be active again [laughs]” (Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011).
still holds in his mind the old Keramas patterns. Unfortunately, unlike most of my other teachers who are musicians by trade, Pak Gobleg works long hours out of town, and I am told that he will never have the time to meet with me. I head back to Ubud, disheartened, and treat myself to a glass of red wine. Cold, as it always is here; the heat too quickly turns unrefrigerated wine to vinegar.

Singapadu and Keramas were equally respected arja centres in the mid-20th century. When the national radio station, RRI (Radio Republik Indonesia), was looking for arja masters for their weekly broadcasts in the 1950s and 60s, musicians and singer-dancers from both Singapadu and Keramas were chosen to become these professional Arja Bon and Arja RRI performers.44 And again in the 1975 two-week-long island-wide arja festival,45 the group from Gianyar regency was made up of performers from both Keramas and Singapadu and placed under the joint direction of Bandem’s father Pak Kredek from Singapadu and Anak Agung Putu Gelgel from Keramas.46 Both styles were considered equally important. Why, then, did the Singapadu style flourish and spread while the Keramas style withered into virtual extinction?

The fates of nations have often been determined by the actions of just a handful of people in positions of power; the fate of arja in Bali was no different. There is a well-established tradition among Balinese performing artists of seeking out master dancers and musicians from other villages to become guest teachers in one’s own. The famous early 20th-century dancer, Mario, for instance, was much sought after across South Bali as a dance teacher

44 Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011. Some of the instrumentalists were also from the Peliatan region, including Pak Cok and Pak Dewa. These artists, though, were connected to Singapadu in various ways that will be explored in Chapter 5.
45 This festival ran for two full weeks, from Nov 28th-Dec. 12th, 1975.
46 Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011. Again, some of the instrumentalists were Singapadu-connected artists from Peliatan.
and choreographer.⁴⁷ Even the old arja Keramas was originally an import from somewhere else: two arja experts from Gianyar village were brought to Keramas in 1910, at the request of an important official, to form an arja troupe there.⁴⁸ And still today, teachers and composers like Pak Cok, or Pak Dewa’s sons Rai and Alit, are frequently invited to different regencies to compose new works and prepare gamelan groups for the annual gong kebyar festival. In the early-to-mid 20th century, this same custom of the active transmission and diffusion of musical styles led to the creation of arja troupes across Bali. Yet, while the Keramas style spread only to the surrounding villages of Medan, Saba, and Blahbatuh,⁴⁹ arja asli Singapadu spread extensively throughout Bali, thanks, in large part, to the very prolific teaching of two arja masters from the village: Cokorda Oka Tublen and I Madé Kredek.⁵⁰

2.2.3 The Singapadu Masters

Bandem often reminisces proudly about his father, Pak Kredek, and the important place that he holds in arja history:

My father was born in 1906 […and] he was already an arja dancer when he was less than 20 years old. He began to perform and teach at the same time. He began teaching here in Singapadu. All Singapadu banjar have arja because of him and Cok Oka Tublen. Because he devoted his life. […] And, when I was young, I remember this house full of people from everywhere, coming and staying for one month, for two months, from Gianyar, from Tabanan… They stayed here. They learned arja. […] For example, in the 1950s, my father taught a group from a village called Benawah in Gianyar. The group came here a couple of times actually; different generations came here. They stayed here maybe 2 or 3 weeks, went back home, came one month, stayed here, studied. […] They liked to learn away from their own village, because they wanted to hide. You know, they didn’t want to show it right away to the public when they began to train. When they have a certain ability to do it, then they will go to the public. Because the public will come every night to see the rehearsal. So therefore they came here, they stayed here maybe two months, back and forth of course, yeah? But the training will be here, in the house. […] They slept

⁴⁷ Coast 2004 describes one such encounter, from late in Mario’s life, but there are countless other reports too.

⁴⁸ Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011. Bandem was not 100% positive on the names of these masters, but remembered them as being I Dewa Made Kenying and Ida Bagus Made Gederan.

⁴⁹ Interview with Bandem, Aug. 3, 2011. Bandem speculates that this limited spread had to do with the fact that the teachers there, who were mostly from the puri or palace, were “unwilling to go” farther afield to teach.

⁵⁰ Dibia’s father I Wayan Griya was also a very important early figure in arja asli Singapadu, but he did not travel to teach as Pak Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen did (Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011).
around here [he points around the house compound], they brought their food, they cooked here. While my father was away performing in Nusa Penida for about 2 weeks, they just stayed here cleaning the house and singing and singing. That’s the way they learned before.51

By the 1930s, Kredek, along with two other local musician-dancers – Cok Oka Tublen and Dibia’s father I Wayan Griya – had begun to really solidify the Singapadu style of arja. Griya was known as a great Penasar Kelihan and often gave advice on arja performance practice to musicians and dancers who came to his home. He worked not only with local musicians, but also those from other villages, including, most significantly, the famous Peliatan musician I Madé Lebah.52 But it was the other two Singapadu masters who really stimulated an extensive transmission of the Singapadu style throughout much of Bali. Cok Oka Tublen was purported to be a beautifully skilled performer of both the Limbur and the Mantri Buduh.53 Kredek was known as something of a jack-of-all-trades, specialising in Penasar Kartala, but also maintaining a basic fluency in each of the other characters.54 Both these dancers were equally skilled musicians, and each had his own idiomatic style of drumming, which were mutually compatible, of course, because they were drum partners, but also distinctive in certain ways. Bandem describes his father’s patterns:

My father always told me how to play with the rim: like this [he shows his fingertips high up on the rim, creating a high, clear tone] instead of this [he moves his fingers lower, touching more of the rim and creating a lower and less pure, clear sound] – as krempeng as I can make it, you know? And then, he always said arja should emphasize the left rim. Both lanang and wadon.55

He plays a few examples of his father’s lanang patterns for tabuh dua, which he characterizes as “very simple.” He begins by cycling the simplest pattern:

52 Interview with Dibia, Aug 15, 2011. Bandem also corroborated this information in an interview, Aug 18, 2011.
53 Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011. Discussions with Komin and Dewa Rai support this as well.
54 Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011.
55 Interview, Aug 18, 2011.
before moving on to a slightly more wayah (great or complex) version:

Figure 2.3. Kredek’s “simple” pattern for lanang, more wayah version

Most of the remaining patterns he plays for me are just one- and two-beat patterns repeated many times, each again focusing on the left rim, the peng (e) stroke. The two he plays most frequently are the repeating 2-beat pattern, with beats not tied to a gong cycle simply marked as “X”:

Figure 2.4. Kredek’s typical repeating 2-beat pattern, lanang

and the related, but denser repeating 1-beat pattern:

Figure 2.5. Kredek’s typical repeating 1-beat pattern, lanang

His father’s wadon patterns, he shows, were equally left-rim-focused. According to Bandem, Kredek’s basic wadon pattern was:
to which he occasionally added Dag strokes, as in the following pattern:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4

(G) n pu n G

(_)_ _ o o _ _ o _ _ o _ _ o _

Figure 2.6. Kredek’s basic wadon pattern

When Kredek played slower gong structures like tabuh telu, he would add in more strokes from the right hand – Dag (D) and Tut (T) – yet this was done in a quite regimented way (to be explored in Chapters 3 and 5). The majority of his patterns for shorter gong cycles were more akin to these very o-e heavy patterns.

Bandem complains that many of the newer kendang arja players, even in Singapadu, have lost the subtlety and lightness – and, he believes, the associated freedom of variation – of these more traditional patterns, in the wake of decades of influence from gamelan gong kebyar:

I think the people right now don’t pay attention to this kind of krempeng for wadon, yeah? […] The last Singapadu arja that you saw in the Art Centre at the PKB [in 2011], that’s already more kebyar, and with a little bit more ramé [busy] style. But you can make interlocking complete with this simpler one. And then, when you play, you can make it bebas [free]. It’s not really terikat [tied], not making a fixed pattern, and you play around listening to the other drummer and can make it more varied. My father played like that.  

Cok Oka Tublen, by contrast, preferred the more ramé (busy) patterns: he was purported to use more Dag (D) and Tut (T), more pung (U), and even some slap strokes (K-P), and he used less anak pukulan (and thus more full strokes) than did Pak Kredek. Bandem, who

---

56 Interview, Aug 18, 2011.
57 Interviews with Bandem, Aug 3 and Aug 18, 2011. For reasons that will become clear in Chapter 5, there are certain patterns that I know to be being played today exactly as Pak Kredek played them over half a century ago. I do not have the same certainty about any of Cok Oka Tublen’s patterns. However, Pak Tama, who studied with
interviewed both his father and Cok Oka Tublen when they were still alive – reports that these
stylistic differences in Cok Oka Tublen’s playing stem from two outside musical influences.
First, having played legong with musicians in Peliatan, Cok Oka Tublen picked up some
patterns from them, purportedly more ramé than Kredek’s arja patterns.\textsuperscript{58} But his biggest
influence came from the village of Pinda:

When I asked him about his style of drumming, why he made it ramé (because he liked it a little bit ramé,
his krumpung a bit ramé), he said he picked up krumpungan from barong bangkal [a dance for a pig-
shaped barong.] You know “melawang”? There’s a barong melawang, lawang meaning travelling, like a
circus. So, one of the best barong melawang in Bali during that time, in the 30s and 40s, was from Pinda.
Pinda has very strong musicians for barong bangkal, and also gamelan gong kebyar. Pinda has a very
Cokorda was always interested in listening to all of these patterns of barong bangkal from Pinda. So you
know, people picking up different things, improving their style. He developed another style like that.\textsuperscript{59}

Both Pak Cok and Pak Tama – students of Cok Oka Tublen – have observed how the latter’s
drumming style changed over time. Pak Cok, who studied with him earlier, claims to have
learned his “original” drum language, where Tama did not. This claim, of course, is virtually
impossible to substantiate. What is pertinent here is that despite the fact that he continued to
play with Kredek, Cok Oka Tublen also effected his own independent development of kendang
arja Singapadu in its formative years.

Together these two men, Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen, each with their unique dance and
drumming specialties, created an unstoppable teaching team who for the next quarter century
would shape the development of arja in Bali.

\textsuperscript{58} Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011. This influence is a complicated one, of course, because Peliatan-style arja
and legong were both influenced by Kredek but were then somewhat independently developed by local musicians
like I Madé Lebah. Many musicians that I interviewed mentioned that Peliatan-style kendang arja is also more
ramé than Singapadu-style kendang arja. And I certainly notice that, of all my teachers, Pak Cok of Peliatan
taught me by far the most ramé patterns.

\textsuperscript{59} Interview with Bandem, Aug 18, 2011.
2.2.4 Singapadu Transmission

Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen began their legacy in Singapadu itself, teaching first in Kredek’s own Banjar Mukt and then going farther afield until each banjar in Singapadu had its own arja troupe. They then expanded beyond into other villages. By 1936, Kredek was teaching arja Singapadu in Peliatan, “work[ing] with Anak Agung Gde Mandera, Madé Lebah, and then Gusti Kompiang Pangkung, to develop arja over there.” Through the 1930s, 40s, 50s and even into the 1960s, Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen developed arja troupes across six of the eight regencies in Bali. (Refer to Figure 2.8 for locations of Bali regencies).

While their influence was most concentrated in Gianyar regency (which includes Singapadu, Peliatan, and Ubud, among other villages), they also taught in Badung, Tabanan and Bangli.

Figure 2.8. Map of Bali, showing the different regencies (from McGraw 2005: 10)

60 Interview with Bandem, Aug 3, 2011.
They taught as far east as Selat in the Karangasem regency and even formed a troupe in the northern village of Gerokgak in the western part of Buleleng regency.\footnote{Interview with Bandem Aug 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2011. Information corroborated by interview with Suasthi Bandem – who wrote her master’s thesis on Kredek – Aug 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2011.}

Teaching would always proceed in the same manner. Kredek would do the grunt work at the beginning, teaching the basic (\textit{dasar}) for both music and dance, as well as establishing the structure of the \textit{lakon} (story). Only at the end of the learning process would Cok Oka Tublen come in, like a guest director, to polish and perfect the performance and to teach different variations to both dancers and musicians.\footnote{Interviews with Bandem, Aug 3 and Aug 18, 2011.} Bandem suspects that this hierarchy of teaching had as much to do with caste as it did with skill or knowledge base: “My father always made the \textit{dasar} — the basic — first, before Cokorda came. I mean, this is a feudal society, right? So, people respected to the \textit{puri} [the palace] and the Cokorda. Always like that. [...] This is the function, the \textit{puri} and the \textit{jaba} [outsider].”\footnote{Interviews Aug 3 and Aug 18, 2011.}

Through Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen’s decades-long dedication to the transmission of \textit{arja}, the original Singapadu style, as we will see, has influenced most if not all of the surviving \textit{arja} musicians in Bali. As Bandem put it:

> We’re lucky, because people from Tabanan, from Buleleng, from Badung, from everywhere learned the \textit{arja} from here. That means this is becoming — uh, would you like to say like a school of thought? Yeah, \textit{aliran}, or style. [...] Because all of this Singapadu style spread all over. And the Keramas style is more limited toward Keramas, Blahbatuh, Saba…”\footnote{Interview, Aug 18, 2011.}

I hypothesize that this prolificacy in Pak Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen’s teaching inadvertently contributed to the disappearance of the distinctive \textit{arja} Keramas drum language. In section 1.5.3, I mentioned that in the 1960s and 70s musicians and singer-dancers from Keramas and Singapadu — both equally celebrated at the time — were brought together and their
drum languages fused so that they could collaborate in *Arja Bon* troupes. And we know that by the late 1970s, the *arja Keramas* troupe had disintegrated, and, by the time of my visit to Keramas in 2011, the drumming style had all but completely vanished. Linguists have shown that one of the most common causes of language death is a language contact situation between politically unequal groups that spurs a gradual shift to the dominant language (Sasse 1992: 22). We see this type of language shift happening in Belarus, where, despite its withdrawal from the USSR in 1991, Russian language increasingly holds sway. A 1999 census showed that while 85.6% of Ethnic Belarusians claimed Belarusian to be their mother tongue, only 41.3% used it in the home. The statistics are even more telling in urban areas, where of the 80.2% of ethnic Belarusians claiming Belarusian as a mother tongue, only 23% used it regularly at home (Smolicz and Radzik 2004: 520-1).

The same effects of language shift, in some cases leading to language death, can be seen in many colonized nations. In the Department of Beni in Amazonian Bolivia, for instance, only 3 Arawakan languages remain of the 39 that were thriving when the Spanish landed in the area in the 16th century (Crevels 2002: 9). Much of this has to do with the establishment, by Jesuit missionaries through the 17th and 18th centuries, of a single *lengua general* (the Mojo language) to be used along with Spanish for all educational and religious communication (Crevels 2002: 12-13). Moreover, the development of the rubber industry through the 19th century promoted a modernization and Westernization of the area that privileged locals who could speak Spanish. These and many other factors led to a major shift toward bilingualism (and even, among many

---

65 It is important to note that there are many other possible outcomes of language contact, including convergence, where the two contact languages become more similar to one another (a sort of linguistic meeting in the middle) and the creation of a pidgin.

66 The complex web of causes behind this shift – many of them related to the education system – is discussed in depth in the article.
language-culture groups, Spanish monolingualism), and the subsequent death of dozens of local languages (Crevels 2002: 15-25).

In virtually all situations of language shift following language contact, we find that through a blend of outside influence and slowly changed attitudes among locals the more socially or politically powerful language almost invariably overshadows the existing indigenous languages. At the time of the fusion of the arja Keramas and Singapadu drum languages, there was a similar imbalance of power and prestige between them. The Singapadu masters had broadly diffused the Singapadu style – as many European languages have been diffused through contact and conquest – where the Keramas masters had taught only in a very localized manner. Thus, when the powerful and widespread Singapadu language met the relatively isolated Keramas language, an inevitable language shift and eventual language death occurred.67

In recent decades there has been top-down legislation, in places like Canada and New Zealand, to preserve and revitalize dead and dying indigenous languages through education.68 As discussed in Chapter 1, the same is true of traditional music practices in many oral music cultures, including Bali. Yet, despite the general atmosphere of pelestarian and revitalisasi (preservation and revitalization) in the Balinese performing arts scene, and some legislated effort to preserve local forms like Saba-style legong,69 this same push for drum language

67 This phenomenon is particularly evident in the playing of the younger arja Keramas troupe. In instances of language shift, “there is often a continuum of language proficiency that correlates with different generations of speakers,” where, increasingly, speakers from the younger generation, if they use the dying language at all, use it “with less proficiency [and] in more restricted contexts than their older cohorts” (Wolfram 2002: 766). This has certainly been the case in arja Keramas.

68 See Fleras 1987 on movements for Maori language renewal and McIvor 2009 on strategies for indigenous language maintenance and revitalization in Canada. These are just two of many examples of recent writings on the topic.

69 Gung Raka of Saba, for instance, told me that his class was taught “Saba-style legong” at ISI Denpasar (though, in fact, he claims that they were teaching it “wrong” and he was forced to correct them) (Lesson, Sept 2008). Pak Cok has also been invited to ISI to teach Peliatan-style drumming for both arja and legong, though my impression was that it was more of a one-time performance than an in-depth study.
revitalization has not happened with *kendang arja asli* Keramas. And, given the small number of people alive who are still fluent in that drum language, revitalization seems unlikely without significant support, either from outside scholars or from a community of young Keramas musicians wishing to preserve their heritage. I am under the impression that neither currently exists. Thus, all further discussion and analysis of patterns will concern only those from the Singapadu line. We will begin with an exploration into the existing Balinese music theory concepts on *arpa*.

### 2.3 Balinese Theory on *Arja* – *Patokan*: The Roles of the Drums

#### 2.3.1 The Relative Simplicity of *Lanang* Improvisations

Despite the fact that Balinese *arja* drummers – like the practitioners of most oral music cultures – have a largely tacit understanding of their tradition, some oral music theory on *kendang arja* does exist, guidelines for playing known as *patokan*.\(^{70}\) One quite consistently stated generalization about *kendang arja* is that the *lanang* player’s improvisations are simpler and less varied than his partner’s. And certainly many studies of group improvised music show that in order for one musician to have ample improvisatory freedom, another must provide a framework of stability.\(^{71}\) However, in the case of *kendang arja*, the reasons behind the *lanang*’s relative lack of freedom are wrapped up in its *role* in the drum pair. And thankfully, while specific patterns are traditionally not discussed, many *arja* musicians *do* have a quite explicit grasp of the roles of each drum. We already know that the *lanang* is the leader of the ensemble,

\(^{70}\) Hood (2001: 87) uses the term *uger-uger* instead of *patokan*. However, this was never a term I heard in my own research. Whenever any of my teachers referred to rules of performance of any kind (which was not incredibly often), they always used the terms *patokan* or *pakem*, both of which translate roughly as ‘standard’.

\(^{71}\) Chernoff 1979 and Arom 1991 both bring up this point several times. See Arom 1991: 298-99 for a few examples of this phenomenon.
cuing the *ngeseh* (volume increases) and *angsels* (movements leading to sudden stops in music and dance) of the singer-dancers. This, of course, means that the *lanang* player often has to stop improvising on a dime to give a cue. Pak Dewa, a *wadon* player, says that because the *lanang* player must lead the ensemble, and particularly because he must focus so hard on the dancers, he has less scope for improvisation than the *wadon* player. In support of this assertion, one of the first things that Sudi taught me was that just a few short, basic *lanang* patterns could be paired idiomatically with virtually any *wadon* pattern, no matter how long or complex, and Hood’s studies support this idea to some extent as well. In the *patokan* for *kendang arja*, he claims, it is understood that the *lanang* leads not only the ensemble but also the improvisation, and that the *wadon* player can respond to each *lanang* pattern with a variety of different patterns of his own (Hood 2001: 87). We see this in Hood’s analysis of Pak Tama’s patterns in what he terms “variable pattern pairs” – a single *lanang* pattern is paired with several different *wadon* patterns to create varied but related composite patterns. Hood’s example of this phenomenon shows a basic pattern in which the *wadon* player over several iterations deletes certain notes from his pattern for variety. For instance, if the *lanang* plays the 2-beat pattern shown in Figure 2.9:

```
(X) - ● - X - ● - X
(_ ) _ e _ e _ e _ _
```

*Figure 2.9. Lanang* for Hood’s “variable pattern pairs”

the basic *wadon* would be the pattern in Figure 2.10:

---

72 Conversation, August 2007.
These patterns together create a composite pattern of

\[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]
\[(_) o \_ \_ \_ o \_ \_ \_

Figure 2.10. Basic \textit{wadon} for Hood’s “variable pattern pairs”

However, the \textit{wadon} could just as easily play any of the following patterns:

\[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]  \[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]  \[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]
\[(_) o \_ \_ \_ o \_ \_ \_ \_
\[(_) o \_ \_ \_ o \_ \_ \_ \_
\[(_) o \_ \_ \_ o \_ \_ \_ \_

Figure 2.11. Hood’s “variable pattern pairs,” basic interlocking

to create these varied composites:

\[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]  \[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]  \[(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X\]
\[(_) e \_ \_ e o \_ \_ \_
\[(_) e \_ \_ e o \_ \_ \_
\[(_) e \_ \_ e o \_ \_ \_

Figure 2.12. Hood’s “variable pattern pairs,” \textit{wadon} variants

We will see that these variable pattern pairs can become far more diverse still than this simple process of note omission.

In his studies of Central African polyrhythmic improvisation, Simha Arom discusses the free interchangeability of variations on a single rhythmic figure:

All the possible realizations of a given rhythmic figure are culturally speaking identical, so that the order in which they are repeated is almost always random. A figure with several realizations can thus just as well be indefinitely repeated in a given form as appear successively in every one of its admissible forms. In other words, with only rare exceptions, the order in which the realizations of a given figure are concatenated is optional. This in turn means that no syntactic constraints apply. Any realization of a given part in a polyrhythmic ensemble can thus be superposed on any realization of any other part, \textit{provided the conditions of interweaving} […] \textit{are respected} (Arom, 1991: 299).
These issues that Arom raises, particularly the concept of equivalence (his idea of rhythmic figures which are “culturally speaking identical”, though they may in fact be sonically different), will play out in more depth in the analyses in Chapters 3 and 4. For the moment, however, this simple example of variable pattern pairs from the existing scholarship on *kendang arja* serves to illustrate the relative freedom enjoyed by the *wadon* player over his *lanang* partner.

Conversations and interviews with my teachers and other drummers almost exclusively supported this theory as well, though there are certainly some who disagree. Pak Dewa’s long-time drumming partner Pak Cok would claim that a *lanang* player has more freedom despite its leadership role. He teases gently that a *wadon* player like Pak Dewa simply has more freedom to let his mind wander. While the *lanang* player is diligently watching the dancers, the *wadon* player can be scanning the audience looking for pretty women.73

Yet, despite some disagreements, the general consensus is that, as leader, the *lanang* player has less freedom in his improvisations than his *wadon* partner. Pak Tama compares this aspect of the relationship between *lanang* and *wadon* to that between *sopir* and *kernet*: the bus driver and the helper who puts the passengers’ bags on the top of the bus. The *lanang* player is the *sopir* who is in control of the bus. He must constantly be watching the road, following it carefully. He cannot stray off the road, or play around too much lest the bus tip over. The *wadon* player is the *kernet*: he has more freedom to move around the bus, placing bags wherever he finds space and socializing with the passengers. Pak Tama dances his hands back and forth to demonstrate the concept like the two dancers inside a *barong*74 costume: the front

73 Conversation, June 2007.
74 The Barong is a mythical lion-shaped demon featured in, among other things, the *Calonarang* story, where he fights the widow-witch Rangda in an epic battle of good against evil. Like the Chinese dragon, the Barong is
hand very carefully traces a path, while the back hand moves around much more freely, ducking left and right, sometimes coming very close to the front hand then backing away playfully. To Tama, the *wadon* is the drum that makes the sound exciting: “We play like this so that it sounds like the voice of the drums is alive,” he says. “The *wadon* is what makes it come alive. Yeah, here [the *lanang*] always continues in the same way. The *lanang* has some variations too, but far less.” I have certainly found this to be true in my own analyses as well. Although *lanang* players like Pak Cok and Komin’s brother Ketut do play a wide variety of patterns, it is true that their patterns are generally shorter, less varied, and less complex than their partners’ accompanying *wadon* patterns.

2.3.2 The Ngegongin/Ngematin Dichotomy

Among the most specific, yet enigmatic, *patokan* for *kendang arja* are the paired concepts of *ngegongin* and *ngematin*. These are terms referring to the complementary rhythmic functions of the *wadon* and *lanang* respectively. As Hood states: “The Balinese phrase, ‘*kendang lanang ngematin kendang wadon*’ means the *lanang* drum provides the beat for the *wadon*” (Hood 2001: 86). The term *ngematin* is rooted in the word *mat*, meaning “beat” and referring to the beat stream in the metrical structure that is kept by the *guntang*. Balinese

---

75 Lesson, June 2011.


77 Interestingly, “*mat* is a loan-word from the Dutch, where it means a musical bar or measure (cf. *maatstreep*, barline; *maatsoort*, meter)” (Marc Perlman, Personal communication, April 2013).

78 The *nge-* prefix and -*in* suffix simply make the term an active verb.
teachers will count *mat* also (e.g. “gong-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-gong” for a *tabuh telu* structure), and I will refer to beat numbers in my analyses as well.$^{79}$

As Hood also notes, “the phrase ‘*kendang wadon* ngegongin *kendang lanang*’ means the *wadon* drum player chooses patterns to reinforce the gong cycle. The *wadon* anticipates each repetition of the gong with characteristic phrases” (Hood 2001: 86-87). While both these concepts will be examined in much more depth in the following chapter, I will make some initial comments on them here.

2.3.2.1 *Ngematin: The Question of Ganjil and Genap*

Related to the concept of *ngematin* is the idea – told to me by several of my teachers, but most particularly Pak Cok – that the *lanang* plays the on-beats and the *wadon* plays the off-beats. Pak Tama, too, spoke explicitly about the concept of an alternating opposition between *lanang* and *wadon*, though he did not use Pak Cok’s English terminology. According to Pak Tama, “If the *lanang* plays on the odd – *ganjil*, *wadon* plays on the even – *genap*. That way, if the *lanang* always falls on the odds, and the *wadon* always on the evens, no matter how freely they play around they won’t run into each other.”$^{80}$ Of course the terms “odd” and “even” are adjectives, not nouns, but Tama does not use them to modify any other words; the dichotomy is simply “odd” and “even.” Though Pak Tama could never really further elucidate this idea verbally, it seemed to me a related concept to Pak Cok’s on-beat/off-beat rule. It is important to

---

$^{79}$ As discussed in Chapter 1, it is important to remember here that the *mat* is the level in the metrical hierarchy that I am always referring to when I use the term “beat.”

$^{80}$ “Kalau *kendang lanang* itu di ganjil [… ] *wadon*, genap. Supaya tetap bisa jatuh itu [lanang] di ganjil, disini [wadon] tetap genap, biar dimana dia main-mainkan, tak tabrakan” (Conversation, June 3rd, 2011). It is important to note that often the terms *ganjil* and *genap* are used to refer not to counting sequence features as Pak Tama (and I, by extension) have done here, but to refer to the number of beats in a gong structure. As Tenzer has noted, many of the older tua-era genres that pre-date the use of cyclic markers “contain many examples of irregularity, asymmetry, and nonquadrupartite meters. Gusti Madé Putu Griya put it simply when he told me in 1982 that the music of *madya gamelan*, such as *gong gedé* and *gambuh* was ‘even’ [genap] and that of the various tua gamelan was ‘odd’ [ganjil]” (Tenzer 2000: 172-3).
note here that this theorizing – both the use of the English terms “on-beat” and “off-beat” in Indonesian-language conversation, and the verbalized concept of patterns as being built of odd and even parts – is very probably a product of long-term contact with Western students versed in music theory (like myself) who have asked their teachers to think about kendang arja in these ways and to articulate those thoughts. None of my more geographically isolated teachers spoke of kendang arja in these ways, nor were they familiar with the terms when asked. Regardless of the source, however, the relative ubiquity of the concepts is noteworthy, and certainly worthy of investigation.

Of the two sets of terms offered by my teachers – on-beat vs. off-beat and ganjil vs. genap – I prefer the latter for a number of reasons. The most significant of these is that the terms on-beat and off-beat imply strong and weak attack points in a metrical hierarchy, most often those running at the half-beat level.81 Yet, as we shall see in Chapter 3, conceptualizing on-beat and off-beat exclusively at the half-beat level seems to give an incomplete picture when applied to an analysis of the interlocking of wadon and lanang. The terms ganjil and genap, by contrast, avoid this colloquial association allowing for a discussion of alternation at all different levels of meter without necessarily assigning judgments of “strong” and “weak.”

If we, like Western music theorists Lerdahl and Jackendoff, consider meter not as a single level of strong and weak pulses but as a metrical grid where “periodicity of beats is reinforced from level to level” (Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1983: 20), we can equally explore ganjil and genap at each level. This conceptualization of meter – shown in Figure 2.14 below – is most obvious in the batel gong structures, where, in fact, each level of the metrical hierarchy

81 If we consider the mat or guntang strokes to be articulating the quarter-note level in the metrical structure, as many scholars do when transcribing gamelan music using Western notation, what I am calling the “half-beat” would be notated as 8th notes. However, for reasons discussed in Chapter 1, I have chosen to avoid Western notation and thus have no wish to muddy the waters with Western naming practices.
is marked by a phenomenal accent on one or more of the cycle-marking instruments. The *gong pulu* punctuates the two-beat level, the *guntang* and *tawa-tawa* articulate the beat, and the *klenang* fills in the spaces between the *guntang* at the half-beat level, leaving the quarter-beat stream for the *kendang*.\(^{82}\)

![Figure 2.14. Metrical hierarchy of cycle-marking instruments in *batel* structures](image)

In the other gong structures of *tabuh dua* and *tabuh telu* we see instances of *gong* and *tawa-tawa* marking slower beat streams in the meter – the 4-beat and 8-beat streams. In both these structures the half-beat level is not articulated by any of the cycle-marking instruments. However, the analyses to follow will show certain kinds of phenomenal accents in the drumming that favor this level in the metrical structure, thus maintaining the hierarchy even in sparser *gongan*.

Though probably used by my teachers to refer to the same phenomenon, then, the relative flexibility in the concept of the *ganjil/genap* dichotomy over the on-beat/off-beat dichotomy has the potential to lead to a far richer analysis. The complicated ways in which *ganjil* and *genap* manifest in the music will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

### 2.3.2.1 Ngegongin: The Concept of Emphasizing the Gong

The concept of *ngegongin* states that the role of the *wadon* is to reinforce the gong with special patterns. The use of specific patterns to prepare gong strokes or other important

---

\(^{82}\) Of course this kind of metric stratification is inherent in all *gamelan* genres, where different cyclic markers and melody instruments run at different densities. Hood, Tenzer, Ornstein, and others discuss this in some depth.
moments in the cyclic structure is a very well-established Balinese compositional device. In *gong kebyar* music, for instance, a *reyong* elaborating a melody with a style of melodic figuration called *norot* will often switch to another style – *ubit-ubitan* – for the two or four beats preceding a major cyclic marker. We see this kind of cyclic signposting in pre-composed drumming as well. A very common drum pattern used to precede the final gong stroke in the long *pengawak* cycles of *legong* is:

\[
(X) - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - G^{83}
\]

(\_\_)K P o e _ o e _ U _ D _ U U U D T T d D _ D _ T T D T D T d D

**Figure 2.15.** *Kendang* pattern leading to gong in *legong*: an example of *ngegongin*

This pattern is recognizable to both musicians and dancers, and gives a sense of completion at the end of a cycle that might be as long as 256 beats. In *arja*, execution of *ngegongin* appears to be a more complicated thing (again explored in depth in Chapter 3).

When I asked Sudi about these concepts from Hood and my other teachers, he became slightly perturbed by the implication that *kendang arja* improvisation could be boiled down to so basic an idea as “*lanang* is on the beat, *wadon* is off the beat,” or “*wadon* anticipates the gong.” He told me that the concepts of *ngegongin/ngematin* and *ganjil/genap* might guide some drummers – and I have heard the same of improvisation on the *reyong* gongchime in *gamelan gong kebyar* music – but that many drummers have never even heard the terms before, and that the reality is certainly “not that simple.”

---

83 I have marked these beats as “X” because the drumming pattern stays the same regardless of the length of the gong cycle (which will be different for different *legong* pieces.)

84 There are many variants of this classic cadential motif. This particular variant is from the Saba style, taught to me by Gung Raka in 2008.

85 Several of my teachers, including Sudi and Alit, have told me that when improvising *norot* on the *reyong*, the first position *penyorog* player should emphasize the off-beats while the second position *pengenter* player focuses...
2.3.3 Pasangan and Rumus

These patokan dictating that the lanang leads while the wadon follows, and that each has its own role in the ngegongin/ngematin and ganjil/genap dichotomies, give us very basic guidelines to improvisation, nothing more. How arja drummers play so seamlessly together at such high speeds, simultaneously improvising without constantly tripping over each other’s patterns is accomplished through years of playing with a single partner and developing pasangan. A term meaning “pair,” “set,” “partner,” or “partnership,” pasangan means becoming accustomed to one another’s grammar of patterns, rhythmic cues, and gestural communications. We can see in the photograph in Figure 2.16 below that longtime partners Pak Cok and Pak Dewa sit close together and watch each other’s faces while playing, reading cues from slight motions in the head, shoulders, or hands, smiles, breath, and so on. This depth of connection between partners is central to their successful paired arja improvisations.

Figure 2.16. Great pasangan arja are intimately acquainted with one’s partner’s gestural, facial and aural cues. Pak Dewa (left) and Pak Cok (right). (Credit: Photo by Chelsea Edwardson, 2011. Used with permission)

---

on on-beat playing. Although my analyses of reyong norot improvisations have shown that this is often the case, as Sudi would say, it’s never “that simple.”

86 Conversation, January 2010.
Pak Tama once told me a story of being invited to play in a performance with Pak Gobleg, an accomplished *arja* drummer from the village of Medan. With a throaty full-bodied laugh, he describes their playing as terrible, bordering on disastrous. They had never played together before that day, and were versed in completely different village styles – Tama in the Singapadu style and Gobleg in the Keramas style. Thus, the patterns they knew were not *cocok* (suited) to one another. Instead of flawlessly interlocking, they were constantly crashing together, *kom* (o) and *peng* (e) or *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T) making collisions (what Tama and others would call *tabrakan*) instead of teasing around each other.\(^{87}\) Tama complains that in order not to destroy the whole performance, he had to settle on just one pattern that could work with anything Gobleg played, and only rarely vary it a little. This despite the fact that both were masters in the same genre, who, had they been playing with their regular partner, could have played *cocok* patterns with very little effort.\(^{88}\)

Yet, even more than the learned *cocok*-ness of style, regular *kendang arja* partners will also develop new patterns together – specific to that pair alone – which Hood refers to as *rumus*

---

\(^{87}\) Lesson with Pak Tama, July 2011.

\(^{88}\) These irreconcilable *tabrakan* could suggest that many of the *patokan* I and other scholars have learned – such as *ngegongin* and *ngematin* – may be purely of Singapadu derivation (as hypothesized above), and that other independently developed *kendang arja* traditions like *arja* Keramas (discussed below) followed completely different guidelines for playing. The only potential insight I have had into the actual patterns from Keramas is the one *wadon* pattern taught to me by Gung Raka of Saba. Though I do not know if it was taught to him by a Keramas master, we do know that there was influence between Keramas and Saba *arja* musicians, and this pattern may in fact be a vestige of that. The pattern that he taught me was: *(r) o r l r o o d r.* The fact that this pattern has exactly the same strokes as a common *lanang* pattern in the Singapadu style – *(r) e r l r e T r* – indicates that were it following *patokan*, they would indeed be quite different than the Singapadu ones. Conversely it may be true (as several of my teachers – most notably Pak Cok – have complained) that Keramas musicians do not follow any specific *patokan*, and simply develop a personal idiom with their own drum partners. Or it may simply be that Gung Raka invented this particular pattern with no understanding of *patokan* in either tradition. If that were true, in the case of Pak Tama and Pak Gobleg, it may simply have been that while both drummers loosely followed the same basic *patokan* discussed above, each took liberties in opposite directions according to their own village idiom, so that the result was still full of *tabrakan*. 

---
(Hood 2001: 79-81). For instance, if Pak Dewa were to play the following pattern in beats 4 and 5 of a tabuh telu gong pattern:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 \\
(pu) t n \\
(_ ) d D _ D _ D _ \\
\]

Figure 2.17. Beats 4 and 5 of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s rumus pattern, wadon

Pak Cok – and no other drummer – would know to respond, in beats 6 and 7, with

\[
(6) - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(n) t G \\
(_ ) T _ T _ T _ T _ \\
\]

Figure 2.18. Beats 6 and 7 of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s rumus pattern, lanang

Together these would create a composite rumus of

\[
(4) - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(pu) t n t G \\
(_ ) d D _ D _ D _ T _ T _ T _ T _ \\
\]

Figure 2.19. Beats 4 through 8 of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s rumus pattern, composite

This pattern is specific to these two drummers and their students, mutually agreed upon by years of perfecting the art of playing together. Were Pak Dewa to play an arja performance with Pak Sidja of Bona, for instance, the latter would not know to respond to his series of Dag (D) strokes with the appropriate Tut (T) response. The same is true of other Balinese improvised forms. Komin once told me that he only really enjoyed improvising on the reyong with his brother Ketut; they understood each other’s styles and tastes so well that the composite

---

89 It is noteworthy that I never heard this term among my various teachers (including Pak Tama, who worked with Hood before me), and when asked they generally did not have a sense of the term in relation to arja.
was always wayah. 90 I’ve heard similar opinions from various other Balinese musicians as well. “The key to *arja* drumming [as to any paired improvisation] is the *pasangan* or partnership and their *setelan* or compatibility. After all, interaction and communication relies upon feeling” (I Ketut Gde Asnawa, as quoted in Hood 2001: 81).

The various Balinese *patokan*, therefore, help to explain only the general roles of each *arja* drum. In order to uncover more detailed rules of improvisation, we must use these broad indigenous categories as a lens through which to analyze the minutiae of specific *kendang* patterns. In this dissertation, I analyze the patterns of four different *arja* drummers from the old generation: Pak Tut of Apuan (Bangli), Pak Tama of Singapadu, and drum partners Pak Dewa and Pak Cok from Pengosekan and Peliatan respectively. Each of these drummers, in his own distinct way, belongs to the original Singapadu tradition, having studied with either Kredek, Cok Oka Tublen, or both. Each, however, developed these Singapadu influences to suit his own personal needs, tastes, and web of musical stimuli, and thus the divergent styles of Peliatan/Pengosekan, Singapadu, and Apuan emerged. Because of the flexibility inherent in the various Balinese theoretical concepts explored above, these play out somewhat differently in each region. In Chapter 3 I will examine each master’s taught patterns as a regional representation of this Balinese music theory. A brief consideration of the broader context of regional variation will set the stage.

### 2.4 Contextualizing Regional Variation

Though a small island, Bali never has been a unified entity, and much of this has to do with its natural topography. The seemingly ubiquitous rice-field expanses of Clifford Geertz’s

---

90 Conversation, June 2008.
“snug little amphitheatre” (Geertz 1980: 20) in fact exist predominantly just in the centre-south of the island, with drier climates in the east and some forest still left in the west. Cutting the island in half east to west is a range of volcanic mountains that have, until relatively recently, made travel across Bali arduous. Furthermore, rivers running off the mountains have forged deep north-south-running ravines down the face of the island. This means that even today most major roads in Bali – with the exception of coastal roads – run north-south, not east-west. The resulting “difficulty of east-west travel was [historically] conducive to political fragmentation” (Pringle 2004: 5). Though only 5780.06 km² in size – about the size of Canada’s Prince Edward Island – from the 17th through the 19th centuries Bali supported nine independent states or mini-kingdoms. Each of these kingdoms alternately formed alliances with and warred against the others, as well as with the Dutch, who were increasingly gaining power through this period. And even within these small kingdoms, there was yet further division. As Pringle has noted, “historically the most lethal Balinese factionalism rarely coincided with the chronically unstable kingdoms, but was manifested at lower levels of the political process” (Pringle 2004: 223). In the kingdom of Gianyar, for instance, the ruling family in Gianyar village competed with increasingly strong royal leaders from the village of Ubud through the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Today we still see evidence of this small-scale kingdom fragmentation in the existence of royal descendants – both Cokorda and Anak Agung – scattered throughout Bali. Of my Gianyar regency teachers alone, Gung Raka of Saba comes from a line of Anak Agung (the local royalty of Saba) Pak Cok is a Peliatan Cokorda, Sudi often collaborates with various

91 Asid from the kingdom of Mengwi, which was eventually absorbed by other more powerful kingdoms, these are essentially the equivalent of today’s eight regencies or kabupaten of Bali.

92 The charismatic and powerful Cokorda Gde Sukawati of Ubud “led his family to political dominance in the kingdom of Gianyar and persuaded its ruler, his nominal overlord, to accept Dutch ‘protection’ in 1900. But rivalry persisted between the Ubud and Gianyar ruling families and they quarrelled during the Indonesian Revolution, with tragic consequences” (Pringle 2004: 77).
Cokorda from Ubud, and of course Cok Oka Tublen belonged to the royal family in Singapadu. Though linked by caste, there would still have been rivalry between all these various factions.93

The historically disjointed nature of Bali – both politically and topographically – propagated the at-least-partially independent development of arts traditions in villages often only a few kilometres apart, leading to many distinct regional styles in various art forms. Of course in the last half-century, better roads, improved communications technology like radio, cassette tapes, television, cell phone cameras and the internet, as well as centralized arts institutions like SMKI and ISI have negated the individualizing effects of geography and history to some extent. However, movements of pelestarian (preservation) and revitalisasi (revitalization) – both top-down and grass-roots – have equally pushed back against these standardizing forces.

2.4.1 Regional Variation in the Arts

Perhaps one of the more easily accessible examples of regional difference still existing in present-day Bali can be seen in the early 20th-century development of Balinese painting. Influenced by several prominent Western artists living on the island, painting practices throughout Bali demonstrate a proclivity there (as elsewhere) for local development of quite distinctive visual arts styles. In the 1930s, three regions in south-central Bali emerged as preeminent painting centres: Ubud, Sanur, and Batuan.94 Anyone who has visited Bali will probably be most familiar with the Ubud style, which has essentially become the definitive

93 This would have been infinitely more true between families of Cokorda royalty with those of Anak Agung lineage. In various conversations with Gung Raka (an Anak Agung) and Pak Cok (a Cokorda), each expressed a firm belief that his particular brand of royalty was the more authentically Balinese variety, with the other form being a newer, Dutch-influenced development.

94 In any of these three areas, one will also still find many painters working in the lukisan wayang style – the oldest of Bali’s traditional painting styles – as well as artists making modern art and popular art – those near-ubiquitous paintings of Bob Marley adorning road-side studios.
“Balinese painting” style for tourists with its colorful “rural and village scenes of cockfights, temple festivals and farming activities” (Pringle 2004: 138). Just over ten kilometres away, in the village of Batuan, a much darker style of painting developed. Examined in depth by Hildred Geertz in her *Images of Power* (1995), these relatively muted and dark-colored works often depicted the more menacing aspects of Balinese culture and religion including demons, witches, and powerful rituals. “The Sanur style, the least prolific of the new schools, was the only one to include marine subjects, probably inspired by the nearby aquarium and ready access to a beach-going tourist clientele” (Pringle 2004, 138). Thus, in each place, painting developed according to individual artists’ differing influences and desires, and was adapted to suit the tastes of its likely audiences.

As we have seen in the independent development of *arja asli Singapadu* and *arja asli Keramas*, this sort of regional variation exists in the performing arts as well. In very general terms Balinese musicians often speak of the differences between musicians from the south and those from the north, the latter of whom are purported to be more *keras* (harsh or strong) in both character and playing style. Yet, as in painting, regional variation in Balinese music and dance is often far more localized than this. Lisa Gold, among others, touches on some of the regional differences in the *gender* playing of various master musicians:

> There are marked differences of musical style between *gender* groups. These differences are due to regional particularities, attitudes and personalities of individual musicians and of the audience, external musical and non-musical influences, and the history and location of the village. Styles are influenced by such things as what instruments the *gender* players specialize in in other types of ensembles such as *gong kebyar* and *semar pegulingan*, or what dance traditions dalang [puppet masters] specialize in when they are not performing wayang. Further, everyone claims that each area has its own feeling and style of

---

95 Interviews and conversations with various musicians and teachers – mostly from south Bali – all support this theory. In terms of music, most of my informants point to differences in the style of *gamelan gong kebyar* performance, and this regional difference has been written on by Éric Vandal and is also discussed in Tenzer 2005.

96 See also Gray 2011 for more information on the individual variation of pieces in the *gender wayang* repertoire.
Gold describes the Sukawati style – which, like the old Singapadu tradition in arja, has become the preeminent style of **gender wayang**, influencing and even replacing diverse regional styles – as “flashy, highly virtuosic, […] and] with a high level of rhythmic and melodic complexity” (Gold 1998: 57-8, quote on 57). To this she compares the playing in relatively isolated Tunjuk, “known for its refined, melodically lyrical style which is influenced by the slow pace of life, and lack of traffic and crowds” (Gold 1998: 57), while describing the Kayu Mas style from the capital city of Denpasar as “eclectic” and strongly influenced by *gamelan gong kebyar* and a faster urban lifestyle (Gold 1998: 57). Thus, like the Keramas and Singapadu arja styles of the early twentieth century, independently developed regional variance among gender wayang players based in different villages seems to be the norm as well. Yet, even when they begin with the same set of musical influences, as my kendang arja gurus have with the Singapadu style, Gold reports that gender wayang players continue to foster regional variation: “When musicians acquire a piece from another group’s repertoire, they reinterpret the piece in their own style over time, often substantially altering the original” (Gold 1998: 56).

### 2.4.2 Regional Variation in Other Drumming Genres

The drumming styles for the famous legong dances of Saba, Peliatan and ISI Denpasar (the standardized academy style), similar enough to be clearly descended from the same source,
have shown a comparable kind of regional variation and innovation.\(^98\) Equivalent excerpts from the *pengawak* (slow section) of both the Saba and ISI styles will serve to illustrate this.\(^99\) There are many different ways that two equivalent versions of the same piece can vary from one another. We see instances of variation regionally, as in the painting and *gender wayang* examples explored above; we see individual development of style over time, as a single musician gathers new influences, or as his tastes mature and change with age; and we will often see – even in a pre-composed genre like *legong* – some spontaneous improvisation leading to limited variance in consecutive cycles of music during a single performance. The following comparative analysis illustrates variation in diverse *legong* drumming styles beginning with the same source material.

It is a generally accepted idea that *legong* is “a segment abstracted and adapted from *gambuh*, using the *semar pegulingan* […] ensemble” (Vickers 2009: 6).\(^100\) However, while knowledge of this historical connection gives *kendang* scholars a general understanding of the roots of *legong*’s drumming patterns and techniques, the origin of the specific *kendang legong* proto-language upon which these three styles are based remains uncertain. What is clear, however, is that such a proto-language must have existed. As we can see in Figure 2.20 below, the ISI and Saba versions of the *pengawak* are far too similar to have been developed independently of one another (and the same could also be said of the Peliatan version, not shown here); genesis in a single location is very likely. Yet, though they share a common

\(^{98}\) See Scoren 1981 for a similar analysis of the regional differences in dance between these three *legong* traditions. See Tenzer 2000: 268, Fig. 7.6 for four regional *kendang* variants of an 8-beat pattern in the *semar pegulingan* piece *Tabuh Gari*.

\(^{99}\) Saba version from Gung Raka, 2008; ISI version from Pasek (Ubud), 2008. I have chosen the *pengawak* because, while other sections may vary between different *legong* pieces within a single repertoire, for every piece in a given region, the drumming of the *pengawak* remains the same.

\(^{100}\) For more information on the local origin myths as well as the oral and written histories of *legong*, see Vickers 2009 and Davies 2008.
source, each version has been altered somewhat to suit the tastes and style of its particular region.

When discussing kendang variation on this scale, it is vital to differentiate major (or structural) variations from minor (or surface) ones. Of paramount importance in distinguishing between these levels of variance is the understanding that, of the drum strokes at play, the right-hand Dag (D) and Tut (T) strokes are universally understood to have more structural weight than the left-hand kom (o) and peng (e) strokes. In all small drum genres – both arja’s kendang krempengan and the kendang krumpungan of legong and gambuh – these strokes are more often associated with significant dance movements and are generally used more heavily in passages leading up to a metrically weighted moment in the cycle (a gong stroke or stroke on one of the slower-moving melody instruments in genres where these are used). Thus, major changes involving placement of D and T strokes would constitute a structural change in the piece.

By contrast, in many instances K-P and o-e can be considered largely interchangeable. This is where we see the most spontaneous variation within a single performer’s playing. In side-by-side iterations of a given passage, for instance, short licks alternating K with P are often varied to instead alternate o with e and vice versa, or the drummers may choose to combine the two, creating a o-e-K-P or K-P-o-e gesture which may, in the next cycle, become o-e-o-e or K-P-K-P. Different drummers, of course, have different preferences for these two stroke types – where K-P is generally understood to be more keras (strong) than o-e – and may exhibit different levels of tolerance for this type of variance. The versions in the transcriptions here are those chosen most often by each drummer under examination. In the transcription in Figure

---

101 In legong, as in other gamelan genres, lower-density melody instruments such as jegogan punctuate faster-moving melody parts at important metrical moments. In the case of the legong pengawak, this will occur every 8 beats, coinciding with all gong and klentong (smaller gong) strokes, which happen every 64 beats.

102 There are certain instances – particularly surrounding angsels, where K-P cannot be changed into o-e.
2.20, those strokes that are common to both styles are transcribed in black. Asterisks (*) are placed in the transcription where the two styles differ. Below these the ISI version is transcribed in red and the Saba version in blue:

Figure 2.20. Interlocking *kendang* for *legong pengawak* ISI vs. Saba, first quadrant (ISI red, Saba blue)

---

153
The two versions of the *pengawak*’s first quadrant (beats 1-64) are quite similar, with most differences being fairly minor surface distinctions, not major structural ones. For example, we see in several instances (in lines 1, 2, 3 and 5) the interchangeability of o-e with K-P where the ISI form generally prefers the more keras K-P strokes. At the end of line 5, a *pung*-heavy pattern in the ISI style is replaced by an o-e pattern in the Saba style. The fact that a *wadon* player in *legong* will almost invariably play rim strokes (o) in the quarter-beats that do not coincide with the half-beats while his partner plays *pung* (U) can explain the close connection between these two variants. In the beginning of line 7, the Saba drum style prefers a slightly denser Tut (T) pattern on the *lanang*. Here we also see some timing discrepancies between the two styles, where placement of some of the *wadon*’s Dag (D) strokes is variable by a subdivision. These and the few other slight differences between these two versions show an obvious familial connection between them, and an ideology that allows for some variation.

Independent regional innovations become more apparent in a later section of the *pengawak* – called the *milpil* – the first half of which is shown in Figure 2.21. I mark the beats simply as “X” because their beat numbers (192-224 in a 256-beat cycle) are too large to fit neatly in this transcription, and are not relevant to the analysis. Again, ISI variants are shown in red while Saba variants are shown in blue. Strokes transcribed in grey are those that are used, in both styles, about 50% of the time.

```
(X) - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X
(T) T _ T _ T * * T _ D _ _ o e D T T D T * * T * * T _ D _ D _ D _ T
  _ T
  _ T

(X) - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X - ● - X
(T) K P * * * * T * * D T D T T _ D _ D _ T _ T d D _ * * o e D T
   d D _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ K P T T
   o e o e D o e
```

*cont’d*
Here we have many of the variation types explored above, such as the interchangeability of K-P and o-e (where, again, the latter is used more in the Saba version), and some minor flexibility of timing in right-hand-heavy sections (e.g., the T’s at the start of line 1 and the D closing line 4). However, there are also some more major differences between the two at the ends of lines 3 and 4. These are less easily explained away as simple variants on the same motif; at least one of them must be a completely independent innovation on the original.

Further analysis also reveals that many of these major structural differences in drumming coincide with significant differences in dance movements between the regional styles.

2.5 Regional Variation in Singapadu-Derived Arja

In arja performance, as I have already established, regional variation is the norm as well. Most obvious, of course, are the historical regional styles of Keramas and Singapadu. Yet even in the modern styles of Apuan, Peliatan/Pengosekan and Singapadu – all partially derived from a single source, as the legong styles of Saba and ISI most patently were – we see some significant regional variants in pre-composed as well as improvised drumming.
2.5.1 Regional Variation in Pre-Composed Arja pieces

Most comparable to the regional variation seen in the legong examples above is the kind of variance seen in pre-composed arja pieces. One of the more common pre-composed kendang pieces used in the body of an arja drama is the halus composition, Adri. This piece is often played for the pepeson (entrance piece) of the Galuh (the refined princess) – particularly in Pak Tama’s Singapadu style – and will almost always be used when arja singer-dancers perform songs of grieving like Semarandana and Eman-Eman. And, unsurprisingly, it is performed somewhat differently in each region. Figure 2.22 below is a comparison of the basic eight-beat cycle of Adri in the Singapadu and Peliatan/Pengosekan styles. As in the legong examples above, those drum strokes used in both styles are transcribed in black. Underneath, the Singapadu style variants are shown in red and the Peliatan/Pengosekan ones in blue:

Like in the first legong example examined above, we see virtually nothing in the way of major structural changes between the two versions. The Peliatan/Pengosekan version is sparser in its kom-peng use, and there are instances where Dag (D) strokes are shifted over by one quarter-beat in either direction, but this generally happens in the middle of a motif and does not alter any of the identifying characteristics of this drum piece – like the silence at the tawa-tawa (pu) stroke or the two-beat gesture leading to gong. Thus, the overall trajectory of the line is the same at important cyclical markers, and the two styles clearly stem from a single source.
2.5.2 Regional Variation in Angsel

In Chapter 1, Figures 1.32 through 1.35, I surveyed the dynamic contribution that *angsels* make to musical form. I remarked that in the improvised portions of an *arja* performance, the most pre-composed elements are the *angsels*. Yet it should come as no surprise that in these, too, there is room for regional variation in village style. For every cyclic structure, of course, there are *angsel lantang* (long *angsel*) and *angsel bawak* (short *angsel*). In each of the analyses below, I will first show just the major strokes in the composite pattern with commonly used optional strokes transcribed in grey. Then I will show one common realization of the *angsel* for each of the two *kendang*. It should become obvious quite quickly that the successful execution of an *angsel* lies largely in the hands of the *lanang* player, though this stance is differently adhered to in different village styles. Pak Dewa of Pengosekan, for instance, often told me that as long as the *wadon* player placed his final *Dag* (D) in the appropriate location, all other *angsel*-related interaction with the *lanang* was of secondary importance. Pak Tut of Apuan, by contrast, believed that the *wadon* player, too, must always perform the full *angsel* pattern with his *lanang* partner.

2.5.2.1 Tabuh Telu (Empat) – Angsel Lantang

Because Pak Tut only taught me *tabuh telu* patterns, these are the only patterns we can compare across the three styles. In Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s Peliatan/Pengosekan style, an *angsel lantang* in *tabuh telu* is executed as follows. We see the composite pattern in Figure 2.23 and common realizations for *lanang* and *wadon* in Figures 2.24 and 2.25 respectively:
Pak Tama in Singapadu and his partner\textsuperscript{103} play this angsel as shown in Figure 2.26, with common realizations on lanang and wadon shown in Figures 2.27 and 2.28:

\begin{verbatim}
(8)- 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8
(G) t t t t n t t n G
( )_ _ D U U D _ P _ T _ D _ T _ D _ D T _ D T _ D T

Figure 2.26. *Tabuh telu angsel lantang* composite, Singapadu Style (CD Track 7)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
(8)- 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8
(G) t t t t n t t n G
( )_ _ d D _ _ K _ D _ o D _ o D _ o D _ o D _ o D

Figure 2.27. *Tabuh telu angsel lantang* common lanang realization, Singapadu Style (CD Track 6)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
(8)- 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8
(G) t t t t n t t n G
( )_ _ d D _ _ K _ _ K _ D _ l D _ l D _ l D _ l D _ K d D

Figure 2.28. *Tabuh telu angsel lantang* common wadon realization, Singapadu Style
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{103} Pak Buda, or I Ketut Buda Astra, is Pak Tama’s partner, but also his student.
And Pak Tut in Apuan teaches his *angsel lantang* for *tabuh telu* – in fact the only *angsel* he seems to be cognizant of – as follows. The composite pattern is shown in Figure 2.29 with one common *lanang* realization in Figure 2.30 and a common *wadon* realization in Figure 2.31:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.29.** *Tabuh telu angsel lantang* composite, Apuan Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.30.** *Tabuh telu angsel lantang* common *lanang* realization, Apuan Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>●</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.31.** *Tabuh telu angsel lantang* common *wadon* realization, Apuan Style

Pak Tut also has an alternate version of this *angsel* in which the final K-P-T-D gesture becomes instead T-T-d-D.

Comparing these three *angsel lantang* side by side in Figure 2.32 will give us a sense of both the level of variance at play *and* the elements considered structurally essential to the proper execution of the *angsel*:
Peliatan/Pengosekan Style

(8)- ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 3 - ⋅ - 4 - ⋅ - 5 - ⋅ - 6 - ⋅ - 7 - ⋅ - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

( ) _ _ T D U U D _ P _ T _ D _ T _ T D _ D T _ T d D T _ d D

Singapadu Style

(8)- ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 3 - ⋅ - 4 - ⋅ - 5 - ⋅ - 6 - ⋅ - 7 - ⋅ - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

( ) _ _ d D U U K _ P K T D _ _ T _ D _ D T _ T D _ P K T D

Apuan Style

(8)- ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 3 - ⋅ - 4 - ⋅ - 5 - ⋅ - 6 - ⋅ - 7 - ⋅ - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

( ) _ K d D U U _ U _ U _ P _ T T D T D _ D T U U D U K P T D

Figure 2.32. Comparative analysis of tabuh telu angsel lantang composites

In each version, the second half of the angsel features almost identical alternation between Dag (D) and Tut (T), with Dag (D) generally striking those quarter-beats that do not coincide with the half-beats.104 The Dag-Tut motif culminates in a final Dag (D) on the beat preceding gong. This Dag, it seems, can be approached in one of two ways – K-P-T-D or T-Ṫ-d-D – and the equivalence of these two gestures for angsel use is supported by Pak Tut’s statement that a lanang player can choose either one at any given time. Further, each of the three versions features its initial pung (U) stroke – often the first marker for an angsel – at exactly the same moment: the two quarter-beats following the beat 1 klenang stroke. While Pak Tut’s pung (U) gesture continues for another beat, the consistent timing of its incipit across village styles is noteworthy. Finally, in each style, shortly after this pung (U) gesture, the lanang plays a Pak (P) stroke – also a very common component of an angsel pattern. In each style, this Pak (P) occurs on the first quarter-beat position following mat. In both the Singapadu and

104 Please refer back to sections 1.4.1, 1.4.4.3 and 1.4.4.4 for equivalences between my notation and Western notation.
Peliatan/Pengosekan styles, Pak (P) occurs just after beat 2. Pak Tut, who extends his pung (U) gesture an extra beat, plays his Pak (P) instead directly following beat 3.

Thus together, these elements – the Dag-Tut-heavy motif ending in a Dag (D) stroke on the beat preceding gong, the double pung (U) gesture immediately following beat 1, and the off-beat Pak (P) stroke shortly afterward – appear to be the scaffolding for a tabuh telu angsel lantang. Beyond them, there is some small scope for regional variation, as we can see in Figure 2.32 above.

Each of the other angsel types contains both essential unchanging elements and regional style variance, though aside from this tabuh telu angsel lantang, we only have data on the Singapadu and Peliatan/Pengosekan styles.

2.5.2.2 Tabuh Telu (Empat) – Angsel Bawak

The angsel bawak for tabuh telu occurs only in the second half of the cycle; for the first four beats of the cycle, players can play any of their improvised patterns. In the Peliatan/Pengosekan style, the angsel bawak is as follows. The composite pattern is shown in Figure 2.33, with lanang and wadon realizations in Figures 2.34 and 2.35 respectively:

```
(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8
(G) n     t     n  pu   n     t     n       G
     K   P   D _ U _ P _ U _ P _ d _ D
```

Figure 2.33. Tabuh telu angsel bawak composite, Peliatan/Pengosekan Style

```
(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8
(G) n     t     n  pu   n     t     n       G
     P _ _ U _ P _ U _ U _ P
```

Figure 2.34. Tabuh telu angsel bawak common lanang realization, Peliatan/Pengosekan Style (CD Track 8)
As in the comparison above, looking at the two village styles side by side reveals major structural similarities between them:

**Peliatang/Pengosekan Style**

(8) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4 ● 5 ● 6 ● 7 ● 8  
(G) n t n pu n t n G  
K _ D _ o o D o D _ o o d D

**Singapadu Style**

(8) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4 ● 5 ● 6 ● 7 ● 8  
(G) n t n pu n t n G  
P _ _ U U _ U _ _ P K T D

Figure 2.39. Comparative analysis of *tabuh telu angsel bawak* composites
In each of these styles, the lanang’s Pak (P) stroke aligning with the tawa-tawa on beat 4 marks the start of the angsel. While in both styles I have heard the wadon player anticipate this Pak (P) with his own Kap (K) slap stroke – as shown in the Peliatan/Pengosekan version here – in neither style is it absolutely necessary. If the wadon player notices the angsel coming, he may play it, but if not, that’s fine too. In both styles the lanang player follows his slap stroke with a pung (U) gesture. And in both styles, this gesture begins on the quarter-beat directly preceding beat 5, though the gesture itself is quite different in the two styles. Finally, the angsel bawak ends with a slap-stroke gesture leading to a Dag (D) stroke on the wadon, and again this final Dag (D) lands on the guntang beat directly before gong, just as in the angsel lantang. As we shall see, this specific Dag (D) placement to end an angsel is universal in all cycle lengths.

2.5.2.3 Tabuh Dua – Angsel Lantang

In tabuh dua, both the Singapadu and Peliatan/Pengosekan style angsel lantang take two full gong cycles to execute. Pak Tama in Singapadu will often anticipate his angsel motif with a single pung (U) stroke one quarter-beat after the beat before gong, as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{(4)} & - & 1 & - & 2 & - & 3 & - & 4 \\
\text{(G)} & \text{n} & \text{pu} & \text{n} & \text{G} & \text{U} & \text{* (angsel)}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2.40. Pak Tama’s Singapadu-style anticipation of tabuh dua angsel lantang

And, very often, he will precede that pung (U) with a simple series of counting strokes beginning on the tawa-tawa (pu), abandoning more complicated improvising in anticipation of the angsel:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{(4)} & - & 1 & - & 2 & - & 3 & - & 4 \\
\text{(G)} & \text{n} & \text{pu} & \text{n} & \text{G} & \text{r l r l r U _ _} & \text{* (angsel)}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2.41. Pak Tama’s Singapadu-style anticipation of tabuh dua angsel lantang, with counting strokes
Pak Cok of Peliatan will also often anticipate the *tabuh dua angsel lantang* with *pung* (U) strokes, but in a less regimented and often more extended fashion. While he will sometimes anticipate it exactly as Pak Tama does (and sometimes not anticipate it at all), not infrequently Pak Cok’s *pung* (U)-heavy *angsel* anticipations will span several cycles of the *ngeseh* section. One typical example of this can be seen in Figure 2.42 below:

As in Pak Tama’s shorter anticipation, this more extended *pung* (U) use will generally occur in quarter-beat positions that do not coincide with beats or half-beats.

The *angsel* motif itself, as expected, is quite structurally similar in the two regional styles. The Peliatan/Pengosekan-style *tabuh dua angsel lantang* is shown in Figures 2.43 through 2.45 below. Here I have provided two common *wadon* realizations in order to demonstrate, again, that the *wadon*’s sole requirement is to execute the final *Dag* (D) in the appropriate place. Any *Dag-Tut* interlocking leading up to that (shown in grey in the composite transcription) is optional:

As in Pak Tama’s shorter anticipation, this more extended *pung* (U) use will generally occur in quarter-beat positions that do not coincide with beats or half-beats.

The *angsel* motif itself, as expected, is quite structurally similar in the two regional styles. The Peliatan/Pengosekan-style *tabuh dua angsel lantang* is shown in Figures 2.43 through 2.45 below. Here I have provided two common *wadon* realizations in order to demonstrate, again, that the *wadon*’s sole requirement is to execute the final *Dag* (D) in the appropriate place. Any *Dag-Tut* interlocking leading up to that (shown in grey in the composite transcription) is optional:
Comparing these two angsel back to back, again, shows their structural similarities and the small regional differences between them:

Pak Tama’s Singapadu angsel lantang for tabuh dua is shown in Figures 2.46, 2.47 and 2.48:

![Figure 2.45. Tabuh dua angsel lantang two common wadon realizations, Peliatan/Pengosekan Style](image)

![Figure 2.46. Tabuh dua angsel lantang composite, Singapadu Style](image)

![Figure 2.47. Tabuh dua angsel lantang common lanang realization, Singapadu Style](image)

![Figure 2.48. Tabuh dua angsel lantang common wadon realization, Singapadu Style](image)

Comparing these two angsel back to back, again, shows their structural similarities and the small regional differences between them:

Peliatan/Pengosekan Style

![Figure 2.49. Comparative analysis of tabuh dua angsel lantang composites](image)

Singapadu Style
The double pung (U) cue, Pak (P) placement, Dag-Tut interlocking in the second half, and final Dag (D) placement are fixed. In fact, these angsel are nearly identical to the tabuh telu angsel lantang above. And this use of similar patterns for multiple cyclic structures plays into improvised kendang arja also, as we will see in the following two chapters.

2.5.2.4 Tabuh Dua – Angsel Bawak

Tabuh dua’s angsel bawak, by contrast, do not mirror those of tabuh telu. In the Peliatan/Pengosekan style these angsel are incredibly short, with just two required strokes in them: a Pak (P) and a Dag (D). Very often there is no time for more in an angsel bawak, not even for a quick pre-angsel pung (U) cue. If the wadon player notices the angsel, he can anticipate the lanang’s Pak (P) with his own Kap (K) slap stroke, but, as usual, this is not necessary to the integrity of the angsel. This short angsel is shown in Figure 2.50 below. Figures 2.51 and 2.52 show common lanang and wadon realizations respectively, including the strokes leading up to the angsel gesture:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
P d D

Figure 2.50. Tabuh dua angsel bawak composite, Peliatan/Pengosekan Style

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(r) l r e e T e T e _ P

Figure 2.51. Tabuh dua angsel bawak common lanang realization with lead-up shown, Peliatan/Pengosekan Style

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
(_)_ o d D l _ l _ K _ d D

Figure 2.52. Tabuh dua angsel bawak common wadon realization with lead-up shown, Peliatan/Pengosekan Style
In Singapadu, an angsel bawak for tabuh dua is quite different, as we can see below:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad G \\
(P) \quad \_ \quad U \quad U \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad P \quad K \quad T \quad D
\]

**Figure 2.53.** Tabuh dua angsel bawak composite, Singapadu Style

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad G \\
(P) \quad \_ \quad U \quad U \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad P \quad T \quad r
\]

**Figure 2.54.** Tabuh dua angsel bawak common lanang realization, Singapadu Style

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad G \\
(\_) \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad K \quad d \quad D
\]

**Figure 2.55.** Tabuh dua angsel bawak common wadon realization with lead-up shown, Singapadu Style

Though the P-d-D gesture in the Peliatan/Pengosekan angsel is also played in the Singapadu version (with wadon and lanang slap strokes reversed), Pak Tama’s angsel bawak is a much more extensive gesture, lasting a full gong cycle as opposed to just a single beat.

As we saw in Chapter 1, angsel bawak can stand alone but are often played in combination with an angsel lantang in what most of my teachers refer to with the borrowed expression angsel dobel (double angsel). Figure 2.56 below shows an angsel lantang (1) followed quickly by another angsel lantang (2) and finally by an angsel bawak (3), as played by Pak Dewa and Pak Cok in a recording session in August 2011. It is important to note that the second angsel lantang in this passage, which is not preceded by a ngeseh build-up in the dance, does not receive a pung (U) pre-cue, and that its Pak (P) cue occurs one beat later than usual. This is common in these instances of angsel dobel. The rest of the angsel, however, remains intact. Here it is shown with counting strokes also:
2.5.2.5 Batel and Batel Marah – Angsel Lantang

It is in the shorter batel structures that we see a bigger change in angsel lantang makeup, though their generic features – pung (U) cue, Kap-Pak interaction and final Dag (D) – remain. In Peliatan, Pak Cok will sometimes anticipate his angsel lantang with a pung-heavy pattern. Figures 2.57 and 2.58 show two possible examples: a short and a long one. As with his tabuh dua pre-angsel (ngeseh) patterns, there appears to be a fair bit of latitude for variation in these, but Pak Cok generally does not align single pung strokes with the cycle-marking instruments and generally lands the second of a double pung stroke together with klenang:

\[(2) – \ast – 1 – \ast – 2\]
\[(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G
\rU \ r \ l \ r \ U \ (angsel) *
\* * * *
\]
The Peliatan/Pengosekan *angsel* itself is shown in Figure 2.59 below, with common *lanang* and *wadon* realizations in Figures 2.60 and 2.61 respectively:

In Singapadu, Pak Tama often anticipates the *angsel lantang* for *batel* with the following cue, though placement of the *pung* strokes can seem ambiguous, sometimes falling between rather than directly on the quarter-beats. This is noteworthy because *kendang arja* playing will never, at any other time, explore a faster beat-stream than the quarter-beat, and here we have intimations of an eighth-beat stream:
Figure 2.62. Pak Tama’s Singapadu-style anticipation of *batel angsel lantang*

Tama executes the *angsel* itself as follows:

\[
(2) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
(G) \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
(\_)_\_ \ U \ U \ _ \ _ \ P \ K \ T \ D
\]

**Figure 2.63.** *Batel angsel lantang* composite, Singapadu Style

Figures 2.64 and 2.65 show common realizations of this *angsel* on the *lanang* and *wadon* respectively.

\[
(2) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
(G) \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
(r)1 \ r \ U \ U \ _ \ _ \ P \ T \ r
\]

**Figure 2.64.** *Batel angsel lantang* common *lanang* realization with counting strokes, Singapadu Style

\[
(2) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
(G) \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
(1)r \ l \ d \ D \ l \ D \ r \ l \ K \ d \ D
\]

**Figure 2.65.** *Batel angsel lantang* common *wadon* realization with counting strokes, Singapadu Style

As we can see in Figure 2.66, in these *angsel*, there is considerable regional variance in the placement of cuing *pung* (U) and *Pak* (P) strokes both before and within the *angsel*. In each region, however, the *angsel* itself is the same length and ends with interlocking slap strokes anticipating the final *Dag* (D):
2.5.2.6 Batel and Batel Marah – Angsel Bawak

The angsel bawak for batel structures are extremely short, as the term bawak suggests, and are virtually identical in the two regions. The only difference is that while the Peliatan/Pengosekan style does not make use of the lanang’s Tut (T) stroke:

\[
(2) - 1 - 2 - 1 - \quad \text{(G)} \quad \_ U \_ U \_ U \_ K \_ P \_ D
\]

the Singapadu style does:

\[
(2) - 1 - 1 - 2 \quad \text{(G)} \quad \_ U \_ U \_ U \_ \_ P \_ K \_ T \_ D
\]

2.5.2.7 Pre- and Post-Angsel Gestures

Each drummer also has certain other relatively fixed gestures in his playing. For instance, following a period of silence after an angsel or a sung-only portion of the drama, each
uses a characteristic gesture to re-enter the texture.\textsuperscript{105} It appears that regardless of the cyclic structure being used, in both the Peliatan/Pengosekan and Singapadu styles, this gesture is always four beats long and will always lead to a \textit{gong} stroke. The transcriptions below show first \textit{lanang} and then \textit{wadon} with the three gong structures above: \textit{tabuh telu}, \textit{tabuh dua} then \textit{batel}.

In the Singapadu style, regardless of the cyclic structure, the 4-beat introductory motif is played as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
(X) - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
\end{verbatim}

Figure 2.69. Introductory motif, Singapadu style

The Peliatan/Pengosekan style introductory motif is almost identical, but denser in terms of its \textit{Tut} (T) stroke use:

\begin{verbatim}
(X) - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X - • - X
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
\end{verbatim}

Figure 2.70. Introductory motif, Peliatan/Pengosekan style

Drummers also use certain motifs to indicate \textit{ngeseh} or otherwise mark the approach of an \textit{angsel}. These motifs are specific to the \textit{lanang}; \textit{wadon} will simply follow the leader by increasing volume at the \textit{ngeseh} while freely using any of his improvised patterns. Again these

\textsuperscript{105} Some pieces will begin with entirely pre-composed introductions; here I am only concerned with the introductions of improvised sections.
angsels-anticipating patterns are different from region to region, but relatively fixed within the playing of each region’s individual practitioners. As we saw in Chapter 1, Singapadu’s Pak Tama will almost invariably ngeseh using the following 4-beat lanang pattern, again leading to a gong stroke:

\[
\begin{align*}
(X) &- \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X \\
(G) &- n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(G) &- n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(G) &- n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Figure 2.71. Pak Tama’s Singapadu-style ngeseh pattern}\]

His student and partner Pak Buda, though he has added his own variants to Pak Tama’s palette of improvised patterns, will also generally ngeseh in this same way. Pak Cok of Peliatan, by contrast, does not have a fixed pattern that he uses to ngeseh. He did teach me, though, that he will often increase the use of his double left-hand counting strokes for a few cycles leading up to an angsel’s initial pung (U) cue, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(X) &- \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X - \bullet - X \\
(G) &- n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(G) &- n \quad pu \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(G) &- n \quad pu \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
\_ &- 1 \quad 1 \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad U \quad _ \quad _ \\
&- * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{Figure 2.72. Pak Cok’s Peliatan-style ngeseh pattern}\]

That Pak Cok plays his counting stroke quite forcefully becomes noteworthy here; it almost sounds as though he is anticipating the angsel cue with Pak (P), a stroke almost exclusively reserved for angsel:
Both lanang players also tend to increase the intensity of their patterns in the ngeseh section by replacing some peng (e) strokes with pung (U) strokes, or by playing their peng (e) strokes with their fingers slightly lower on the drumhead to create a deeper timbre. In the transcriptions in Appendix 4, these are sometimes transcribed with a lower case “u,” and I think of them as a kind of half-pung (U) stroke. 106

As I have shown, while there are definitive connections between the three arja areas under examination in this study, regional variation exists across the board in both pre-composed and semi-composed passages. Where things become considerably more interesting, however – where flexibility between village styles is even more extreme – is in the improvised kendang arja patterns of these masters, students of the old Singapadu style. It is in these patterns that we see each tukang kendang, in his own unique way, interpreting vernacular guidelines and other inherently known “rules” through his patterns. In the following chapter I will mostly limit my analysis to taught patterns, using them both to elucidate further the existing Balinese theory of arja – its limits and its flexibility – and to develop additional arja theory hypotheses. In Chapter 4 I will then take what I have discovered (and theorized) about each drummer’s taught patterns to analyze improvised patterns and their interactions.

---

106 It is interesting to note that this same half-pung technique is also used quite liberally throughout in lanang playing for the faster batel and batel marah cycles, again creating a more intense rasa (feeling).
Chapter 3 Analysis of Taught Patterns

3.1 The Hunt Begins

I came to Bali in 2011 well-prepared – or so I thought – to quickly and efficiently fill the gaps in my knowledge on *kendang arja*, to glean any missing information I needed from my various teachers through regular lessons and a few interviews. I had been playing *gamelan* for over a decade, and had studied *kendang legong* and *kendang gambuh* as well as *kendang arja* on previous visits to Bali. I had read Dibia, Hood, Kellar, and Herbst, and I knew all the important terms I wanted to ask about: *ngegongin, ngematin, rumus*... I was ready. Of course I had never before thought to interview my teachers about these things. I was always more interested in simply playing and recording, transcribing and analyzing great music. But how hard could it be to get underneath the theory when I had such close, open friendships with each of my teachers? All I needed to do was to ask the appropriate questions and I would unlock their subconscious insights into the Balinese music theory surrounding *arja*. Yet, as has been my experience time and again, fieldwork humbles you, stomping on presuppositions and overconfidence like Goliath on a lucky day. And in my search for clarification on these theories, I was no David. It was here that I faced my biggest challenges and frustrations as a researcher.

Among my various teachers and drumming friends, probably the most commonly stated “rule” for *arja* improvisation is that the *lanang* plays “on the beat” while the *wadon* plays “off the beat,” so this was where I began my questioning. I found this dichotomy to be an immensely confusing one, since both players’ hands in fact generally strike their drums on *every* beat, *every* half-beat, even *every* quarter-beat. When asked to clarify this rule, though, most drummers will simply play a pattern and then say, triumphantly, “See?” Not terribly helpful, alas. No matter how I phrased the question, though, and no matter how frequently I tried to casually steer a conversation to the topic, none of my teachers could satisfy me with a specific music-theory answer.
None but Komin, the young Pengosekan drummer so curious about his music that he had taught himself to play left-handed in order to know explicitly what other drummers implicitly knew (but could not describe) about playing technique. In a lesson one rainy August afternoon, he unceremoniously informed me – completely unsolicited (and to my great delight) – that the most basic composite pattern for *kendang arja*, the *dasar*, was conceptually as follows:\(^1\)

![Figure 3.1. Kendang arja dasar (basic) with metrical hierarchy](image)

In this pattern, which uses only the high rim strokes *kom* (o) and *peng* (e), we see the *lanang* faithfully articulating the half-beat level of the metrical hierarchy while the *wadon* plays only in those quarter-beat positions that do not align with the half-beat stream. Was this perhaps what Tama was referring to when he used the term “odd” or *ganjil* for *lanang* and “even” or *genap* for *wadon*?\(^2\) Could this simple *dasar* (basic pattern) be the answer I was seeking? It seemed so elegant and uncomplicated... but plausible, no? I was elated to have gotten some insight at last, but the nagging ethical ethnomusicologist in the back of my drummer’s mind warned me to be wary of presuming too much. Yes, Komin’s insight could be interpreted as the explanation I was looking for, but without concrete corroboration from my other teachers and informants – and I didn’t have any – it

---

\(^1\) Conversation Aug. 20, 2011.

\(^2\) One of the reasons I suspect the concept of *ganjil* and *genap* to be a product of contact with Western musicians and theorists is that what Western musicians often call the first subdivision of a beat (the 16\(^{th}\)-note position that lines up with the quarter-note beat stream [the *mat*]) is actually considered to be the fourth subdivision of the previous beat in a Balinese conception of beat (discussed in Ch. 1). Thus, were it a purely indigenous concept, the roles would be reversed: *lanang*, lining up with the quarter- and 8\(^{th}\)-note levels of the metrical grid, would be said to play *genap* (the even fourth and second subdivisions of a beat) and *wadon* would be said to play *ganjil* (the odd first and third subdivisions).
could just as easily be the Greeks bringing gifts. I decided that the best way to verify my new theory of *ganjil* and *genap* was to go back to the source: the music itself. If my teachers’ patterns told the same story, it could become a working theory. And I would begin where my teachers began: with the patterns that they themselves had taught to me, those that they thought most fully encompassed their own particular playing styles.

### 3.1.1 Learning the Patterns

Over several trips to Bali over a number of years, I collected patterns through lessons with each of my teachers. Some teachers only ever taught me one or two patterns, which we then simply jammed with; others had explicit knowledge of several that they could teach. And each master had his own ideas about the best approaches for teaching *kendang arja* – which elements I should learn, and in which order. Out of respect for these master musicians, and assuming that when it came to *arja*, they knew more about my needs than I did, I left the content of my lessons largely in their control (though, of course, being of *keras* character, I couldn’t help but make some requests, and I suppose I often asked leading questions). Some teachers considered to be virtuoso specialists in one of the two *kendang* only ever taught me patterns for that particular drum. Pak Cok in Peliatan, for instance, is a *lanang* player first and foremost, and though he is fluent in *kendang wadon*, he only ever taught me his patterns for *lanang*. His long-time partner Pak Dewa in Pengosekan largely taught me *wadon* patterns. He did this partially because he knew that I was studying *lanang* with Pak Cok, but also because he believed that if I could play the more complicated *wadon* patterns, learning to play *lanang*
would be a breeze.³ When pressed, Pak Dewa did show me a few of his lanang patterns, but our lessons were almost exclusively wadon-focused.

By contrast, Pak Tama does not specialize in one of the two drum parts. Currently considered to be Singapadu’s sole active kendang arja expert, he generally performs not with other master drummers of his own generation, but with the best of his private students.⁴ Like Kredek as a dancer, then, Pak Tama is a jack-of-all-trades as a drummer. In addition, being a teacher to troupes in several villages across the island (and perhaps never seeing himself as a great virtuosic drummer, though, in fact, his playing is impeccable), Tama was more concerned that I understand the larger structure of the drama and the pieces within it than that I become fluent in a large assortment of patterns. Thus, he taught me a handful of lanang patterns – because the lanang is the ensemble leader – but then focused largely on the pre-composed pieces, the structure of individual songs in terms of their lyrics, melodies, and angsel placement, and other more general performance concerns. When I asked him to show me his wadon patterns, he would play them once through at speed but never take the time to teach them to me; that was of secondary importance for a player at my level.

Pak Tut of Apuan was the one teacher who taught me his patterns as composites first, only showing me individual lanang and wadon parts at my request, and with some difficulty. A student of the late Apuan arja master Pak Patrem, and purportedly the only Apuan resident still fluent in the playing (though Patrem’s son, Wardana, could vocalize the patterns), Pak Tut, like Pak Tama, would not have specialized in one of the two drums. While I played exclusively

---

³ Lesson, June 2007.

⁴ In the recording session I did with Pak Tama, for instance, he chose as his partner his student Pak Buda. While a very accomplished drummer, Buda is not yet a master, and still occasionally struggles with the dasar, particularly in faster gong structures like batel marah where the difference between his and Tama’s levels of proficiency becomes glaringly obvious.
lanang in my lessons with him, what was important for Pak Tut was that I understood the interlocking of the two drums. Individual details of patterns sometimes seemed to be less pertinent for him, and he often simply said of his dasar pattern “and now you can vary it” without really showing me how. Thus, with each teacher, I learned patterns for different drums and focused on different aspects of the art of kendang arja.

Each of my teachers also focused on different gong structures for pattern transmission. Regardless of the length of their patterns, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok both taught using exclusively tabuh dua. This was in spite of the fact that both drummers were very aware of the existence of the multiple gong structures at play in arja performance. Pak Tut taught his patterns entirely with tabuh telu, and, when asked, showed no understanding of the existence of other cyclic structures in arja (see Chapter 1, footnote 37). Pak Tama, who learned his tabuh dua patterns from Cok Oka Tublen and his tabuh telu patterns from Pak Kredek, was always very careful to differentiate between them, both when teaching and when playing. For the initial analyses in this chapter, however, I will not be focusing on the different improvised realizations of patterns for different gong structures. The point here is simply to gain an understanding of the pertinent elements of each teacher’s taught patterns – both their similarities in terms of the existing Balinese theory and their individual idiosyncrasies. Thus, I will transcribe patterns using the gong structure preferred by each individual teacher without comment, except where the length of the gong structure becomes relevant to the discussion of the Balinese theory, as it will when we consider the concept of ngegongin.

As much as possible, my goal here is for the reader to gain insight into the patterns as I did. I present them in the order I learned them, with all the complications, misunderstandings
and sudden insights of my own learning processes laid out alongside the patterns with the intention of providing immersion into my own learning experience.

In this chapter, I will analyze the whole collection of taught patterns, one by one, in order to bring to light both the connections between them and their specific differences. What is exciting to me about presenting here an exhaustive data set is that, while kendang arja improvisation can seem vast and unapproachable, in these taught patterns we are offered a finite, representative vocabulary of the language. A comprehensive paradigmatic analysis of the many units of music at play in this limited vocabulary will give insight into the design of the language as well as deepening our understanding of the Balinese theory on arja touched on in Chapter 2. This will provide a basis for analyzing the parameters of improvisation in Chapter 4. From these three angles, then – a structural analysis of the taught patterns, a deeper examination of the extant Balinese theory on arja, and an exploration into methods of improvisation on the taught patterns – will we gain an understanding of both the scope and the limits of the kendang arja asli Singapadu language and its dialects.

3.2 The Taught Patterns

Pak Cok was the first old generation arja master I ever studied with. We met in the summer of 2007, and – at the risk of sounding sycophantic and hackneyed – our meeting changed my life. I had been studying kendang legong and the technique of small drum playing with Sudi, expanding my kendang repertoire and thinking vaguely about what I might research for my dissertation. Sudi had even begun to teach me a little kendang arja; I had been harassing him for it ever since first hearing him jam arja with Gus Dë. But, while he had a fairly varied and extensive repertoire of wadon patterns, Sudi admitted to knowing less about
the lanang parts. He had taught me just two lanang patterns before suggesting that he take me to see Pak Cok. Sudi’s first lanang pattern is shown in Figure 3.2 below:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e e T _

Figure 3.2. Sudi lanang pattern 1

The second pattern was a sparser variation on the first, not using any Tut (T) strokes:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e _

Figure 3.3. Sudi lanang pattern 2

Pak Cok expanded my lanang vocabulary far beyond this. He taught me patterns much denser in their main stroke use, an aesthetic preference that sets his taught patterns apart from those in other styles. The seeming density of his playing in relation to other masters was further intensified because Pak Cok taught that most anak pukulan – particularly the right hand strokes, but also certain specific left-hand counting-strokes – should be played loudly as well, almost becoming Pak (P) strokes.

---

5 Sudi did continue to teach me after this: more lanang patterns similar to those I then learned from Pak Cok. This connection makes perfect sense, since, as a child of Ubud village, Sudi would have taken inspiration from Pak Cok’s playing for his own.

6 Interestingly, when I went back to my gamelan group in Vancouver, Canada, and began using Pak Cok’s patterns in the batel sections of legong, Sudi informed me that they were far too ramé for use in legong, particularly in their Tut (T) use, and were probably meant to be used only in the fastest of the arja gong structures – batel and batel marah. Pak Cok, however, taught them to me for use in tabuh dua, and even uses them for tabuh telu, though often interspersed with other slightly sparser patterns.
3.2.1 Pak Cok’s Peliatan Patterns

As mentioned above, Pak Cok taught me his patterns using *tabuh dua*, and unlike those of my other teachers, these patterns were all 4-beat, single-cycle units. When first entering the texture – either at the beginning of a song or following an *angsel* – Pak Cok will almost invariably play the following 4-beat pattern, which I have labeled variant 0 or the “intro” variant:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n pu  n G
(_)_ _ e e T _ e T _ e T _ e T _
```

*Figure 3.4.* Pak Cok *Lanang* Variant 0 (“intro”)

Here we see a strict alternation between *peng* (e) and *Tut* (T), similar to Komin’s composite *dasar* in its *peng* (e) placement but far more *ramé* (busy). Each of Pak Cok’s other patterns is equally dense with main strokes. The first pattern that he taught me was the following:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n pu  n G
(_)_ _ e e T _ e T _ e T _ e T _
```

*Figure 3.5.* Pak Cok *Lanang* Variant 1

The two motifs featured in this pattern, “_ e e T _” and “e T e T _”, we will see coming back again and again in *lanang* variants, both those of Pak Cok and of those of other drummers. The *e-T* motif contained in both of these gestures frequently precedes *mat* in other *lanang* patterns as well.

Pak Cok taught his second pattern as what he called a backwards (*terbalik*) version of variant 1:
Of course analysis of this variant shows that it is not, in fact, a backwards version of variant 1. From a purely analytical perspective, however, if we take the basic elements of variant 1 – three instances of “_ e e T” and one instance of “e T e T_” (which can be segmented into two instances of “e T,” and a single right-hand counting-stroke, here transcribed simply _), we will see that a rearrangement of these elements does, in fact, create variant 2, as seen in Figure 3.7 below. We can thus analyze variant 2 as a reversal of these two basic modules from variant 1:

Yet Pak Cok may have meant many things in his use of the term terbalik. For instance, not only have the individual modules of the variant been shifted around, but this has lead, significantly, to the use of a new gesture to prepare the gong stroke – “e T e T” as opposed to the “_ e e T” in variant 1. This may suggest that the term terbalik is used to signify an exchange of roles with respect to the gong pattern, a hypothesis that will return again in my analysis of another terbalik variant. Or it may simply be referring to the position of the “e e T” gesture, which is shifted from the beginning to the end of the variant. What results, also, from this terbalik-ing of pattern modules is a total reversal of events coinciding with the mat. In variant 1, there is a peng (e) on the beat three mat and a counting stroke on the beats one and two mat; in variant 2 the opposite is the case. Thus Pak Cok has created a “backwards” version
of variant 1 on a number of different levels: in terms of the order of its modules, the gesture chosen to anticipate the arrival of gong, and the placement of strokes relative to the mat.

That Pak Cok noticed a terbalik relationship in his patterns, though he was not able (or desirous) to express it in such a reductive analytical fashion, raises new questions. Could it be that Pak Cok recognizes the modular nature of his own patterns? If so, we are given insight into how his ear may segment elements of his patterns while listening and playing, and into his logic for ordering those segments in performance. If not, the challenge would be to devise a method able to discover whether his subconscious choices nevertheless conform to this sort of logic.

His third pattern, Pak Cok told me, was with (dengan) pattern 2. By this he did not mean necessarily that they were meant to be played in sequence, but rather that they were somehow rhythmically related to one another:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad \text{npu}\quad \text{n}\quad \text{G}
\]

\[
(\_\_e\_e\_T\_e\_e\_T\_e\_e\_T\_e\_T\_)
\]

**Figure 3.8.** Pak Cok lanang variant 3

Why Pak Cok felt that this pattern was “dengan” variant 2 was initially something of a mystery to me. Again, this pattern contains the familiar “\_e\_e\_T\_” gesture and a “e\_e\_T\_e\_T\_” gesture (which we may also analyze as a larger motif made up of two modules – “e\_T” and “e\_T”). But Pak Cok does something rhythmically different between the beat 2 tawa-tawa (pu) and beat 3 klenang (n) strokes: he plays “e\_e\_e\_e\_”, creating a quarter-beat cross-rhythm of 3+3+2 against the 4+4 of the mat, as follows:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad \text{npu}\quad \text{n}\quad \text{G}
\]

\[
(\_\_e\_e\_T\_e\_e\_T\_e\_e\_T\_e\_T\_)
\]

**Figure 3.9.** Cross-rhythmic feel in Pak Cok lanang variant 3
Though somewhat tenuous, the strongest connection I can find between this and his variant 2 – the thing that sets these patterns apart from his others – is this cross-rhythmic effect, which feels very distinctive when being played. While not at the same metrical level, his variant 2 also creates a cross-rhythmic tension with the *mat*:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
(G) & n & pu & n & G \\
(_{e} & e & T & e & T & _ & e & e & T & e & T & _ \\
6 & 6 & 4
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 3.10.** Cross-rhythmic feel in Pak Cok lanang variant 2

If analyzed from the sparser metric stream of the half-beat, this variant, too, demonstrates a 3+3+2 cross-rhythm against the 4+4 of the cyclic structure. This 3+3+2 grouping structure can be found in several patterns from each of my teachers, and will be discussed in depth in section 3.3.4.2. That Pak Cok may have noticed this cross-rhythmic effect occurring in both patterns, despite its occurrence at different metrical levels, would again be a testament to his own aural analysis skills.

When I had trouble learning to play this pattern accurately (particularly the “e e _ e e T” gesture, which requires a slightly different right-hand technique than the one I had grown accustomed to in the “e T” and “T _” stroke combinations of all his previous patterns), Pak Cok abandoned this pattern in favor of the slightly simpler (but rhythmically related) variant 4. He said that variant 3 was “terlalu berat” (too “heavy” or “difficult”) for me, and that we would come back to it when my technique was better; for the time being, we would instead play variant 4. I have thus always presumed that Pak Cok saw variant 3 as a slightly more *wayah* (complex or deep) version of variant 4:
The most notable common element in these two patterns, of course, is the cross-rhythmic “e e T e e T” (or “e _ e e T”) beginning on the tawa-tawa stroke. The main difference between them lies in the strokes preceding this gesture: those between the beat 1 klenang and the beat 2 tawa-tawa strokes. This portion of the cycle is realized as “_ e e T” in variant 3 and “e T e T” in variant 4; Pak Cok simply replaces one of our familiar gestures with the other. That Pak Cok appears to consider his variants 3 and 4 as being interchangeable, and that each of these motifs features a peng-Tut (e-T) gesture in anticipation of the tawa-tawa, may lend some weight to a hypothesis that they are regarded as equivalent. While variant 4 feels different to play, and is certainly a denser pattern creating a somewhat different musical effect, this simple change does not drastically alter the grouping structure of the pattern:

Analyses of Pak Cok’s improvised patterns in Chapter 4 will allow us to test this theory of equivalence against a much larger corpus of data.
Pak Cok claimed that the final pattern he taught me was used mostly in the cycles leading up to an *angsel*. Though I did not understand this at the time, I now know that he was referring to its use in the *ngeseh* sections of the dance:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
(_) l l T _ e e T _ l l T _ e e T _
```

*Figure 3.13. Pak Cok lanang variant 5*

Clearly a variation on his variant 1, this pattern replaces alternate double *peng* (e) strokes in the “_* e e T _*” gesture with double left-hand counting strokes. Pak Cok gave his left-hand counting strokes increased prominence in these passages, and I always felt them to be acting as anticipations of the *Pak* (P) stroke that would mark the *angsel* to follow. That this pattern is otherwise identical to pattern 1, but without the differentiating “e T e T _” anticipating the gong, lends further weight to my hypothesis that “_* e e T _*” and “e T e T _” are interchangeable gestures in Pak Cok’s playing.

### 3.2.2 Pak Dewa’s Pengosekan Patterns

It was during a *kopi* (coffee) break in one of my long, wonderful, sweaty, exhausting lessons with Pak Cok that I first learned that he and my old *kendang tunggal* (solo drumming) teacher Pak Dewa had been *kendang arja* partners for decades. And, while Pak Cok could certainly teach me some *wadon* patterns, he suggested instead that I study *wadon* with Pak Dewa – to learn the art of *kendang arja wadon* from a true master.

#### 3.2.2.1 Wadon

Unlike Pak Cok, Pak Dewa taught his *tabuh dua* patterns as 8- and 12-beat units, not 4-beat ones. I initially assumed that this meant they could only be played in their entirety – that these
longer patterns were to be thought of as indivisible units of music. However, conceptualizing them as such led to huge problems when I began to jam with Pak Dewa on these patterns, following his lanang cues for ngeseh and angsel. I could play each of the taught patterns to my satisfaction, and I could react to his angsel cues in isolation. But when he inserted an angsel cue at will into our improvising, two times out of three I missed it. I would still be in the middle of a pattern when his tolerant smile told me I had failed to place a Dag (D) in the magic spot. My pleas of “but I haven’t finish the pattern yet” were met with blank stares of incomprehension followed by a review of how the angsel sounded and where I needed to place my Dag (D) stroke to end it. Clearly, Pak Dewa did not conceive of his 8- and 12-beat patterns as inseparable units as I did, units that could only have an angsel placed at their end. Yes, it was nice to play them as such, to balance out the more with less ramé elements (discussed below). But they could be interrupted in the middle if need be, mixed and matched at will, or divided into smaller 4-beat sub-units that could be played independently. This fact was made even clearer to me after I had learned a few patterns and Pak Dewa instructed me to campur-campur (mix them up). By this he meant not only playing the full patterns in any order I wished, but also blending the first half of pattern 2 with the second half of pattern 1, or vice versa. Thus, in the transcriptions below, I will show the patterns first as Pak Dewa taught them, and then divided into 4-beat units and labeled for analysis. For these and all analyses to follow, I use the term “full pattern” (or sometimes just “pattern”) to discuss the patterns as they were taught to me, and the term “variant” to refer to these four-beat building blocks.

The first important thing to note about Pak Dewa’s taught patterns is that certain small details are not entirely fixed. For instance, many of Pak Dewa’s patterns have the gesture “o o D” which, in subsequent repetitions, he would freely replace with “o d D.” When asked,
Pak Dewa said that these two gestures were sama (the same). In the transcriptions below I have chosen the version that Pak Dewa initially used when teaching each pattern, but it is important to note that these two gestures are considered to be entirely equivalent.

Second, each of Pak Dewa’s taught patterns begins with the following 2-beat gesture – one that, like the “_ e e T _” motif in lanang playing, we will see coming back in various forms in all of my teachers’ wadon patterns:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \bullet \quad 1 \quad \bullet \quad 2 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \\
(r) & \quad l \quad r \quad o \quad r \quad l \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.14.** Pak Dewa 2-beat opening wadon motif, with counting strokes

Or, in its reduced form, with only main strokes and the most structurally important counting strokes shown:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \bullet \quad 1 \quad \bullet \quad 2 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \\
(\_) & \quad o \quad l \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.15.** Pak Dewa 2-beat opening wadon motif, without counting strokes

However, because the drum stroke that aligns with gong is entirely dependent on the preceding pattern, there are times when Pak Dewa will need to alter this pattern slightly. Thus, when the preceding cycle ends with a kom (o) stroke on gong, this gesture will be played instead as:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \bullet \quad 1 \quad \bullet \quad 2 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \\
(o) & \quad r \quad r \quad o \quad r \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.16.** Pak Dewa alternate 2-beat opening wadon motif, with counting strokes

Or, in its reduced form:
Again, I have transcribed each pattern as it was initially taught to me, but these two versions—though they create a slightly different groove and a slightly different playing challenge—should also be considered essentially equivalent.

With these caveats in place, we now turn to Pak Dewa’s specific patterns. The first pattern that he taught me can be seen in Figure 3.18 below:

![Figure 3.18. Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 1](image)

Only months later, when I actually thought to ask him about the mixing and matching of pattern elements that I noticed in his playing, did Pak Dewa reveal to me that he thought of the first cycle of this pattern as an independent unit called the *pokok*. A Balinese term meaning “root” or “trunk,” I had only ever heard this word used to refer to the slow-moving melody in a *gamelan* piece, the melody that provides the basis for all the other parts. And a light went on in my brain. For Pak Dewa, this 4-beat pattern was the *dasar* (basic):

![Figure 3.19. Pak Dewa wadon dasar (pokok)](image)

---

7 Lesson, July 2008.
In the context of a full pattern, of course, this *dasar* will generally also have *kom (o)* strokes leading to *gong*, as shown in Figure 3.20:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(\_)_\_ _ o _ l _ o o _ o d D _ _ o o \quad * \quad * \\
\]

*Figure 3.20. Pak Dewa *wadon dasar* with *kom (o)* strokes leading to *gong* (version 1)*

Alternately, it could be played with one additional *kom (o)* stroke as follows:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(\_)_\_ _ o _ l _ o o _ o d D o o o \quad * \quad * \quad * \\
\]

*Figure 3.21. Pak Dewa *wadon dasar* with *kom (o)* strokes leading to *gong* (version 2)*

This *pokok* contains several elements that we will see coming back again and again in Pak Dewa and other *wadon* players’ patterns. These include a “o _ o d D” motif where the *Dag* (D) coincides with the *mat*, the now-familiar opening motif (“_ _ _ o _ l _ o o “) that features an off-beat “o _ l _ o” alternation (which we will sometimes see extended in other *wadon* variants), and a double *kom (o)* stroke leading to important structural markers, like the *tawa-tawa* and *gong* strokes.

The other patterns Pak Dewa taught me (including the second half of pattern 1), he thought of as more elaborate than this *dasar*, perhaps because they were much more *ramé* (busy) in their main stroke (and particularly in their *Dag* (D) stroke) use, or perhaps because many of them emphasized more complicated rhythmic gestures. Whatever the reason, though, this first variant was considered to be the *pokok*, the *dasar* (basic). And, Pak Dewa explained, in performance it was always nice to come back to the *pokok* between other variants. *This was* why he had taught his variations as 8- and 12-beat patterns: he was ensuring that I balanced
*pokok* use with the use of other more complicated variants, so that my playing was neither too repetitive nor too *ramé*.

Pak Dewa’s pattern 2, then, is the 12-beat pattern shown in Figure 3.22:

This pattern opens with a variation on the 4-beat *pokok* that delays the arrival of the *Dag* (*D*) on beat 3 by a single quarter-beat position. Pak Dewa follows this with a full statement of the original 4-beat *pokok*. I know that Pak Dewa considers the first four beats of this pattern to be a variation on the *pokok*, because when he broke the pattern down and played it slowly for me, he would often say “dua kali” (“two times”) when we came to the second (unvaried) iteration of the *pokok*:

---

8 Conversations with Pak Dewa, 2008 and 2011.
The final four beats of pattern 2 contain new material. And here we can see something of Pak Dewa’s compositional logic, as the delayed, off-beat Dag (D) placement from the pokok variation comes back three times in this last cycle:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
(4) & \color{red} \bullet & - & 1 & - & \color{red} \bullet & - & 2 & - & \color{red} \bullet & - & 3 & - & \color{red} \bullet & - & 4 \\
(G) & \text{n} & \text{pu} & \text{n} & \text{G} & \text{n} & \text{pu} & \text{n} & \text{G} \\
(\circ) & _ & _ & o & \text{d} & D & _ & o & \text{d} & D & _ & o & \text{d} & D & _ & o & o & * & * & * \\
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 3.24.** Delayed Dag (D) placement in Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 2, final four beats

In learning his full pattern 3, I was finally offered insight into Pak Dewa’s aesthetic conception of the desired relationship between lanang and wadon in kendang arja. This pattern – discussed in section 2.3.3 – is meant to be paired with a quite specific lanang pattern. Of course, until this point, I had always assumed that all arja patterns had an ideal mate, that though they might not always be played as such in performance (and this was a product of high-speed improvisation) each pattern had its perfect pair. This was what I had learned from Hood, who discusses kendang arja almost exclusively in terms of strict interlocking. And learning pattern 3, I thought, confirmed that for me.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
(4) & \color{red} \bullet & - & 1 & - & \color{red} \bullet & - & 2 & - & \color{red} \bullet & - & 3 & - & \color{red} \bullet & - & 4 \\
(G) & \text{n} & \text{pu} & \text{n} & \text{G} & \text{n} & \text{pu} & \text{n} & \text{G} \\
(\circ) & _ & _ & o & \text{d} & D & _ & o & \text{d} & D & _ & o & \text{d} & D & _ & o & o & o & o & o \\
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 3.25.** Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 3

The first half of this pattern is simply the 4-beat pokok. The final quadrant is a piece of the original dasar – a basic alternation between kom (o) strokes and right-hand counting strokes (“\text{o o o o o o o o o}”). The third quadrant of this pattern, however, features a dense use of Dag (D) not yet seen in Pak Dewa’s patterns. And, as mentioned in Chapter 2, Pak Dewa taught me that
this “D _ D _ D” gesture was only truly satisfying if responded to with a parallel Tut (T) gesture in the beats following (an example of Hood’s concept of rumus), as shown in Figure 3.26:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) - & \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4 \\
(G) & n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(\_ ) d \quad D _ D _ D _ _ T _ T _ T _ T _
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.26. Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 3, last four beats, with lanang rumus

Here we have a quite different style of lanang-wadon interrelating that I have not discussed in-depth because it does not, in fact, occur frequently in kendang arja. In this pattern, instead of interlocking on a small scale from quarter-beat to quarter-beat, Dag (D) and Tut (T) play these relatively parallel patterns in sequence. The Tut (T) strokes meant to accompany this pattern would coincide with the wadon’s kom (o) strokes, a very common device in all small drum genres, as is playing peng (e) in alignment with Dag (D).

This very pre-planned moment in Pak Dewa’s playing seemed to justify Hood’s analysis of kendang arja first and foremost as an art of quite strict wadon-lanang pairing. After I had learned pattern 3, however, I asked Pak Dewa to show me the lanang patterns meant to be paired with his wadon patterns 1 and 2. He changed the subject. I asked in a different way: Could he show me the lanang pattern most suited to (“yang paling cocok dengan”) his wadon pattern 1? He laughed, finally understanding my apparently silly question, and then shook his head. What followed was a conversation that told me, in no uncertain terms, that there was no such thing as the most cocok (appropriate) lanang pattern for any one wadon pattern, or vice versa. With the exception of these specific moments of rumus (pre-composed interactions between long-time partners), much as Simha Arom discovered of improvisation in Central African pygmy polyphony, each wadon pattern could be combined with any lanang pattern. The interlocking might not be perfect, but it would always be close enough. And, even in these
semi-composed moments, the world would not fall apart if the lanang player did not notice the Dag (D) gesture, or was too busy doing his own thing to offer his pre-planned Tut (T) reply (though the mark of a good pasangan would be one in which each drummer was sensitive to the patterns of his partner and could respond accordingly). Understanding how this freedom works, of course – how to determine equivalence classes in kendang arja – is the million-dollar question, and we will return to it in section 3.3 below.

Pattern 4, Pak Dewa told me, was a backwards version of pattern 3. By this I assume he was referring to the placement of the “D _ D _ D” gesture, which, in this pattern, is placed where the “T _ T _ T” gesture had been in pattern 3. This lends credence to the idea that when Pak Cok says a pattern is terbalik it means that the roles of certain gestures have changed with respect to the gong pattern. I wondered if this also meant that the lanang player would place his Tut (T) strokes where the Dag (D) had been in pattern 3. When I asked if there were a specific lanang pattern meant to be paired with this wadon pattern, however, Pak Dewa laughed and dismissed the question once more.

In the pattern above, we again see the 4-beat pokok up front. Other familiar elements include the double kom (o) leading to both the central and final gong strokes, and a motif similar to that used in the final four beats of Pak Dewa’s pattern 2 where the “_ o d D” sequence, instead of coinciding with the mat on the final Dag (D), is delayed by one quarter-beat position, coinciding, then, on the preceding right-thumb counting stroke (d).

Figure 3.27. Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 4
I see Pak Dewa’s patterns 5 and 6, shown in Figures 3.28 and 3.29, as being variations on one another. Both are 12 beats long, beginning with the 4-beat pokok and ending with an identical 4-beat pattern that I will call the Pak Dewa wadon end variant. Only in the middle gong cycle do these two patterns differ, each offering a unique mash-up of dense kom-Dag interaction that, in each case, is an atypically symmetrical 2+2-beat pattern:

(4) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4

(G)  n  pu  n  G  n  pu  n  G

(o) _ _ o _ 1 _ o o _ o d D _ _ _ o d D o o D o D o D o D o

Figure 3.28. Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 5

(4) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4

(G)  n  pu  n  G  n  pu  n  G

(o) _ _ o _ 1 _ o o _ o d D _ _ _ o d D o o D o D o d D o D o

Figure 3.29. Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 6

As mentioned above, for the purposes of analysis and because of Pak Dewa’s flexible mix-and-match (campur-campur) approach to playing, I segment these taught patterns into four-beat chunks as follows:

Pak Dewa Wadon Dasar

(4) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4

(G)  n  pu  n  G

(_)_ _ o _ 1 _ o o _ o d D _ _ _ o

Pak Dewa Wadon Dasar with first beat variation

(4) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4

(G)  n  pu  n  G

(o) _ _ o _ 1 _ o o _ o d D _ _ _ (cont’d..)
Pak Dewa Wadon Dasar with Dag delay
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) _ _ o _ l _  o _ _ _ o  d D _  o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon Variant 1
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) D _  o _ o  D  _  o _ o  d D _ _ o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon Variant 2
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) _ _ o  d D _ _ o  D _  o  d D _ _ o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon Variant 3
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) d D _ D _ D _  o _ o _ o _ _ o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon Variant 4
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) D _ o  d D _ _ o  D _ D _ D _ _ o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon Variant 5
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) D  o  d D _ o  o  D _ o  d D _ D _ _ o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon Variant 6
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) d D _ o _ D _ _ o _ d D _ D _ D _ _ o _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon End Variant
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n  n  pu  n  G
(o) D  o  d D _ _ _ _ _ _ o _ _ o _ _ _ _ _

Figure 3.30. Pak Dewa’s taught wadon patterns segmented into 4-beat wadon variants

3.2.2.2 Lanang

As previously mentioned, while Pak Dewa and I focused almost exclusively on wadon patterns in terms of playing proficiency, he did also briefly show me several of his lanang
improvisations. For obvious reasons, many of these are similar to Pak Cok’s, but there are certainly some differences, too.

The first lanang patterns that Pak Dewa played for me, he called “pukulan dari dulu” (“patterns from before”). He explained that these patterns were from an even older generation than his own. I was exceptionally interested to learn these patterns, as I thought they might offer some insight into how patterns from Pak Kredek, Cok Oka Tublen, and other earlier generation drummers like Peliatan’s I Madé Lebah might have sounded. The first of these pukulan dari dulu is shown in Figure 3.31:

\[(4)- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]

\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]

Figure 3.31. Pak Dewa lanang dari dulu full pattern 1

This pattern in many ways is made up of elements we have already seen in Pak Cok’s lanang patterns – the “_ e e T _” and “e T e T _” gestures in particular. Yet two things stand out as setting this pattern apart, aside from its particular arrangement of those familiar elements. First of all, it introduces a new gesture “_ e _ e _” (or, with counting strokes, “r e r e r”). And while this may be seen as a variant on the simple counting-stroke alternation “r-l-r-l-r” used in many sparser lanang patterns like Sudi’s, as we shall see in section 3.3 below its use would make interlocking with the partner drum more difficult. The second notable thing about this pattern is that unlike many of Pak Cok’s patterns, it does not make use of the solitary “e-T”, “e-e-T” or other motif to create tension with the metrical structure and thus may be said to be a relatively “straight” pattern like Pak Cok’s pattern 1. Pak Dewa’s second pattern “dari dulu” exhibits similar “straightness” in its grouping structure:
Here we see a pattern that essentially combines Pak Cok’s variant 5 in its first half with his variant 2 in its second half, creating, like Pak Dewa’s 8- and 12-beat wadon patterns, a longer musical phrase that balances different elements of ramé.

When talking about the old style, Pak Dewa only ever played these two patterns, stating: “That was all before. There wasn’t much variation.” When he began to teach me his own lanang patterns, I discovered that they were slightly different from these “dari dulu” patterns. Still utilizing many of the elements from Pak Cok’s patterns discussed above, we see Pak Dewa combining them in new ways. Figure 3.33 shows the pattern that he referred to as the first, most basic lanang pattern (“yang pertama; yang paling dasar”):

In this pattern, again, we see a new configuration of strokes, “_ e _ l _” (or “r e r l r”), which, though it may be seen as a variation on “r-l-r-l-r”, again creates some interesting problems when we begin to look at the rules of interlocking.

Pak Dewa’s lanang pattern 2 is identical to Pak Cok’s pattern 1, though, as was his habit, he taught it as an 8-beat (not 4-beat) pattern, repeating the same material twice:

---

9 “Itu aja dulu. Tidak ada banyak variasi” (Lesson, June 2008).
Pak Dewa’s lanang pattern 3 again makes use of the “_ e _ l _” gesture:

And basic analysis shows that this pattern is simply a reworking of elements from his pattern 1, taking two of its 2-beat gestures (two quite similar gestures) and rearranging them:

While most of Pak Dewa’ lanang patterns can be easily parsed into two-beat sub-patterns all related to one another, his pattern 4 is somewhat exceptional:

Like many of Pak Cok’s patterns, this one’s grouping structure does not line up so simply with the meter. At the beginning of the second cycle, Pak Dewa sets out a six-stroke motif that typically could be the basis for a hemiola-like rhythm. It begins to repeat but subverts
expectations of a full repetition with an interruption by the familiar “e T e T _” gesture to end the pattern:

\[(4) - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4\]

\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]

\[(_)_e_e_e_e_1_e_e_T_\quad e_e_T_e_e_T_e_T_e_T\]

**Figure 3.38.** Grouping structure analysis of Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 4

At this point in my lessons I asked Pak Dewa again for the most *cocok* (appropriate) lanang patterns to match each of his wadon patterns. And though he continued to insist that there was no such thing as the proverbial most *cocok* pairing, he did teach me patterns that he considered to be “*cocok* enough” with two of his wadon patterns. Though Pak Dewa probably did this more to appease me than because he himself thought about the patterns in this way when he played, his ability to create idiomatic *cocok* patterns at my request is still significant.

Pak Dewa’s lanang pattern 5, then, was well suited to be played with his wadon pattern 2. Figure 3.39 below shows the lanang pattern alone, and Figure 3.40 shows its interlocking with wadon pattern 2:

\[(4) - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4\]

\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]

\[(_)_e_e_e_e_1_e_e_T_\quad e_e_T_e_e_T_e_e_T\]

**Figure 3.39.** Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 5
Figure 3.40. Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 5 interlocking with his wadon full pattern 2

It is noteworthy that in this interlocking lanang part, Pak Dewa does not feel the need to differentiate between the variant that interlocks with his wadon dasar with delayed Dag (D) stroke – the first cycle in this wadon pattern – and his regular wadon dasar – which makes up the 2nd gong cycle in this pattern. The comparison of these two wadon variants, from Figure 3.23, is reproduced here for reference:

Each of these dasar variants creates a slightly different composite pattern with the lanang:

This shows, again, a flexibility to interlocking; it need not always be “perfect.”
In subsequent iterations of the same pattern, Pak Dewa would sometimes replace the final gong cycle with Pak Cok’s lanang variant 1 creating a quite different composite line and even a Dag-Tut collision when played with his wadon pattern 2, indicating that perhaps this particular variant is less cocok with that pattern.¹⁰

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.42.** Pak Cok lanang variant 1 (top) then shown interlocking with last four beats of Pak Dewa wadon full pattern 2 (bottom)

The next lanang pattern that I learned from Pak Dewa is in the vein of this last one in terms of its structure – two identical cycles of a sparser variant are tied up at the end by a third denser cycle of related material:

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.43.** Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 6

Here the denser “l_e T l” motif that ends each of the first two cycles is repeated four times in the last cycle. As mentioned above, in our lessons Pak Dewa often didactically mixed variants

---

¹⁰ These collisions (or tabrakan) are discussed in more detail in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 below.
that were ramé with those that were sparse in order to encourage me to do so in my own playing. This pattern, then, much like his full wadon pattern 2 in Figure 3.22 above, begins sparsely and moves to a more ramé variant for its final four beats. And while this directed progression toward increased ramé-ness is common in kendang arja patterns (for reasons that will be discussed in section 3.3.3 below), what is important here is a balance of densities.

Pak Dewa also showed me a pattern that he considered to be cocok with his wadon full pattern 6:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n    pu    n    G    n    pu    n    G
(_)    _    e    e    T    _    e    _    l    _    e    e    T    _    e    e    T    _    e    e    T    _    e    e    T    _
```

Though seemingly quite different from the other patterns, this one still largely makes use of the “_ e e T _” and “_ e _ l _” gestures, or variations on them. The rests in the final gong cycle mirror the rests in the associated wadon pattern. In Figure 3.45 below, the two are shown interlocking:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n    pu    n    G    n    pu    n    G
(o)    _    o    _    e    e    T    o    e    o    d    D    e    e    T    o    e    D    T    _    D    _    T    _    e    D    T    _    D    T    _
_|_    o    _    o    d    o    e    o    d    o    e    o
```

**Figure 3.44.** Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 7

**Figure 3.45.** Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 7 interlocking with his wadon full pattern 6
The final lanang pattern that Pak Dewa showed was, in theory, meant to demonstrate how the lanang “tetap” (stays the same). By this I assume he means that the lanang part makes use of only a few quite fixed gestures, rearranged in various ways as we have seen in the analyses above:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(,) & \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad \_ \quad e \quad _\_ \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.46. Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 8

This pattern makes use of the basic “\_ e e T _” and “\_ e _ l _” gestures explored above, but adds an element of hemiola in its second half. One of the flaws of these reduced transcriptions is that, because counting strokes are meant to be audible, a group can be felt as beginning on a counting stroke, which in this transcription would look like a rest. In the hemiola below, for instance, it is important to remember that the gesture transcribed as “\_ \_ \_ e e _” is actually played “r l r e e t”:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(,) & \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad \_ \quad e \quad _\_ \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad \_ \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \quad e \quad \_ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.47. Hemiola in Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 8

Now, by splitting these longer 8- and 12-beat patterns into their 4-beat sub-patterns, as I have done with his wadon variants, we can determine which elements of his lanang patterns Pak Dewa shares with Pak Cok and which are his own personal variants.

In his full lanang pattern 1, Pak Dewa explores a sparser palette of variants than any of Pak Cok’s, the first one being more akin to those initial patterns I learned from Sudi than to Pak Cok’s particularly ramé variants:
The second half of this taught pattern is reminiscent of Pak Cok’s variant 1, both in terms of its central focus on the “_ e T _” gesture and in terms of the increased Tut (T) density in its final “e T e T _” gesture. However, it features a sparser alternate beginning:

Pak Dewa also makes use of Pak Cok’s variant 1 verbatim, however, for both the first and second half of his full pattern 2. This is the one fully symmetrical pattern that he taught me.

In the first half of his full pattern 3, Pak Dewa reworks his variant 2 from Figure 3.49 above. Here he takes the first two beats of the variant and repeats them, as opposed to maintaining the contrasting second half used in variant 2:

The second cycle of his full pattern 3 features his variant 1 above.

The first cycle of Pak Dewa’s full pattern 4 offers a reworking of his variant 3, keeping the second half but changing up the first half:
The second cycle in this pattern introduces a quite distinctive variant – like Pak Cok’s variants, very dense in both its peng (e) and Tut (T) make-up:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \]
\[(G) \quad \text{n pu n G} \]
\[(_) \text{e e e e l e e T} \]

**Figure 3.51.** Pak Dewa lanang variant 4

In both the first and second cycles of his full pattern 5, Pak Dewa plays what is essentially his variant 1 but with a single note substitution. By replacing the Tut (T) that anticipates the tawa-tawa stroke with a right-hand counting stroke, he creates a sparser overall pattern. Because of this distinct structural similarity, I label this 4-beat motif “variant 1a”:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \]
\[(G) \quad \text{n pu n G} \]
\[(_) \text{e e e e l e e T} \]

**Figure 3.53.** Pak Dewa lanang variant 1a

The final cycle in this pattern is a similar variant but with increased use of the “_ e e T _” gesture:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \]
\[(G) \quad \text{n pu n G} \]
\[(_) \text{e e T e e T e e T e T} \]

**Figure 3.54.** Pak Dewa lanang variant 6
When Pak Dewa plays his full pattern 5 with its alternate ending, he uses Pak Cok’s *lanang* variant 2. Originally shown in Figure 3.6, it is reproduced here for reference:

\[(4) - \circ - 1 - \circ - 2 - \circ - 3 - \circ - 4 \]
\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]
\[
(\_ e e T e T \_ e e T e T \_ e e T \_)
\]

**Figure 3.6.** Pak Cok *Lanang* Variant 2

In his Full Pattern 6, Pak Dewa again introduces a different kind of *lanang* groove, very faithfully underscoring the half-beat stream. The first two cycles he realizes as follows:

\[(4) - \circ - 1 - \circ - 2 - \circ - 3 - \circ - 4 \]
\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]
\[
(1) _ e _ 1 _ e _ 1 _ e _ 1 _ e T \_ 1
\]

**Figure 3.55.** Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 7

As mentioned above, the last cycle in this pattern introduces a denser reworking of this variant 7, which focuses on its more closely-packed final beat:

\[(4) - \circ - 1 - \circ - 2 - \circ - 3 - \circ - 4 \]
\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]
\[
(1) _ e T \_ 1 _ e T \_ 1 _ e T \_ 1 _ e T \_ 1
\]

**Figure 3.56.** Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 8

In his full pattern 7, Pak Dewa begins with a cycle of variant 1. Then he offers a new variant, a symmetrical pattern that focuses heavily on the “*e e T \_*” gesture and its close relative, “*e T \_*” (or “*e l T \_*”):

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}} \text{That this was the first small drum pattern taught to Michael Tenzer – who studied with Peliatan *arja* master Madé Lebah 29 years before my first *arja* lesson in 2007 – indicates that this is the dasar pattern of Lebah’s generation.}\]
The final cycle in this pattern – like its partner in his *wadon* full pattern 6 – offers textural variety through its rests, but still uses familiar elements in its make-up: the “_ e e T _” gesture to begin, and an ending that mirrors the strict alternation of strokes in Komin’s original *dasar*:

(Figure 3.57. Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 9)

Pak Dewa’s full pattern 8 begins with a cycle of his variant 1 before introducing a new, cross-rhythmic variant shown in Figure 3.59:

(Figure 3.58. Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 10)

Pak Dewa’s “dari dulu” pattern 1 gives us two new variants, not played by Pak Cok. The first, like his variant 6, heavily features the “_ e e T _” gesture. I, thus, call it variant 6a:

(Figure 3.59. Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 11)

The second cycle in this taught pattern is almost identical to Pak Dewa’s variant 2. Therefore, I have labeled it variant 2a:
The particular cross-rhythmic “e e e T”/“e e T e e T” feature that that unites Pak Cok’s variants 3 and 4 does not appear at all in Pak Dewa’s taught patterns. Pak Cok’s lanang variant 5, however, turns up in the first half of Pak Dewa’s “dari dulu” pattern 2. Shown first in Figure 3.13, it is reproduced here for reference:

Figure 3.13. Pak Cok lanang variant 5

The second half of this “dari dulu” pattern is almost identical to Pak Cok’s variant 1. I thus label it Pak Cok variant 1a (Dewa):

Thus, while Pak Dewa does use some of Pak Cok’s variants, and certainly his patterns make extensive use of the now-familiar lanang pattern elements, in terms of their arrangement and details, many of his taught variants are different.
3.2.3 Pak Tama’s Singapadu Patterns

As previously mentioned, Pak Tama of Singapadu was always more concerned that he imparted to me a holistic understanding of the kendang’s role in arja than that I gathered a large collection of specific patterns from him. As such, I had just two tabuh dua patterns under my belt when he began teaching me about song and dramatic structure. And, while his focus sometimes felt counter to that of my research – which was about collecting as many kendang arja variations as I could (or so I thought, at the time) – in many ways he was my most valuable teacher.

3.2.3.1 Tabuh Dua

As mentioned in Chapter 2, at the beginning of most pieces and when re-entering the texture after each angsel, Pak Tama will always play the following pattern which I have named his “intro” pattern or variant 0:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]
\[(_)_ e e _ _ e _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ \]

*Figure 3.63. Pak Tama lanang variant 0 (“intro”)*

This pattern, as previously stated, is identical to Pak Cok’s lanang variant 0 in its peng (e) use, but replaces Pak Cok’s Tut (T) strokes with the less ramé right-hand counting strokes.

When cueing ngeseh (volume increases), Pak Tama will play a related pattern which I have labeled variant 0a (ngeseh), because it is very similar to his intro variant, but delays the double peng (e) stroke by a half-beat:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]
\[(_)_ e e _ _ e _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ \]

*Figure 3.64. Pak Tama lanang variant 0a (“ngeseh”)*
Each of the other patterns that Pak Tama taught to me for use in *tabuh dua* was eight beats in length. Because of this, like with Pak Dewa’s patterns, I initially conceived of them as being single, indivisible units of music, and they are often played as such. However, because an *angsel* can be placed at the end of any gong cycle, one may occasionally by necessity only play the first half of one of these patterns before inserting an *angsel*. Thus, it will also become useful in later analyses to think of Pak Tama’s longer patterns as being composed of two shorter 4-beat sub-patterns. The fact that the second half of pattern 1 is identical to the first half of pattern 2 also lends weight to this interpretation. His full pattern 1 is as follows:

\[
(4) \quad \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad G_n \quad pu \quad G \quad G_n \quad pu \quad G
\]

\[
(\_) \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T
\]

**Figure 3.65.** Pak Tama *tabuh dua* lanang full pattern 1

Pak Tama once informed me that I should generally play his full pattern 1 at least once or twice before moving onto his denser second pattern: \(^{12}\)

\[
(4) \quad \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad G_n \quad pu \quad G \quad G_n \quad pu \quad G
\]

\[
(\_) \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad e \quad T
\]

**Figure 3.66.** Pak Tama *tabuh dua* lanang full pattern 2

In reality, of course, his improvised playing does not always reflect his verbal instructions quite so faithfully.

In terms of the different variants at play in these two patterns, we see in the first cycle of Pattern 1 an almost perfect carbon copy of Pak Dewa’s variant 1, with one single note replacement – Pak Tama uses a left-hand rim stroke (as opposed to counting stroke) in the

---

\(^{12}\) Lesson, June 2011.
quarter-beat position directly anticipating the beat-3 *klenang* stroke. I therefore call this pattern Pak Dewa variant 1b (Tama)

![Figure 3.67](image)

Figure 3.67. Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama) (top) compared to Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1 (bottom)

The second cycle of Tama’s pattern 1 introduces a new variant with a hemiola or 3+3+2 cross-rhythmic feel similar to Pak Cok’s variant 2:

![Figure 3.68](image)

Figure 3.68. Cross-rhythm in Pak Tama *lanang* variant 1

Or we can imagine this variant as simply another reworking of the familiar “_ e e T _” and “e e T e T _” gestures.

Pak Tama’s Full Pattern 2 begins with this same variant. Its second cycle is another new variant, denser in its main-stroke use:

![Figure 3.69](image)

Figure 3.69. Pak Tama *lanang* variant 2

Analysis shows that this variant begins like Pak Dewa’s *lanang* variant 4, but rearranges elements in the latter half to create its own distinctive ending.
We can also see this pattern as an intensification of Pak Tama’s variant 1, maintaining most of its rhythmic elements, but replacing some counting strokes with main strokes in the corresponding hand as follows:

Both kinesthetically and aurally, however, this seemingly small change creates a quite different experience because of its denseness; suddenly we have a pattern with almost full main stroke saturation.

In terms of individual variations in tabuh dua, Pak Tama and I focused exclusively on lanang. Analyses in Chapter 4, however, will also show deep similarities between his and Pak Dewa’s wadon playing. As expected, though, these analyses will also reveal wadon variants diverging from Pak Dewa’s own, as do Tama’s lanang patterns.

Unlike my other teachers, Pak Tama was careful to teach me patterns in relation to specific gong structures. His tabuh telu patterns (examined in Section 3.2.3.2 below) are not the same as his tabuh dua patterns. For the batel and batel marah structures, however, Pak
Tama claims that there are no distinct patterns in the Singapadu style. Instead, *tabuh dua* patterns can be imported wholesale into both *batel* structures, though sometimes in *batel marah* (and particularly in its use for the Penasar characters, the male clown figures) Pak Tama will replace all *kom* (o) and *peng* (e) strokes with *Kap* (K) and *Pak* (P) to create a more *keras* feeling or *rasa*. Further, any *kom* (o) and *peng* (e) strokes will usually be played with the fingers lower on the drumhead to create a slightly lower timbre and heavier sound in these faster, more *keras* cyclic structures.\(^{13}\)

### 3.2.3.2 Tabuh Telu

While there is some crossover between Pak Tama’s *tabuh dua* and *tabuh telu* patterns, many of the latter are sparser in their use of *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T). It is also important to note that Pak Tama’s *tabuh telu* playing is far more fixed than his playing for other cyclic structures. For this gong structure Tama taught me four distinct patterns to be cycled always in exactly the same order, with no variation in the placement of their *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T) strokes. This is true not only in his teaching, but in both his and Pak Buda’s improvised playing as well. In addition, while an *angsel* can be placed at the end of any of these cycles, Tama will always begin again with the intro pattern followed by pattern 1. However, though an *angsel* can occur at the end of pattern 3 (remember these are purely dancer-controlled cues), Tama considers patterns 3 and 4 to be a single unit. When he began teaching these new patterns he told me: “Pattern 3 is together with pattern 4. One.”\(^{14}\) Both this and the relative sparseness of his *tabuh telu* patterns (mentioned above) will become relevant when we discuss *ngegongin* in Section 3.3.3.

---

\(^{13}\) Various lessons, performances, and discussions, May-August 2011.

The four *tabuh telu lanang* patterns that I learned from Pak Tama, with his same four-beat intro pattern, are shown in Figure 3.72 below:

![Figure 3.72. Pak Tama full *tabuh telu lanang*: intro and patterns 1 through 4](image)

Initial analysis shows that pattern 4 is virtually identical to Pak Tama’s *tabuh dua* full pattern 2, with the exception of one left-hand counting stroke that becomes a left-hand rim stroke instead (shown in Figure 3.73). That Pak Tama often varied this stroke in his playing for both these patterns tells me that the two are absolutely interchangeable:
What we commonly see in Pak Tama’s other tabuh telu patterns is the use of variants quite similar to those already examined, but with main Tut (T) strokes often replaced by right-thumb counting strokes (t), making the patterns kinesthetically identical but sonically sparser. For instance, the first four beats in his tabuh telu pattern 1 are the same as the first cycle in his tabuh dua pattern 1, what I have labeled Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama). Kinesthetically the only difference between these two patterns, as shown in Figure 3.75, is the volume of his thumb strokes. Sonically, however, it creates a quite different and sparser pattern that I have labeled Pak Tama lanang variant 3:
Figure 3.75. Pak Tama takes Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama) (top), turns full Tut (T) strokes into right-thumb counting strokes (middle) to get his lanang variant 3.

The second half of his full tabuh telu pattern 1 is very similar, kinesthetically, to Pak Dewa’s variant 4, again with sparser use of the full Tut (T) stroke. Pak Tama replaces all but the last two Tut (T) with a right-hand counting-stroke (marked here as *):

Figure 3.76. Transformation from Pak Dewa lanang variant 4 (top) to the second half of Pak Tama’s tabuh telu pattern 1 (bottom).

In his improvisations for the faster, shorter gong structures, Pak Tama will often play this pattern with all Tut (T) strokes sounding loudly, and I label this pattern his “variant 5”:

Figure 3.77. Pak Tama lanang variant 5.
In terms of compositional logic and limitations for interlocking, these two patterns could be said to be interchangeable. However, this distinction of sounded vs. unsounded Tut (T) strokes – main vs. counting strokes – creates a very different auditory experience. As we shall see in Chapter 4, in both Pak Tama’s more fixed and Pak Dewa’s and Cok’s more improvised tabuh telu patterns we see a greater use of sparseness than in other gong structures. This is true especially when compared with the quite ramé patterns that Pak Cok uses in his batel structures. Thus, we may surmise that the sparser feel created by replacing Tut (T) strokes with right-thumb counting strokes is a vital aspect of proper tabuh telu performance. Sparseness creates the appropriate rasa for the more serious, dialogue-heavy, or sad moments of the drama associated with tabuh telu.

Pak Tama’s tabuh telu full pattern 3 ends with a new variation on the familiar “e e T”, “e T e T _” and “_ e _ e _” gestures, as shown in Figure 3.78 below:

![Figure 3.78](image1)

And, in the second half of his pattern 2, we see another example of a 3+3+2 cross-rhythm ending with the “e e T _” gesture:

![Figure 3.79](image2)
Though sparser, this pattern is quite similar to Pak Dewa’s variant 5. As we can see in Figure 3.80 below, each features the “e e t T” gesture in cross-rhythm, and each ends with one of the stock-standard lanang gestures. Pak Dewa uses the more ramé “e e T e T _” while Pak Tama uses the sparser “_ e e T _”:

![Figure 3.80](image)

Figure 3.80. Pak Tama lanang variant 6 (top) compared to Pak Dewa lanang variant 5 (bottom)

While Pak Tama did not wish to take the time to teach me his wadon patterns for tabuh telu before I had a firm understanding of the lanang parts and of the drama as a whole, I did once manage to record him playing through them in a lesson. On that particular day, he played his four tabuh telu wadon patterns with a four-beat introduction as follows:

```
Pak Tama Tabuh Telu Wadon Intro
(8) - e - 1 - e - 2 - e - 3 - e - 4 - e - 5 - e - 6 - e - 7 - e - 8
    (G)         n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
                 o  o  o  o  o  o  d  D  _  _  _
```

```
Pak Tama Tabuh Telu Wadon Pattern 1
(8) - e - 1 - e - 2 - e - 3 - e - 4 - e - 5 - e - 6 - e - 7 - e - 8
    (G)         n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
                 (_)_ _ o  _  l  _  l  _  o  _  l  _  o  _  o  _  o  _  d  D  _  _
```

```
Pak Tama Tabuh Telu Wadon Pattern 2
(8) - e - 1 - e - 2 - e - 3 - e - 4 - e - 5 - e - 6 - e - 7 - e - 8
    (G)         n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
                 (_)_ _ o  _  l  _  l  _  o  _  l  _  o  o  D  _  l  _  o  o  D  _  d  D  _  _  o  _
```

(cont’d…)
Here, as expected, we see some similarities to Pak Dewa’s wadon patterns. For instance, the intro phrase, which I have labeled “Pak Tama wadon 0 (intro),” is similar to Pak Dewa’s dasar 1 with two small changes. First, placement of the double kom (o) stroke has been delayed by half a beat (but, importantly, without then altering the placement of the final Dag (D) on beat 3). Second, one left-hand counting stroke has been replaced with a left-hand rim-stroke (not surprising since this pattern was designed to interlock with the rim-stroke-heavy lanang intro phrase):

However, many of the elements in these and other sub-patterns are purely Tama’s. For instance, the sparseness of his Dag (D) strokes in patterns 1 through 3 – meant to be cocok with the Tut (T) scarcity in his corresponding lanang patterns – is something never entertained by Pak Dewa in taught patterns, where each four-beat variant contains at least one Dag (D) stroke.
We see the first half of pattern 1 – an example of a Dag-free variant – repeated again in both patterns 2 and 3, with only some slight variance in main-stroke vs. counting-stroke use in the left hand, as shown in Figure 3.83 below:

![Figure 3.83](image)

Figure 3.83. Pak Tama wadon variant 1 (top) compared to his wadon variant 1a (bottom)

While the second halves of his patterns show some similar motif use to Pak Dewa’s, their construction is quite different. For instance, the second half of his pattern 1 seems thematically similar to Pak Dewa’s dasar patterns in its genap alternation of counting and main strokes in the left hand and its single “o d D” gesture preceding gong. Tama’s placement of the “o d D” gesture, though, is closer to gong than in either of Pak Dewa’s dasar variants:

![Figure 3.84](image)

Figure 3.84. Varied placement of the “o d D” gesture in Pak Dewa wadon dasar (top) Pak Dewa wadon dasar with Dag (D) delay (middle) and Pak Tama wadon variant 2
The second half of Tama’s tabuh telu pattern 2 also balances familiar with unfamiliar wadon elements. In its final two beats, it displays a likeness to Pak Dewa’s wadon variant 5. The first half of the pattern, however, particularly in its placement of Dag (D) in the quarter-beat preceding the guntang stroke (mat), differs from all of Pak Dewa’s taught patterns:

![Diagram of pattern 2](image)

**Figure 3.85.** Pak Tama wadon variant 3 (top) compared to Pak Dewa wadon variant 5 (bottom)

The second half of Tama’s tabuh telu pattern 3 also contains several elements never played as such by Pak Dewa. First of all, in Pak Dewa’s playing the “_ o o d D” motif is generally placed in the third beat of a 4-beat variant, not in the first beat as it is in this variant of Tama’s. The dasar “_ o _ o _ o _” ending here mirrors the ending in Pak Dewa’s wadon end variant, but the central portion of the pattern features Dag (D) strokes in positions and combinations quite different from those in Pak Dewa’s patterns:

![Diagram of pattern 3](image)

**Figure 3.86.** Pak Tama wadon variant 4

---

15 We may explain its existence here in Pak Tama’s pattern in a number of different ways. With its Dag (D) stroke coinciding with the guntang, this motif may serve exactly the same function as the o-D-o-D gesture that opens Pak Dewa’s wadon variant 5. Or it may be that this r-o-o-D motif generally falls after the tawa-tawa stroke – whether that lands on the 3rd beat of a 4-beat gesture, as it does in tabuh dua, or on the first beat of a 4-beat gesture, as it does in the second half of the 8-beat tabuh telu gong structure.
Tama’s *tabuh telu* pattern 4 gives us two new variants, shown in Figures 3.87 and 3.88 below. The first four beats (Pak Tama *wadon* variant 5), like in his variant 2, feature a *dasar* alternation of *genap* left-hand rim and counting strokes culminating in a “o o d D” gesture that lands on last half-beat. Its first beat, however, is much denser than in variant 2:

```
(8)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(G) t n t pu
(●) o o d D _ _ o _ _ o d D _ _
```

Figure 3.87. Pak Tama *wadon* variant 5 (top) compared to his *wadon* variant 2 (bottom)

The second half of this pattern, which I have labeled Tama’s variant 6, closely resembles Pak Dewa’s variant 1, particularly in its *Dag* (D) placement. Differences between the two variants are marked in blue in Figure 3.88 below:

```
(4)-●-5-●-6-●-7-●-8
pu t n t G
_ l _ o _ l _ _ _ o _ o d D _ _
```

```
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(o) D _ _ o o D _ _ o o d D _ _
```

Figure 3.88. Pak Tama *wadon* variant 6 (top) compared to Pak Dewa’s *wadon* variant 1 (bottom)

3.2.4 Pak Tut’s Apuan Patterns

Studying with Pak Tut in Apuan was a very different experience. Unlike these other three masters, Pak Tut had never before taught a *bulé* – or really anyone, for that matter. In fact, when I went searching for a teacher in Bangli regency it was not Pak Tut I had in mind. I had
been advised to seek out the Bangli-style arja master Pak Patrem in the village of Apuan. Unfortunately, when I got to Apuan in June of 2011 some friendly laborers on the road told me that Patrem had recently passed away. They advised me to seek out his son, I Wayan Wardana, and it was through Wardana that I met Pak Tut, his father’s most promising anak buah (disciple). Pak Tut was passionate about kendang arja and unbelievably excited at the chance to teach a bulé (Westerner) so interested in the style of his revered teacher Pak Patrem, but he had never taught kendang before. Thus, unlike my other teachers, he had never given any thought to methods of transmission and had no arsenal of patterns ready to be taught. He was simply a tukang kendang (drum player) with a deep love of the genre.

3.2.4.1 Dasar

In my first lesson with Pak Tut he taught me his Apuan-style dasar (basic pattern). Like Komin’s, it was a strict alternation of kom (o) and peng (e) as follows:

(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G
(e) o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e

Figure 3.89. Pak Tut dasar (basic) 1, composite

Pak Tut had quite a different playing technique from that of my other teachers, insisting that I use my ring and middle as opposed to ring and pinky fingers for left-hand rim-strokes, and that these strokes should be played not until the hand is parallel with the drum head but until it is bent well past parallel. This brand new playing style (which I found to be incredibly difficult after years of perfecting a different art of playing) ensured that it would take several lessons before he was satisfied enough with my technique to incorporate Dag (D) and Tut (T) into our playing.
Once I had mastered the basic pattern to his satisfaction – in fact quite a difficult feat at high speeds because of its absolute regularity – Pak Tut added certain variations. First of all, he created shape to the line, bringing out the inherent directedness of the cycle toward the gong stroke by incorporating Dag (D) and Tut in the three quarter-beats preceding it:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(G) & n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(e) & o \quad e \quad o \quad o \quad e \quad o \quad e \quad o \quad e \quad o \quad e \quad o \quad e \quad o \quad e \quad o \quad e \quad T \quad D \quad T \quad e
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.90.** Pak Tut dasar 2 (with Dag-Tut anticipation of gong), composite

Next, any of the wadon’s kom (o) strokes could be replaced with a left-hand counting stroke. Pak Tut never wanted to single out and teach one of these patterns. I suspect this was because he didn’t consider any one version to be more “Apuan style” than any other, calling them all “sama” (the same), but I noticed that he often played wadon patterns similar to this:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(G) & n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(\_\_) & o \quad o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad o \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad l \quad l
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.91.** Pak Tut dasar 2, wadon variation

Here we can definitely see a connection to Pak Tama’s sparser tabuh telu wadon patterns where left and right hand strokes – be they rim or counting strokes – often happen in strict alternation:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(G) & n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(\_\_) & o \quad o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad _\_ \_ \_ o \quad o \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad l \quad l
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.92.** Strict alternation of right- and left-hand strokes in Pak Tama tabuh telu wadon pattern 1 (top) and Pak Tut dasar 2 wadon variation (bottom)
This was the only kind of left-hand variation on the dasar that Pak Tut ever taught or ever played on the wadon: turning a rim-stroke into a counting-stroke. The lanang, by contrast, seemed to be given slightly more freedom in its variations. In his playing Pak Tut would often mix the single peng (e) strokes and counting strokes of his dasar with some double peng strokes. He told me that on lanang I could “play anything,”\textsuperscript{16} again seeming hesitant to teach me a single pattern exemplifying this generalization. I experimented with blending these various strokes, disappointing him again and again with my choices (“you can play anything” never really does mean that, I’ve noticed). After many failed attempts at improvisation on my part, Pak Tut finally gave in and showed me the following lanang pattern:

(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8

\[(G)\] n t n pu n t n G
\[(_)e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e\_e T T\]

\textbf{Figure 3.93.} Pak Tut dasar 2, lanang variation

Only when I could play these simple variations on the dasar to his satisfaction did Pak Tut (and his co-teacher, Wardana) decide I was “ready” to learn the true, complete Apuan style.

\textbf{3.2.4.2 The Four Apuan Cycles}

When Pak Tut plays kendang arja – not the dasar, but the “real thing” – he works with a palette of four distinct patterns. For reasons that will become clearer in Chapter 5, these patterns show marked similarities to Pak Tama’s four tabuh telu patterns, though because I learned Tama’s patterns as independent lanang patterns at first, I was not immediately cognizant of this connection. Like Pak Tama, Pak Tut always appears to cycle his four patterns

\textsuperscript{16}“Bisa main apa-apa,” literally “you can play everything.” Wardana and Pak Tut, Lesson July 2011.
in exactly the same order without exception. And, again like Tama, though he can play an
angsel at the end of any one of these four patterns, he will always begin again from pattern 1.
Pak Tut began teaching me these patterns by first vocalizing only the Dag (D) and Tut (T)
strokes in relation to gong, as follows (CD Track 10):

![Figure 3.94. Dag-Tut placement in Pak Tut’s four patterns](image-url)

He then told me to fill in the spaces with peng (e) while he did the same on his wadon with kom
(o). When I asked for more specific examples or guidelines on how to do so, Pak Tut instructed
me to practice the patterns first using the strict alternation of the dasar, adding that I could also
insert slap strokes (K and P) as anticipations to the Dag-Tut entrances in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th
cycles, as follows:
Pak Tut Pattern 1

(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

(e) o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e T D T e

Pak Tut Pattern 2

(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

(e) o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e K P D T _ _ _ _ D T _ D _ _ _ e

Pak Tut Pattern 3

(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

(e) o e o e o e o e o e o e o e o e K P d D _ _ D _ D _ _ _ T _ T _

Pak Tut Pattern 4

(8) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8

(G) n t n pu n t n G

(_K P T D _ _ _ _ _ _ T _ D _ T _ D T D T _ d D _ T _ d D _ _ _ T _

Figure 3.95. Pak Tut’s 4 patterns with basic alternating kom-peng filler

And, when I could play these patterns as shown in Figure 3.95 above, Pak Tut then claimed that both lanang and wadon could use the sort of kom-peng variance exhibited in Figures 3.91 and 3.93. He told me to use my lanang dasar 2 variation as opposed to the strict kom-peng alternation he had initially taught me, though he hoped that eventually I would understand how to improvise in a more varied fashion. And he varied his wadon patterns by freely and diversely replacing any left-hand rim-stroke with a left-hand counting stroke, as in his wadon dasar 2 variation above. Pak Tut also informed me that I could (and should) fill in the additional rests in the above patterns with interlocking kom-peng strokes, and that I was free (bebas) in how I chose to do so. As usual the definition of “free” seemed contingent on a better understanding of the Apuan style than I currently had.
I often felt frustrated when studying with Pak Tut for these reasons. Unlike all my other teachers, why was it that he had no sense of fixed peng (e) use, or at least of a fixed kom-peng relationship in his four patterns, instead teaching the patterns as Dag-Tut interactions with relatively free kom-peng filler? This seemed strange to me when Pak Tama had taught his very similar pukulan tabuh telu as full patterns with specific kom (o) and peng (e) placement. Was the new Singapadu style really so much more fixed than the Apuan style? As I got to know these two drummers better as people, however, I came to realize that while this relative pattern rigor in Pak Tama’s teaching may have been caused by a stricter pre-composition in the Singapadu style, it was much more likely a product of his experience teaching bulé drummers to play kendang arja. Pak Tut, having never before taught an outsider to play Apuan-style arja, would have been unprepared for the level of spoon-feeding I needed to understand the tradition. Pak Tama, by contrast, has many Western kendang students and worked closely with Madé Hood for his MA thesis on kendang arja. Thus, he would have understood that, without the tradition already internalized, I needed more specific instructions.

From these initial analyses we can see that while each of my teachers taught me a different palette of patterns, there are distinct connections between them. It is my hypothesis that these connections were caused by a common ancestry of indigenous rules for pattern creation.

3.3 How Patterns Conform to Arja “Rules”

With some knowledge of each drummer’s taught patterns, and some sense that though certainly related they are all somewhat different and quite varied, I return to the original research question. Each of these master drummers interlocks with his partner in a way that implies some fixity in their rhythmic interactions. Different though all of Pak Dewa’s patterns
may be, he can combine each of them with any of Pak Cok’s equally distinctive patterns, and both will feel satisfied with the level of interlocking that these many combinations produce. With the exception of the semi-precomposed patterns from Pak Tut and Pak Tama, the same can be said for each of my other teachers and their many variants. We also know that each teacher, to a greater or lesser degree, shows an understanding of at least some of the Balinese theories on arja outlined in Chapter 2. Thus, the question becomes how each drummer interprets these and other rules to create his palette of patterns. How do the rules limit what each can play; and how has each drumming pair stretched these rules, extrapolated sub-clauses to them, or created their own new ones (consciously or not) in order to interlock satisfyingly together. In other words, by examining both the similarities and the differences between each style, can we shed light on the Balinese music theory of arja… and vice versa?

### 3.3.1 The Ganjil/Genap Dichotomy Unraveled

Emboldened by Komin’s revelation about the most basic (dasar) kendang arja pattern, I began looking for the ganjil/genap dichotomy in my teachers’ playing with the following hypothesis: regardless of my Western baggage with the terms, when Balinese drummers talk about “on-beat” and “off-beat” they are referring specifically to the placement of their high left-hand rim-strokes. This means that the lanang’s peng (e) strokes generally align with the half-beat stream while the wadon’s kom (o) strokes most commonly occupy the quarter-beats that fall between the half-beats. Yet, though Komin’s theoretical basic composite does occur (as we have seen in Pak Tut’s teaching) in reality no experienced drummer would play a pattern this simple or repetitive for long. And analysis shows that there are several different ways that a drummer can vary this simple pattern without “breaking” the ganjil/genap rule.
As we learned in Chapter 1, in places where an *arja* drummer is not playing one of his main strokes he will tap lightly on one of the two drum heads, kinesthetically maintaining a steady quarter-beat pulse at all times. So, in Komin and Pak Tut’s *dasar*, where each drummer appears to rest he is in fact filling in the spaces with a soft counting stroke (*anak pukulan*) in the right hand. In Figure 3.96 we see the *wadon dasar* both with and without counting strokes:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n  pu  n  G
(r) o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o

Figure 3.96. *Wadon dasar* (basic) in the *ganjil/genap* dichotomy with counting strokes (top) and without (bottom)

Figure 3.97 shows the *lanang dasar*, both with and without counting strokes:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n  pu  n  G
(e) r  r  r  r  r  r  r  r  r  r  r  r  r

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n  pu  n  G
(e) _ e  _ e  _ e  _ e  _ e  _ e  _ e  _ e

Figure 3.97. *Lanang dasar* (basic) in the *ganjil/genap* dichotomy with counting strokes (top) and without (bottom)

We see this basic pattern in its pure form in Pak Tut’s *dasar*, of course, but many other drummers use it in a slightly altered form as well. For instance, in his intro *lanang* variant 0 (shown in Figure 3.63 but reproduced here for reference), Pak Tama alters the *dasar* by beginning with a sparser counting-stroke gesture before falling into this straight “e r e r e” alternation. It is quite common, in both improvised and pre-composed Balinese music, for a
moment of sparseness to come with or just after the *gong* stroke as a way to emphasize that important metrical moment in the texture. *Reyong* (interlocking gong-chime) players improving in a style called *norot*, for instance, will often rest on the *gong*, then articulating the gong tone one quarter-beat late (Tilley 2003: 55-57). Similarly, after a loud passage in *gong kebyar* music like an *angsel*, elaborating *gangsa* players will often come back into the texture not directly on *gong* but one or more *mat* strokes later. Thus, this shaping of the *dasar* through a sparser first quadrant is entirely idiomatic of Balinese compositional and improvisational practices. Finally, the *Tut* (T) at the end of the pattern (a quarter-beat before the *gong* stroke) anticipates the arrival of *gong*. This and other *Tut* (T) stroke use in the following patterns will be discussed in sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 below.

\[
(4) - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2 - \_ - 3 - \_ - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
(_) \_ \_ \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e T \_
\]

**Figure 3.63.** Pak Tama *lanang* variant 0 (“intro”)

A denser variant on this pattern is Pak Cok’s *lanang* variant 0 (reproduced below from Figure 3.4), which replaces most of Tama’s right-hand counting strokes with *Tut* (T) strokes. That *Tut* (T) strokes in small drum genres are often accentuated by the *wadon*’s *kom* (o) strokes (just as the *lanang* player will often accompany the *wadon*’s *Dag* (D) with a *peng* (e) stroke) will help to explain the compositional logic behind this variant:

\[
(4) - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2 - \_ - 3 - \_ - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
(_) \_ \_ \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e \_ e T \_
\]

**Figure 3.4.** Pak Cok *Lanang* Variant 0 (“intro”)

---

17 Conversations and rehearsals with Sudi, 2005-2012.
Here we can also see the basis for the “e T e T _” motif that is featured in so many lanang patterns. A drummer may not wish to play this repetitive intro pattern for long, but can still maintain its essence in other more wayah (complex) variants.

The next simplest way to vary the basic pattern above is to replace one of the main left-hand rim-strokes with a left-hand counting stroke. This may be done through strict alternation, replacing every other stroke as in Pak Dewa’s full lanang pattern 6:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) &\text{ n pu n G n pu n G}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) &- e_1 e_1 e_1 e_1 e_T l_1 e_1 e_1 e_1 e_T l_1 \\
&\ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast \ast
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) &\text{ n pu n G}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) &- e_T l_1 e_T l_1 e_T l_1 e_T l_1 \\
&\ast \ast \ast \ast \ast
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.98.** Pak Dewa lanang full pattern 6 strictly alternates between main and counting strokes in left-hand ganjil placement

Wadon patterns, too, may alternate main strokes with counting strokes in this symmetrical way, as in the following variant often played (though never taught) by Pak Dewa:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) &\text{ n pu n G}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) &- _l_ o_ l_ o_ l_ o_ l_ o_ l_ o_ l_ o_ l_ o
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.99.** Wadon variation with strict alternation between main and counting strokes in left-hand genap placement

However, not all patterns of this type use strict alternation of main and counting strokes, as we saw in Pak Tut’s wadon dasar variation:
Figure 3.100. Pak Tut *wadon dasar* variation does not strictly alternate between main and counting strokes in left-hand *genap* placement.

In the first four beats of this pattern, we see another example of a 3+3+2 cross-rhythm:

Figure 3.101. Cross-rhythm in Pak Tut *wadon dasar* variation, left-hand strokes.

Pak Tama, too, blends rim- and counting-strokes in the left hand without strict alternation for his *tabuh telu* pattern 1:

Figure 3.102. Pak Tama *tabuh telu wadon* pattern 1 does not strictly alternate between main and counting strokes in left-hand *genap* placement.

Again, this pattern presents a cross-rhythm in the grouping structure of its first four beats, this time organized as 2+3+3:

Figure 3.103. Cross-rhythm in Pak Tama *tabuh telu wadon* pattern 1, left-hand strokes.
Each of these \textit{wadon} variants then creates its own unique composite with the basic \textit{lanang}, shown in Figure 3.104:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad G \\
(e) & \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \\
\end{align*}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{align*}
(8) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(e) & \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e \_ o \_ e
\end{align*}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Figure 3.104.} Composites with basic \textit{lanang} for \textit{wadon} patterns from Figure 3.101 (top), 3.102 (middle) and 3.103 (bottom)

Remembering that the \textit{lanang} player, too, can replace any of his \textit{peng} (e) strokes with a counting stroke, and, not even taking into account the different types of counting strokes at play (r, l, t, and d), we get a total of 65,536 (or $2^{16}$) different possible variants on this seemingly simple 4-beat phrase ($4,294,967,296 = 2^{32}$ when we extend the phrase to eight beats in length!) And, while individual drummers generally stick to just a handful of favorites, each of these many thousands of possibilities can be, and most probably has been played by an \textit{arja} master somewhere at some point.

Even in patterns with a heavier use of \textit{Dag} (D) and \textit{Tut} (T), drummers still seem to follow the \textit{ganjil/genap} guiding principle in their left-hand \textit{kom} (o) and \textit{peng} (e) strokes, as can be seen in the examples in Figure 3.105 below. In these more complex patterns, we will also see instances where \textit{kom} (o) or \textit{peng} (e) occur on two successive quarter-beats, what I have called double \textit{kom} (o) and double \textit{peng} (e) strokes (discussed in section 3.3.1.1). For now I will focus solely on single \textit{kom} (o) and \textit{peng} (e) use as it plays out the \textit{ganjil/genap} dichotomy.
In each of these patterns we again see *ganjil/genap* rim-stroke use with single *peng* (e) strokes generally articulating the half-beat-stream and single *kom* (o) generally falling in the in-between quarter-beat positions.

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G \\
(_e)_ _ e \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \\
* \ * \ * \ * \ * \\
\]

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G \\
(_e)_ e \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \ e \ T \\
* \ * \ * \ * \\
\]

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G \\
(_o)_ o \ o \ o \ o \ o \ o \ o \ D \ _ \ _ \ _ \ _ \\
* \ * \ * \\
\]

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) \ \ n \ \ pu \ \ n \ \ G \\
(_D)_ o \ d \ D \ _ \ _ \ _ \ _ \ _ \ _ \ o \ o \ D \ _ \ _ \ _ \ _ \\
* \ * \ * \ * \\
\]

**Figure 3.105.** “Rule-abiding” *ganjil/genap* rim-stroke use in Pak Cok *lanang* variant 0 (top), Pak Cok *lanang* variant 4 (2nd), Pak Tama *wadon* variant 0 (3rd) and Pak Dewa *wadon* full pattern 6 (bottom)

Unfortunately for my neat, easy categories, however, players don’t always strictly abide by the *ganjil/genap* principle. This is true even in taught patterns, as we can see from the last *wadon* example in Figure 3.105 above. Here, in two instances, Pak Dewa’s *kom* (o) lands in a *ganjil* position (marked with a red star):
While some of these rogue rim-strokes can only be explained away when we consider the apparent flexibility of kom-peng interlocking relative to the interconnections of Dag and Tut (discussed in section 3.3.2 below), for others perhaps a different explanation is possible.

One of the most consistent examples of this kind of ganjil/genap “rule-breaking” occurs in the first lanang pattern taught to me by Pak Tama, his tabuh dua full pattern 1:

In this 8-beat pattern there are two “off-beat” peng (e) strokes following the first tawa-tawa hit. When I played this pattern for Pak Cok in Peliatan, he chuckled knowingly and told me that it was a bad pattern because it mixed “on-beat” and “off-beat.” Using this pattern, he warned, would ensure that my wadon partner could never be completely bebas (free), or, if he were, we would have many tabrakan (unwanted collisions of like strokes). Yet Pak Cok’s own partner Pak Dewa taught me a similar lanang pattern, not one that he played himself, but one of his “pukulan dari dulu,” or klasik (classic) patterns. Here the genap lanang strokes come just after the central gong stroke:
And in his own improvisations, I was shocked to discover given his comments, Pak Cok uses some of the same variants! These genap lanang strokes, therefore, are clearly not just a product of personal variation on Pak Tama’s part, but rather appear to be fairly widespread. That Pak Tama and Pak Dewa both studied arja with Bandem’s father Kredek, while Pak Cok did not, leads me to believe that these may be elements of his original patterns. And looking at a typical tabuh dua wadon improvisation from Pak Tama we can see that it is constructed to avoid tabrakan by placing only counting strokes or the first of a double kom (o) (discussed below) in those positions where the lanang pattern breaks the ganjil/genap rule:

Figure 3.108. “Rule-breaking” genap rim-stroke placement in Pak Dewa lanang dari dulu full pattern 1

Why these genap lanang strokes are allowable, of course, and how the wadon player knows to avoid them is a different set of questions. Insight into this quandary may come if we remember that Pak Dewa, when discussing these old-school patterns, asserted that there were only a few possible versions and not much room for variation within them. If we assume Pak Tama to be playing in this older klasik style that Pak Dewa spoke of, we might equally assume that his allowance for variation is also narrower. And close examination of Pak Tama’s improvisations and those of his partner Pak Buda show that they are, in fact, far less varied than Pak Dewa’s or his partner or Pak Cok’s. Further, Tama’s genap lanang use in tabuh dua occurs
after the *tawa-tawa* about 70% of the time, before the *tawa-tawa* about 25% of the time, directly after *gong* only very rarely, and never directly before *gong*. Tama’s *wadon* partner and former student, Pak Buda will know Tama’s proclivities and limit his *wadon* variations accordingly. Thus, we may hypothesize that the more pre-composed a passage – the less allowance for free variation there is – the more that passage can appear to break the *ganjil/genap* rule without creating *tabrakan* (collisions).

There may, however, be a more satisfying answer to the question of allowable *genap* strokes in *lanang* improvisation and allowable *ganjil* ones in *wadon* improvisation. In order to find it, though, we must first discuss double strokes and *Dag-Tut* placement.

### 3.3.1.1 Double Strokes

*Ganjil/genap* variation becomes even more complicated, still, when we consider double rim stroke use. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Hood claims that the first in a double rim stroke is considered subordinate to the second; in fact he analyzes these as just another kind of counting stroke. I contend that this is a dangerous generalization. For one thing, both strokes in a double rim stroke are generally played to be both kinesthetically and sonically equal, and in some cases the first of two rim strokes should perhaps be analyzed as the stronger one. And certainly not all counting strokes can be considered equally subordinate to the main strokes. That said, looking at the patterns in this way can offer some useful insight into their construction.

---

18 That the first two *lanang* variants taught to me by Sudi were (r) l r l _ e e T _ and the reduced (r) l r l r e _ _ r leads me to believe that, in this case, Sudi hears the first *peng* (e) as the stronger one (or at least as equal to the second).

19 This is especially true in left-hand counting strokes played as part of a (r)-o-r-l-r-o-r-l-r or (l)-r-e-r-l-r-e-r-l gesture, for instance, where they are given weight as a counter-balance to the main rim strokes: (_)-o_-l_-o_-l_- and (l)-_e_-l_-e_-l
We know that Apuan village *arja* master Pak Tut often alters the contour of his *lanang* part by inserting some carefully placed double *peng* (e) strokes into his patterns. And analysis of his taught variation – a very typical illustration of his *lanang* playing – reveals that each single *peng* (e) and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of each double *peng* (e) still abides by the *ganjil* mandate, always aligning with the half-beat stream:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
(G) &n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G \\
(\_)&e \quad e \quad e \quad _ \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad _ \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad _ \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad T \quad _ \\
&* \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad * \quad *
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Figure 3.110.} *Genap* placement of single and double *peng* (e) strokes in Pak Tut dasar 2 *lanang* variation

When I listen back to recordings of the lessons in which I attempted to create my own Apuan-style *lanang* patterns – and Pak Tut immediately made me aware that I had failed – I find that I am sometimes playing single *peng* (e) strokes and often landing the second of a double *peng* (e) stroke in a *genap* position. Since this was the only kind of mistake I could have made, (given that there were no *Tut* (T) strokes in these patterns), we can conclude that in the Apuan style the *lanang ganjil* rule is extended to include the second of a double *peng* (e) stroke as well.

Pak Cok in Peliatan also uses double *peng* (e) strokes in his *lanang* playing, and, like Pak Tut’s, the second of these strokes almost invariably aligns itself with the half-beat stream. To complicate issues, however, his *wadon* partner Pak Dewa’s double *kom* (o) strokes also frequently land on the beat. Characteristic *wadon* patterns like his *wadon dasar* with *Dag* (D) delay seemingly break the *ganjil/genap* rule, as we can see in Figure 3.111:
Certainly this pattern is not an ideal match for Pak Tut’s pattern above; their double strokes would land together as opposed to interlocking:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) &\quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(o) &\quad _\_ o \quad 1 \quad o \quad o \quad _\_ o \quad d \quad D \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Figure 3.111.} Seemingly rule-breaking placement of double \textit{kom (o)} strokes in Pak Dewa \textit{wadon dasar} with \textit{Dag (D)} delay

Here the inherent flexibility of these Balinese categories of variation must be considered, as we see different village styles interpreting – and “breaking” – the general rules in their own idiomatic ways. In Pak Tut’s Apuan style, \textit{wadon} variations in fact never stray from their \textit{genap} placement. Pak Tut can freely fluctuate between main strokes and counting strokes in his left-hand, but, with the exception of parts in the cycle using \textit{Dag (D)} and \textit{Tut (T)}, he will never stray from his strict right-hand-left-hand alternation. There also appears to be no allowance for double \textit{kom (o)} strokes. Thus, an Apuan \textit{lanang} player is free to place his double \textit{peng (e)} strokes at any beat in the half-beat stream without worry of crashing into his partner. Pak Cok in Peliatan, by contrast, has a footnote next to his on-beat rule: my partner’s double \textit{kom (o)} strokes often land directly on a beat (the \textit{mat}), so I will place the majority of my double \textit{peng (e)} strokes on the half-beat positions between \textit{mat} strokes. We can see this inclination in his \textit{lanang} variant 1 – all double \textit{peng (e)} land on the half-beat that does not align with the \textit{mat}, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \ldots \\
(G) &\quad n \quad t \quad n \quad pu \ldots \\
(_\_ ) &\quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad e \quad \ldots \\
(o) &\quad _\_ o \quad 1 \quad o \quad o \quad _\_ o \quad d \quad D \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Figure 3.112.} Colliding double rim strokes between the patterns in Figure 3.110 and Figure 3.111
Figure 3.113. Pak Cok’s double *peng* (e) strokes generally land on the half-beat that does not align with the *mat*, as in his *lanang* variant 1

This use of our familiar “*e e T*” gesture leaves space for Pak Dewa to interlock with his *wadon dasar* with *Dag* (D) delay above, creating a composite of:

![Diagram](image1)

Figure 3.114. Double rim-stroke interlocking between Pak Cok *lanang* variant 1 and Pak Dewa *wadon dasar* with *Dag* (D) delay

And here we can see that something very interesting has happened to the *ganjil/genap* dichotomy in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing. While with single strokes at the quarter-beat level the *lanang* plays the odd or *ganjil* positions while the *wadon* plays the even or *genap* ones, when considering double rim strokes at the half-beat level there appears to be a reversal in those roles, as shown in Figure 3.115:

![Diagram](image2)

Figure 3.115. *Ganjil/Genap* role reversal from the single rim-stroke alternation at the quarter-beat level (top) to the double rim-stroke alternation at the half-beat level (bottom)
Here we can see that the wadon aligns the second of his double strokes with the mat – the ganjil or “on-beat” – while the lanang takes the in-between half-beats – the genap or “off-beat.”

Of course even within the larger confines of this somewhat conflicting sub-clause to the ganjil/genap rule, there will be patterns that break it. In Pak Dewa’s wadon dasar 1, for instance, the double kom (o) stroke landing with tawa-tawa is followed by a straight left-hand-right-hand alternation that leaves a single kom (o) stroke in a ganjil position:

```
(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4
(G)    n    pu    n    G
(_)    o    l    o    o    d    D    _    _    _
         *    *    *
```

**Figure 3.116.** “Rule-breaking” ganjil single kom (o) stroke following “rule-abiding” ganjil double kom (o) stroke

And his wadon variant 1, though it features two double kom (o) in their expected ganjil positions, also contains one in a genap position (marked with a red star):

```
(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4
(G)    n    pu    n    G
(o)    D    o    D    o    D    o    D    D    l    o    o
         *    *    *
```

**Figure 3.117.** “Rule-breaking” genap double kom (o) stroke in Pak Dewa wadon variant 1

That both these “rule-breaking” kom (o) strokes occur directly before a d-D gesture on the mat preceding gong (the “final Dag position”) implies that it may be useful to look at them as part of a larger metrically-oriented gesture leading to this more structurally important stroke. Thus, perhaps some of the minute “rule-breaking” instances need to be considered within their larger rhythmic contexts.

Of course, because this ambiguity in the ganjil/genap dichotomy – and Pak Dewa’s wadon style in general – allows him so much relative freedom, there are occasions in
performance when his double \textit{kom} (o) strokes collide with Pak Cok’s double \textit{peng} (e). This, in theory, is a huge musical faux-pas in an interlocking genre, but when I asked Pak Cok about it he laughed at me, exclaiming jovially: “This isn’t Baris, Leslie!” His meaning? \textit{Arja} is not the same as a pre-composed piece like the famous \textit{Baris} dance, meant to have perfectly interlocking drumming. What was important in \textit{arja} was that the overall impression was one of interlocking; especially at such high speeds, the details were sometimes incidental and small \textit{tabrakan} could be enjoyed. As Pak Bandem has said of younger \textit{arja} performers, when the playing becomes too \textit{kebyar} and too “perfect” it is less satisfying.\footnote{Interview, Aug 18, 2011.} Both these men’s opinions lend credence to the idea that interlocking in \textit{arja}, while often suited to analysis at the minute, note-to-note level, should also sometimes be considered from a slightly more holistic perspective.

### 3.3.2 The Relative Rigidity of \textit{Dag} (D) and \textit{Tut} (T) Placement

The idea that small details of interlocking could be glossed over, and some \textit{tabrakan} tolerated (even looked for) in \textit{kom-peng} interactions, seems resonant with most drummers’ opinions of what \textit{arja} is. Details became significantly more important, however, and \textit{tabrakan} far less common or seemingly acceptable, when I began looking at the main right-hand strokes: the \textit{wadon’s Dag} (D) and \textit{lanang’s Tut} (T). This greater attention to detail is hardly surprising – as mentioned in Chapter 2, \textit{Dag} (D) and \textit{Tut} (T) are universally understood to be more structurally significant than \textit{kom} (o) and \textit{peng} (e). It may be hypothesized, therefore, that more attention would be paid to their placement and their careful interlocking in improvised as well as pre-composed drumming, and this hypothesis is reinforced by Bandem’s comment that the playing of \textit{tukang kendang arja} from the young generation is forcibly more rigid – less \textit{bebas} –
because they use more Dag (D) and Tut (T) strokes.²¹ I wondered if my analyses would support this hypothesis as well.

Beginning with the lanang, we can see in Pak Cok’s variant 1 that Tut (T) strokes most commonly fall in the quarter-beat position directly preceding the mat, and that they never align with the mat:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
\[\begin{array}{ccc}
G \\ n & pu & n \\
(\_)& e & e T & e T & e T \_ & e T \_ \\
* & * & * & * & * & *
\end{array}\]

Figure 3.118. Quarter-beat Tut (T) placement in Pak Cok lanang variant 1

His variant 2 follows similar parameters, as do more cross-rhythmic patterns like his variant 4, both shown in figure 3.119 below:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
\[\begin{array}{ccc}
G \\ n & pu & n \\
(\_)& e & e T & e T & e T \_ & e T \_ \\
* & * & * & * & * & *
\end{array}\]

Figure 3.119. Quarter-beat Tut (T) placement in Pak Cok lanang variants 2 (top) and 4 (bottom)

In fact, with the exception of special patterns used for angsel, Pak Cok’s Tut (T) strokes never land together with a guntang stroke. About 75% of them fall on the quarter-beat just before mat; 20% on the quarter-beat just after mat; and just a handful in very specific cross-rhythmic contexts like the one in variant 4 above, on the half-beat. This meticulous Tut (T)

²¹ See section 2.2.3.
placement allows his wadon partner to confidently play Dag (D) on any half-beat with almost no worries of a collision. And analysis of Pak Dewa’s wadon patterns shows that many of his Dag (D) strokes do, in fact, occupy these half-beat positions, as we can see in the following three examples. The first, Pak Dewa’s wadon dasar 1, shows Dag (D) in its predictable “final Dag position,” on the mat before gong, but the other two feature several quite different instances of “on-beat” Dag use.

![Diagram](image1)

**Figure 3.120.** “On-beat” Dag (D) use in Pak Dewa wadon dasar 1 (top), Pak Dewa played (not taught) wadon variant (middle) and Pak Dewa wadon variant 3 (bottom)

However, just as Pak Dewa’s wadon patterns are more flexible than his partner’s in their double kom (o) use, so too do they exhibit a freer use of Dag (D). In his wadon variant 5, for instance, while we see Dag (D) primarily in its “allotted” positions, two Dags (marked with red stars) land on quarter-beats directly following mat, purportedly a spot reserved for lanang use:

![Diagram](image2)

**Figure 3.121.** “Rule-breaking” Dag (D) placement in Pak Dewa wadon variant 5
And, in his wadon variant 2, every Dag (D) lands in one of these same supposedly Tut (T) locations:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) - & \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \text{n pu n G} \\
(o) _ _ o d D _ o d D _ o d D _ o o \\
\star & \star \star \star \star
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.122.** “Rule-breaking” Dag (D) placement in Pak Dewa wadon variant 2

While this may seem initially problematic, when we remember that the majority of Pak Cok’s Tut (T) strokes land in the quarter-beat position directly preceding mat, not the one directly following it, we can assume that Pak Dewa feels fairly safe in placing a Dag (D) stroke directly after mat. Further analysis of Pak Cok’s improvised patterns also reveals that his use of Tut (T) in the quarter-beat position following mat is more frequent in the second half of a cycle, as we can see in his lanang variants 1 and 3 below (in this figure, Tut use in the quarter-beat after mat is marked with a green star):

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) - & \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \text{n pu n G} \\
(_) _ e e T _ e e T _ e e T _ e e T \_
\star & \star \star \star \star
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) - & \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \text{n pu n G} \\
(_) _ e e T _ e e T _ e e T _ e e T \_
\star & \star \star \star \star
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.123.** Tut (T) placement relative to mat in different parts of the cycle, Pak Cok lanang variants 1 (top) and 3 (bottom)

Pak Dewa, who often though by no means exclusively restricts his “off-beat” Dag (D) use to the earlier beats in a cycle, is thus quite unlikely to run into his partner. The absolute rigidity of Pak Cok’s Tut (T) idioms, therefore, allows Pak Dewa increased Dag (D) flexibility.
And while it is true that this slight regulatory ambiguity leads to the occasional *tabrakan* between Pak Dewa’s *Dag* (D) and Pak Cok’s *Tut* (T) strokes in performance, these instances are extremely rare. In every *arja* performance there will be moments when the drummers would say they did not interlock well together. These moments are far more rare between old partners like Pak Dewa and Pak Cok, but, given the improvisatory nature of *arja*, they certainly occur. For instance, if Pak Dewa were to play his *wadon* variant 1 as Pak Cok were playing his *lanang* variant 4, there would be significant *tabrakan* just before the *tawa-tawa* stroke:

![Diagram of *tabrakan*](image)

**Figure 3.124.** Significant *tabrakan* (collision) between Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 1 and Pak Cok *lanang* variant 4

An angle of research that I touched on briefly, but which really deserves its own study – perhaps linked with a larger study of cognition in both playing and listening to improvised drumming – involves playing recordings back to the drummers and asking for their commentary. The few brief times that I attempted this research approach revealed much about my teachers’ tolerances for different forms of *tabrakan*. It appeared that unless there were too many in a row, instances of *kom-peng tabrakan* were fairly well tolerated. However, if these were also combined with one or more *Dag-Tut tabrakan*, drummers would often single out that passage as being unsuccessful. This seemed to be exponentially more the case when those *tabrakan* occurred just before the *gong* stroke, meaning that *tabrakan* may be more acceptable earlier in a cycle. Much more research is needed, however, to substantiate these initial hypotheses. Such a study would not only help to corroborate (or disprove) these musical details
– it could also give insight into the cognition of structure in general: the different levels of attention and awareness, strictness and looseness at play in both listening to and executing improvisations.

Some *arja* drummers – particularly those trained in the style of Pak Kredek – will go so far as to have the *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T) elements of their playing completely pre-composed so as to avoid any unwanted collisions. As we have seen, Pak Tut of Apuan, for instance, always cycles through the same four patterns, always in the same order. While he uses much of the *kom* (o) and *peng* (e) variation explored above, placement of *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T) is utterly fixed. The same can be said of Pak Tama’s *tabuh telu* patterns, which he also learned directly from Pak Kredek. Here again, as in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing, the greater structural, cyclic significance of *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T) strokes results in their much more regimented use.

### 3.3.3 The Mystery of Ngegongin

This brings us to our next aspect of *arja* theory: the concept of *ngegongin*, or emphasizing the *gong*. This procedure manifests as a rule that the *wadon*’s function is to reinforce the underlying cyclic structure by emphasizing the arrival of the final gong stroke. (Of course, because *kendang arja* is interlocking music, the *lanang* will unavoidably contribute as well). *Ngegongin* is accomplished in a number of different ways. The first method – in fact a very well established Balinese compositional device – is to increase the density of main strokes, and particularly of *Dag* (D) and *Tut* (T) strokes, approaching a cycle’s end.22 We can see this type of *ngegongin* clearly in Pak Tut’s semi-composed patterns. Originally shown in Figure 3.94, they are reproduced here for reference:

---

22 The concept of increased movement toward a cycle’s end is common not just in Balinese drumming but in Balinese melody-making as well, which will often become more *majalan* (kinetic) and less *ngubeng* (static) toward the approach of *gong*. This compositional practice is discussed in depth in Tenzer 2000, Chapter 6.
Dividing each of these patterns into four quadrants according to the placement of major cyclic markers reveals a definite increase in Dag-Tut use over the course of each cycle. The first cycle features 0, 0, 0, and 3 main strokes, respectively, in its four phases; the second 0, 0, 2, and 3; the third 0, 0, 2, and 3; and the fourth 2, 3, 5, and 3. Further, if we imagine this fixed progression of four cycles to be a larger composition, leading to a final gong stroke at the end of the fourth cycle, once again increased activity of Dag (D) and Tut (T) strokes is evident at this level of hypermeter, with the four cycles featuring 3, 5, 5, and 13 main right-hand strokes respectively. While it is important to note that structure at this hypermetric level is not necessarily articulated by the singer-dancer (who does not pay attention to specific kendang)

---

23 The reader should remember that, while they are included in the transcription, the first stroke in a double Dag (d) is a counting-stroke, not a main stroke, and is not considered in the following analysis.
patterns and may place her angsel in any cycle), the compositional logic of this larger hypermetric structure suggests that articulation of ngegongin merits a closer look.

Ngegongin is certainly easier to engineer in pre-composed music, but even in non-pre-composed passages, increased activity in general and Dag-Tut-stroke saturation in particular very often occur in the beats just before gong. Pak Tama’s tabuh telu lanang pattern 1 exhibits this kind of increased density:

\[ (8) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \]

\((G)\) n n u n t n G
\[ (_{\_}____) _{\_} e e t _{\_} e _{\_} e e t _{\_} e e t _{\_} e e T e T _{\_} \]

Figure 3.125. Increased activity and Tut saturation leading toward gong in Pak Tama tabuh telu lanang pattern 1

Analysis reveals that each quadrant of this phrase exhibits an increased use of main strokes – 2, 4, 5, and 6 respectively – and an increased frequency of Tut (T) strokes approaching gong. Even the right-thumb counting strokes (shown as “t” in the above transcription) show increased density over the course of the cycle. That these would be played as full strokes in a tabuh dua structure attest to their compositional as well as kinesthetic importance.

This densification of main strokes approaching gong exists in shorter arja phrases as well. In Figure 3.126 we see two distinct patterns in which both main-stroke use and Tut (T) density increase toward the gong stroke. Pak Cok’s lanang variant 1 has 6 main strokes in its first half and 7 in its second half; the first half contains 2 Tut (T) strokes where the second contains 3. In Pak Dewa’s lanang variant 1 the first half contains 3 main strokes, one of which is a Tut (T) where the second half contains 4 main strokes, one of which is a Tut (T). This second pattern also demonstrates a typical absence of main strokes directly following gong, which will be felt in stark contrast to the increased density of strokes that preceded gong:
The wadon player, too, will often increase main-stroke density and Dag (D) stroke usage over the course of a single cycle, as we can see in the variants in Figure 3.127 below:

Yet what makes Balinese drummers say that the wadon in particular is the drum that ngegongins is a very specific use of Dag (D). In any cyclic structure type the wadon player will
often prepare a gong stroke – will often ngegongin – by placing Dag (D) on the beat directly preceding gong, what I have been calling the “final Dag (D) position.” For further emphasis this stroke will frequently be followed by soft counting strokes or even rests (which are virtually non-existent elsewhere). Pak Tut’s semi-composed patterns exhibit this Dag (D) placement. In the first, second, and fourth cycles, Dag (D) lands either on the guntang stroke before gong (the most common position for final Dag) or on the half-beat that follows it:

**Pak Tut Pattern 1**

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ T D T _

**Pak Tut Pattern 2**

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ D T _ _ _ D T _ _ _ _

**Pak Tut Pattern 3**

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ d D _ _ D _ D _ _ _ T _ T _

**Pak Tut Pattern 4**

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ T D _ _ _ _ T _ _ _ _ _ _ _ T _

**Figure 3.128. Ngegongin Dag (D) placement, Pak Tut’s four patterns**

Many of Pak Dewa’s wadon patterns also exhibit this final Dag (D) placement. In his dasar pattern we see final Dag (D) placement directly aligning with mat. In other patterns Pak

---

24 The reader should remember here that many Dag (D) strokes are played as double Dag (d D). The first, smaller dag (d) stroke is considered a counting stroke; it is the second of these strokes – the main stroke – that ngegongins.
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Dewa creates a slightly more *wayah* variation, subverting expectations by delaying the final *Dag* (D) stroke by one quarter-beat.\(^{25}\)

![Diagram](image.png)

**Figure 3.129.** “Final *Dag* (D) placement” for *ngegongin* in several of Pak Dewa’s *wadon* variants

---

\(^{25}\) This kind of *wayah* delay is common in other improvised forms like *reyong norot*. See Tilley 2003 for details.
In each these many patterns, regardless of cycle length, Dag (D) marks the beat just before gong. It ngegongins.

### 3.3.3.1 Meta-Cycles and the Complex Realization of Ngegongin

Of course music will seldom so obediently fit into our theoretical categories, and the concept of ngegongin becomes cloudy in arja’s relatively short cycles where drummers tend not to emphasize every gong stroke but every few cycles. In Pak Tut’s patterns, for instance, the third and fourth cycles are better thought of as one continuous 16-beat phrase.\(^{26}\)

Alternately, as discussed above, the entire arrangement of four cycles may be thought of as a single sentence, leading through an increased density of Dag (D) and Tut (T) strokes over each subsequent cycle to a final gong at the end of the fourth cycle.

This cycle-grouping phenomenon is exponentially more common and complex in the shorter 2- and 4-beat cyclic structures. We know that while angsel can be placed before any gong stroke, drummers often conceive of their patterns as longer units. Both of Pak Tama’s taught tabuh dua patterns, for instance, are 8 beats in length; and Pak Dewa taught both 8-beat and 12-beat tabuh dua patterns. While many of these full patterns do feature final Dag (D) placement in each cycle (not just the final one), it by no means happens before every gong stroke, and the widespread existence of these longer patterns seems to demand a more nuanced conception of ngegongin. The issue becomes even more complicated in improvised patterns, where there does not seem to be any fixed idea about which cycles should feature a final Dag (D). Thus it may become necessary to think about ngegongin not in terms of single cycles but

\(^{26}\) Though Pak Tut never analyzed his patterns for me, as mentioned above, Pak Tama (who plays very similar patterns in his tabuh telu cycles) told me that cycles 3 and 4 made up one long cycle.
flexible meta-cycles, and perhaps for the purposes of arja a new term is needed. I have chosen to use the term “meta-cyclic pattern.”

The concept of the meta-cyclic pattern becomes even more important when we look at batel structures with their gong strokes punctuating every second mat. Most teachers will claim that any pattern used for tabuh dua is equally suited to batel, but in batel a dancer can place an angsel before any gong stroke. Were s/he to place an angsel after an even number of gong cycles, the tukang kendang could play his tabuh dua patterns with no worries. However, it is as likely that the singer-dancer will angsel after an uneven number of gong cycles, forcing the drummer to subdivide his 4-beat sub-patterns even further. Particularly in wadon patterns, which are generally longer and more complex than lanang ones, batel structures create some interesting “rule-breaking.”

3.3.3.1.1 The Dag-on-Gong Question

It is commonly understood that in kendang arja the wadon player should never align his Dag (D) stroke with gong, except on the very last gong stroke of a piece which will almost invariably be articulated with a Dag stroke. In fact, one of the most common musical jokes among Balinese drummers – when playfully mocking bulé drummers like myself – is to improvise a few cycles of arja and then, in the midst of improvisation, place a strong Dag (D) directly on gong instead of aligning it with the mat preceding gong. This will inevitably be followed by peals of good-natured laughter and wide grins in the direction of any bulé musician present. Yet, analysis of the batel patterns of a master drummer like Pak Dewa does in fact

---

27 There are certain exceptions to this, of course, given the rasa differences between the two. Sudi, for instance, claims that Pak Cok’s very dense patterns are suited to batel but not tabuh dua, and some sparser patterns used in both tabuh dua and tabuh telu would not be used in batel. As a general rule, however, it applies.

28 I would like to thank Andy McGraw for posing this question following my paper presentation at the 2012 joint AMS/SEM/SMT conference in New Orleans.
show the occasional on-gong Dag (D) stroke. And while I could simply analyze this as a mistake on his part (and these certainly exist), the concept of the meta-cyclic pattern allows for a far more interesting analysis. Figure 3.130 below shows approximately 8 seconds of Pak Dewa’s batel improvisation leading into an angsel. Dag (D) strokes in the final Dag position are marked with a black star; Dag (D) strokes aligning with gong are marked with a red star; all other Dag (D) are marked with a green star:

(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2

(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G

(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2

(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G

(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2...

(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G

In most of these two-beat cycles we do see the occurrence of final Dag (D), either in its usual position or in one of the two wayah variant positions (delayed by one or two quarter-beats). In others, a denser o-D-o-D-r variation occurs leading up to gong. We could, say, therefore, that ngegongin occurs in many cycles even in batel structures. However, examination of these patterns as larger meta-cycles yields more fruitful results for a comparative analysis of pattern use in contrasting gong structures. Further, in one instance in this improvisation – marked by a red asterisk – Dag (D) lands directly on the gong. I know this is not a mistake because Pak Dewa played a quite similar passage later in this same portion of the recording session. This Dag (D) placement is deliberate. Yet, while it seems to break the
biggest rule of all (turning my master-guru into an awkward bulé), analysis of this passage as a collection of meta-cycles can help to explain it. In Figure 3.131 I have divided this passage up into numbered segments of cycles and meta-cycles based on Pak Dewa’s taught patterns:

As expected, many of the patterns in this passage are simply variations on those 4-beat variants that Pak Dewa uses for his tabuh dua improvisation. For instance, the first two gong cycles, which I have labeled as 1, are a meta-cyclic pattern based on Pak Dewa’s wadon variant 1, as follows:

Figure 3.131. Batel improvisation from Figure 3.130 divided into segments based on the taught patterns

Figure 3.132. Segment 1 (top) shown as a variation on Pak Dewa wadon variant 1 (bottom)
The subsequent cycle, labeled “2”, is akin to the second half of his *wadon dasar* with *Dag* (D) delay and thus may be said to *ngegongin* in two beats:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(o) & \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad o \quad _{-} \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
(\_o) & \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.133.** Segment 2 (bottom) shown as a variation on Pak Dewa *wadon dasar* with *Dag* (D) delay (top)

The next cycle does not *ngegongin*, and thus must be grouped into a meta-cycle, which I have labeled segment 3. Looking at the latter two cycles in this segment, we can see that their content is identical. These cycles are akin to the final two beats of Tama’s *wadon* variant 2:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
pu \quad t \quad n \quad t \quad G \\
- \quad _{-} \quad o \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad _{-} \quad o \quad _{-} \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad - \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
(o) & \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.134.** Second and third cycles in Segment 3 (bottom) shown as variations on Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 2 (top)

Or they may be seen as a modified, sparser version of Pak Dewa’s *wadon* variant 5, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad o \quad o \quad G \\
(o) & \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(o) & \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _{-} \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.135.** Second and third cycles in Segment 3 (bottom) shown together as a variation on Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 5 (top)
As mentioned, I have labeled these and the preceding cycle together as meta-cycle “3”.

However, one could just as easily argue for an analysis that groups the first two together as a modified variant 5 and the third as an independent cycle that *ngegongins* in 2 beats.

Beginning in the cycle following the offending on-gong Dag (D) stroke, the section I have marked as segment 5 in Figure 3.131 above, we see an almost verbatim instance of Pak Dewa’s *wadon* variant 1 followed by the beginning of an *angsel* cue:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(o) & D \quad _\quad o \quad D \quad _\quad o \quad o \quad D
\end{align*}
\]

This leaves a collection of three cycles in the middle of the passage, one of which features an on-gong Dag (D) stroke. These cycles, marked as segment 4 in Figure 3.131 above, I conceive of as a single meta-cyclic pattern emphasizing a hemiola, which, as discussed in section 3.3.4 below, is a quite common device in *kendang arja* improvisation. The meta-cycle begins with a familiar “(o) D o d D” motif that could easily become *wadon* variant 5, and it seems as though it will:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(o) & D \quad _\quad o \quad D \quad _\quad o \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad o
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.136.** Segment 5 (bottom) shown as a variation on Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 1 (top)

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
(o) & D \quad _\quad o \quad D \quad _\quad o \quad o \quad D
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.137.** First cycle of Segment 4 (bottom) shown as a variation on Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 5 (top)
Only at the occurrence of the “o d D” gesture on the next gong stroke do we retroactively reassess the grouping of this pattern into a hemiola, as follows:

```
(2)  ●  1  ●  2  ●  1  ●  2  ●  1  ●  2
(G) n  pu  n  G  n  pu  n  G  n  pu  n  G
(o) D  o  d  D  o  o  D  o  o  D  o  o
```

* * *

**Figure 3.138.** Hemiola in segment 4 (Dag on gong marked with a red star)

In this context, the Dag (D) on gong is, in fact, simply the middle of a cross-rhythmic pattern that resolves with an appropriately-placed final Dag (D) in the following cycle. Were we to consider ngegongin in its strictest meaning, the subtlety of this pattern would be lost in our analyses.

Though never discussed by any of my teachers or other informants, the existence of these hemiola and other cross-rhythms seems ubiquitous enough to be worthy of discussion – and this is the final topic addressed in this chapter.

### 3.3.4 Theory Derived from Taught Patterns: Cross-Rhythm Aesthetic

In his analyses of kendang arja improvisations, Hood offers up ten interlocking patterns for analysis, all of which he places in the context of a tabuh telu framework. Eight of these are 2-beat patterns and contain many of the features I have discussed in the above analyses. The other two are the following 3-beat patterns:

---

29 Because Hood does not transcribe any counting strokes (including the first of a double peng or double kom stroke, or any of the stronger left-hand counting strokes that in my experience have a great deal to do with the kinesthetic quality of different kendang arja patterns), all of the 2-beat lanang patterns analyzed by Hood appear to be subsets of a single pattern, his pola 7: (*)_ e T e T _ . In various iterations this pattern becomes pola 1: (*)_ e _ _ _ e _ , pola 5: (*)_ e _ e _ _ , pola 2: (*)_ _ _ _ _ e T _ , pola 3: (*)_ _ _ _ e T _ , pola 4: (*)_ e T _ _ _ e T _ , pola 6: (*)_ e _ e T _ , and pola 8: (*)_ e _ e T _ . Each of these, he claims, is meant to be played with a specific wadon variant that is its particular perfect match (though there is some room for variation, as examined in his “variable pattern pairs”). His wadon patterns are slightly more complex (as expected), though
While I disagree with Hood’s segmentation of patterns into 3-beat chunks when a drummer almost always conceives of his patterns as they relate to 2-4- and 8-beat gong structures (and find it very difficult to imagine, based on my own experience, that Pak Tama would have divided the patterns that way when teaching Hood), I applaud his recognition of these more metrically ambiguous patterns. It is clear from the analyses above that cross-rhythm is a common compositional aesthetic in the creation of kendang arja patterns.

While I disagree with Hood’s segmentation of patterns into 3-beat chunks when a drummer almost always conceives of his patterns as they relate to 2-4- and 8-beat gong structures (and find it very difficult to imagine, based on my own experience, that Pak Tama would have divided the patterns that way when teaching Hood), I applaud his recognition of these more metrically ambiguous patterns. It is clear from the analyses above that cross-rhythm is a common compositional aesthetic in the creation of kendang arja patterns.

We have already seen several instances of the 3+3+2 hemiola effect in the taught patterns examined above: a pattern six drum-strokes in length is played twice, filling three full beats, and the fourth beat is filled in using one of the stock standard motifs – “_e e T _” for lanang, for instance. Here I will catalogue the taught hemiola patterns side-by-side before

---

many appear to be subsets of a theoretical ( ) o _ o D o D o D pattern, including his pola 1: (•)__ o__ o__, pola 5: (•) o__ o__ o__, pola 8: (•)__ o__ o D o D and pola 7: (•)__ o D o D o D. While all these patterns feature strict genap kom (o) use and, by extension, strict ganjil Dag (D) use, his other patterns stray from that rule: pola 2: (•)__ o D__ __, pola 3: (•) o__ o D__ __, pola 4 (•) D__ o D__ o, and pola 6: (•)__ o D__ o D.
adding to that list those patterns commonly played in improvisation but not taught directly to me.

### 3.3.4.1 Cross-Rhythm in Lanang Patterns

Extending Hood’s *Pola* 9 by adding some double *peng* strokes and a fourth beat, we get Pak Cok’s *lanang* variant 2; and Pak Tama’s *lanang* variant 1 may be seen as a modified version of this pattern:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
(\_) e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad T
\]

\[
3 \quad 3 \quad 2
\]

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(\_) e \quad e \quad T \quad T
\]

\[
3 \quad 3 \quad 2
\]

**Figure 3.140.** Cross-rhythm from Hood’s *pola* 9 given a fourth beat to become Pak Cok *lanang* variant 2 (top) and, modified, Pak Tama *lanang* variant 1 (bottom)

Pak Dewa’s *lanang* variant 4, as explored above, uses a hemiola with a surprise ending:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
(\_) e \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad T \quad e \quad T \quad T
\]

\[
3 \quad 3 \quad 2
\]

**Figure 3.141.** Cross-rhythm in Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 4

Other commonly played hemiola patterns in Pak Cok’s *lanang* improvisations include the two related patterns shown in Figure 3.142:
**Figure 3.142.** Cross-rhythm in Pak Cok lanang variants 6 (top) and 7 (bottom) (both played, not taught patterns)

Even in Pak Tut’s dasar variations we find this same kind of hemiola effect with a longer, 10-note motif repeated three times before the turnaround, as follows:

**Figure 3.143.** Cross-rhythm Pak Tut lanang dasar variation

Pak Cok also creates metric tension in smaller 3+3+2 grouping structures, intimating the beginnings of a 4-against-3 feel in the final two beats of his lanang variants 3 and 4 below. As with the 1-beat turnaround at the end of Pak Cok’s longer hemiolas above, these shorter cross-rhythmic patterns are “evened out” just before the patterns’ ends:

**Figure 3.144.** Cross-rhythm in Pak Cok lanang variants 4 (top) and 3 (bottom)
3.3.4.2 Cross-Rhythm in Wadon Patterns

The use of hemiola and other cross-rhythms also exists in wadon improvisation, as evidenced by the improvised passage from section 3.3.3.1.1 above. The most basic example of wadon hemiola can be seen in Pak Tut’s wadon dasar variations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(8)} & \quad \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
\text{(G)} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pu} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{G} \\
\text{(_)} & \quad \text{o} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{d} \\
\text{3} & \quad \text{3} \quad \text{2} \quad \text{3} \quad \text{3} \quad \text{2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.145. Cross-rhythm in Pak Tut wadon dasar 2 variation

No other wadon hemiola exists in either Pak Dewa or Pak Tama’s taught patterns, with the exception of this partially repeated hemiola gesture in Pak Tama’s wadon variant 3:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} & \quad - \bullet - 5 - \bullet - 6 - \bullet - 7 - \bullet - 8 \\
\text{pu} & \quad \text{t} \quad \text{n} \\
\text{3} & \quad \text{3} \quad \text{2} \\
\text{G} & \quad \text{o} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.146. Cross-rhythm in Pak Tama wadon variant 3

However, in many of Pak Dewa’s improvisations we see evidence of this same cross-rhythmic aesthetic. Two typical examples of this are shown in Figure 3.147 below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} & \quad - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
\text{(G)} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pu} \quad \text{n} \quad \text{G} \\
\text{(D)} & \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{D} \\
\text{3} & \quad \text{3} \quad \text{2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.147. Cross-rhythm in Pak Dewa wadon variants 7 (top) and 8 (bottom) (both played, not taught variants)
In his pattern explored in section 3.3.3.1.1, the hemiola idea is further extended: the 6-stroke rhythm occurs three times in succession and spans the duration of 4.5 beats:

\[
(2) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2
\]

\[
(G) \hspace{1em} \text{n \hspace{1em} pu \hspace{1em} n \hspace{1em} G \hspace{1em} n \hspace{1em} pu \hspace{1em} n \hspace{1em} G \hspace{1em} n \hspace{1em} pu \hspace{1em} n \hspace{1em} G
\]

\[
(o) \hspace{1em} D \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} d \hspace{1em} D \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} d \hspace{1em} D \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} d \hspace{1em} D \hspace{1em} o \hspace{1em} o
\]

**Figure 3.148.** Cross-rhythm in Pak Dewa’s *wadon* improvisation for a *batel* structure from figure 3.131

Though not part of the existing Balinese theory on *kendang arja*, the ubiquity of these hemiola and other cross-rhythms seems to demonstrate their important place, aesthetically, within the tradition.

### 3.4 The Patterns Arranged for Analysis

On the pages below are each of the variants discussed in this chapter, presented in an order reflecting their relative similarity to one another. While this is a rather onerous task that could feasibly be accomplished with several quite different approaches, I have chosen to organize the patterns as follows. For *lanang* I begin the list with the *dasar* patterns of my teachers and those that most closely follow the *ganjil/genap* rule, beginning with rim-stroke-heavy patterns. I then list the most basic patterns that include the “_e e T_” gesture followed by those patterns with the “_e e T_” gesture that break the *ganjil/genap* rule in their rim-stroke use. I then proceed to denser patterns, such as those ending in the “_e e T e T e T_” or “_e e T e T_” gestures. Only at this point do I introduce those variants with cross-rhythms. Patterns sharing noteworthy elements, like similar cross-rhythms or similar rule breaking, are placed next to one another. Though an imperfect process with imperfect results, this categorization of the diverse variants at play will hopefully give the reader a better sense of their many connections. The *lanang* variants are shown in figure 3.149:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Dasar</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) e e e e e e e e e e e e</td>
<td>(l) l l l l e e T e e T e e T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 0 (intro)</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e e e T</td>
<td>(_) e e T e e T e e T e e T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Cok Lanang 0 (“intro”)</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) e e Te Te Te Te Te Te T</td>
<td>(_) e e T e T e e T e e T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 0a (ngeseh)</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e e e T</td>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 11</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e</td>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Tutt Lanang Dasar 1</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 1b (Tama)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e</td>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Tutt Lanang Dasar 2</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e e e T T</td>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e e e e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 7</th>
<th>Sudi Lanang 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) e l e _ l e l e l e T l</td>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 8</th>
<th>Sudi Lanang 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td>(4) - • - 1 - • - 2 - • - 3 - • - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) e T l e T l e T l e T l</td>
<td>(_) e e e e e e e e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont’d…
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sudi Lanang 2</th>
<th>Pak Cok Lanang 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T e _ e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sudi Lanang 4</th>
<th>Pak Cok Lanang 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e e _ _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T e T e e T e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 3</th>
<th>Pak Cok Lanang 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e _ l _ e e T _ e _ l _ e e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T _ e e T _ e e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 4</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e e _ _ e _ l _ e e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T e _ e e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 4</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e e _ _ e e T e T _ e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 2</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e _ l _ e e T _ e e T e T _ r</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T _ e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 2a</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ e _ e e T _ e e T e T _ e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T _ e e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 6</th>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e _ _ e _ e e T _ e T _ e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 5</th>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e _ e _ e _ e e T _ e e T _ e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Cok Lanang 1</th>
<th>Pak Cok Lanang 6 (not taught)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
<td>(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e e T _ e e T e T _</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> e e T _ e _ e e T e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...cont’d...
Figure 3.149. 4-beat lanang variants arranged for analysis

In the table in Figure 3.150 below (continued onto the following page), these patterns are presented in a more visual, graphical format in an effort to show the connections between them in a different way. Each of the seventeen boxes in a single row represents one quarter-beat. The white boxes represent lesser counting strokes or silences, the yellow boxes represent the more important left-hand counting strokes (l), the green boxes represent peng (e) strokes, and the blue boxes represent Tut (T) strokes. In the few instances of double Tut strokes, the lighter first stroke (t) is shown in a light blue. In pattern names, “PT” is Pak Tama, “PC” is Pak Cok, “PD” is Pak Dewa, “Sudi” is Sudi, and “Tut” is Pak Tut:
I have organized the *wadon* variants in a similar fashion, beginning with the *dasar* and those closest to it in terms of their rim-stroke placement (and in this list I include Pak Dewa variant 3, which, though more *Dag*-heavy, abides very strictly by the *ganjil/genap* rule). I proceed from there to the increasingly complex *Dag*-filled patterns, grouping together those with similar *Dag* (D) placement and ending with the cross-rhythmic variants. Given the wider range of *wadon* variants (despite their smaller number), this process was far more difficult and, I fear, yields far less useful results:

![Graphical representation of 4-beat *lanang* variants arranged for analysis](figure_3.150.png)
Dasar

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_o o o o o o o o _

Pak Tut Wadon Dasar 1

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_o o 1 o 1 o 1 o 1 _

Pak Tama Wadon 1

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_o _ 1 _ 1 _ 1 _ 1 _

Pak Tama Wadon 1a

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_o _ 1 _ 1 _ 1 _ 1 _

Pak Dewa Wadon 3

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o) o D D _ _ o o o o _

Pak Dewa Wadon End Variant

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o) D o D _ _ o o D _ _ _ _

Pak Tama Wadon 0 (intro)

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_ o o o o o o D _ _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 0

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_ o _ 1 _ o o o o D _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 0a with Dag delay:

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o)_ o _ 1 _ o o o o D _ _

Pak Tama Wadon 2

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_1 _ o _ 1 _ 1 _ o o D _

Pak Dewa Wadon

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_o o d D _ _ o _ 1 _ o o D o o

Pak Tama Wadon 5

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_o o D _ _ o 1 o o D o o

Pak Tama Wadon

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o) o o D _ o D _ o D _ _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 4

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o)_ o o D _ o D _ o D _ _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 1

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o)D o o D _ _ o o D _ _ _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 6

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o)D o D _ _ o D _ o D _ _ _

Pak Tama Wadon 0

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(_)_ o o o o o o D _ _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 5

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o)D o d D _ _ o D _ _ _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 6

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(o)D o D o D _ o D _ o D _ _

Pak Dewa Wadon 7 (not taught)

(4)-  1 -  2 -  3 -  4
(D)o o o D _ o D _ o D _ _ o o cont’d
Pak Dewa Wadon 8 (not taught): Pak Tama Wadon 3

\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
\text{(o)} &D _ _ o _ o _ o D _ o _ o D _ o o
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
\text{(o)} &\_ o D _ _ o o o D _ d D _ _ o _
\end{align*}

Figure 3.151. 4-beat wadon variants arranged for analysis

Again, a graphical analysis of these patterns will offer a more visual perspective on their connections, though we see far less unity among these variants than the lanang ones. In Figure 3.152, white boxes indicate lesser counting strokes, pink boxes indicate major left-hand counting strokes (I), orange boxes indicate kom (o) strokes, and dark purple boxes are Dag (D) strokes. In patterns with double Dag strokes, the first stroke (d) is shown in a lighter purple:

Figure 3.152. Graphical representation of 4-beat wadon variants arranged for analysis
Now, with a sense of the range of taught patterns derived from *arja asli* Singapadu – the features and theories that unite them as well as the level of variance seen in each village style – I turn to an analysis of improvised patterns. In the following chapter I will examine patterns played in two recording sessions in the summer of 2011: one session with Pak Cok and Pak Dewa, another with Pak Tama.\(^29\) Through the lens of these taught patterns and the Balinese discourse behind them, I will analyze these master drummers’ improvised patterns and their interactions.

---

\(^29\) Pak Tama played this session with his partner-student Pak Buda. However, since this particular study focuses only on the playing of the older generation masters, I will not be examining Pak Buda’s patterns in the analyses to follow. I did not do a session with Pak Tut, partially because he does not have a steady drum partner, and partially because he is too unsteady a drummer to play for more than a few cycles without stopping. Furthermore, I found that any improvisation Pak Tut executed fell within the confines already discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 4 Analysis of Improvised Patterns
Through the Lens of Taught Patterns

4.1 The Transcription Process

I triumphantly pull off my headphones, breathe an epic sigh of relief, and reward myself with a too-big handful of dark chocolate chips. My eyes wander glassily down to the clock on my computer screen; it’s almost 3:00 in the morning. I’ve been at it for hours – for months, actually. For months I have spent every free waking hour (many of which probably should have been sleeping hours) holed up in coffee shops and libraries and living rooms, transcribing. I have developed both a deep appreciation and a strange seething hatred for the slow-down program, which has made possible the accurate transcription of kendang arja improvisations, especially in the faster batel gong structures, but has also introduced a level of micro-timing and timbral ambiguity not pertinent to this particular analysis.¹ I have constantly had to remind myself not to get bogged down in irrelevant details that become smoothed over at full speed, to remember that this is a living, moving, oral tradition. But today, I am done!

I jack the tempo up to 100% and plug in my computer speakers, heedless of my neighbors despite the hour. And I listen, eyes closed, a huge grin of amazed, exhausted affection creeping across my face. This is what I’ve been doing all these months; I had almost forgotten. I have been documenting one of the coolest genres I know, played by teachers I have grown to love as well as respect. My mind wanders back to the day I

---

¹ For the transcriptions in this study, I made extensive use of the program “Transcribe!” by Seventh String Software. Something of a misnomer in my case, this program was not remotely useful for the purposes of transcription; it is better designed to deal with melodies and harmonies than drum sounds with complex overtones. However, I found the program invaluable as a tool to slow down a recording without changing the pitches. I found I could slow down my recordings to about 60% of their original speed before they became too distorted to hear effectively (though sometimes I found 70%-85% to be a better speed for hearing both the details and the full patterns). As intimated above, one of the drawbacks of such a program is that it often introduces a level of detail, such as a timbral or rhythmic distinction, not really relevant at full speed. Thus, when using this program, I often found it essential to listen to a passage I had transcribed on slow-down again at full speed, as a way of checking my work.
recorded this particular track. Pak Dewa was taking a cigarette break and Pak Cok was talking music with Pak Tama (who had stepped in to play kajar for this session) when Bu Candri quietly appeared beside me. In a whisper she confided: “You are capturing the end of an era. I’m getting old and I’ve spent too much of my life being a dalang (puppet-master); my voice isn’t what it used to be. And Pak Dewa’s hand doesn’t work as well as it once did. We don’t have many years left for this. And there is no generation of great arja artists after us. You are recording history.”

I’ve been longing for this moment, just like, as a kid, I longed for Christmas morning — this moment when I could look at my files of transcriptions without wondering: “how much longer?” But I’ve been secretly dreading it too, because this is the moment of truth, and all my insecurities have come out to play. This is where the study leads, but what if I’m wrong? What if kendang arja improvisation is completely random, or, worse, what if it’s just the taught patterns and nothing more? What if I have nothing to show for this time but a new batch of grey hairs and an unhealthy relationship with the post-midnight hour? Only one way to find out...

4.1.1 The Dangers of Codification

The analyses in this chapter begin with the supposition that the taught patterns are a starting point for improvisation, and with that comes the idea that these patterns, to some extent, “belong” to their teachers. Of course the reality is not that simple. Arja drumming has not been theorized in a formal institutional context; the social construction of its materials and theory are ad hoc and vary by teacher and place. Of course, in a tradition where all the masters have some common musical ancestry, there is bound to be some crossover in known patterns. As such, assigning ownership through the labels I use (e.g. “Pak Dewa Lanang Variant 1”) is a

---

2 Between my 2008 and 2011 trips to Bali, Pak Dewa suffered from a stroke. Though he is mostly recovered, he still feels numbness in one hand, and this, unfortunately, greatly affects his playing.

somewhat arbitrary decision based on the idea that these taught patterns have an identity outside the context of my own lessons. I have chosen to analyze the improvised patterns through the lens of the taught patterns because these provide a point of reference that can be clearly pointed to throughout each drummer’s improvisations.

That being said, the reification of certain patterns as somehow more “basic” or “fundamental” to a given drummer’s style than others is problematic. I wonder, for instance, if *kendang arja* improvisation would be presented the same way to a different student that came into Pak Dewa or Pak Tama’s home next summer, or if the specific patterns that they chose to teach me were largely based on their particular *rasa* (feeling) on a given day or on my own drumming abilities. Yet, the similarity of Sudi’s improvised *lanang* playing to Pak Cok’s taught patterns (from whom he learned them, years earlier than myself) leads me to believe that Pak Cok might teach a comparable palette to any student who came looking. Further, I learned most of Pak Dewa’s patterns in 2008. When I returned to his home in 2011 to study more, Pak Dewa could only think of one additional *wadon* pattern that he had not yet taught me. Of course, as we will see, he plays many more than just these few taught variants. This inability to teach more, then, implies a hierarchy of consciously known patterns and purely improvised ones, and something of a separation between Pak Dewa’s taught patterns and those of Pak Tama or Pak Cok.

Alongside this issue is the question of individual taste. Pedagogically one might assume that a teacher giving only a handful of patterns to a student would teach just the most basic forms (the *dasar*). And this was certainly where each teacher began with me, and was perhaps the extent of my lessons with both Pak Tut and Pak Tama. Yet I suspect for Pak Cok and Pak Dewa there was a desire not only to teach the fundamentals of *kendang arja*, but also to reveal
its more wayah (complex, developed) aspects. Thus, while their first few taught patterns may have been quite dasar, I see the later taught patterns as being those they were most proud of, the most wayah of their consciously known patterns.4

And this brings us back to the question of codification. In teaching what appears to be every single one of his consciously known patterns (both the dasar and the wayah), Pak Dewa, like my other teachers, has perhaps unwittingly created a line between a “pattern” and an “improvisation.” Yet we still have no idea why he has singled out these patterns as being foundational to his particular style. What is the status of these taught patterns? Where did they come from? Are they givens from previous generations – patterns passed down directly from teachers like Kredek – or has Pak Dewa composed them himself or borrowed them from other drummers? And in their codification, has Pak Dewa thought of these taught patterns theoretically as pre-composed building blocks for improvisation, or are they simply the distillations of previously improvised patterns meant to best represent the limits of his playing style? Further, is there something more fundamental about these patterns than the others we see in his improvisations – in the same way that a V7 chord is more fundamental to a an improvised jazz solo than a ii9♭13 chord – or are they simply a representative sampling? Perhaps these are questions to which we cannot truly find the answers; certainly I do not have them. In choosing to categorize improvisation based on taught patterns, however, and thus further reify those cognitive categories in my own analyses, these are questions that must at the very least be asked.

4 As discussed briefly in the introductory chapter of this dissertation, p.12-13, I’ve seen this happen with teachers in the younger generation, too. Sudi, when teaching me wadon patterns, taught me several 4- and 8-beat dasar before then composing a very cool 20-beat “improvisation” for me to learn.
4.2 Pak Tama’s Singapadu Style

I begin my analysis of improvised patterns with Pak Tama. Slightly more conservative than both Pak Dewa and Pak Cok in his opinions on innovation in *kendang arja*, I suspect that his improvisations will be closer to the taught patterns than either of theirs. And I begin with *tabuh telu*. The most pre-composed of his patterns, I hope these will give insight into smaller-scale *arja* variation techniques.

4.2.1 Improvisation vs. Variation

Up to this point I have skirted the sticky problem of definitions, avoiding the can of worms in the question “is *kendang arja* ‘improvisation’ or ‘variation’?” Unquestionably, as R. Anderson Sutton says of Javanese *gamelan* music, *kendang arja* performance “is certainly ‘less improvisational’ than jazz, if such cross-cultural comparisons can be meaningfully made” (Sutton 1998: 73). Yet these drummers, though working from a palette of pre-composed patterns, at the very least still make numerous decisions on the fly concerning the order and exact execution of these patterns, and one performance is always quite different from the next. Like all improvised forms, then, *kendang arja* is “the creation of music in the course of performance” (Nettl 1998: 1). In recent years several scholars, including the two just cited, have addressed the definitions and limits of improvisation,\(^5\) and I do not see it as my place here to assign a value judgment on the *level* of spontaneous creation among my many teachers.

\(^5\) In both the collection containing these two articles (Nettl 1998) and its more recent cousin (Solis and Nettl 2009), as well as in other collected works such as Tenzer and Roeder 2011, many scholars differently define the boundaries of pre-composition and improvisation. Hesselink’s definition of improvisation in Korean *p’ungmul* drumming and dance is on par with, or perhaps even more inclusive than, my own: “While some may feel that *improvisation* is an imprecise term in a *p’ungmul* context, implying a concerted and mature compositional effort ‘in the course of performance’ […], I use the word here […] to refer to an individual’s decision to alternate between standard and variant forms of the rhythms, as well as add, delete, or even alter strokes and footsteps as the particular moment or spirit dictates” (2011: 278). Other scholars have explored the limits and characteristics of improvisation through a lens of music education (Burnard 2000), phenomenology (Benson 2003), physiology and neuropsychology (Pressing 1987), linguistic models (Kippen and Bel 1988), and so on.
Improvisation is seldom a limitless art. There are almost always rules or grammars – conscious or subconscious – guiding a musician through improvisation, and the borderlines between improvisation and variation seem hazy at best, impossible (or even irrelevant) to define at worst. I tend to think of small changes on taught patterns, such as replacing a main stroke with a counting stroke, as “variation,” while seeing the larger rearrangement of pattern elements, for instance, as “improvisation.” That said, the two terms have mutable boundaries, and solving this quandary of definition, happily, is far outside the confines of this particular study. The majority of my teachers and drumming friends will generally use the term *improvisasi* or *improv* when referring to their *arja* playing, despite the fact that the loanword *variasi* also exists in the Indonesian language. Therefore, this is the term that I have chosen to use throughout this study as well.

### 4.2.2 Tabuh Telu

As mentioned above, because of the semi-composed nature of Pak Tama’s *tabuh telu* patterns much of his improvisation in this cyclic structure tends more toward what I have called “variation”: small, relatively structurally insignificant alterations of taught patterns played in the completely fixed sequence of cycling patterns 1 through 4 (always in that order). An examination of just a handful of his improvised variants will give the reader a sense of the scope for variation allowed Pak Tama in these stricter patterns.

#### 4.2.2.1 Lanang Variation

Pak Tama’s taught pattern 1 for *tabuh telu* is shown in Figure 4.1 below:
Of the four patterns, this is the one that Pak Tama most often plays in its original taught form during performance. However, Figure 4.2 below shows three played variations. Varied strokes are marked in blue:

**Variation 1**

(8) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ _ e e t _ e _ e _ e e t _ e e t _ e _ e e T e T _

**Variation 2**

(8) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ e _ e e t _ e _ e _ e e t _ e e T e T _

**Variation 3**

(8) – ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ e _ e e t _ e _ e _ e e t _ e e t _ e e T e T _

We can see in the examples above a similar kind of variation as that seen in the surface-level regional variation of *kendang legong* explored in Figure 2.19. Pak Tama allows only minor surface changes like an added *peng* (e) stroke, a removed *peng* (e) stroke, or the replacement of a *peng* (e) stroke with a left-hand counting stroke (which, in *legong*, might instead be played as a *Pak* (P) slap-stroke). No structural changes are made to the pattern: the placement of all *Tut* (T) – and even all right-thumb counting-strokes (t) – is fixed.

Pak Tama allows a slightly wider berth for variation in his *tabuh telu* pattern 2. Figure 4.3 shows this pattern in its original taught format, followed by four variations on the pattern.
with changes marked in blue. It is important to note that the progression of changes shown in this figure is of my own imagining; my teachers do not talk about their own patterns and variations in this serial way:

**Figure 4.3. Variations on Pak Tama tabuh telu lanang pattern 2**

In variation 1, we see the simple addition of single *peng* (e) strokes in the very idiomatic location directly following a *Tut* (T) stroke. Variation 2 adds *peng* (e) strokes in varied locations but all quite common in Pak Tama’s *tabuh dua* patterns. Its end shifts the double *peng* (e) two quarter-beats earlier, essentially taking the single *peng* (e) that precedes the double *peng* (e) in variation 1 and switching their positions. What this really feels like when playing is that slightly sparser versions of the familiar modules “e T” and “e e T” in variation 1 become
“e e T” then “e T” in variation 2. In variation 3 we see this same switch at the parallel spot in the first half of the cycle. Pak Tama also replaces the first peng (e) stroke with a counting stroke in this pattern. And, finally, he replaces the final “_ _ e e T _” gesture with a “e e T e T _” gesture, a motif he intimated with the “e e _ e T _” gesture at the end of variation 2. We see this switch happen in two parallel locations in variation 4. I hypothesized in Chapter 3 that these two gestures – “_ _ e e T _” and “e e T e T _” – were functionally equivalent in kendang lanang improvisation, and their seemingly free alternation in Pak Tama’s otherwise quite carefully composed tabuh telu patterns seems to lend credence to that hypothesis.

In the following improvised variation, I see this rhythmic transformation being taken to the next level, creating a 2+3+3 cross-rhythm in the first half of the cycle that also seems to continue into the second half before being subverted by the required “_ e e t T” gesture that individuates his tabuh telu pattern 2. Figure 4.4 below shows the variant itself, while Figure 4.5 outlines its transformation from the original taught variant. The reader should continue to bear in mind that this transformation is not necessarily what Pak Tama would be imagining when playing; it is my own fantasy of logical and incremental steps based on connections I see between various taught patterns (as described in Chapter 3):

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_ _ _ _ e e t _ e _ e e t _ e _ e e t _ e e t _ _ e e t _

Figure 4.4. Pak Tama tabuh telu lanang pattern 2 variation 5
A final variant on pattern 2, played by Pak Tama only once, is interesting to me because it creates a Dag-Tut tabrakan (collision) with the original wadon pattern. Figure 4.6 below shows these two patterns, with the tabrakan marked in red. In Figure 4.7 I have transcribed the “proper” interlocking of the original, taught pattern 2:

![Diagram of Pak Tama tabuh telu lanang pattern 2 transformation to cross-rhythmic variation 5]

**Figure 4.5.** Transformation from Pak Tama *tabuh telu lanang* pattern 2 to its cross-rhythmic variation 5

**Figure 4.6.** Pak Tama *tabuh telu lanang* pattern 2 variation 6 (top), and the colliding original wadon pattern 2 (bottom)
As discussed in Chapter 3, the few kom-peng tabrakan are minor, but the Dag-Tut tabrakan in this relatively pre-composed pattern is unusual and would certainly be noticed by a drummer listening to the recording. Because this tabrakan happens in the second half of the pattern – which is quite distinctive in pattern 2 – I wonder if, in fact, Pak Tama has not made a mistake here, beginning to play pattern 1 by accident before catching himself just after the beat 5 kleang stroke and reverting to the characteristic “_ e e t T_” gesture of pattern 2.\\footnote{Sutton touches briefly on this issue in the section of his chapter entitled “Improvisation as Recovery and ‘Faking’” (1998: 86). Jazz players, too, will talk about turning mistakes to their advantage, by sustaining and resolving dissonance, for instance. Of course the interlocking quality of kendang arja makes this sort of mistake-driven improvisation somewhat more problematic.}

Patterns 3 and 4 are varied in similar fashions, replacing left-hand rim-strokes with counting strokes and vice versa, and occasionally replacing “_ e e T_” with “e T e T_” gestures, and vice versa. No major structural changes or other large-scale pattern alterations occur.

\subsection*{4.2.2.2 Wadon Variation}

Pak Tama shows similar restraint in his tabuh telu wadon variations, where most of his changes involve small alterations of left-hand strokes. For instance, Tama will often omit extraneous kom (o) strokes in Dag-heavy sections, as in the third quadrant of pattern 3, replacing them either with deliberately audible counting strokes (l) or soft ones (_). Figure 4.8 compares the original pattern 3 with one such variation; alterations are shown in blue:

\begin{center}
\textbf{Figure 4.7.} “Proper” interlocking for Pak Tama \textit{tabuh telu} pattern 2
\end{center}
Figure 4.8. Counting stroke substitution and stroke omission in variation on Pak Tama *tabuh telu wadon* pattern 3
(original pattern top, variation bottom)

The sparser beginnings of patterns 1 through 3 also allow Pak Tama to explore the range of left-hand variants on the *dasar*, alternating freely between rim-strokes and counting strokes on *genap* (“off-beat”) quarter-beat positions à la Pak Tut *wadon* variation. Figure 4.9 below shows Pak Tama’s variants 1 and 1a – the original taught variants for the first halves of patterns 1 through 3; Figure 4.10 shows four improvised variations. Note that some of these improvised variations feature a strict alternation between rim and counting strokes, but that most create a more complex and sometimes cross-rhythmic relationship between them:

![Figure 4.9](image)

Figure 4.9. Pak Tama variants 1 (top) and 1a (bottom): alternating left-hand rim and counting strokes

(cont’d…)
That both Pak Tama and Pak Tut learned their *tabuh telu* patterns, either directly or indirectly, from Singapadu *arja* master Pak Kredek (discussed more in Chapter 5) explains their similarity of approach in *tabuh telu* variation.

While most of Pak Tama’s *tabuh telu wadon* variations involve just these minor left-hand alterations, three played variants that I will briefly explore here go beyond this level of variance, each in quite different ways.

In the first example, Tama replaces the second half of pattern 4 (which is usually his own variant 6) with the 4-beat variant I have called Pak Dewa variant 1. Seeing the two variants side-by-side in Figure 4.11 below, however, we can see that while more significant than the minor left-hand variance explored above, this switch does not truly alter the character of the pattern in terms of its *Dag* (D) placement. The pattern still features a *Dag*-heavy beginning and still *ngegongins* at the expected moment on the *klenang* (n) stroke before *gong*:

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4.11.** Pak Tama *wadon* variant 6 (top) compared to Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 1 (bottom)
Here, just as in the lanang examples above, we see a “o _ o o D” gesture being replaced by “o o D o D”, suggesting that these two variants are perhaps structurally interchangeable.

In this next example, alongside the expected left-hand variance and this same allusion to Pak Dewa’s variant 1 in the kom (o) placement of the “o o _ o D” gesture, Tama subverts the strong ngegongin feel at the end of a tabuh telu pattern 4 by delaying the arrival of the final Dag (D) stroke. In itself this is not a truly shocking modification; it mirrors the delayed final Dag (D) placement of his wadon variant 2. However, Tama then continues to subvert the ngegongin feel in this pattern by then pairing this delayed “d D” with a second “d D” gesture, thus altering the beginning of the following pattern 1 for two quarter-beats before then reverting to its expected rim-stroke/counting stroke dasar alternation. In this way, he altogether avoids the feeling of repose or release often supplied by the ngegongin gesture:

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G)       n   t     n   pu   n   t     n   G
(_)_o o d D _ _ o _ l _ o _ o D _ _ o o D _ _ o D _ _ _ _

Figure 4.12. Variation on Pak Tama tabuh telu wadon pattern 4 with delayed and added Dag (D) strokes (original pattern 4 top, variation bottom)

Following this pattern is a statement of Pak Tama’s tabuh telu wadon pattern 1, and we can see that the “d D” in its first beat does not alter the remainder of the pattern at all:

(8)– ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4 – ● – 5 – ● – 6 – ● – 7 – ● – 8
(G)       n   t     n   pu   n   t     n   G
(d)_D _ _ o _ l _ l _ _ o _ l _ _ o _ l _ _ o _ l _ _ o _ l _ _ o _ _

Figure 4.13. Pak Tama tabuh telu wadon pattern 1 with alternate beginning, otherwise unchanged
This implies that, though appearing after gong, the “d D” gesture is meant to be felt as part of the previous cycle. An analysis of pattern beginnings as dictated not by the conventions of the pattern itself, but by the previous pattern played, will become even more relevant when we discuss Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s wadon improvisations in section 4.3.3.

The final improvised tabuh telu wadon pattern I will discuss here, a variation on Pak Tama’s pattern 3, is shown in Figure 4.14:

![Figure 4.14](image)

In this variation most of the alterations are of the minor left-hand variety: Tama creates a strict alternation of rim and counting strokes in the first half of the cycle and removes some of the kom (o) in the Dag-heavy portion of the second half. The “o o d D” gesture straddling the guntang (t) stroke on beat 3, however, is a marked departure from the original wadon pattern, creating a new contour in a structurally significant way (with the addition of the Dag (D) strokes). This is a variant type that Pak Tama played many times, so I know it was not simply a mistake. And this delayed final Dag (D) placement is certainly idiomatic to Tama’s style – we see it in his variant 2. Further, if we interlock this new variation with the taught lanang pattern, it works quite well:

---

Footnote: This phenomenon links cycles into meta-cyclic patterns, discussed in the previous chapter.
In fact, this variation seems to be a better match for the taught lanang pattern than was the original wadon – Dag (D) and Tut (T) interlock in the first half of the pattern in the manner we would expect. What makes this played variant important for discussion here is something that Pak Tama once told me in a lesson. When teaching me the lanang patterns for tabuh telu, Pak Tama was careful to point out that the Tut strokes in the first half of pattern 3 played a special role. He called these strokes batu-batu, meaning “stones.” In Balinese music this is a term generally used to describe a special technique, seen in some minimally improvised paired drumming with mallets,\(^8\) “where sparse and syncopated D or T strokes […] are ‘dropped’ (with a report, like little explosions; not dropped as in omitted) during the improvisations” (Tenzer 2000: 289). Thus these batu-batu Tut (T) in Tama’s pattern 3 are meant to be played alone, without wadon interlocking. In this and other wadon improvisations, though, Pak Tama, knowing that his partner will be “dropping” batu-batu in that location, inserts an interlocking Dag (D) all the same.

---

\(^8\) Used in the classic long-metered lelambatan style and other genres.
4.2.3 Tabuh Dua and Batel

As expected, Pak Tama demonstrates a slightly richer range of improvisations in his tabuh dua and batel patterns. Here I will examine several full passages of Tama’s improvisations, where a “passage” is considered to be all patterns falling between two angsel, from introductory pattern through to the beginning of the angsel preparation patterns. I will again be analyzing the level of variation on taught patterns, but what interests me as well is the question of improvisational logic within these longer sections.

4.2.3.1 Lanang Improvisation for Batel

Figure 4.16 shows the first passage of batel improvisation that I analyze (CD Track 11):

---

**Figure 4.16.** Pak Tama lanang improvisation 1 for batel, divided into segments based on the taught patterns
For visual ease I have numbered the patterns that I will be discussing. These numbers do not represent meta-cycles as they did in Chapter 3; they are there simply for the purposes of analyzing this improvised passage in the context of the taught patterns. I will be calling these numbered patterns “fragments” or “segments” interchangeably. In this transcription, “0” marks the angsel and one empty cycle preceding the improvised passage. The segment marked “1” is not one of the taught variants, though it is quite similar to Sudi’s Variant 1. This pattern is so commonly played at the beginning of Pak Tama’s improvised passages, however, that I have labeled it the Pak Tama beginning variant:  

(2) – ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 1 – ● – 2

(G) pu G pu G

(_)_ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e e T _

Figure 4.17. Segment 1 (top) compared to Sudi lanang variant 1 (bottom)

The segment marked “2” is a perfect replica of Pak Tama’s variant 1a. The following two fragments of this improvisation, two beats apiece, are each smaller segments of one of Tama’s taught variants. Fragment 3 contains the second half of the variant I have labeled Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama), and fragment 4 contains the second half of Tama’s variant 4. Both of these are shown in Figure 4.18:

Another variant that Tama occasionally used for this introductory function, not examined in the analyses below, was (_)_ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e T _ _ _ __. A close relative to his taught introductory variant, (_)_ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e T _ _ _ __, this one shifts its double peng (e) to slightly later in the cycle and its final Tut (T) a full beat earlier.
Figure 4.18. Segment 3 uses the second half of Pak Dewa lanang 1b (Tama) (top) and segment 4 uses the second half of Pak Tama lanang variant 4 (bottom)

That Tama chooses just the denser portions of these two variants seems appropriate for the more ramé (dense, busy) feel demanded of batel structures.

In the segment I have labeled “5” we see Tama’s first major departure from the taught patterns. I see this pattern as being a quite significant improvised reworking of his variant 2:

Figure 4.19. Segment 5 (bottom) shown as a reworking of Pak Tama lanang variant 2 (top)

As we can see in Figure 4.19 above, Tama has taken the two ending gestures in his variant 2, “e e T e T _” and “e e T _”, and reversed them. And, perhaps most significantly, he has replaced the characteristic “e e t T” gesture at the beginning of variant 2 with the familiar “e e T _” gesture. Thus, though the elements are almost the same, we are left with a completely different musical experience in this variant. Main strokes align with the mat on different beats, and there is a terbalik-ing (reversal) of gestures leading up to the gong.

Segment 6 is a just slightly denser variation on the full Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama); Tama adds one peng (e), shown in blue, to this otherwise unaltered variant:
Next, he uses his typical variant 0a to \textit{ngeseh} (increase volume in preparation for \textit{angsel}). In Pak Tama’s \textit{lanang} improvisations this is a constant; he will always \textit{ngeseh} with this variant. Here he alters the pattern very slightly, cutting just one \textit{peng} (e) stroke – the first of the double \textit{peng} (e), again transcribed in blue in Figure 4.21 below:

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure421}
\caption{Segment 7 (top) shown as a slightly sparser variation on Pak Tama \textit{lanang} variant 0a (bottom)}
\end{figure}

And finally, Tama leads into his \textit{angsel} pattern with a reiteration of Pak Dewa \textit{lanang} variant 1b (Tama), this time in its unaltered form. This again is quite common. In his improvisations Tama directly precedes \textit{angsel} preparation with this variant (sometimes the full four beats, sometimes just its second half) over 50\% of the time.

Figure 4.22 summarizes the basic patterns used in this passage, with each box in the table representing two beats and the “…” representing a continuation of the pattern from the previous box:
In this passage overall we see Pak Tama largely improvising his *batel* structure using full 4-beat variants, most of them with only minor alterations on the taught variants. Yet we also see him further subdividing these variants, playing just two-beat portions from them. In this passage these smaller two-beat variants do not disrupt the larger 4-beat grouping structure of patterns; this section could just as easily be played in *tabuh dua*.

Further, as expected, Tama largely makes use of his denser (more *ramé*) variants in this *batel* passage, as we saw in his choice of the two-beat variant fragments in segments 3 and 4. Though the continuum from sparseness to *ramé*-ness is complicated to subdivide and categorize, I have done so as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No <em>Tut</em> stroke</th>
<th>1 <em>Tut</em> stroke</th>
<th>2+ <em>Tut</em> strokes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sparse (s)</strong></td>
<td>and 1-5 left-hand strokes</td>
<td>and 0 left-hand strokes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium (m)</strong></td>
<td>and 6+ left-hand strokes</td>
<td>2-5 strokes total</td>
<td>and 0 left-hand strokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ramé (R)</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6+ strokes total</td>
<td>and 1+ left-hand stroke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we can see that a two-beat segment that contains no *Tut* (T) strokes and less than 6 *peng* (e) strokes or audible left-hand counting strokes (l), or 1 *Tut* (T) stroke and no other main strokes, I have labeled “sparse” or “s.” A two-beat segment with no *Tut* (T) strokes but at least 6 *peng* (e) strokes or audible counting strokes (l), or 2 to 5 strokes that include one *Tut* (T), or two *Tut* (T) strokes and nothing else, I have labeled “medium” or “m.” A two-beat segment
containing more than one *Tut* (T) stroke and at least one other important stroke (“e” or “l”), or containing at least six strokes including one *Tut* (T), I have labeled “*ramé*” or “R.”\(^{10}\)

Both Pak Tama’s “beginning variant” and his variant 0a (*ngeseh*) begin with a sparse two-beat segment. Thus, many of his passages will contain at least these two sparse segments. In the passage from Figure 4.16 above, however, the rest of the two-beat segments are either medium or dense, consistent with the more *ramé* feel demanded of *batel*. With a slash before the *ngeseh* for visual clarity, the density analysis of this passage is as follows:

\[
\text{s-m-R-R-m-R-R-m-m} / \text{s-m-m-m-ang}
\]

**Figure 4.24.** Density analysis for Pak Tama’s *lanang* improvisation 1 for *batel* from Figure 4.16

Medium segments make up 50% of this passage, dense segments 36%, and a mere 14% of the passage is sparse – just the two expected sparse patterns. This density spread stands in stark contrast to a passage of *tabuh telu* featuring Pak Tama’s typical intro pattern followed by his taught patterns 1 through 4. In such a passage, with spaces marking the beginnings of each new gong pattern, the density spread would be as follows:

\[
\text{s-m s-s-s-R s-s-R-R s-R-s-R R-R-R-R}
\]

**Figure 4.25.** Density analysis for Pak Tama’s *tabuh telu lanang* patterns

Here 44% of the two-beat segments are sparse, 6% are medium, and 50% are dense. Already there is a marked difference: sparse patterns now make up nearly half the passage as opposed to being relegated to simply beginning and *ngeseh* patterns. Yet if we remember that most *tabuh telu* passages are not exactly four cycles long, and that each new passage will begin again with the intro pattern followed by pattern 1, we know that the dense pattern 4 occurs far

---

\(^{10}\) I have chosen to mix languages here for purely practical reasons. Were I to use the term “dense,” its abbreviation would be “D”, which is already in use to represent a *Dag* stroke. Yet, were I to use all Balinese terms, the commonly-used word for sparse patterns – *langah* – would be abbreviated “l”, a letter already used to represent a left-hand counting stroke.
less frequently in performance than patterns 1 and 2. Perhaps a more accurate density analysis of Tama’s tabuh telu improvisation as dictated by the needs of a singer-dancer, then, would be a slightly longer passage where he plays patterns 1 through 4 as above but continues on to play through patterns 1 and 2 and the first half of pattern 3 again before receiving a cue to give a short angsel. In such a passage the density spread differs even more severely from the batel passage examined above:

\[
\text{s-m s-s-s-R s-s-R-R s-R-R-R-R s-s-s-R s-R-R s-R-ang}
\]

**Figure 4.26.** Density analysis for a longer passage of Pak Tama’s tabuh telu lanang patterns

Now a full 50% of the strokes are sparse in contrast to the mere 14% in the batel passage above. In all these various passages, regardless of their relative densities, what we see is a larger compositional logic that prizes a balancing of more with less ramé elements. In the tabuh telu passages, each gong structure (with the exception of pattern 4) moves from sparser to denser two-beat segments. And, as mentioned in the discussion of Pak Tut’s closely related tabuh telu patterns in section 3.3.3, the full meta-cycle of four patterns also balances sparseness with ramé-ness in an end-weighted fashion. While the batel passage examined above does not exhibit the same directionality in its density shifts, we still see a balancing of varying densities. This time medium-density segments are balanced with fully dense ones. And this hearkens back to the lessons about arja improvisation that I learned from Pak Dewa, both in the construction of his full 8- and 12-beat taught patterns and in his instructions for how to combine (campur-campur) them: 1) there are more and less ramé variants at play, and these should always be balanced; and 2) a very ramé passage should be followed by a sparser one, and vice versa. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the idea of balancing the opposing elements in a duality is central to Balinese Hinduism. I wonder if this preference for density balancing in kendang arja
Improvisation stems from the same culturally preferred aesthetic. While this may perhaps be said of many musical systems, I suspect that my Balinese teachers and friends would respond very positively to the idea that the balance in their drumming reflects Balinese Hindu philosophy.

Examination of two other typical batel passages will allow us to determine if the same density spread and other variance preferences apply. Figure 4.27 is CD Track 12.

\[ \begin{align*}
(2)- & \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 \\
(G) & n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
(\_\_) & _U \_U \_U \_P \_T \_ \ (3x) \ e \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \ e \ e \ T \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
(2)- & \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 \\
(G) & n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
(\_\_) & e \ e \ T \_ e \_e \ e \ T _ _e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
(2)- & \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 \\
(G) & n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
(\_\_) & _e \ e \ T \_ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T _ e \ e \ T \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \text{Figure 4.27. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 2 for batel, divided into segments based on the taught patterns} \]

This passage has certain parallels to the previous one. Once again we see Pak Tama’s typical “beginning variant” (here marked “1”), the use of a slightly altered lanang variant 1a for ngeseh (segment 6), and the reappearance of Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama) (segment 7) directly preceding the angsel preparation (segment 8). Yet the quite contrasting use of patterns between this familiar scaffolding implies definite improvisation, not pre-composition.
In this passage segment 2 is a faithful rendering of Pak Tama’s lanang variant 5.

Segment 5 also makes use of this variant, reworking its beginning motif to create a new 3+3+2 cross-rhythm, as we can see in Figure 4.28 below:

Segment 3 is a reworking of Pak Cok’s variant 1 that reverses its first and second halves:

This is the first time we have seen Pak Tama using a variant that is not a variation or reworking of one of his own taught variants, and this is noteworthy. That Pak Tama and Pak Cok would have some patterns in common is not surprising; they both studied with Cok Oka Tublen. However, examination of his improvisations shows that Pak Tama only makes use of a small number of patterns aside from his own taught patterns, the most common being all or half of Pak Dewa’s variant 6. This is unsurprising, since this is one of the more generic variants,
simply balancing a sparse beginning with three iterations of the “e e T _” gesture. Originally shown in Figure 3.54, it is reproduced here for reference:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]
\[(\_) \_ \_ \_ \_ e \ e \ T \_ e \ e \ T \_ e \ e \ T \_\]

**Figure 3.54.** Pak Dewa lanang variant 6

And in fact segment 4 in the current passage is the first half of this variant.

Figure 4.30 below once again summarizes the pattern use in this passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: PT beg ges</th>
<th>2: PT5</th>
<th>3: PC1 rev’d</th>
<th>4: PD6 1/2</th>
<th>5: PT5 var, c-r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>6: PT0a</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7: PD1b (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>angeseh</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>angsel prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.30.** Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s lanang improvisation 2 for batel from Figure 4.27

An examination of the density of these variants reveals a similar spread to that of the first batel passage. Again, the only sparse segments are those in the beginning gesture and the ngeseh gesture. Of the remaining segments, six are dense and five are medium, balancing contrasting densities but with an overall much more *ramé* feel than in *tabuh telu*, as follows:

\[s-m-R-R-R-m-R-R / s-m-m-m-ang\]

**Figure 4.31.** Density analysis for Pak Tama’s lanang improvisation 2 for batel from Figure 4.27

Thus, this passage mirrors the first in its general density spread as well as its opening and closing segments. And again in this passage, Pak Tama makes use of largely his own taught variants – either in their full 4-beat forms or in smaller 2-beat segments – and demonstrates both some limited surface variation techniques and select reworkings of taught patterns. Yet he draws from a completely different sub-set of his taught patterns in this passage, not making use of the variants 1a, 4, and altered 2 explored in the previous passage. Further,
while the first passage examined maintained a constant 4-beat grouping structure, despite the more flexible 2-beat meter of batel, this passage does not. The insertion of the 2-beat segment 5 disrupts the flow of an otherwise strict 4-beat grouping structure, thus making this particular arrangement of variants not appropriate for use with tabuh dua. Thus we see a common framework to the first passage in terms of types of pattern variation, density spread, and beginning and ngeseh variants, but unique content in terms of the specific segmentation, organization, and variation of taught patterns.

The final lanang pattern I will examine for Pak Tama’s batel structure again shows this balancing of the pre-planned with the spontaneous (CD Track 13):

```
0-----------------------------------1
(2)- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(P) _ _ U U _ _ P t T _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ e _ e e T _

2-----------------------------------3
(2)- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ e e T _ _ _ e e T _ e e T _ e _ e _ e e T _

5-----------------------------------6
(2)- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ e e T _ _ _ e e T _ _ _ e e T _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e _ e

7-----------------------------------8
(2)- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(e)T _ e _ e e T _ e _ _ e e T _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ e _ e _ e e T _

*ngeseh

9-----------------------------------10
(2)- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2- ●- 1- ●- 2...
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G...
(_)_ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ e e T _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ U _ U _ _ _ _...
```

**Figure 4.32.** Pak Tama lanang improvisation 3 for batel, divided into segments based on the taught patterns.
This passage begins with a denser variation on the beginning variant, adding extra *peng* (e) strokes after the central *gong*, à la Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama):

![Diagram of percussive patterns](image)

**Figure 4.33.** Segment 1 (bottom) shown as a denser variation on Pak Tama *lanang* beginning variant (top) with elements from Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama) (middle)

And, similar to the other two passages examined, in this one Pak Tama uses his variant 0a to *ngeseh* (segment 9) and then precedes the *angsel* preparation with Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama) (segment 10). Flanked by these familiar pillars we see a fresh segmenting and organizing of taught patterns, some with new surface-level variations, some entirely reworked.

As in the previous passage, segment 2 makes use of Tama’s variant 5, though in a slightly sparser variation where the first *Tut* (T) is played instead as a right-thumb counting stroke. However, from here the passage diverges again into something new. The subsequent two-beat segment features the second half of Pak Dewa’s *lanang* variant 6 (*e e T _ e e T _*), and the following one, the second half of Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama). Again, Tama selects the denser of their two halves to make this new *batel* pattern, which could be said to be a denser variation on the latter variant:
Segment 5 may be seen as a sparser variation on Pak Tama’s variant 1, which, in its sparseness, creates a new 3+3+2 cross-rhythm akin to that in Pak Cok’s lanang variant 7, but reversed (terbalik) and thus shifted in its relationship to the mat – “e e T” occurs a half-beat earlier:

Segment 6 is a 2-beat variant that falls between the first half and the second half of Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama) in that it features just one peng (e) stroke in its first beat and a “_ e e T _” gesture in its second beat:
Segment 7 is the cross-rhythmic reworking of Tama’s variant 5 that we saw in Figure 4.28 above, but is slightly sparser, with the first Tut (T) stroke replaced by a right-thumb counting stroke (t), shown here in blue:

Figure 4.37. Segment 7 shown as a slightly sparser variation on Figure 4.28

This segment perhaps provides a context to retroactively reanalyze segment 5 as a sparser variant of segment 7.

Segment 8 is the same as the second half of Sudi’s lanang variant 2, but may also be seen as a slight variation on segment 6, reversing the left-hand main and counting strokes in its first beat:

Figure 4.38. Segment 8 (bottom) shown as a variation on segment 6 (top)

Figure 4.39 again outlines the variants used in this passage:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PT5 var</td>
<td>c-r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PT5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PT0a</td>
<td>ngeseh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PD1b</td>
<td>(T) 2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PD1b</td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.39.** Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s lanang improvisation 3 for batel from Figure 4.32

Here we see that the two-beat segment 6 disrupts the 4-beat grouping structure, but that it is re-established with segment 8, meaning that this passage could in theory be used in a tabuh dua gong structure if Pak Tama were willing to have segment 7 off-set from the cyclic structure. Analysis of his tabuh dua playing, however, reveals that he is not.

In terms of its density spread, this passage, too, demonstrates a non-directional balancing of medium and dense segments, with the only sparse segment marking the beginning of the ngeseh:

\[ m-m-R-R-R-m-m-R-R-R-m/s-m-m-m-ang \]

**Figure 4.40.** Density analysis for Pak Tama’s lanang improvisation 3 for batel from Figure 4.32

Thus in each of these lanang patterns we see familiar taught patterns, whole or segmented, often intact but sometimes varied or heavily reworked, creating a balance between medium and dense patterns. Because Pak Tama taught that the variants used to play batel were the same as those for both tabuh dua and batel marah, I suspect that similar improvisations will be used for these two structures as well. Examination here of a representative sampling of each will reveal the connections and differences between improvisations for these three cyclic structures in Pak Tama’s Singapadu style.

### 4.2.3.2 Lanang Improvisation for Tabuh Dua and Batel Marah: The Same?

Tabuh dua passages appear to mirror batel improvisations in virtually every respect. A single characteristic example will serve to illustrate this (CD Track 14):
This passage begins with Pak Tama’s classic beginning gesture in segment 1, followed by his variant 5 in segment 2, both in their unaltered forms. Segment 3 is a very slightly varied Pak Tama variant 4: Tama plays the first peng (e) as a left-hand counting stroke (l). Segment 4
is a re-working of Pak Tama’s variant 2 in which he has reversed the two end motifs, as follows:

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
(\_ ) e \ e \ e \ T \ e \ T \quad e \ e \ T \quad -
\]

\[
(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4
\]

\[
(\_ ) e \ e \ e \ e \ T \quad -
\]

**Figure 4.42.** Segment 4 shown as a reworking of Pak Tama *lanang* variant 2

Segment 5 is Tama’s variant 1a in its original form. Segments 6 and 7 together make up the next gong cycle. They are the first half of Tama’s variant 2 followed by the second half of Pak Cok’s variant 0, together creating a very *ramé* cycle. Segment 8 is a slightly sparser Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama), with a right-thumb counting stroke (t) replacing the first *Tut* (T). Segment 9 is where Pak Tama performs his *ngeseh* with the expected variant 0a, this time made slightly sparser by the removal of the first stroke in the double *peng* (e). The remainder of the passage includes another statement of Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama), Pak Tama’s variant 1a, and the second half of Sudi’s variant 2, all in their original taught formats. Much like in his *batel* improvisations, these variants combine to create a passage with a balance of medium and dense segments. Unlike in Pak Tut’s and Pak Tama’s semi-composed *tabuh telu* patterns, however, there is not a larger-scale directedness to the passage, moving from sparser to denser variants for instance. Tama simply mixes sparser with denser segments over the course of the passage without real concern for an overall shape or arc, as follows:
Thus, just as in his batel passages, Pak Tama’s tabuh dua improvisations are a spontaneously organized presentation of a large assortment of taught patterns finding a spread with roughly the same number of medium as dense segments, and sparse moments largely only at the beginning and in the ngeseh. These taught variants are sometimes played in their original forms but are, as often as not, either presented with surface variations, significantly reworked, or segmented into 2-beat variants that may be mixed and matched at will within the context of a 4-beat metrical and grouping structure.

Batel marah improvisations, by contrast, do differ in a few important ways from batel biasa (regular batel) and tabuh dua playing. The most significant involves the relative variety of their patterns. With batel marah drumming generally more heavily based on pre-composed pung (U) and Dag (D) shots to accompany fighting and other action onstage, there is seldom the time to explore a broad palette of patterns in the improvised passages. Further, given the increased pace of batel marah, Pak Tama seems to stick more closely to a small handful of favorite patterns, segmenting and varying them as in the batel biasa structure. He uses almost exclusively Pak Dewa variant 1b (Tama), Pak Tama variant 1a, Pak Tama variant 4, and 2-beat segments from Pak Dewa variant 6, all shown in Figure 4.44. That these variants contain only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: PT beg var</th>
<th>2: PT5</th>
<th>3: PT4</th>
<th>4: PT2 end rev’d</th>
<th>5: PT1a</th>
<th>6: PT2 1/2</th>
<th>7: PC0 2/2</th>
<th>8: PD1b (T)</th>
<th>9: PT0a ngeseh</th>
<th>10: PD1b (T)</th>
<th>11: PT1a</th>
<th>12: Sudi 2 2/2</th>
<th>13: angsel pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density analysis: s-m R-R m-R R-R R-R R-R m-m / s-m m-m R-R m-ang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.43. Summary of patterns and density analysis for Pak Tama’s lanang improvisation 1 for tabuh dua from Figure 4.41
medium and dense segments is no mistake; *batel marah* is meant to have the most *ramé* feel of all the cyclic structures.\(^{11}\)

\[
\text{Pak Dewa Lanang Variant 1b (Tama)}
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \\
(_h) & _h _h _h _h \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad _e \quad _e \quad _e \quad e \quad T \quad _e
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{Pak Tama Lanang Variant 1a}
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \\
(_h) & _e \quad e \quad T \quad _e \quad _e \quad _e \quad T \quad _e \quad e \quad T \quad _e
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{Pak Tama Lanang Variant 4}
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \\
(_h) & _h _h _h _h \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad _e \quad _e \quad e \quad T \quad _e
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{Pak Dewa Lanang Variant 6}
\begin{align*}
(4) & - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & n \quad \text{pu} \quad n \\
(_h) & _h _h _h _h \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad _e \quad e \quad e \quad T \quad _e
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.44. The dense variants that make up Pak Tama’s basic palette of patterns for his *batel marah* improvisations

Almost invariably Pak Tama begins his *batel marah* improvisations with Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama). I suspect that he does not feel the need to open with one of his intro patterns because he is not starting his improvisations from silence; he has been playing fixed gestures beforehand, as we can see in the following *batel marah* passage (CD Track 15):

---

\(^{11}\) This feeling of *ramé* is also accomplished through increased volume. As previously mentioned, Pak Tama will often play his *peng* (e) strokes with his hand further down the drumhead for the *batel* structures, creating a timbre somewhere between a *peng* (e) and a *pung* (U). And, when *batel marah* is used for the Penasar characters, Pak Tama will very often replace his *peng* (e) strokes with the louder *Pak* (P) strokes for a further increase in volume and a resulting more *ramé* feel.
In this passage segment 0 marks the end of the previous angsel and the 4 empty gong cycles that follow; segment 1 contains fixed gestures associated with dancers’ movements. The improvisation begins in segment 2 with, predictably, Pak Dewa lanang variant 1b (Tama). Pak Tama follows this up with a variation on his variant 4 that leads directly into the angsel:

Figure 4.45. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 1 for batel marah divided into segments based on the taught patterns

The sparser ending of this variant leaves space (kinesthetic as much as aural, at such high speeds) for Pak Tama to prepare the Pak (P) angsel cue. Yet, even with this sparser
variant, we still have an overall passage exhibiting a roughly even spread of mostly medium and dense segments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2: PD1b (T)</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>PT1a</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>PT4 var</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>angsel prep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Density analysis: **m-m-R-R-m-s-ang**

**Figure 4.47.** Summary of patterns and density analysis for Pak Tama’s *lanang* improvisation 1 for *batel marah* from Figure 4.45

The next *batel marah* passage shows a similar spread of medium and dense segments chosen almost exclusively from the four standard patterns in Figure 4.44 above (CD Track 16):

---

**Figure 4.48.** Pak Tama *lanang* improvisation 2 for *batel marah* divided into segments based on the taught patterns
And here, as in the *batel biasa* passages examined above, we see variants segmented into smaller 2-beat patterns, temporarily subverting the larger 4-beat grouping structure that prevails overall. However, as with the previous *batel marah* passage, none of the patterns offers a major reworking of taught variants. *Batel marah* is simply too fast to allow for this deeper level of spontaneous re-creation.

This is one of the few instances in my recordings where Pak Tama does not open his *batel marah* improvisation with a full Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama). Following the pre-composed segment 0, Tama instead plays just the denser second half of this variant twice (segments 1 and 2). He follows this up with his variant 1a in segment 3 before finally giving us a full Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama) in segment 4. This is followed by a repetition of just the second half of this variant in segment 5, here disrupting the 4-beat grouping structure. Pak Tama then repeats his variant 1a. Lastly, he offers a 2-beat variant that is the second half of Sudi’s *lanang* variant 2, but which may also be seen as a variation on the second half of the now-familiar Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama).

In his organization of these taught patterns, Pak Tama again creates a non-directed even spread of medium and dense segments, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: PD1b (T) 2/2</th>
<th>2: PD1b (T) 2/2</th>
<th>3: PT1a</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>4: PD1b (T)</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>5: PD1b (T) 2/2</th>
<th>6: PT1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>7: Sudi 2 2/2</td>
<td><strong>angsel</strong></td>
<td>prep</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Density analysis: m-m-R-R-m-m-m-R-R-m-ang

**Figure 4.49.** Summary of patterns and density analysis for Pak Tama’s *lanang* improvisation 2 for *batel marah* from Figure 4.48

The final *batel marah* passage that I will examine here introduces the last of the four common *batel marah* patterns listed in Figure 4.44: Pak Dewa variant 6. This variant Pak Tama
seldom plays in its entirety for *batel marah*, but uses it instead for its two-beat segments, “(_)_ _ _ e e T _” and “(_)_ _ e e T _ e e T _”. Figure 4.50 is CD Track 17:

```
0-----------------------------------1-----------------------------------
(2) - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ U U _ U _ P t T _ (5x) _ _ _ _ U _ _ P _ _ U U _ P _ _
```

```
(2) - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ U _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ _ U _ _
```

```
2-----------------------------------3-----------------------------------
(2) - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ e e e T _ e e e T _ e e T _ e e e T _ e e T _
```

```
4-----------------------------------5-----------------------------------6-----------------------------------7
(2) - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2 - ⋅ - 1 - ⋅ - 2
(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ e e e T _ e e e T _ e e e T _ e e e T _ e e e T _ e e T _ _ _ e _ e U _ _
```

**Figure 4.50.** Pak Tama *lanang* improvisation 3 for *batel marah* divided into segments based on the taught patterns.

In this pattern once again, following the pre-composed segment 1, Pak Tama begins his improvisations with Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama). This one is a slightly denser variation, featuring an extra *peng* (e) in the quarter-beat before the first *tawa-tawa* (pu) stroke, again a surface-level variation of the kind seen in his *batel biasa* playing. Pak Tama follows this with a statement of his variant 1a in segment 3, then two statements of the second (denser) half of Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama) in segments 4 and 5. Segment 6 gives us the second half of Pak Dewa’s variant 6 to lead us into the *angsel* cue.
As expected, a small palette of predictable patterns, sometimes lightly varied, sometimes foreshortened (which sometimes disrupts the prevailing 4-beat grouping structure) is organized in another spread with a roughly equal number of medium and dense segments as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PD1b (T)</th>
<th>PT1a</th>
<th></th>
<th>PD1b (T) 2/2</th>
<th>PD1b (T) 2/2</th>
<th>PD6 2/2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Density analysis: m-m-R-R-m-m-R-ang

**Figure 4.51.** Summary of patterns and density analysis for Pak Tama’s lanang improvisation 3 for batel marah from Figure 4.50

Thus Pak Tama’s batel marah improvisations follow the density aesthetics and surface variation practices of his batel biasa variations, but using a smaller palette of taught patterns and reworking them less.

### 4.2.3.3 Wadon Improvisations for Tabuh Dua and Batel

As might be expected given the Balinese discourse on the relative freedom of the two arja drums, Pak Tama’s wadon playing exhibits a slightly broader scope for variation. Where his lanang improvisations for tabuh dua and the two batel structures stuck largely to his own taught patterns, in his wadon playing we will see him branch out, improvising not only on his own taught variants but on those of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok also. We will see him rework elements of these patterns, sometimes quite drastically, and we will even see him invent brand new patterns in the course of performance. In this section, an examination of two representative passages of improvised batel, one of batel marah and two of tabuh dua will allow us to make some generalizations concerning Pak Tama’s wadon improvisations in these shorter cyclic structures, while at the same time determining whether or not there are classifiable distinctions between them. The first batel passage is transcribed in Figure 4.52 (CD Track 18):
The first very obvious difference between this passage and its lanang cousins is its length. This pattern is twice as long as any lanang variant discussed above, and the same can be said for all the other wadon passages under examination here. This increased length is partially due to the fact that while the lanang player is beginning his angsel preparations, the wadon player will still be improvising. However, I suspect that the main reason for this difference in length is that Pak Tama believed he played more varied wadon patterns, and thus chose to improvise on them for a greater span of time.  

In segment 1 of this passage we see a sparser variant of the ubiquitous gesture “o d D” landing directly on the beat preceding gong. Because this gesture is used in so many variants, I prefer not to associate it with just one variant when it is played in isolation as here. Thus, I have named it the “two-beat dasar” (two-beat basic pattern). Like all variants, this dasar, too, is played in a multitude of different ways. In the above passage Pak Tama replaces the kom (o) stroke with a left-hand counting stroke (l). Yet, as we have seen in its use in the taught variants, this two-beat dasar can also be altered further to include a kom (o) stroke on the first beat and a double kom (o) landing on the final beat. In Figure 4.53 I have transcribed these optional beginning kom (o) and final double kom (o) strokes in grey and the main “o d D” gesture in bold black:

---

12 When I did the larger recording session with Pak Tama and his partner-student Pak Buda, Pak Buda was the one to play wadon in the interlocking portions of the session. Thus, all of these wadon patterns of Pak Tama’s come from his solo improvisations, which I recorded in advance of recording the interlocking parts so that I could get a sense of each player’s improvisations on both drums. Because of this, Pak Tama would have complete control over the length of his passages between angsel – a rarity, of course, in kendang arja wadon.
We see this two-beat variant inserted at will throughout the two-beat batel structures. But it is also used in the longer gong cycles, both when beginning to play after an angsel as in the above passage, and as filler between patterns segmented into shorter two-beat units.

Segment 2 in this passage is a faithful rendition of Pak Tama’s wadon variant 0, and segment 3 is a slightly sparser variation on his wadon variant 6, with the Dag (D) stroke directly preceding the central gong being replaced by a right-thumb counting stroke (d).

Segment 4 displays the strict genap left-hand stroke placement of the dasar, alternating freely between rim strokes and counting strokes. I have taken to calling this type of pattern generically “dasar with alternation” (or “dasar alt” for short). In this particular dasar alt, Pak Tama creates a 3+3+2 cross-rhythm that is in fact a complete opposite of Pak Tut’s dasar 1 in its stroke use:

![Figure 4.53. Two-beat dasar (basic) for wadon](image)

Alternately, if we see the cross-rhythm as beginning on the kom (o) stroke preceding gong, it becomes almost a 3+3+3 cross-rhythm of “o _ _ _” spread over 4.5 beats, with the final kom (o) subverting our expectations of exact repetition (marked with a red star):

![Figure 4.54. Segment 4 (top) as a 3+3+2 cross-rhythm exhibiting total stroke reversal from Pak Tut wadon dasar 1 (bottom)](image)
Segment 3
(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2
(G) n p u n G n p u n G n p u n G
(o) D _ o _ o _ o _ o _ d _ o _ o _ d _ d _ D _ _ o _ l _ l _ o _ l _ o _ l

Segment 4
(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2
(G) n p u n G
(_ ) 1 1 d D 1 D 1 1

Figure 4.55. Segment 3 into 4 shown as an almost perfect 3+3+3 cross-rhythm spread over 4.5 beats

In segment 5 we see the first example of Pak Tama improvising on one of Pak Dewa’s taught patterns, in this case the first half of his variant 5:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2
(o) D o D D D

Figure 4.56. Segment 5 (top) shown as a variation on the first two beats of Pak Dewa wadon variant 5 (bottom)

For this passage Tama varies this pattern in a number of ways. The most obvious is the replacement of all left-hand rim strokes (o) with counting strokes (l), but he also reworks the opening motif, not landing with a kom (o) stroke directly on the gong as Pak Dewa does but delaying its arrival by one quarter beat and replacing the D that Pak Dewa places there:

“(o) D o D D” becomes “(_ ) 1 1 d D”. A cursory glance at Pak Tama’s taught wadon patterns (those he demonstrated for tabuh telu, discussed in section 3.2.3.2) will tell us that this particular change is completely idiomatic to his playing style. Only in one pattern, his variant 6, does Tama line a double kom stroke up with mat at the beginning of a 4-beat group. And, if we consider the above variant in its context with the 4-beat dasar alt preceding it, we have something quite similar to Pak Tama’s tabuh telu patterns 2 and 3:
Segment 5 lasts only two beats, thus subverting the 4-beat grouping structure that has prevailed up to this point.

In segment 6 Pak Tama uses another of Pak Dewa’s taught variants. A slightly sparser version of Dewa’s variant 1, this variation replaces the “o o D o D” gesture in the middle of the pattern with “o o _ o D”, but otherwise keeps the pattern intact.

In segment 7 we see the first really interesting reworking of a wadon pattern. Here Pak Tama appears to take as the basis for his pattern the rasa (feeling) of Pak Dewa’s wadon variant 2, with its “o d D” gesture landing on the quarter-beat just after each guntang stroke as opposed to on it:

Yet now, instead of simply playing this full pattern, Pak Tama alternates this “o d D” gesture (which he idiomatically varies as “o o D”) with beat-long dasar alt motifs. Figure 4.59
below shows this passage beginning on the previous *gong* cycle to show where the *dasar alt* pattern begins:

\[
\begin{align*}
(2/2 \text{ Segment 6}) & \quad \text{Segment 7} \\
(2) & \quad \text{●} - 1 - \text{●} - 2 - \text{●} - 1 - \text{●} - 2 - \text{●} - 1 - \text{●} - 2 \\
(G) & \quad \text{n} \text{p} \text{u} \text{n} \quad \text{G} \quad \text{n} \text{p} \text{u} \text{n} \quad \text{G} \quad \text{n} \text{p} \text{u} \text{n} \quad \text{G} \quad \text{n} \text{p} \text{u} \text{n} \\
(_) & \quad \text{o} \text{o} \text{d} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{o} \text{ o} \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{o} \text{ o} \text{D} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{o} \text{ o} \text{D} \quad \text{D} \\
\end{align*}
\]

*Figure 4.59.* Segment 7 alternates the *rasa* of Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 2 with 1-beat *dasar alt* gestures

This variant type, as we shall see in section 4.3.3, becomes even more extended and complex in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s improvisations.

In segment 8 Pak Tama plays a slight variation on his variant 6, cutting the first *kom* (o) stroke. Segment 9 is a repeat of the *dasar alt* from segment 4. This repetition of previously played variants within a single passage is a quite common device in Pak Tama’s playing. We have seen already it in his *lanang* improvisations. For instance, in many of his passages Pak Tama will return to Pak Dewa *lanang* variant 1b (Tama) multiple times. And any passage using the cross-rhythm based on his *lanang* variant 5 (see Figure 4.28) will have introduced that variant in its original taught form first. This example becomes yet more interesting because it implies something of a strategy for improvisation in Pak Tama’s playing – an understanding that there are home-base patterns (the taught patterns) which he then departs from and sometimes returns to.

The next several segments in the *wadon* passage under examination here will serve to further elucidate this technique of self-referential pattern repetition, and to show how this technique seems to become even more central in Tama’s *wadon* passages.

In segment 10 Pak Tama plays a denser variation on the second half of his variant 0, most significantly including the addition of a second *Dag* (D) stroke two quarter beats after the first one:
Figure 4.60. Segment 10 (top) shown as a denser variation on the second half of Pak Tama wadon variant 0 (bottom)

This added Dag (D) is not without precedent in kendang arja; Pak Dewa’s variant 5 uses it also:

\[
(4) - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
(o) D \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad D
\]

\[
* \quad * \quad *
\]

Figure 4.61. The added Dag (D) stroke in Pak Dewa wadon variant 5

The placement of this second Dag (D) gives this pattern kinship with some of Pak Tama’s other wadon patterns, like his variants 2 and 5, which feature a delayed final position Dag (D):

\[
(4) - \cdot - 5 - \cdot - 6 - \cdot - 7 - \cdot - 8
\]

\[
pu \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad G
\]

\[
_1 \quad o \quad _1 \quad _1 \quad o \quad o \quad o \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad _-
\]

\[
* \quad *
\]

\[
(8) - \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4
\]

\[
(G) \quad n \quad t \quad n \quad pu
\]

\[
(_o \quad o \quad D \quad _o \quad _o \quad _1 \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad o
\]

\[
* \quad *
\]

Figure 4.62. Delayed final position Dag (D) in Pak Tama wadon variants 2 (top) and 5 (bottom)

Looked at in this way, and in the context of his variant 6 in segment 11 to follow, this passage could almost be considered as a reworking of his tabuh telu pattern 4:
In segment 12 Pak Tama introduces a variation on his variant 0 that replaces the two genap (“off-beat”) kom (o) strokes flanking the beat after gong with an equally idiomastic double kom (o) gesture landing directly on the beat. And, with its kom (o) stroke in the quarter-beat before gong, this pattern seems to be leading into another alternation between the dasar alt motif and the delayed Dag “o o D” gesture of Pak Dewa’s variant 2 seen in Figure 4.59 above. However, this pattern only lasts two beats before changing into something new again:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) &- \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) &\_ \_ \_ o _ o d D \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \\
\end{align*}
\]

What we have in segments 14 though 16 is a repeat of segments 10 through 12, though with some small surface alterations: a denser variation on the second half of Pak Tama’s variant 0, his full variant 6, and finally full variant 0. This is an example of the self-referential pattern repetition discussed above, a series of segments unique to this passage returns again later in a slightly altered form. This group of three repeated segments ending in Pak Tama’s variant 0 is
followed by an immediate repetition of variant 0 in segment 17 that features a strict alternation between left-hand rim and counting strokes in its first half:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment 16</th>
<th>Segment 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 1 - ● - 2</td>
<td>(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G n pu n G n pu n G</td>
<td>(<em>)</em> _ o _ 1 _ o _ o o D _ _ o _ 1 _ o _ 1 _ o _ o o D o _ o o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.65. Segment 16 leads into a strict alternation between left-hand rim and counting strokes in Segment 17’s variation on Pak Tama wadon variant 0

Segment 18 returns to Pak Tama’s variant 6, which leads directly into the *angsdel* preparation. In segments 10 through 18, then, Tama essentially takes three different taught patterns, repeats them, varies them, rearranges them, and interjects other patterns, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 4.66. Motivic development of the three main patterns in segments 10-18

The table in Figure 4.67 gives a summary of all the patterns in this passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1: 2bd</th>
<th>2: PT0</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>3: PT6</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>4: dasar alt</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5: PD5 1/2</td>
<td>6: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7:PD2 alt dasar alt</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>8: PT6</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: dasar alt</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10: PT0 2/2 d.v.</td>
<td>11: PT 6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12: PT0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13: PD2 alt d. alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: PT0 2/2 d.v.</td>
<td>15: PT6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16: PT0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>17: PT0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>18: PT6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>19: <em>angsdel pr</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.67. Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s wadon improvisation 1 for batel from Figure 4.52

The kind of motivic development seen here exists in many of Tama’s wadon passages. In another batel sequence, for instance, he alternates between variations of the *dasar* alt pattern (marked as A in Figure 4.68), his variant 0 (B) and Pak Dewa’s variant 1 (C) as follows:
This passage features a completely different group of variants played in a unique sequence, but follows the same aesthetic of motivic repetition and development.

The second *batel* passage I will examine is transcribed in Figure 4.69 (CD Track 19):

| A | B | ... | C | ... | B | ... | A | ... | B | ... | C | ... | B | ... |

---

Figure 4.69. Pak Tama *wadon* improvisation 2 for *batel* divided into segments based on the taught patterns
Here we see many of the same types of surface variance, pattern reworking, and motivic repetition as in the previous passage. Instead of discussing the full passage in depth, therefore, I will focus in on its most noteworthy segments and structural characteristics. Segments 1 and 4 each offer a new kind of extended sparse variant. In segment 1 Pak Tama gives us yet another reworking of the delayed Dag feel found in the “o d D” gesture from Pak Dewa’s variant 2. In segment 7 of the previous passage we saw Pak Tama alternating “o o D” at the tawa-tawa stroke (pu) with beat-long dasar alt gestures surrounding gong. In segment 1 of this new passage Tama maintains the tawa-tawa placement of his “o o D” gesture, though he gives us a slightly sparser “o _ D” variation. Yet, where he used the dasar alt gesture above, here Tama plays all soft counting strokes as follows:

\[(2) - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2 - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2 - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2\]
\[(G) \_ \_ o \_ D \_ \_ \_ \_ o \_ D \_ \_ \_ \_ o \_ D \_ \_ \_ \_ \]

**Figure 4.70.** Segment 1 features a sparser variation on the delayed Dag (D) placement of Pak Dewa wadon variant 2.

As in the passage in segment 7 above, this one lasts for three full gong cycles – 6 beats. Segment 4 offers a very different sparse 6-beat variant. Beginning exactly like the “(_)_l _ l _ o _ l _ l _ o _ l _ o _” dasar alt in segment 4 of the previous passage, this one extends its cross-rhythm over 3 full gong cycles creating a 3+3+3+3 cross-rhythm against the 4+4+4 of the meter:

\[(2) - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2 - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2 - \_ - 1 - \_ - 2\]
\[(G) \_ \_ o \_ D \_ \_ \_ \_ o \_ D \_ \_ \_ \_ o \_ D \_ \_ \_ \_ \]

**Figure 4.71.** 3+3+3+3 cross-rhythm in segment 4.
Further, as in the above passage, there appears to be a larger compositional logic through motivic development to Tama’s improvisations here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: sp. var</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>2: PT0</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>3: PD1</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>4: dasar alt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD2 feel</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5: PT0</td>
<td>2/2 d.v.</td>
<td>6: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7: PT0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9: PD1 1/2</td>
<td>10: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>11: PT0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12: PD1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.72. Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s wadon improvisation 2 for batel from Figure 4.69

Tama is largely playing with just two variants in this passage – his variant 0 and Pak Dewa’s variant 1. Yet, by varying, segmenting, and rearranging them, and by slowly introducing other variants into the mix (such as his variant 6 and the two sparse variants explored above), he keeps the overall structure unpredictable and fresh. What’s more, the entire passage is flanked by matching bookends that contrast the rest of the passage with their delayed Dag (D) feel:

A ... B ... C ... X ... Y C C ... B ... C ... A

Figure 4.73. Motivic development of the three main patterns Tama’s wadon improvisation 2 for batel from Figure 4.69

Unlike in his lanang playing, there is very little appreciable difference between Pak Tama’s batel marah improvisations and these batel biasa passages. Much of the reason for this is undoubtedly practical. With so many quick pre-composed passages to insert at the will of the dancers in batel marah, the lanang player must pay too close attention to be any more creative in his improvisations. The wadon, by contrast, can improvise more freely and simply “cheat” off his partner for dancer cues. A single characteristic example of Pak Tama’s batel marah improvisations will serve to illustrate its aesthetic similarities to the batel biasa passages examined above. Shown in Figure 4.74 it is also CD Track 20.
Figure 4.74. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 1 for batel marah divided into segments based on the taught patterns

An examination of the table in Figure 4.75 below will give a sense of the overall structural organization of this passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2: 2bd</th>
<th>3: 2bd</th>
<th>4: PT0</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>5: PD2 alt d.a.</th>
<th>6: PT0 2/2 d.v.</th>
<th>7: PD1</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8: PD2 alt d.a.</td>
<td>9: PT0 2/2</td>
<td>10: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>11: PD2 alt d.a.</td>
<td>12: PT6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13: PD2 alt d.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12: *angsel pr*

Figure 4.75. Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s wadon improvisation 1 for batel marah from Figure 4.74

Here, much as in the batel biasa passages above, we see a collection of three variants receiving the lion’s share of the attention: Tama’s variant 0, Pak Dewa’s variant 1, and the new sparser
variant in which the delayed *Dag* (D) feel of Pak Dewa’s variant 2 is alternated with *dasar* alt gestures (PD2 alt. d.a.). These three variants are altered slightly at each iteration, as above, and are segmented, re-spliced, and arranged at will, as well as being interspersed with other variants. Once again we see a near complete absence of literal repetition within a musical context that still maintains a deep aesthetic of self-referencing, as follows:

| X | X | A | ... | B | A | C | ... | B | A | C | ... | B | Y | ... | B |

*Figure 4.76.* Motivic development of the three main patterns Tama’s *wadon* improvisation 1 for *batel marah* from *Figure 4.74*

Central to this passage are the immediate repetitions of the “B-A-C-…” figure – the PD2 alt. d.a. variant for two beats, the second half of Pak Tama’s variant 0 and all of Pak Dewa’s variant 1. Yet even in this repetition Pak Tama creates a sense of motion and change through surface variation in almost half his drum strokes, shown in blue in *Figure 4.77*:

```
5--------------------6--------------------7--------------------
(2) - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2
(G) n  p  u  n  G  n  p  u  n  G  n  p  u  n  G  n  p  u  n  G
(_ ) o  o  o  d  _ o  o  o  d  D  _ D  _ D  _ l  l  D  _ l  l  D  _ o  o
```

```
8--------------------9--------------------10--------------------
(2) - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2 - 1 - 2
(G) n  p  u  n  G  n  p  u  n  G  n  p  u  n  G  n  p  u  n  G
(_ ) l  o  o  d  _ _ _ o  o  d  D  _ D  _ D  _ o  o  D  _ o  o  D  _ D  _ D  _ o  o
```

*Figure 4.77.* Segments 5-10 as varied back-to-back iterations of the “B-A-C” figure

Following these two statements of “B-A-C-…” Tama once again plays “B”, but then subverts expectations by introducing a new variant to this passage: his variant 6, before returning to the “B” variant prior to his *angsel* preparation.

Thus we see a very similar level of both surface variation and structural organization of variants in his two *batel* gong cycle types. In *tabuh dua* improvisations, however, Pak Tama
appears to expand his creativity in pattern reworking. As much as anything else, this is probably because the slower tempo of *tabuh dua* gives Tama’s brain and hands the time to innovate more extensively in performance. The two quite distinct passages examined below exemplify this increased freedom. The first, transcribed in Figure 4.78, is CD Track 21:

Figure 4.78. Pak Tama *wadon* improvisation 1 for *tabuh dua* divided into segments based on the taught patterns

In this first passage we see the introduction of yet another new variant: a two-beat variant that appears in segments 3, 6, and 14 in three somewhat different incarnations. A
comparison of this variant with Pak Tama’s variant 0 (though any other variant would do just as well) will illustrate why I have affectionately named it the “weird Dag variant”;

Figure 4.79. Dag (D) placement in Pak Tama wadon variant 0 (top) compared to the “Weird Dag” variant (bottom)

This beat-2 tawa-tawa (pu) placement of Dag (D) in a tabuh dua structure does not occur in any of the taught patterns; nor, in fact, does it occur in any other improvised pattern in my recordings. Neither do we find Dag (D) placement two beats after gong (G) in any of the other cyclic structures. Yet this variant appears not only in Pak Tama’s playing but also in both Pak Cok and Pak Dewa’s improvisations. It must, therefore, be idiomatic to the original Singapadu tradition. Of course in tabuh dua we will always hear this variant in the context of a full 4-beat gong structure, and in that larger framework there are a few plausible explanations for its existence. Perhaps the Dag (D) on beat 2 is simply meant to be heard as an anticipation of the larger final Dag (D) stroke that will so often come on beat 3 or in the quarter-beat following:

Figure 4.80. “Weird Dag” variant contextualized in segments 14-15

Or perhaps it is simply meant to be heard as a delay on the Dag (D) stroke that commonly falls a quarter-beat before the tawa-tawa (pu), as in Pak Dewa’s variant 1:
(4) – ● – 1 – ● – 2 – ● – 3 – ● – 4

(G) n pu n G
(o) D _ o o D o D _ o o d D _ _ o o

Figure 4.81. “Weird Dag” variant in segment 14 (bottom) re-heard as a variation on the first half of Pak Dewa wadon variant 1 (top)

The rest of the variants used in this passage are familiar taught variants, though Pak Tama will often alter them creating a sparser (s.v.) or denser (d.v.) feel as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(G)</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: sparse dasar</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2: PD0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3: weird Dag</td>
<td>4: PD0a 2/2</td>
<td>5: PD0 d.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: weird Dag</td>
<td>7: PD6 2/2 s.v.</td>
<td>8: end var s.v.</td>
<td>9: PD6 2/2 s.v.</td>
<td>10: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>11: PD2 feel s.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: PT6 d.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13: PT0 d.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14: weird Dag</td>
<td>15: PD2 feel s.v.</td>
<td>16: PT5 → ang pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.82. Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s wadon improvisation 1 for tabuh dua from Figure 4.78

As we can see in Figure 4.82, in his tabuh dua improvisations Pak Tama plays with a broader palette of patterns within a single passage than he did in either of his batel structures. While he does return to some of these variants again throughout the passage, there is less pattern repetition here than in any of the batel passages examined above. What’s more, Pak Tama presents in this passage some rather unusual pattern variations. In segment 12, for instance, he adds a seemingly ganjil/genap rule-breaking Dag (D) stroke to his variant 6, shown in Figure 4.83:
Given the *Tut* (T) sparseness at the beginning of most of his *lanang* patterns, perhaps he simply feels safe to add this somewhat unidiomatic variation here.

Tama also creates a distinctive and relatively sparse *Dag*-only section from segments 7 to 9 in this passage:

In this section, segments 7 and 9 may be seen as sparser variations on the second half of Pak Dewa’s variant 6 with *kom* (o) strokes removed, as follows:

---

**Figure 4.83.** Segment 12 (top) as a variation on Pak Tama *wadon* variant 6 (bottom) that breaks the *ganjil/genap* rule in its *Dag* (D) placement

**Figure 4.84.** Tama plays a sparse, *Dag*-only section in segments 7-9

**Figure 4.85.** Segments 7 (middle) and 9 (bottom) as sparser variations on the second half of Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 6 (top)
Segment 8 may be seen as a similarly sparse variation on the first half of Pak Dewa’s end variant, with the final Dag (D) feel in its unusual location on beat 1:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n  pu  n  G
(o) D  o  d  D  _  _  _  _  _  _  _  o  o  o  
*

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2...
(G)  n  pu...
(_)_ _ d  D  _  _  _  _...
*
```

**Figure 4.86.** Segment 8 (bottom) as a sparser variation on the second half of Pak Dewa *wadon* end variant (top)

Thus, though the elements are all familiar, Pak Tama reworks and splices them in an entirely distinctive way for this passage.

This next *tabuh dua* passage – one of his longest – exhibits the most extensive spontaneous creativity in all of Pak Tama’s recorded passages. Again I will discuss here only the most striking of his variants (see Figure 4.87 on this page and the next; CD Track 22).
Figure 4.87. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 2 for tabuh dua divided into segments based on the taught patterns
Figure 4.88 below shows the layout of taught pattern elements within this improvisation, and again we see a larger number of variants at play in a single *tabuh dua* passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(G) pu</th>
<th>G pu</th>
<th>G pu</th>
<th>G pu</th>
<th>G pu</th>
<th>G pu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: 2bd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: PT0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: PD1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: PT0</td>
<td>d.v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: weird <em>Dag</em></td>
<td>6: PD2 s.v.</td>
<td>7: end var 1/2</td>
<td>8: PT2 2/2</td>
<td>9: PD1 d.v.</td>
<td>10: PD6 off-set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: weird <em>Dag</em></td>
<td>12: PD2 s.v.</td>
<td>13: weird <em>Dag</em></td>
<td>14: end var 2/2</td>
<td>15: PT2</td>
<td>16: PD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: PD0 d.v.</td>
<td>18: PD1</td>
<td>19: PT5</td>
<td>20: PD1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: PD2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: weird <em>Dag</em></td>
<td>23: end var 2/2</td>
<td>24: PT0</td>
<td>25: weird <em>Dag</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: PD0a 2/2</td>
<td>27: PT0 2/2→<em>ang</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.88.* Summary of patterns used in Pak Tama’s *wadon* improvisation 2 for *tabuh dua* from Figure 4.78

No new variants are introduced in this passage, yet it is highly original in terms of the variation, segmentation, and organization of familiar pattern elements. Segments 5 though 8, for instance, blend elements of four distinct patterns over the course of 8 beats to create a striking arrangement of drum strokes that, because its elements are drawn from taught patterns, by definition still follows the limitations of *wadon* playing examined in Chapter 3. Segment 5 offers a variation on the “weird *Dag*” variant with one *kom* (o) stroke cut:

```
(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2...  
(G) n pu...
(o) D __ __ o o d D...
```

*Figure 4.89.* Segment 5 (top) shown as a variation on the “Weird *Dag*” variant (bottom)
Segment 6 is the now-familiar sparse reworking of the delayed Dag (D) feel in Pak Dewa’s variant 2, but it stands out in the context of the on-beat Dag (D) stroke preceding it. In segment 7 Pak Tama lands his “d D” on the beat 1 klenang stroke, as in Pak Dewa’s end variant. However, instead of using Pak Dewa’s “(o) D o d D” gesture (which most probably stems from the “o _ o d D” ngegongin gesture in Pak Dewa’s variant 0), Tama uses the “_ o o d D” gesture of his own variant 0 for this variation:

Pak Dewa Wadon 0a

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4  
(G) n pu n G  
(_) _ _ o _ 1 _ o _ o _ o d D _ _ o o  
→ (o) D o d D _ _ _ _

Pak Tama Wadon 0 (intro)

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4  
(G) n pu n G  
(_) _ _ o _ o _ o _ _ _ _ o _ o d D _ _ _ _  
→ (o) D o d D _ _ _ _

Figure 4.90. Analysis of the beat 1 klenang final position of the “(_) o o d D” gesture in segment 7

Pak Tama concludes this small section of the passage with a variation on the last half of his variant 2:

Figure 4.91. Segment 8 (top) shown as a variation on the second half of Pak Tama wadon variant 2 (bottom)

Following this innovative portion of the improvisation, Pak Tama returns to familiar ground, playing the full four-beat Pak Dewa variant 1 in segment 9. However, even in this he innovates, removing one of the Dag (D) strokes in the first half of the pattern and adding an extra Dag following the usual ngegongin Dag (D) stroke, as in the variation explored above:
This leads him directly into an interesting reworked variant in segment 10. Here Pak Tama introduces a variant that is almost identical to Pak Dewa’s variant 6, but displaced by a beat and with audible left-hand counting strokes replacing kom (o) and soft counting strokes:

Thus, in his tabuh dua improvisations Pak Tama displays a broader use of the taught patterns in a shorter timespan – including not only his own taught patterns but several others as well – and he reworks these patterns in more extreme ways than he did in either his batel biasa or batel marah structures. This developmental urge and less-repeating compositional perspective becomes even more apparent in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s Peliatan/Pengosekan style improvisations.
4.3 Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s Peliatan/Pengosekan Style

4.3.1 An Expanded Vocabulary

As I began to analyze my transcriptions of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing, one of the first things I noticed was that aside from the taught patterns and their variants, several other patterns also recurred frequently enough to be noteworthy. I outline them here to be added to the stockpile of taught patterns. These will be labeled as “Recurring Played Variants” (RPV).

4.3.1.1 Lanang

One of the more interesting new variants that I found in both Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing was this sparse pattern and its common variant shown in Figure 4.94 below:

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]
\[(\_\_\_\_\_\_) e e _ l e e e e e\]

\[(4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4\]
\[(G) \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G\]
\[(\_\_\_\_\_\_\_) l l T e e _ l e e e e e\]

**Figure 4.94.** Recurring played lanang variants (RPLV) 1 (top) and 1a (bottom)

In this pattern the “e e _” gestures in the two quarter-beats following beats 1 and 3 may be seen simply as sparser versions of the familiar “e e T_” gesture which so often leads to important structural markers like tawa-tawa and gong. What makes this pattern unusual among lanang variants is the “e e _ e e” gesture in its second half. Perhaps mirroring the “e e _ e e” gesture that created a cross-rhythmic feel between beats two and three in Pak Cok’s lanang variant 3, it is shifted a half-beat later, thus maintaining the cross-rhythm while forcing a new end to the pattern. Similar to the familiar “e e T_” (but in a sparser variant: “e e _ _”) as opposed to the longer “e e T e T_” gesture, this new ending is shown in blue in Figure 4.95:
Figure 4.95. Recurring played lanang variant (RPLV) 1a (bottom) analyzed as mirroring Pak Cok lanang variant 3 (top) in its “e e _ e e” gesture.

The next new variant shows marked similarities to Pak Tama’s variant 5 in its final “e e _” and “e e T e T _” gesture placement:

Figure 4.96. Recurring played lanang variant (RPLV) 2 (top) shown as a variation on Pak Tama lanang variant 5 (bottom).

From a purely analytical perspective, however, this pattern may also be seen as a reworking of elements from Pak Cok’s cross-rhythmic lanang variant 2. Given Pak Cok’s penchant for rearranging pattern elements to create new terbalik (backwards) variants, as we saw in his own analysis of his variant 2 as the (very complex) terbalik of his variant 1, this later explanation seems possible as well. Again, he reverses elements and winds up with the other familiar gesture (“e e T e T” as opposed to “e e T”) leading to gong:

---

13 See Figure 3.7. Of course, as discussed in chapter 3, there are many possible meanings in Pak Cok’s use of the word terbalik, but I see this as one of the plausible ones.
A denser variant on this last, but reminiscent of Pak Cok’s intro pattern in the strict “e-T” alternation in its second half, is the following pattern:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} \quad & \quad -1 - & -2 - & -3 - & -4 \\
\text{(G)} \quad & \quad n \quad & \quad pu \quad & \quad n \quad & \quad G \\
\text{(G)} \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.98. Recurring played lanang variant (RPLV) 3

And, densest of all, perhaps a variation on Pak Cok’s intro variant 0:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4)} \quad & \quad -1 - & -2 - & -3 - & -4 \\
\text{(G)} \quad & \quad n \quad & \quad pu \quad & \quad n \quad & \quad G \\
\text{(G)} \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \quad & \quad e \quad & \quad T \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.99. Recurring played lanang variant (RPLV) 4 (bottom) shown as a variation on Pak Cok lanang variant 2 (top)

4.3.1.2 Wadon

For the wadon, too, a handful of un-taught patterns seemed to recur in improvisation. The “weird Dag” variant and the two-beat dasar (2bd) we have already discussed above. Additionally, a denser version of the two-beat dasar, akin to the beginning of Pak Dewa’s wadon end variant but prevalent in other taught variants as well, I call the “two-beat denser dasar” or 2bdd:
Figure 4.100. Two-beat denser dasar (2bdd) (top) compared to Pak Dewa wadon end variant (bottom)

Like the sparser two-beat dasar, in improvisation this pattern is inserted throughout gong structures of all lengths.

Two other un-taught 4-beat patterns also occur frequently in both Pak Cok and Pak Dewa’s wadon passages. The first I see as a slightly sparser variation of Pak Tama’s variant 6:

Like the sparser two-beat dasar, in improvisation this pattern is inserted throughout gong structures of all lengths.

The second may be seen as a combination of the first half of Pak Dewa’s variant 4 and the two-beat denser dasar:

Figure 4.102. Recurring played wadon variant (RPWV) 2 (bottom) as combination of the first two beats of Pak Dewa wadon variant 4 (top left) and the two-beat denser dasar (top right)
However, as these two variant segments are so often presented as a single unit, I have chosen to name them as such. This unit, which I have analyzed in Figure 4.103 below as a reworking of elements from Pak Dewa’s variant 1 has been labeled “special alternate Pak Dewa wadon variant 1” (or sp. alt. PD1):

![Figure 4.103. Special alternate Pak Dewa wadon variant 1 (sp. alt. PD1) (bottom) shown as a reworking of Pak Dewa wadon variant 1 (top)](image)

These two variants both begin with a Dag (D) on the quarter-beat after gong and this is followed by a “o o D” gesture that, in both patterns, is oriented identically to the beat-1 klenang (n) stroke. But, where in his variant 1 Pak Dewa extends that “o o D” gesture with a “o D” module to create another very familiar wadon gesture, “o o D o D,” in the special alternate variant, he repeats the “o o D” gesture again, with the same orientation to the tawatawa (pu) that it had to the klenang stroke. Then both patterns present a “o d D” gesture oriented identically to the beat-3 klenang stroke before ending with a double kom (o) leading to gong. The aesthetic effect of the two patterns is very similar.

In the analyses to follow we will see each of these patterns being played, varied, and reworked alongside the taught variants.

### 4.3.2 Lanang Improvisations

Unlike Pak Tama, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok did not teach me different variants for the different cyclic structures, leaving me with the impression that any of their taught variants
could be used for any structure. However, conversations with Sudi – a student of the Peliatan/Pengosekan style himself – concerning Pak Cok’s particularly *ramé* *lanang* patterns had led me to believe that they might not be considered wholly appropriate for use in slower structures like *tabuh dua* or *tabuh telu*. And of course Pak Dewa taught that a balance of his sparser *dasar* patterns with his more *ramé* ones was the aesthetic ideal of *kendang arja* improvisation. These conflicting ideas left me with many unanswered questions: was variant use free for each of the four cyclic structures in the Peliatan/Pengosekan style, and was this freedom “freer” than Pak Tama’s? Further, like in Pak Tama’s playing, was more improvisation tolerated in some of the cyclic structures than others? And could one also find in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing a balance between sparse and *ramé* elements that tended toward more density in the faster cyclic structures? I seek to answer all of these questions in the following analyses, beginning with the simpler issue of density.

### 4.3.2.1 A Question of Density

Because their palette of taught patterns is putatively usable in all cyclic structures, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok do not have density differentiation built into their patterns as Pak Tama does with his *tabuh telu* playing. However, examination of their improvised *lanang* passages reveals an aesthetic that tends to favor denser playing overall in the shorter structures. The tables in Figures 4.104 through 4.107 give a breakdown of each of Pak Cok’s improvised *lanang* passages in terms of its density, offering the percentages of sparse, medium, and dense 2-beat segments as in the analyses in sections 4.2.3.1 and 4.2.3.2 above. The final line in each table is a simple average of these percentages. It is important to note that this segmenting of patterns into two-beat fragments to assess relative density is a much

---

14 Conversation during a *gamelan* rehearsal, 2008.
more effective method of analysis for lanang than for wadon patterns. Because lanang playing is always bound to the dance – which can change at a moment’s notice – the patterns are simpler, more tightly tied to a grouping structure that aligns with metrical structure, and very often made up of discrete 2-beat patterns like the familiar “( ) e e T _ e e T _” and “( ) _ _ _ e e T _” (which is played “(r) l r l r e e T _” with counting strokes). Wadon patterns, by contrast are often longer and more complex, and, as we shall see, often exhibit grouping structures that do not align with the cycle. Thus, these reductive analyses, while they can tell us much about lanang density, are not exceptionally useful for wadon analysis.

Of course there are other flaws to this kind of statistical analysis too. For instance, analyses of percentages become somewhat less useful in shorter improvised passages, where a single sparse segment in an otherwise dense passage can account for a relatively high percentage. In the typically short batel marah passages, for instance, ngeseh is very often cued with a sparse segment containing just one pung (U) stroke: ( ) _ _ _ U _ _. And in a passage that only contains 5 segments, this will automatically put sparse segments at 20%, despite the fact that a much longer passage might still only contain this one sparse segment. That being said, these tables will offer a general sense of the density spreads in Pak Cok’s improvisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batel Marah</th>
<th>Ramé (R)</th>
<th>Medium (m)</th>
<th>Sparse (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average %</strong></td>
<td><strong>= 70.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>= 17</strong></td>
<td><strong>=12.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.104. Density spread by percentage in Pak Cok’s lanang improvisations for batel marah
From these tables we can see quite definitively that Pak Cok shares Pak Tama’s aesthetics of density spread. Improvising for each of his structures exhibits a balancing between sparser and denser variants, but the specifics of that balancing are relative to the
gong structure type. *Batel* structures allow only very few sparse segments, instead striking a balance between dense and medium segments that still favors the dense ones. This gives the appropriate *ramé* feel for the coarser characters, situations, and emotions associated with *batel* and *batel marah*. *Tabuh dua* and *tabuh telu* playing, by contrast, allow heavier use of the sparser variants, with dense segments taking up less than 50% of the playing. Figure 4.108 lets us see the numbers in a slightly different way, tallying the total percentage of segments in each density type across the full performance. This ensures that segments in shorter passages are not given more weight in the final analysis than those in longer passages. These final percentages, then, may be used to compare average densities across the four structures for a full performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyclic Structure</th>
<th>Ramé (R) %</th>
<th>Medium (m) %</th>
<th>Sparse (s) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batel Marah</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batel</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabuh Dua</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabuh Telu</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.108.** Density spread by percentage in Pak Cok’s *lanang* improvisations across a full performance

The differences between the four cyclic structures are just as clear-cut in Pak Dewa’s few improvised *lanang* passages shown in Figures 4.109 to 4.112. Again, though, single *ngeseh* gestures in his *batel marah* structures (Figure 4.109) account for a larger percentage because of the shorter passages at play:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Batel Marah</em></th>
<th>Ramé (R)</th>
<th>Medium (m)</th>
<th>Sparse (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average %</strong></td>
<td><strong>= 55</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.109.** Density spread by percentage in Pak Dewa’s *lanang* improvisations for *batel marah*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batel</th>
<th>Ramé (R)</th>
<th>Medium (m)</th>
<th>Sparse (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average %</td>
<td>= 59</td>
<td>= 35</td>
<td>= 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.110. Density spread by percentage in Pak Dewa’s lanang improvisations for batel (biasa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabuh Dua</th>
<th>Ramé (R)</th>
<th>Medium (m)</th>
<th>Sparse (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average %</td>
<td>= 41.5</td>
<td>= 39.75</td>
<td>= 18.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.111. Density spread by percentage in Pak Dewa’s lanang improvisations for tabuh dua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabuh Telu</th>
<th>Ramé (R)</th>
<th>Medium (m)</th>
<th>Sparse (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage 3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average %</td>
<td>= 34.67</td>
<td>= 33.67</td>
<td>= 31.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.112. Density spread by percentage in Pak Dewa’s lanang improvisations for batel marah

The total tally for each density type across all passages is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyclic Structure</th>
<th>Ramé (R) %</th>
<th>Medium (m) %</th>
<th>Sparse (s) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batel Marah</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batel</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabuh Dua</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabuh Telu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.113. Density spread by percentage in Pak Cok’s lanang improvisations across a full performance

We can see here that Pak Dewa overall is a slightly less ramé player than Pak Cok, and this is not surprising, given the relative densities of their taught patterns. However it is also clear that Pak Dewa, too, aims for a balanced spread of density types in his playing and that he increases his use of sparser segments in the longer gong patterns.
Thus, though they do not have the benefit of semi-composed patterns that spread density, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok are clearly acutely aware of the different *rasa* of each cyclic structure and the relative *ramé*-ness that will best support it. And while the analyses of specific improvised passages in sections 4.3.2.2 and 4.3.3 below will demonstrate their freedom for innovation and varied pattern use throughout the four cyclic structures, these aesthetic requirements, by necessity, limit the use of certain variants in certain structures. Figure 4.114 below, for instance, shows a collection of relatively sparse taught *lanang* patterns often used by both Pak Cok and Pak Dewa, but which one would almost never see in their *batel* structures, particularly in *batel marah* (note: figure continues on the next page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Tama Lanang 0 (intro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) _ _ e e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ _ T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pak Dewa Lanang 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) _ _ _ _ e e _ _ _ _ e _ _ e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sudi Lanang 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) _ _ _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sudi Lanang 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) _ _ _ _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _ _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sudi Lanang 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) n pu n G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(_) _ _ _ _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e T _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sudi Lanang 4

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
( _) _ _ _ _ e _ l _ e _ l _ e _ _ _

Pak Dewa Lanang 4

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
( _) _ _ _ _ e e _ _ _ e _ l _ e e T _

Pak Dewa Lanang 10

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
( _) e e T e _ _ _ _ e e _ e _ _

Pak Dewa Lanang 11

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G
( _) _ _ e e _ _ _ e e _ e _ _

Figure 4.114. Taught patterns commonly played by Pak Dewa and Pak Cok yet too sparse for frequent use in their batel structures

Sudi, it turns out, was uncharacteristically wrong (or at least halfwrong) in his supposition that Pak Cok’s exceptionally ramé taught patterns were reserved for batel use only. However, when used in tabuh dua and tabuh telu structures they are generously interspersed with other sparser variants in order to create the proper rasa (feeling).

4.3.2.2 Lanang Passages Analyzed

In many ways Pak Cok and Pak Dewa’s improvisations are comparable to Pak Tama’s, not surprising given their joined musical heritage. Each player bases his improvisations on the taught patterns explored in Chapter 3, balancing elements of sparseness and ramé-ness as explained in section 4.3.2.1. Further, like Pak Tama, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok frequently alter the taught patterns in performance through surface variation, segmenting, re-splicing, and some re-working of pattern elements. That being said, I contend
that the Peliatan/Pengosekan style, for reasons to be discussed in Chapter 5, allows a wider scope for pattern innovation than Pak Tama’s Singapadu style, just as Tama’s improvisations diverge further from the taught patterns than Pak Tut’s in Apuan. The analyses in this section and in section 4.3.3 to follow will illustrate this.

Comparing the range of variants and innovations at play in these drummers’ lanang improvisations is a relatively simple task. In his lanang playing we know that Pak Tama uses almost exclusively his own taught patterns and their variations and reworkings. The only exceptions to this are the following patterns, each of which is quite generic in its placement of the familiar “_ e e T _” gesture and ganjil/genap arrangement of “e T e T…” sequences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pak Cok Lanang } & \ 0 - 2/2 \\
& \ 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
& \ pu \ n \ G \\
& \ e T e T e T e T _ \\

\text{Pak Dewa Lanang } & \ 6 - 1/2 \\
& \ (4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 \\
& \ (G) \ n \ pu \\
& \ (_) _ _ _ _ e e T _ \\

\text{Pak Dewa Lanang } & \ 6 - 2/2 \\
& \ 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
& \ pu \ n \ G \\
& \ _ e e T _ e e T _ \\

\text{Pak Cok Lanang } & \ 1 - \text{reversed} \\
& \ (4) - \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
& \ (G) \ n \ pu \ n \ G \\
& \ (_) e e T e T e T _ e e T _ e e T _
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.115. Lanang patterns played by Pak Tama in improvisation, aside from his taught patterns, are relatively generic.

In their lanang improvisations, by contrast, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok make use of not only their own taught patterns and their partners’ (as well as of the new variants explored in
section 4.3.1), but also of variants from Sudi and Pak Tama’s collection of taught patterns.

Of course all these teachers’ traditions are intricately connected, but the fact that both Pak Cok and Pak Dewa choose freely from all possible variants, where Pak Tama does not, is significant. A closer examination of two representative lanang passages will further elucidate this and other freedoms of the Peliatan/Pengosekan style.

The first passage, in Figure 4.116 and CD Track 23, is a tabuh dua passage from Pak Dewa:

```
1-------------------------2-------------------------3-------------------------4-------------------------5-------------------------6-------------------------7-------------------------8-------------------------9-------------------------10-------------------------11-------------------------12-------------------------13-------------------------14-------------------------15-
(4)- ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(1)_e _l _e _l _e _l _e _e _e _T _e _e _e T e T e T _

(4)- ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ e _ _ e e T _ e _ e _ e T e T e T _

(4)- ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T e T e T _

(4)- ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T e T e T _

(4)- ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T e T e T _

(4)- ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4 - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G n pu n G
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T _ e _ _ _ _ _ e e T e T e T _
```

Figure 4.116. Pak Dewa lanang improvisation 1 for tabuh dua divided into segments based on the taught patterns
Here we have a familiar collection of taught patterns from Pak Dewa, Pak Cok, Sudi, and Pak Tama, some segmented, some altered with small surface variations. Before examining a table of their layout, two reworked variants warrant special mention. In segment 8 Pak Dewa presents all the elements of Sudi’s variant 2, but they are offset by one full beat:

![Figure 4.117](image)

While this variation does not present any “un-allowable” gestures, per se, the placement of the “_ e e T _” gesture leading to *klenang* (n) as opposed to *gong* (G) in an otherwise sparse context is unusual. Being a *wadon* player first and foremost, I wonder if Pak Dewa is using this *Tut* placement to anticipate the “final Dag (D)” position on the *klenang* stroke. It is just as likely, however, especially given the fact that he plays this as a counting stroke (t) and not a full *Tut* (T) stroke, that he has placed the “_ e e t _” gesture there simply for variety.

The other noteworthy segment in this passage follows directly on the heels of this one. A dense pattern to idiomatically follow this sparse one, I analyze it as being a reversal and reworking of elements from Pak Cok’s variant 2 but with its *rasa* still continuing the sparseness of the pattern that came before:
Figure 4.118. Segment 9 (middle) shown as a reworking of elements from Pak Cok lanang variant 2 (top) that maintains the rasa (feeling) from segment 8 (bottom)

The table in Figure 4.119 shows the layout of these and other taught and reworked patterns in this passage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(G)</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>pu</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: PD7 s.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2: PD6 1/2</td>
<td>3: PT4 2/2 s.v.</td>
<td>4: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5: PC7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: PD1b (T) 2/2</td>
<td>7: PD1 2/2 s.v.</td>
<td>8: Sudi 2 off-set</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9: PC2 rev. s.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10: PT6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: PT1a</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12: PC1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13: PC2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14: PD6 1/2</td>
<td>15: angsel pr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.119. Summary of patterns used in Pak Dewa’s lanang improvisation 1 for tabuh dua from Figure 4.116, with colors indicating the source of each taught pattern (Pak Dewa = blue, Pak Tama = orange, Pak Cok = green, Sudi = purple)

Here we see a balanced use of taught patterns from multiple sources, each shown in a different color – Pak Dewa explores the full range of available variants in his improvisations.

In this analysis, the seven 2-beat segments shown in blue are taken from Pak Dewa’s own taught patterns, the eight green segments from Pak Cok’s (though here, of course, there is some overlap), the six orange ones from Pak Tama’s, and the two purple ones from Sudi’s.

As a side effect of this larger and more varied palette of patterns, we also see far less pattern repetition over the course of the passage than we did in Pak Tama’s playing. While Tama
generally focused on about three variants in a given passage, modifying and rearranging, segmenting and re-splicing them, and only occasionally incorporating other variants in the mix, Pak Dewa does not repeat a single variant over the course of this passage (and would presumably take pride in that fact). Pak Cok’s variant 2 is the only pattern to appear more than once in the above table. As seen in Figure 4.118 above, however, it is so seriously reworked in the first of its two iterations that it in effect becomes an entirely new variant.

Thus Pak Dewa presents here a completely through-improvised passage, without the motivic development or the feeling of familiarity, cyclicity, or return implied in much of Pak Tama’s playing. Many of the other lanang passages recorded from both Pak Dewa and Pak Cok display this same propensity for pattern diversity throughout.

We will look at just one more—a tabuh telu passage from Pak Cok—to see, yet again, how it is freer than Pak Tama’s playing (CD Track 24):

```
(8)---------------------------1---------------------------
(G) n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
   n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
   e e T e T e T e T e T e T

2---------------------------3---------------------------4---------------------------
(G) n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
   (_)_ _ _ e e _ 1 _ e _ 1 _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e e _ e e _ e e T e T

5---------------------------6---------------------------7---------------------------8---------------------------
(G) n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
   (_)_ _ _ e e _ 1 _ e _ 1 _ e _ _ _ _ _ _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ e e _ l l T _ l l T _ l T _

8---------------------------9---------------------------10---------------------------
(G) n  t  n  pu  n  t  n  G
   (_)_ e _ 1 _ e e T _ _ _ _ _ _ _ l l T _ l T _ e _ l l _ e e T _ l l _ T _ l T

(cont’d…)
```
(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e l T _ e e _ l _ e e _ e e _ _ _ _ e _ e e _ _

(8) e l T _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ e e T e l T _ T _ e e T e T _ e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e T _ l l T _ e e T _ l l T _ e e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e T _ l l T _ e e T _ l l T _ e e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e T _ e _ l _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e e T _ e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e e T _ e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e e T _ e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e e T _ e T _

(8) n t n pu n t n G
(_)_e T _ e e _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e e T _ e T _
Similar to Pak Tama’s passages, Pak Cok creates cycles that balance different qualities of density, frequently leading from sparse to ramé as they approach gong. And he often contrasts adjacent cycles by exploring a different range of the density spectrum in them. The density spread of this passage is analyzed in Figure 4.121:

\[
\begin{align*}
\_ & \_ R-R \ s-s-s-R \ m-s-s-R \ m-R-s-R \ m-m-R-R \ m-s-s-s \ s-s-s-R \ R-R-R-R \ R-R-R-R \ R-R-s-s \ m-s-s-s \ m-m-R-R \ m-R-s-R \ m-R-s-R \ s-s-s-m \ \text{angsel prep} \\
\end{align*}
\]

And, as in Pak Tama’s improvised playing, Pak Cok here offers surface-level variation on taught patterns. His segments 7 and 10, for instance, each present a different version of the Recurring Played lanang variant 2 (RPLV 2) discussed in section 4.3.1.1. In segment 7 he simply replaces the majority of his left-hand rim-strokes with left-hand...
counting strokes, leaving the overall structure of the variant otherwise intact. In segment 10, variation becomes slightly more extreme. Pak Cok offers a denser first beat and also shifts the double left-hand stroke leading to the final *klenang* (n) one quarter-beat earlier. In Figure 4.122, strokes that diverge from the original pattern are shown in blue:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n  pu  n  G
( _) _ _ _ e _ e e T _ e e T e T _

(4) - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8
 _ _ _ _ _ e _ 1 1 T _ 1 1 T 1 T _

(4) - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8
 _ e _ 1 _ 1 _ e e T 1 1 _ T 1 T _

**Figure 4.122.** Segments 7 (middle) and 10 (bottom) shown as different variations on the recurring played *lanang* variant (RPLV) 2 (top)

Sometimes Pak Cok’s variation becomes slightly more structural as well, meaning that not just left-hand strokes but the more structurally important *Tut* (T) strokes are also varied. In segment 4, for instance, he plays a much sparser rendition of his variant 3:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G)  n  pu  n  G
( _) e e T _ e e T e e _ e e T e T _

(4) - ● - 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8
 _ _ _ _ _ e e _ e e _ e e T e T _

**Figure 4.123.** Segment 4 (bottom) shown as a much sparser variation of Pak Cok *lanang* variant 3 (top)

And Pak Cok, like Pak Tama and Pak Dewa, also creates new patterns by re-working familiar elements. In this particular passage, we see several examples of the splicing of elements from two different patterns. In segments 13 and 14, for instance, Pak Cok begins
the pattern as though he will play his variant 2, but then dovetails smoothly into the ending of
the Recurring Played variant 3 (RPLV 3):

(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4
(G) n pu n G
(_e e T _ e e T e T _ e e T _)

(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4
(G) n pu n G
(_e e T _ e e T e T _ e e T _)

Figure 4.124. Segments 13 and 14 (bottom) shown as the beginning of Pak Cok lanang variant 2 (top left) morphing into the end of the recurring played lanang variant (RPLV) 3 (top right)

In segments 29 through 30 Pak Cok plays a varied and extended version of the

Recurring Played lanang variant 1a lasting five full beats before tacking on the last 3 beats of

Sudi’s variant 2 in a slightly sparser incarnation:

(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4
(G) n pu n G
(_e e e _ e e _ e _)

(4) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4
(G) n pu n G
(_e e e _ e e _ e _)

Segment 29
(8) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4 ● 5 ● 6 ● 7 ● 8
(_e e e _ e e _ e _)

Segment 30
(8) ● 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4 ● 5 ● 6 ● 7 ● 8
(_e e e _ e e _ e _)

Figure 4.125. Segments 29 and 30 (bottom) shown as the reworking of elements from the recurring played lanang variant (RPLV) 1a (top left) Sudi lanang variant 2 (top right)

These and other variations in this passage are of a type that could be played by Pak
Tama, though the extending, splicing, and re-working may be a bit extreme to be
idiomatically Tama-style lanang. Yet what places this passage clearly in the

Peliatan/Pengosekan style is the sheer number of different variants at play, shown in Figure
4.126:
Pak Cok chooses patterns not just from his own arsenal but also from Pak Dewa’s, Pak Tama’s, Sudi’s, and, of course, the collection of recurring played patterns (RPLV) not taught to me by anyone (shown here in pink). While some patterns, such as Sudi’s variant 1, do recur, they are often segmented into smaller 2-beat fragments, and their context is completely different in each iteration. Again we have a much more diverse and through-improvised passage than any of Pak Tama’s more self-referential offerings.

### 4.3.3 Wadon Improvisations

The increased freedom of *arja* improvisation in the Peliatan/Pengosekan style becomes perhaps even more apparent in *wadon* passages. Like the *lanang* passages examined above, these also display a broader use of the full palette of taught variants, as will be seen in the analyses to follow. However, the increased flexibility of Pak Dewa and Pak
Cok’s *wadon* playing is also evident in an increased interest in pattern splicing and reworking. A handful of examples will serve to clarify.

Like the *wadon* pattern with altered beginning in Figure 4.13, most of the variants played in in the Peliatan-Pengosekan are flexible in the make-up of their first few quarter-beats. Often (though by no means exclusively) the content of those beats is determined not by the current pattern but by the *rasa* or prevailing density of the previous pattern. This might create the illusion that switching between patterns occurs independently of the cyclic structure – that grouping structure and metrical structure are, to a large extent, unfettered from one another. Figures 4.127 and 4.128 below show two typical instances of this phenomenon in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing. In each figure, the pattern is shown in its played context to give a sense of what came before, while the original taught variants are transcribed above:

**Figure 4.127.** The more ambiguous relationship between grouping structure and metrical structure in *wadon* improvisation, example 1, *tabuh dua*

**Figure 4.128.** The more ambiguous relationship between grouping structure and metrical structure in *wadon* improvisation, example 2, *tabuh telu*
Other examples of this less symmetrical style of wadon pattern segmenting and splicing abound in the Peliatan/Pengosekan style. Figure 4.129 below, for instance, shows a 4-beat tabuh dua pattern that takes its first beat from the two-beat denser dasar and its final three beats from Pak Tama’s variant 2:

(2) - ● - 1 - ● - 2
(o) D o d D _ _ ○ ○

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
_ 1 _ ○ _ 1 _ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ d D _

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ○ - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D o d D 1 _ ○ _ ○ _ ○ _ d D _

Figure 4.129. Improvised wadon variation (bottom) asymmetrically segmenting and splicing from the 2-beat denser dasar (top left) and Pak Tama wadon variant 2

In Figure 4.130, an otherwise faithful rendering of Pak Dewa’s End Variant is injected in its sparse middle beats with the delayed Dag (D) gesture from his variant 2:

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(G) n pu n G + (G) n pu n G
(o) D o d D _ _ - - _ _ ○ ○ ○

(4) - ● - 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) _ _ o d D _ oD D _ o D _ ○ ○

Figure 4.130. Improvised wadon variation (bottom) unequally featuring elements from Pak Dewa wadon end variant (top left) and Pak Dewa wadon variant 2 (top right)

More extreme pattern reworking in the Peliatan/Pengosekan style includes taught patterns offset from their original position in the metrical framework, cross-rhythmic elements of taught variants extended into full patterns, and the back-and-forth splicing – or alternation – of gestures from two different pattern types. The handful of examples in Figures 4.131 through 4.134 below typify these various methods of pattern re-working.
The alternation between the delayed *Dag* (D) gesture of Pak Dewa’s *wadon* pattern 2 and the *dasar* alt. gesture, seen in Pak Tama’s playing in Figure 4.59 above, becomes even more extended and complex in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing. Figure 4.131 shows a *tabuh dua* passage played by Pak Dewa in which this alternation lasts five full gong cycles.

Yet instead of maintaining a strict beat-for-beat alternation between the “(_) o o D _” and “(_) o _ l _” gestures, as Pak Tama does, Pak Dewa mixes it up with a 3+3+2 cross rhythm in the middle. As with all the other gestures in this pattern, the boundaries of this cross-rhythm are out of alignment with the metrical structure, beginning instead in the quarter-beat before *gong* (G). The sequence ends with a statement of Pak Tama’s variant 2 (with alternate beginning, of course):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(G)} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pu} \quad \text{n} \quad G \\
\text{(o)d} & \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \\
\text{(4)} & \quad \text{●} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{1} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{2} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{3} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{4} \\
\text{(G)} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pu} \quad \text{n} \quad G \\
\text{(o)d} & \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \\
\text{(4)} & \quad \text{●} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{1} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{2} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{3} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{4} \\
\text{(G)} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pu} \quad \text{n} \quad G \\
\text{(o)d} & \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \\
\text{(4)} & \quad \text{●} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{1} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{2} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{3} \quad \text{●} \quad \text{4} \\
\text{PT2} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pu} \quad \text{n} \quad G \\
\text{(o)d} & \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{d} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.131. Pak Dewa’s extended improvised segment alternating the *rasa* of Pak Dewa *wadon* variant 2 with *dasar* alt. gestures of varying lengths.

Cross-rhythm, as we have seen, is a somewhat central aspect of *kendang arja* pattern design. Thus it should not be terribly surprising that the cross-rhythmic elements of taught variants are sometimes extended for the purposes of improvisation. In the following example Pak Dewa takes the three quarter-beats at the opening of his variant 3, creates a 1.5-beat gesture with the addition of three counting strokes, then creates a 3 against 4 cross-rhythm.
It receives just shy of three full iterations over four full beats before moving onto a new
variant, as follows:

Figure 4.132. Improvised cross-rhythmic wadon variant (bottom) playing on the gesture at the beginning of Pak
Dewa wadon variant 3 (top)

Very often these extended cross-rhythmic patterns stem from taught variants that are
then offset from their original placement in performance. In Figure 4.133 below we see an
example of this kind of offset extended cross-rhythm. Here Pak Dewa’s cross-rhythmic
variant 7 is displaced by a half beat in a batel marah structure. Because the dominant gesture
in this pattern is 6 quarter-beats in length, this creates a new variant featuring a “weird Dag”
stroke on the central gong of the pattern and a delayed “final Dag” stroke as in Pak Tama’s
wadon variant 2:

Figure 4.133. Improvised cross-rhythmic wadon variant (bottom) featuring the gesture from Pak Dewa wadon
variant 7 (top left) displaced, and ending with a delayed “final Dag” as in Pak Tama wadon variant 2 (top
right)

The larger context of this played variant, shown in Figure 4.134, makes it even more
interesting. Pak Dewa begins this sequence with what I like to call a bait-and-switch, playing
the opening gestures from Pak Tama’s wadon variant 3 – “(_ ) o o D _ o _ o o D _” – in segment 1. However, he then subverts expectations by replacing the second “D _” of this gesture with a “d D,” thus retroactively altering our aural analysis of the second “o o d” gesture as being the beginning of the extended cross-rhythm sequence from Figure 4.133 (segment 2). Pak Dewa follows up this offset variant with his more basic wadon variant 1, but in a creative way. First he plays a sparser variation of the pattern in segment 3, with altered notes shown in blue. Segment 4 is then a statement of just the first half of this variant in its original taught format, and only in segment 5 does Pak Dewa finally present the full taught pattern in its original form:

Figure 4.134. Improvised wadon pattern from Figure 4.133 contextualized (segments 1-5) (bottom), taking elements from Pak Tama wadon variant 3 (top left) and Pak Dewa wadon variant 1 (top right)

With these methods of variation and pattern reworking in mind, we now turn to an analysis of a representative passage from Pak Dewa’s wadon improvisations that will show these many elements of innovation and creative license in their played contexts. This tabuh telu passage was paired in performance with Pak Cok’s lanang passage from Figure 4.120 above. Shown in Figure 4.135, it is also CD Track 25:
Figure 4.135. Pak Dewa wadon improvisation 1 for tabuh telu divided into segments based on the taught patterns.
This passage is based on numerous taught variants, many of which are altered through surface variation. In segments 9 and 10, for instance, Pak Dewa creates new, sparser variations on the first half of his variant 5 and the two-beat denser dasar variant (2bdd) by removing all the kom (o) strokes:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4 \\
(2) & \quad \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 \\
(0) & \quad D \quad d \quad D \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad D \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Segment 9} & \quad \text{Segment 10} \\
(4) & \quad \cdot - 5 - \cdot - 6 - \cdot - 7 - \cdot - 8 \\
(0) & \quad D \quad _ - d \quad D \quad _ - D \quad _ - l \quad D \quad _ - D \quad _ - D \quad o \quad o \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.136. Segments 9 and 10 (bottom) shown as variations on the first half of Pak Dewa wadon variant 5 (top left) and the two-beat denser dasar (top right)

In other instances Pak Dewa varies patterns to make them denser. In segment 7, for instance, we see the now-familiar denser version of Pak Dewa’s variant 0:

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) & \quad \cdot - 1 - \cdot - 2 - \cdot - 3 - \cdot - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(0) & \quad _ - _ - o \quad _ - 1 \quad _ - o \quad o \quad o \quad o \quad d \quad D \quad _ - _ - o \quad o \quad o \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4.137. Segment 7 (bottom) shown as a denser variation on the second half of Pak Dewa wadon variant 0a (top)

Throughout this passage we also find numerous examples of the flexibility in pattern beginnings discussed above. Segment 3, for instance, is a statement of Pak Tama’s variant 2 but with a denser beginning akin to the beginning of Pak Dewa’s variant 1. This beginning gesture feels cocok (appropriate) with the more Dag-heavy Tama variant 6 preceding it. And this latter pattern, in segment 2, is given a sparser than usual beginning to match the two-beat dasar preceding it:
Figure 4.138. Segment 3 (bottom right) is a variation on Pak Tama wadon variant 2 (top right) but with a denser beginning beat (shown in red) to match the variation on Pak Tama wadon variant 6 (top left) in segment 2 (bottom left) preceding it.

Deeper levels of pattern variation and re-working also occur in this passage, the most noteworthy being the section ranging from segment 28 to 30. Pak Dewa begins this section with what looks like a statement of the two-beat dasar starting on gong – a strange place to put this dasar pattern, which is usually used as an anticipation to gong. It is in fact more likely, therefore, that Pak Dewa is referring here to the rasa of his end variant, which begins with the two-beat denser dasar gesture on gong. He then transitions from this beginning gesture into the final 2.5 beats of his variant 1. Segment 30 is a slightly sparser statement of the offset variant 7 cross-rhythm explored in Figure 4.133 above. However, because of the specific rhythm of Pak Dewa’s variant 1, we can actually see this cross-rhythm as beginning in segment 29 and spanning a full four repetitions, as shown with red lines in Figure 4.139:

Figure 4.139. The diverse influences on segments 28 through 30 (middle). (Pak Dewa wadon end variant shown top, Pak Dewa wadon variant 1 bottom left and the offset variation from Figure 4.133 bottom right. Cross-rhythm is underlined in red.)
Through all these pathways Pak Dewa creates a complex re-working of familiar elements that, by definition, still follows the “rules” of *wadon* pattern-making. And, idiomatic to his Peliatan/Pengosekan style, Pak Dewa has presented us with a passage built out of a large arsenal of variants from numerous regional styles. In Figure 4.140 below Pak Dewa’s own taught variants are written in blue and Pak Tama’s in orange. Those patterns played but never taught are shown in pink, and the various *dasar* patterns, pervasive in all styles, I have left black:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4: <em>dasar</em></th>
<th>5: PT3 2/2</th>
<th>6: PD6 1/2</th>
<th>7: PD0 2/2 d.v.</th>
<th>8: PD0</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>9: PD5 1/2 var</th>
<th>10: 2bdd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11: PD0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12: sp alt PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13: PD2 alt d.a.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14: PT2</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: PT6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16: PD2 alt d.a.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>17: PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: PD0 s.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>19: sp alt PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20: PD0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>21: PD5 var</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: PD0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23: PD2 alt d.a.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>24: PT2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25: PT6 s.v.</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: PD0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>27: sp alt PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>28: end var 1/2</td>
<td>29: PD1 2/2</td>
<td>30: PD7 c-r</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: PD0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>32: sp alt PD1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>33: PT4 1/2 d.v.</td>
<td>34: 2bd</td>
<td>35: <em>angsel pr</em></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.140.* Summary of patterns used in Pak Dewa’s *wadon* improvisation 1 for *tabuh telu* from Figure 4.135, with colors indicating the source of each taught pattern (Pak Dewa = blue, Pak Tama = orange, recurring played variant = pink, generic *dasar* pattern = black)

Pak Dewa has again offered us a mosaic of taught, varied, and reworked patterns from all the different styles presented here, creating a striking improvised passage. This passage is slightly more thematically composed than the *lanang* examples analyzed above in its full-cycle restatements of Pak Dewa’s variant 0 followed by the special alternate Pak
Dewa 1 variant in segments 18-19, 22-23, and 31-32. However, it is still a largely through-improvised passage with a broad palette of patterns varied and reworked in diverse ways.

Here we see the pinnacle of what *kendang arja* improvisation can become, and from this and the other passages explored in this chapter we can create a typology of improvisation, outlining the kinds of transformations that can occur on the taught patterns. This sort of categorization of variations on a pattern within a simple periodicity is something also seen in studies of Sub-Saharan African musics.\(^{15}\) That a similar approach can be made here suggests a potential for rich cross-cultural analyses of improvisation.\(^{16}\) The types of transformation seen in the *kendang arja* improvisations of my teachers are as follows. First, and most simple, are transformations involving the omission or addition of single strokes, as well as the substitution of one kind of stroke for another (a left-hand rim-stroke for a counting stroke, for instance). We also see the *campur-campur* (mixing) of various pattern elements. This occurs both at the simple level of blending the first half of one 4-beat variant with the second half of another, but, as we have seen, can become the quite complex splicing of shorter pattern elements into new and unique combinations. Finally, various pattern elements can be shifted in their relationship to the *mat* (main beat), *terbalik*-ed (reversed), and expanded or repeated, often cross-rhythmically, to create brand new variants.

Combining these various transformation types together has given *kendang arja* masters enormous scope for improvisation on what may initially seem like a limited vocabulary in a highly controlled system.

\(^{15}\) As in Arom 1991.

\(^{16}\) In this idea, I am indebted to Michael Tenzer, both his writings (most particularly his edited work *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music* – Tenzer and Roeder 2011) and our numerous conversations. An equally important influence here is Arom 1991.
4.4 Concluding Remarks on Improvisation

In this study, my goal has been to discover how *kendang arja* musicians simultaneously improvise at very high speeds without constantly creating unidiomatic *tabrakan* (collisions). The analyses in Chapter 3 began to answer this question. I found that each pair of drummers begins with a palette of taught patterns of which they are consciously aware. These may be patterns that they learned from their teachers, patterns that they have collected by watching other drummers, or patterns that they themselves have invented. Yet while these patterns can be quite varied, and not every *lanang* pattern in the collection is perfectly suited to every *wadon* pattern, conscious and unconscious rules have guided their creation to avoid most major collisions, no matter how the variants are combined. This is where improvisation begins.

I sought to understand how far a drummer could stray from his taught patterns in performance – how free he really was in improvisation. The above analyses have served to demonstrate that while there is certainly a spectrum of tolerance for innovation and pattern reworking, with Pak Tut being on the more conservative end and Pak Cok and Pak Dewa on the more liberal end, the vocabulary of improvised variants from all these *kendang* masters can always be related back to the taught patterns and a handful of other recurring variants. These drummers offer surface-level variation, create denser or sparser versions of a pattern, repeat and extend elements of a pattern (sometimes creating new cross-rhythms), splice elements of several patterns together, or re-arrange gestures within a single pattern. And this freedom generates a unique creation every time they pick up their drums. Yet the component pieces of the whole are always drawn from the finite pool of elements laid out over the
course of my lessons with each teacher. The taught patterns dictate where the improvisation can go.

4.4.1 Interlocking Parts?

These analyses have directly addressed the concept of interlocking only a little – strange, considering that the reason I began this study on *kendang arja* was because of its wild, unpredictable interlocking. In his studies Hood would have us believe that all *kendang arja* patterns are composed with a *cocok* pair, that they are designed to perfectly interlock. And, while the Balinese theory on *arja* discussed in Chapter 3 was certainly created with an eye to the interlocking qualities of the two drums, in reality musicians seldom play as though each pattern had one perfect pair (Tama’s *tabuh telu* patterns, of course, being an exception to this); and those from the old generation decry such “perfect” playing as unidiomatic *Baris* drumming.\(^{17}\) To illustrate the flexibility of interlocking in the course of performance, I have transcribed from Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s recording session several played instances of Pak Dewa’s *wadon* pattern 1 (reproduced for convenience below as originally shown in Figure 3.30) with its in-the-moment pair.

\[
\begin{align*}
(4) - & \quad \bullet - 1 - \bullet - 2 - \bullet - 3 - \bullet - 4 \\
(G) & \quad n \quad pu \quad n \quad G \\
(o) & \quad D \quad _ \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _ \quad o \quad o \quad D \quad _ \quad o \quad o
\end{align*}
\]

Each of these instances contains surface-level variation that I will not address. What is relevant here are the differing levels of *cocok*-ness in each pairing. Of course, when dealing with Pak Dewa’s variant 1, inherent in the pattern itself is a potential *tabrakan* on the *Dag* stroke in the quarter-beat preceding the *tawa-tawa* (pu). With one of the most common

\(^{17}\) As discussed in Chapter 2, Pak Cok, Bandem, and others have expressed very strongly the concept that *kendang arja* improvisation should not interlock perfectly like the drumming in pre-composed pieces like the famous *Baris* dance.
lanang gestures being “_ e e T _”, a Dag-Tut collision is a distinct possibility anytime Pak Dewa’s wadon variant 1 is played. In fully pre-composed interlocking, the lanang pattern would be made to work there, as in the first example in Figure 4.141 below. Yet while this one tabrakan is allowable in kendang arja, provided that the more important Dag on the following beat sounds without a Tut collision, some of the pairings below do appear to contain a less desirable level of Dag-Tut and other tabrakan (marked in red). This speaks to the controlled aleatory of kendang arja:

**Sudi Lanang Variant 1**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Composite**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Pak Dewa Lanang Variant 6 2/2 x2**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) e e T _ e e T _ e e T _

(odd) l _ l l D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Composite**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) e e T l D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Pak Cok Lanang Variant 5**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) l _ l l T _ e _ T _ l l T _ e e T _

(odd) o _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Composite**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) o l T _ D _ o o T D _ o e T _

(odd) o e T _ o o d _ o o d o

**Pak Cok Lanang Variant 5 (d.v.)**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) T _ T _ e e T _ l l T _ u u T _

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Composite**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) D _ D _ o o T _ D _ o o T _ D _ o o o

**Pak Cok Lanang Variant 1 (s.v.)**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) l _ l _ l _ e T _ e e T _ e T _ e T _

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o l l

**Composite**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o T _ D _ T _ D _ o o o

**Pak Dewa Lanang Variant 6 1/2 → ang.**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o o

**Composite**

(2) - _ - 1 - _ - 2 - _ - 1 - _ - 2

(odd) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o D U _ o o e o T _ o o o

(cont’d..)
Bearing in mind the somewhat random nature of specific pairings in any given moment, I will now break down the interactions in one improvised tabuh telu passage played by Pak Cok and Pak Dewa. We have analyzed its two component parts already – the lanang in Figure 4.120 and the wadon in Figure 4.135. Here I focus on the tenor of their interlocking, with special emphasis on Dag-Tut interactions (CD Track 26).

Figure 4.141. Various different taught lanang patterns interlocking in improvisation to varying degrees of tabrakan with variations of Pak Dewa wadon variant 1

(8)– ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
T T T T D D T T

(8)– ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
d d D D D T T T T d d D D D T T T d

(8)– ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(d) D T d D T D d D D T d D T T

(8)– ⋅ – 1 – ⋅ – 2 – ⋅ – 3 – ⋅ – 4 – ⋅ – 5 – ⋅ – 6 – ⋅ – 7 – ⋅ – 8
(G) n t n pu n t n G
d D T T d D T D T T T d d D T T T
As we can see, there are very few instances here of **Dag-Tut tabrakan**, though, like **kom-peng tabrakan**, they do exist. Yet while the patterns are certainly designed to interlock together, there is nothing pre-composed about their moment-to-moment
interactions. Each drummer plays, in no pre-set order, a large variety of different patterns, both those that are dense with Dag (D) or Tut (T) strokes and those that are sparse. Sometimes Pak Dewa’s Dag-heavy patterns line up with Pak Cok’s Tut-heavy ones as though they had been planned in advance, but very often they don’t. Thus neither each individual drummer’s exact patterns, nor the strict rhythmic relationships between them, are pre-planned.

I have no wish to reduce the rules of kendang arja interlocking down to the chance combinations of lanang with wadon variants that happened on that specific day with no context for which pairings were wayah (complex, great, or deep), which acceptable, which questionable, and which simply “oops moments.” A complete study of specific moments of interlocking, as previously mentioned, would need to involve cognitive testing and extensive self-reflexive listening analysis among my many teachers and drumming friends. That is not what this particular study is about. The simple examples above will give the reader a sense for how much the successful execution of kendang arja – while being utterly reliant on interlocking – is not actually about the interlocking. Not really. It is about how master drummers make spaces in their spontaneous creations for another person’s spontaneous creations to fit, necessarily imperfectly. And, while long-time partners are certainly more successful in this task than new partners, the moment-to-moment interlocking of a given performance actually involves a great deal of chance. This chance, of course, is mitigated by the range of variants at play within each style and their idiomatically allowable variations and reworkings. Even with seasoned partners, however, major tabrakan do occasionally happen (and are scowled at when played back). The question, then, has become not
which pattern fits best with which other pattern, but how patterns are created to avoid scowls 95% of the time. What I have sought to find in this study is the very distinct ways in which drummers from three different areas, each at least partially based in the arja asli Singapadu tradition, have reworked old patterns and developed new ones with care for how they will interlock with the rest of the collection. Yet one question still remains. We have seen that both the individual patterns created and the level of tolerance for innovation differ significantly from region to region and drummer to drummer. In the following chapter I will delve into the larger question of why. Why did these patterns evolve differently in different places?
Chapter 5 Diffusion

5.1 The Recording Session

I have set up the arja instruments and a swath of recording equipment under the cool shade of the coconut tree in Bandem’s family compound in Singapadu. In the true Murphy’s Law fashion of field recordings, a missing microphone-stand has necessitated that I carefully masking-tape one of my mics to the sturdiest branch of an obliging potted plant. There are video cameras everywhere – some wielded by Balinese, others by Western students of Balinese music and dance who have somehow heard through the grapevine that I will be recording an arja performance here today. We are all waiting for the guests of honor: Pak Dewa and Pak Cok. They are coming from the nearby villages of Pengosekan and Peliatan and, as jam karet (rubber time) would dictate, they are very late. Bu Candri is entertaining us while we wait, demonstrating the uproariously funny dance moves she uses for the quirky Liku character to gales of enthusiastic laughter. Along with Pak Dewa and Pak Cok, Candri was part of a powerhouse arja troupe in the 1970s, and everyone here has come out of the woodwork to watch this momentous musical reunion take place in the home of one of the pre-eminent arja performers and teachers of the early 20th-century: Bandem and Candri’s father, Kredek.

The laughter ebbs momentarily, and I suddenly notice that behind me Bandem – who seldom plays – has picked up a kendang and begun jamming with my Singapadu teacher Pak Tama, the local arja master here. Bandem has always promised that one day he will play me his father’s old patterns, and I quietly move closer to them and sit on the ground to listen, hoping to catch something of their fast improvisations. A moment later I am shocked to realize that I know these patterns already! These are not the patterns I’ve learned from Pak Tama here in Singapadu – though they are quite similar to his tabuh telu patterns – nor
are they anything like the constantly varying patterns I will record later today from Pak Dewa and Pak Cok. But I’ve played these patterns before. And it suddenly hits me that these are the exact patterns I have been learning with Pak Tut in the distant village of Apuan, Bangli.

5.2 Family Tree of Kendang Arja Masters

Though Pak Tut himself was unaware of the lineage of his drumming beyond his own teacher who had never told him that the patterns had originated in Singapadu, I later learned in an interview with Bandem that Pak Tut’s teacher had studied arja extensively with Kredek.¹ In fact, as previously mentioned, I slowly came to discover that all of my teachers claimed at least partial lineage to the old Singapadu tradition. But I had also learned that arja drumming is a constantly shifting art of improvised patterns, where most drummers pride themselves on their ability to innovate – sometimes extensively – within the idiom of their teachers. Even Pak Dewa’s own son Rai plays patterns that diverge from his father’s. How, then, were Kredek’s over-half-century-old patterns still extant – in an unaltered form – in Pak Tut’s playing, two musical generations removed from the source and in the faraway and relatively unconnected village of Apuan?

No one I asked seemed able to offer insight into this mystery. Not the Apuan musicians, not Pak Tama in Singapadu, not even Bandem in his scholarly role had lost sleep over the question of why. Then late one night – in one of those dark periods where you sleep with a pad of paper by your bed in case of half-conscious inspiration – I remembered once being laughed at by a Parisian French speaker for my “antiquated” Québécois dialect; some of my words and expressions, he told me, hadn’t been used in

¹ Interview, Aug 17, 2011.
France for hundreds of years. It was as though I had been spouting Shakespeare at him. And I found myself beginning to wonder if the same preservation of older language forms in linguistically isolated areas might also be true of musical languages – such as the vocabularies of improvised patterns used in arja drumming – and, by extension, if other concepts of transmission, contact, variation, and change, borrowed from linguistics, might help shed some light on my many unanswered questions about the differing evolutions of Singapadu’s arja patterns among my various teachers.

As we saw in Chapter 2, the old Singapadu arja drum tradition – like a language – was diffused to dozens of drummers from different villages throughout Bali, thanks to the prolific teaching of two arja musicians and dancers from the early 20th-century: Kredek and his partner-in-crime Cok Oka Tublen. Of my own drum teachers, Pak Cok in nearby Peliatan studied extensively with Cok Oka Tublen, and his Pengosekan-based drum partner Pak Dewa briefly with Kredek. In Singapadu itself Pak Tama studied with both these masters. And Pak Patrem from distant Apuan in Bangli regency, who would later teach my own Apuan guru Pak Tut, learned kendang arja from Kredek. Figure 5.1 below shows this genealogy and Figure 5.2 gives a sense of the distances between these villages.

---

2 In his 1997 article “Le Français populaire de Paris dans le Français des Amériques,” Henri Wittmann analyzes language use in Nouvelle-France (Québec) as well as several different stages of popular language use in Paris to show that the French language version most closely related to Québécois French is the 17th-century koiné of Paris. Of course Québécois French becomes a much more complicated case than other more isolated language forms because it then absorbed influences from Canadian English as well as diverse local Aboriginal languages.
Each of these musicians then took these Singapadu patterns home with them to be played in their own village *arja* ensembles, and eventually independent *dialects* of the
Singapadu language developed in each region – mutually intelligible, because they all stemmed from a single language, but also unique. Today while Pak Tut closely preserves Kredek’s original drum language, Pak Tama demonstrates some small personal variation in the use of his two gurus’ patterns. In addition, as we have seen, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok both show not only much greater divergence from their teachers’ patterns but also a wider spectrum of variation within their own improvisations.

In Chapter 2 we saw that regional variation and continual innovation are at the heart of Balinese artistic endeavors as they are in many places; analyses in Chapters 3 and 4 also support this claim. Yet while musical analysis can prove that regional variation does, in fact, exist in Balinese musical traditions, and history and geography can provide a justification for its existence, the reasons behind these differing levels of variation and innovation in Singapadu-derived arja drum dialects remain murky. Certain factors used to explore sociolinguistic variation, however, can help to further elucidate this mystery. In this chapter, I will largely focus on issues surrounding language contact, but will also touch briefly on questions of proficiency and ideology.

5.3 Apuan Conservatism

Of the three arja areas under examination, Apuan presents the most cut-and-dried illustration of direct drum language transmission. In the mid-20th century Pak Patrem of Apuan travelled to Singapadu to learn arja with Kredek. There is no evidence of an existing arja tradition in Apuan before that time, so it is very likely that Patrem transplanted the Singapadu tradition wholesale to Apuan, similar to the way that British

---

3 This idea is explored in more detail in Vickers 1985, where the whole tradition of Southeast Asian scholarship and oral tradition, including Hindu Brahman texts, is understood in terms of variation.
English was imported to the New World with its first English settlers. With Kredek’s teachings Patrem formed a troupe to perform at ceremonies and celebrations in and around Apuan. These men were not professional musicians, but rather farmers and laborers. Among them was a laborer by the name of I Ketut Bicuh – Pak Tut – who would later become Patrem’s main drum disciple.

As mentioned in chapter 3, I arrived in Bangli regency in the summer of 2011 in search of Pak Patrem just months after his death, and instead met his son, a local dancer named I Wayan Wardana. Wardana invited me into his home with genuine pride and excitement; Apuan is far enough off the main tourist track that he could not remember a bulé (Westerner) ever coming there to learn kendang arja stil (style) Apuan. After hours of drinking kopi with his family, listening to his grandmother sing tembang macapat (the song forms used in arja), and looking at old photographs of his father dancing and playing, he finally took me to meet his father’s anak buah (disciple), Pak Tut.

Clad in bright pink too-short sweat pants and an ill-fitting tuque – Apuan’s higher altitude makes its nights quite cold – and still covered in white dust from his day job, Pak Tut bashfully resisted the idea of teaching me. He was a laborer, not a drummer; he loved arja, but had never actually taught before. After much cajoling from Wardana, however, Pat Tut finally picked up a kendang and began timidly playing Patrem’s patterns for us. His drumming was halting and imperfect; he often stopped and started, lost the beat, or forgot patterns, but he played with joy and, once he got over his initial shyness, was even keener than Wardana to pass on Patrem’s patterns. Between the two of them they made one good drummer: Wardana remembered the patterns and could vocalize them when Pak Tut hesitated, while Pak Tut had the confidence to play despite
his mediocre technique. It was in this group-lesson environment that I slowly, falteringly, learned Patrem’s *kendang arja* vocabulary. And it was only months later, at the recording session in Singapadu, that I was surprised to discover that despite the time passed and the changes in personnel from Patrem’s mid-century visit to Singapadu until today, Apuan drummers have maintained Kredek’s original patterns. But why, when so many other drummers have not?

### 5.3.1 Contact

I hypothesize that one of the major reasons for this long preservation of Kredek’s patterns in Apuan is its relative isolation. After Pak Patrem returned to Apuan with Kredek’s patterns, he would not have had the chance to be influenced by other nearby *arja* drummers; there simply weren’t any. When a group of speakers becomes separated from their core language area – either through transplant or through geographical or cultural boundaries – we often see the development of so-called *remnant dialects*. These are relatively historically isolated dialects “retain[ing] vestiges of earlier language varieties that have receded in speakers in the more widespread population” (Wolfram 2004: 84). The southern Appalachian communities of West Virginia and the western Carolinas, studied by Michael Montgomery (1989 and 1998) through the late 1980s and the 1990s, are a prime example of a remnant dialect community. Historically isolated from other English-speaking Americans by their mountainous terrain, the core group of Scotch Irish who migrated to the area has been a significant and continuous part of these...

---

4 Furthermore, “the local construction of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ may be perpetuated in the postinsular state of the community as well and therefore help maintain some dialect distinctions when the physical barriers promoting isolation are reduced or eliminated” (Wolfram 2004: 90). This is especially the case in remnant dialect communities that have been stigmatized as “backward” by “outsiders.” This very common situation is discussed in Wolfram 2004: 88-90.
communities since their formation. The *founder principle* of dialectology states that “the distinctive structural traits of a given dialect are predetermined by the varieties spoken by the population that first brought the language to the region” (Wolfram 2004: 91). And, not surprisingly, the distinguishing structural and idiomatic linguistic attributes of these Scotch Irish immigrants formed the backbone of their Southern Appalachian dialects. Though there has certainly been out-migration, and even some in-migration in these areas, linguistically it has been relatively insignificant.

What’s more, dialectologists have found time and again “that dialect forms in historically isolated varieties will be quite conservative with respect to language change and thus will remain relatively intact after the formative period” (Wolfram 2004: 92). This generalization is referred to as the *relic assumption*. And, as expected, old Scotch Irish linguistic markers – such as attaching -s to verbs with plural subjects (e.g. “The men chortles,”) – are still prevalent in these Southern Appalachian communities. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2004) have done comparable studies of remnant dialect communities along the southern and mid-Atlantic coasts of the U.S., with similar results.

In his provocative “Echoes of Our Forgotten Ancestors,” Victor Grauer – although he does not approach the issue from a linguistics perspective – uses a parallel concept to support his hypothesis that Pygmy and Bushmen groups, long isolated by geography, both maintain salient structural features of the same ancient musical practices. The striking similarities in their musics – interlocking polyphony made up of short phrases of continuous sound, repeated and varied, and sung in open-throated, blended voices with yodeling – he ascribes to a common ancestor, a concept he supports with current research in genetic anthropology. Communities of this common ancestor, Grauer
hypothesizes, migrated throughout the African continent, many eventually being wiped out by or assimilating with the more powerful so-called Bantu tribes. Yet in the inhospitable Kalahari Desert and faraway Central African tropical forests, members of this hypothetical “founder population” lived relatively undisturbed – and thus uninfluenced – by outside forces (Grauer 2006: 8-12). Grauer posits that in these isolated locations the people would have maintained their original musical practices, hypothesizing that there is “a tendency on the part of any human group to retain the most deeply ingrained and highly valued elements of its lifestyle until acted upon by some outside force” (Grauer 2006: 10). He backs this theory of sociocultural inertia – his own relic assumption – by extending Leibnitz’s Principle of Sufficient Reason⁵ to state that:

nothing can change without a sufficient reason for such change, meaning that any tradition can be expected to continue indefinitely from generation to generation unless something happens at some point to alter or destroy it. In other words, there is nothing “natural” or intrinsic about cultural change, it does not happen on its own, for no reason (Grauer 2006: 12).

While the development of remnant dialects is certainly not the only possible result of prolonged linguistic (or musical) isolation,⁶ and the existence of linguistic drift does seem to contradict Leibnitz’s Principle to some extent,⁷ the widespread existence of remnant dialects is noteworthy, and a theory of remnant dialectology can go a long way to explaining Pak Tut’s conservative Apuan drum dialect. As we saw in Chapter 3, Pak Tut plays four distinct arja patterns with only limited surface-level variation. Because all these patterns were played by Bandem that day at the recording session, I know that they

---

⁵ The principle “insists that all ‘truths of fact’ (as opposed to ‘truths of logic’) must have a sufficient reason for their existence” (Grauer 2006: 12).

⁶ See Natalie Schilling-Estes 2002 for a discussion of how some isolated communities become linguistically innovative and heterogenous, partly because they are not exposed to the levelling influences associated with the larger language group, and partly because their close community ties allow for a more complete transmission of intricate patterns of variation.

⁷ Drift is unconscious change in natural language. A common, simple example is the shift from the grammatically correct “Whom did you see?” to the more frequently uttered “Who did you see?” in most recent English dialects.
are direct, unchanged imports from Kredek’s mid-century drum language. Pak Tut has not expanded the vocabulary of his drum language, nor has he varied the existing vocabulary. As previously mentioned, probably one of the major reasons for this is that unlike the other musicians I discuss in this study, Patrem’s arja group – and Pak Tut’s after him – existed in relative musical isolation. There were no influential neighboring arja troupes playing in other drum dialects, nor were there other closely related drum genres in the area developed thoroughly enough to stimulate change in arja performance practice. And Pak Tut never returned to Singapadu to study with Kredek, or with Pak Tama after him. Had he done so – had there been a feedback loop of influence between Singapadu and Apuan – we would most certainly have seen more innovation and variation in the Apuan dialect. Instead, relative musical isolation led to the maintenance of a remnant dialect of the Singapadu form in Apuan.

Of course “we cannot simply assume that so-called relic forms will remain static in their linguistic composition,” and certainly some isolated dialect communities exhibit their own independent development and change (Wolfram 2004: 93), as have the Pygmy and Bushmen music cultures examined by Grauer. In his studies of peripheral dialects in Okracoke and Smith Island, for instance, Wolfram discusses specific examples of divergent changes in the pronunciation of [ai] and [au] diphthongs – changes that have taken place relatively rapidly – to demonstrate the differing pace and direction that independent development can take even within remnant dialect regions. Thus we must

---

8 Grauer is careful to clarify that “the perpetuation of archaic ancestral traditions need not entail stagnation or entrapment in a repetitive rut for thousands of years, as assumed by the ‘living fossil’ paradigm.” To back this assertion, he points to the fact that “new compositions, forms, and techniques are still being created” in Pygmy and Bushmen communities (Grauer 2006: 13).

conclude that relative isolation is only one of many factors that have led to the full preservation of Kredek’s patterns in Pak Tut’s playing. Two others, which I will explore briefly now, are proficiency and ideology.

5.3.2 Proficiency

Studies of Language Acquisition have shown that language innovation and change do not generally occur in speakers until they are fully versed in all the subtleties of the language.10 This implies not only structural or grammatical competence but also so-called communicative competence, a knowledge of proper language use: “when it [is] appropriate to speak and when not, when a question would show interest and when it would constitute an interruption” (Chambers 2002: 10), the culturally appropriate response to “How are you?” and so on. In first-language acquisition, very young children who have not yet attained full “command of an adult range of speech styles” (Kerswill

---

10 Some possible exceptions to this rule involve the effects of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). “Research with young classroom learners has shown how subtly the first language can affect both learners’ production and their perceptions of what is grammatical in the target language” (Lightbown 2000: 441). For instance, in their studies of French use among native English speakers in French immersion programs, Harley and King found that their verb use reflected the “English pattern for showing direction of motion,” such as using the term “aller en bas” (to go down” instead of the term “descendre” preferred by native French speakers (Lightbown 2000: 441). Were a community of these speakers large enough – or socially powerful enough – this type of variant might effect language change, at least locally. Another example of SLA potentially changing a language is the “fossilization” that comes most often in adult SLA. Linguists refer to the changing grammars that occur over the course of SLA as “interlanguage,” a term coined by linguist Larry Selinker (1972) to describe grammatical systems that are native to neither the first language of the learners (L1) nor the second (L2). While most child language learners will go through several stages of interlanguage before eventually reaching full fluency in the L2, many adults never attain a full level of fluency, instead fossilizing in the midst of SLA and thus maintaining unique elements of the interlanguage. Fossilization “happens when the learner has satisfied the need for communication and or integration in the target language community, but this is a complicated area, and the reasons of fossilization are very difficult to determine with any accuracy” (Lightbown 1985: 179). The fossilized aspects of the L2 may be considered a kind of language innovation, and were they to develop in a relatively isolated language area could potentially create permanent language change. This type of language change might relate back to arja learning were I to begin teaching students in Canada how to play. Still not fluent in the kendang language of my teachers, I would pass my own fossilizations on to my students, thus creating a unique language community based in my own fossilized “innovations.” These various possibilities, however, do not play into the questions of regional variation and innovation of the Balinese musicians under examination in this study.
generally closely mirror the language use of their parents. Teenagers, by
contrast, who have already reached a high degree of language maturity, often innovate
heavily (Levey 2008: 42). This same correlation between fluency and innovation is
found in Second Language Acquisition studies as well. Because “younger learners
acquire second languages automatically from mere exposure, while older learners have to
make more conscious and labored efforts” (Hyltenstam and Abrahamson 2000: 152),
“language innovation tends to be most prevalent amongst younger speakers” (Levey
2008: 41).

Pak Tut – a laborer by day, not a professional musician, and a still-hesitant
drummer – has not yet reached a sufficient level of proficiency to allow innovation.
Though he may have performance competence in the four patterns he uses, he does not
have a deep enough grammatical competence or immersion into the structure of the
language to understand how to vary those patterns idiomatically as a fluent English
speaker would subconsciously know when to use the word “follow” as opposed to
“chase” (Chambers 2002: 9), how to properly conjugate a verb s/he has just learned, and
how to create new, grammatically correct sentences from his/her own existing
vocabulary. Thus, in his drumming, Pak Tut neither varies existing patterns nor creates
new ones. Neither does he have full communicative competence – the deeper concepts of
the specific contexts in which different patterns should be used. He does not have an
understanding, for instance, of the different cyclic structures involved in arja and thus
cannot possibly hope to understand which patterns are appropriate to use with which

---

11 See also Eckert 1997 for a discussion of some of the other reasons for extensive linguistic innovation
among adolescents including a social desire to diverge from their parents and identify with their peer
groups.
cyclic structures as a musician like Pak Tama does. Pak Tut does not, therefore, as linguist Gumperz would say, have the “ability to select, from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him, forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behavior in specific encounters” (Gumperz 1972: 205). This, again, limits his ability and confidence to innovate.

5.3.3 Ideology

Alongside this constellation of external considerations influencing Pak Tut’s conservative approach to drum language variation and innovation are internal, personalized ones. In his seminal *Guns, Germs, and Steel* Jared Diamond discusses how different societies that seem quite similar in terms of geography, socio-economic conditions, and so on, may in fact demonstrate opposite ideological stands toward technological innovation. “Thus, the development and reception of inventions vary enormously from society to society [even] on the same continent” (Diamond 1999: 253). Diamond gives the example of two New Guinean highland tribes both “discovered” by Westerners in the 1930s. While the Chimbu tribe adopted any new technology that came along – most significantly growing coffee as a cash crop – the neighboring Daribi people, he reports, were “especially conservative and uninterested in new technology” (Diamond 1999: 252). These vast ideological differences existed despite that fact that most of the external factors shaping both tribes were comparable.

The same dichotomy exists in linguistic innovation as well. In language contact situations Henning Andersen differentiates endocentric from exocentric languages – communities whose identities are focused on maintaining their own internal linguistic

---

12 See Chapter 1, fn. 49 for a discussion on Pak Tut’s lack of understanding of cyclic structures.
norms versus those open to embracing outside linguistic innovations. He distinguishes this opposition from the simple question of differing levels of contact with the outside world – what linguists studying remnant dialects are primarily concerned with – which he dichotomizes as *open vs. closed*. Andersen claims that in many cases of language preservation and change, the former dichotomy can exert far more influence than the latter, though of course both factors are important:

To illustrate this very briefly, one can expect exocentric closed dialects to accept diffused innovations just like exocentric open dialects, but at a rate which is slower in proportion to the lower density of their inter-dialectical communicative networks. Endocentric open dialects may retain their individuality in the face of relatively extensive exposure to other speech forms whether they form relic areas [...], or they represent the dominant norms which are diffused from focal areas. It may be primarily an attitudinal shift from endocentric to exocentric which changes the course of development of a local dialect when it becomes part of a wider socio-spatial grouping and not just the opening up of new avenues of interdialectal communication (Andersen 1988: 74-5).

Linguist Ronald Macaulay has tackled these questions in his studies of what he calls the “radical conservatism” of English-speaking Scots, an example of an endocentric open dialect. In the face of possible language change through influence from England, Macaulay observes that “Scots speakers are more or less unanimous in the belief that what distinguishes the Scots from the English is the way that they speak” (Macaulay 2004: 179). Like the Southern Appalachian speakers discussed above, modern Lowland Scots maintain vestiges of an earlier form of English, a northern dialect of Old English known as Northumbrian.\(^{13}\) This dialect is distinct from other forms of modern English in its morphology, syntax, and lexicon, but especially differs in its pronunciation from “the Queen’s English” (Received Pronunciation or RP). For instance, unlike in RP, Lowland Scots’ [r] is pronounced in final position, or before consonants, as in the words *car* and *card*, and, particularly among lower-class Scots speakers, the [u] vowel is not

---

\(^{13}\) This is most extreme among working class Scots, and Macaulay examines in some depth the connections between working-class pride and linguistic pride.
diphthongized so that *down, out, and house* become *doon, oot, and hoose* (Macaulay 2004: 179-80). These and other linguistic markers of modern Lowland Scots English are understood to be relics from Northumbrian Old English.

Yet, unlike the abovementioned Southern Appalachian speakers whose remnant dialect stems from geographical isolation, modern Lowland Scots are by no means protected from RP, which is the standard English dialect used in schools, churches, administration, and virtually all written materials in Scotland (one very self-conscious exception being Robert Burns’ poetry) (Macaulay 2004: 179). Andersen, thus, would refer to this as an open dialect where the Southern Appalachian dialect is closed. And, in fact, Macaulay’s findings show that Lowland Scots are acutely aware of different forms of speech – and their social significance – and that they are capable of using the standard forms when they choose to (Macaulay 2004: 180-1). It is, Macaulay concludes, their pride in their working-class identities in the context of Scotland as a poor country, coupled with their loyalty to the areas in which they were raised and the accompanying pride in their own distinct speech forms, that drives these Lowland Scots to such linguistic conservatism. As one of his informants put it: “We can all sit and talk wer ain [our own] tongue in wer ain way” (Macaulay 2004: 193).

With their sense of identity and pride of place so tightly wrapped up in language use, these and many other linguistic cultures remain consciously resistant to change – endocentric whether or not they are an open language community in Andersen’s sense of the word. And when the choice between preservation and innovation in a language lies in the hands of just a few people – as it does with many *musical* languages – personal ideologies become exponentially more influential. This can certainly be said of Pak Tut’s
When I asked him if he varied Patrem’s patterns at all or invented his own, his reaction was one of almost comical shock. This was the way it was meant to be played – the style of his revered teacher, the Apuan style. What right did he have to change it? While this reluctance to vary Patrem’s patterns was undoubtedly also influenced by Pak Tut’s middling proficiency level and lack of contact with other arja dialects (which created a closed drum language in Apuan), it seems clear that ideology of change does play a significant role in his relative unwillingness for variation and invention.¹⁴

5.4 Peliatan/Pengosekan Liberalism

Analyzing the drum dialect of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok through a similar lens reveals telling parallels between levels of innovation and variation and these numerous linguistic factors. In all arenas we find these two drummers on the opposite end of the spectrum from Pak Tut. First of all, this pair of drummers began with a broader palette of Singapadu patterns than Pak Tut. While Pak Dewa, like Pak Tut, studied briefly with Kredek,¹⁵ Pak Cok studied very extensively with Cok Oka Tublen. Together, then, they were equipped with two idiolects, or individual idioms of the Singapadu language, instead of just one.

¹⁴ Coming back to questions raised in Chapter 2 on the death of the Keramas arja drum language, some linguists exploring the reasons behind language death and dying also look to ideology for explanations. In her studies of language endangerment in South America, for instance, Colette Grinevald notes that language loss is “mostly a matter of shift in language loyalty” (Grinevald 1998: 142). Thus ideologies of language loyalty could also help to explain the loss of the Keramas language, as the Singapadu language gained prestige among Keramas musicians.

¹⁵ Pak Dewa’s main influences, though, came from the Pelitan village style, and particularly from Peliatan drum master I Madé Lebah, who also taught Pak Cok (discussed below).
5.4.1 Contact and Proficiency: Dialects and Idiolects

The majority of linguists today agree that each individual, though s/he may belong to a fairly homogeneous language group, speaks his/her own unique version of that language – or idiolect – based on his/her personal web of linguistic influences.16 Most people listening to my speech, for instance, would identify it as North American English, and more discerning listeners might recognize my dialect as Maritime Canadian. However, many other influences also make up my particular idiolect. My pronunciation of the word tomato with a long [a] as in the word father rather than the [ey] in potato shows my linguistic origins in England and my parents’ insistence on a more “proper,” upper class pronunciation. Yet my aspirated “yeah” (spoken while inhaling) and my vowel fronting in the [ar] of car and bar place my accent as Nova Scotian, though less acutely than many of my high school friends. The relative subtleness of my Nova Scotian accent is probably due to the fact that my parents, who grew up in Montreal, never adopted it, and that it always maintained a lower status in my family than the more homogenized standard “Canadian accent.” Accent leveling – a state in which dialects converge into a standard form – is also a product of urban living. And, though I am Nova Scotian, I grew up in the capital city of Halifax where my education happened in a cosmopolitan environment, not in a small town in Cape Breton where my regional accent would have been reinforced by my teachers and peers. Other Nova Scotian-isms, like the

16 It is important to note that many of the linguistics terms being used here are disputed to some extent, their edges fuzzy. Where idiolect bleeds into dialect and dialect into language, or what is borrowing and what code-switching, and so on, are not rules set in stone. For instance, William Labov, a highly respected linguist generally understood to be the father of variationist sociolinguistics, insists that “idiolects are not a theoretical reality […] and that] language variation grammar exists at the level of the speech community but not at the level of the individual. [Yet, as Kirk Hazen counters] these assumptions prohibit a nested view of language variation whereby dialects are collections of similar idiolects, and languages are collections of similar dialects” (Kirk Hazen 2002: 501-2). I tend to agree with Hazen, not Labov, in this case.
expression “to fall arse over teakettle,” I have picked up as a conscious affect of Nova Scotian identity from my more rural friends.

To complicate matters, a French immersion education means that some of my academic vocabulary – such as the term Homo habilis – I pronounce with a French accent. My years of research in Bali have also influenced my idiolect in some small ways. For instance, I use the Indonesian term malu to describe that social blend of shyness and embarrassment for which we do not have an English term. Furthermore, some of my vocabulary is generational. I use the term rad as often as cool or awesome, though people in a generation just five years older or younger than me do not. And even personality plays into idiolect. I prefer direct to euphemistic language, and thus, in my idiolect, people die; they do not pass away, and, were I to have children, they would never go potty or get a boo-boo. All of these elements make up my particular linguistic idiom – my idiolect – though of course no one would deny that I speak North American English.

Musicians, too, “speak” their own distinct idioms of musical language, which can be explained using linguistic models of language, dialect, and idiolect. In the case of
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17 This explanation of my idiolect is based on Wardhaugh 2010: 4.
18 I posit that the linguistics concepts at play here – idiolect, dialect, and language – can also be applied at multiple levels to otherwise quite dissimilar musical traditions. For instance, in the performance of the North Indian vocal genre dhrupad (examined in depth in Sanyal and Widdess 2004) there are several well-established hereditary family traditions (gharānā) as well as a number of bānī (styles). Unlike in the various styles of kendang arja under examination here, these designations do not comprise collections of specific rhythmic or melodic patterns making up a given tradition but refer rather to general stylistic guidelines: aesthetic characters, vocal techniques such as ornaments, and so on. Sanyal and Widdess describe the dhrupad style, or dhrupad aṅg, as follows: “In comparison with other styles of Indian art music, dhrupad is often considered to be virtually unornamented; it is, however, richly endowed with slow glissandi between melody notes, momentary pitch inflections, and microtonal oscillations, which demand a different technique of voice production from the rapid fioritura of khyāl. Only certain ornamentation techniques […] are permitted in dhrupad. […] They are to be used with restraint, without unnecessary showmanship; in particular the tans of khyāl – rapid virtuoso passage-work, often sung to the vowel ‘ā’ – are forbidden in dhrupad style. […] Melodic style – ‘the way of approaching the svaras, their intertwining etc.’ – is perhaps the most powerful single criterion for distinguishing dhrupad from other genres. (cont’d)
Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s *kendang arja* dialect, for instance, what we have are two musicians who, through their collaboration, have developed fluency in both of the founding idiolects of *kendang arja asli* Singapadu. Although Kredek and Cok Oka Tublen were drumming partners, each, as we saw in Chapter 2, had his own style – his own idiolect – of the original Singapadu language with roots in various external musical influences. And these two idiolects provided Pak Dewa and Pak Cok with a more extensive collection of patterns from the Singapadu tradition than Pak Tut. Each is fluent in the idioms and inflections of both idiolects, and has the communicative competence to switch between them appropriately.

### 5.4.2 Contact and Proficiency: Code-Switching

Even more central to their Pengosekan/Peliatan *arja* dialect, though, is the fact that each of these drummers also studied extensively with another teacher: the Peliatan drum master I Madé Lebah. Lebah, who sometimes played and discussed music with Kredek, Griya, and other Singapadu *arja* musicians\(^\text{19}\) but largely interacted with Peliatan

---

\(^{19}\) Interviews with Bandem and Dibia, August 2011.
musicians, would have developed his own distinctive drum dialect. Because of his Singapadu contacts, Lebah’s dialect would have been mutually intelligible – and thus able to be blended – with the Singapadu patterns. Yet it was also unique. Thus Pak Dewa and Pak Cok are, by virtue of their teachers, versed in multiple arja dialects. Pak Cok often spoke to me of his ability – and Pak Dewa’s – to freely pick and choose between the dialects of their various teachers, combining their patterns at will in a technique used only by proficient bilingual speakers (or, in this case, bilingual drummers) known as code-switching. “In many of the world’s bilingual communities, fluent bilinguals sometimes engage in code-switching by producing discourses which, in the same conversational turn or in consecutive turns, include morphemes from two or more of the varieties in their linguistic repertoire” (Myers-Scotton 1997: 217), two broadly-known examples being Franglais and Spanglish. Code-switching can occur intrasententially – within a single sentence – or intersententially, but the mechanism controlling both types appears to be the same (Thomason 2003: 695).

In her studies of language use among the various linguistic groups in the Papua New Guinean province of New Ireland, Rebecca Sue Jenkins observes several different patterns of code-switching. Most involve communication between people from differing linguistic backgrounds. A Tigak who studied Tungag in school will code-switch between both languages when addressing a Tungag, for instance, or both will communicate in a

20 That Lebah also had many musical connections in Sukawati – particularly for legong – as well as associations with Blahbatuh (conversation with Tenzer, June 2012) further complicates his musical picture.

21 Much like modern dhrupad performers who play in multiple bānī. (See fn. 18 for more details on this).

22 With the social superiority of belonging to the more dominant language group, the Tungag speaker, by contrast, will probably not code-switch, preferring instead to communicate entirely in Tungag, though s/he understands the Tigak’s language also (Jenkins 2005: 27).
mixture of Tok Pisin\textsuperscript{23} as a “common language for friendly communication” and English as a marker of sophistication (Jenkins 2005: 27-8, quote 27). Yet, in an urban setting, two Tigaks may also choose to code-switch when communicating amongst themselves, “us[ing] the vernacular [Tigak] to establish their ethnic identity and Tok Pisin to establish their urbanity” (Jenkins 2005: 27). The Balinese language, too, is an example of socially institutionalized code-switching where speakers use different levels of the language based on their relative social standing.\textsuperscript{24}

Analyses of code-switching, both in language and in music,\textsuperscript{25} often focus on the socio-political reasons behind language choice – be they for the purposes of inclusion, exclusion, identity, and so on. However, in the case of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s drumming, my sense is that their code-switching is motivated by nothing more than the predilection for variety and a desire to be more cosmopolitan.\textsuperscript{26} And their material has come from several sources aside from their main arja gurus. Through the 1960s and 70s Pak Dewa and Pak Cok were frequently invited to play with all-star Arja Bon troupes, both for national radio broadcasts (RRI) and for live shows throughout Bali. Performing with musicians and dancers from across the island, they would have been exposed to numerous independently-developed dialects of Singapadu arja, as well as working with musicians and dancers versed in mutually unintelligible arja languages. Professional musicians for many years, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok had the opportunity to achieve a very

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} The local pidgin/creole.
\item \textsuperscript{24} While these differences are largely based on the Balinese caste system, age too plays into language choice among Balinese speakers, particularly those of the same caste.
\item \textsuperscript{25} One example of an important ethnomusicological work touching on code-switching is Mark Slobin’s \textit{Micromusics of the West} (2000), but there are many.
\item \textsuperscript{26} It is interesting to note that neither Pak Dewa nor Pak Cok plays in as pre-composed a fashion as Pak Tut; they would probably consider this to be too kampungan (small-town).
\end{itemize}
high level of proficiency – of both grammatical and communicative competence – in this much more expanded and nuanced vocabulary of *kendang arja* patterns. In addition, because they were based in the artistic center of Peliatan, these musicians also frequently heard and played several other genres of gamelan music that may have informed their *arja* performance. Central among these was *legong*, the genre Peliatan is probably most historically famous for, whose related drumming idioms would have provided fodder for multi-lingual code-switching in *arja* performance.

All these musico-language contact situations, in turn, would have generated a fuller picture of their own dialect’s grammatical “rules” or boundaries, and thus a confidence in creating pattern variation or even innovating new patterns within their existing idioms. Even more than this, however, these two drummers also created – and continue to create – new patterns that blend elements of each of their codes, thus code-switching not only intersententially but intrasententially as well.

### 5.4.3 Ideology: “Weak Ties”

Milroy and Milroy claim that linguistic innovations “are normally transmitted from one group to another by persons who have weak ties with both groups” (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 380). Labov, by contrast, maintains that linguistic innovators are those with a large number of contacts within their own community yet who also maintain ties with various people outside their local neighborhood (Labov 1980: 261). Though

---

27 Here they are assuming Granovetter’s suggestion that “the strength of a tie is a (probably linear) combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services which characterize a tie” (as quoted in Milroy and Milroy 1985: 364).

28 In his study, Labov also focuses a great deal on social class or status as a component in the diffusion of linguistic change, a theory Milroy and Milroy are less eager to focus on. Milroy and Milroy suspect that the people Labov refers to here are actually not the initial innovators but what Rogers and Shoemaker have termed early adopters. These linguists define innovators as marginal members of the group adopting the
somewhat contradictory, both these theories posit that innovations spread through large networks with, by necessity, collections of weaker ties joining otherwise unconnected groups together. In their work on the role of social networks in linguistic innovation and variation, Milroy and Milroy looked at the use of phonological variants in Belfast speakers in relation to the speaker’s degree of integration into his/her community. They found, across the board, that “a tendency to select relatively low (conservative) variants [was] associated with a relatively high integration into the community” and vice versa (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 361).

The same may be said of Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s drumming choices. Though Peliatan-Pengosekan musicians at the core, with their hands in so many different drum language cookie jars, Pak Dewa and Pak Cok do not have the same strong ties to the standards of any one group that a musician like Pak Tut has – both practically and

innovation, and thus more likely to accept outside influence, while claiming that early adopters are those members with strong ties within the adopting group, generally highly conforming to group norms, who can provide a model of change for other non-innovative group members (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 367-70). Reconciling Labov’s with Milroy and Milroy’s findings is still somewhat problematic, but what is important to us is that in each case innovators have ties with multiple groups, and in many cases these ties are weak ones. Further, there is “no easy way for empirical studies of linguistic change in progress (particularly phonological change) to make the crucial distinction” between innovators and early adopters (Ibid.: 369). And in the much smaller pool of users involved in arja drum language innovation, it seems that innovators and early adopters may in fact be the same people. This makes the comparison – if we follow Milroy and Milroy as opposed to Labov – an imperfect one, but I believe the similarities in terms of the end result of linguistic innovation are certainly compelling enough to bear consideration.

29 Granovetter posits that “whatever is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and traverse greater social distance (i.e., path length), when passed through weak ties rather than strong. If one tells a rumour to all his close friends, and they do likewise, many will hear the rumour a second and third time, since those linked by strong ties tend to share friends. If the motivation to spread the rumour is dampened a bit on each wave of retelling, then the rumour moving through strong ties is much more likely to be limited to a few cliques than that going via weak ones; bridges will not be crossed” (Granovetter 1973: 1366). Milroy and Milroy take this statement to its logical conclusion: “it is evident that genuine diffusion of the rumour will take place if each person tells it to acquaintances with whom he is only weakly linked; they in turn will transmit it to a large number of non-overlapping groups, so that the ‘retelling effect’ will not occur” (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 366).

30 Milroy and Milroy also consider other factors in their analyses such as sex, social status, age, and so on. For instance, when looking at the sex of the speaker in relation to variance in [a] vowel pronunciation among Belfast speakers, they note that women “appear to correlate their choice of variant more closely with their personal network than do men,” though the opposite is true for other vowel sounds (1985: 360).
emotionally – for his sole musical community in Apuan. The former are thus more open to influence from teachers and musicians in various different drumming communities, as well as to personal innovation within all these different styles. This, of course, bleeds into ideologies of change, and these are liberal with both these drummers. Pak Cok claims, with the pride of a man who knows he is very good at what he does, that his arja drumming has changed significantly throughout his lifetime as he gathers new influences, and as his feeling (rasa) changes with age.³¹ This may well be an attitude he inherited from Cok Oka Tublen, who, as we know, sought out influences from different genres in other villages. Pak Dewa unabashedly boasts of the countless patterns he has stolen from every good drummer he has ever heard, which he then seamlessly incorporates into his own arja improvising.³² Unlike Pak Tut in Apuan, therefore, these arja masters have created an exocentric as well as an open drumming community, where innovation – both from within and without – is encouraged. This liberal attitude to innovation, when combined with Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s high level of proficiency and intimate contact with multiple arja languages and dialects, has led to an enormous level of variation in existing patterns as well as new pattern innovation in Peliatan and Pengosekan that simply could not exist today in Apuan.

5.5 Singapadu in the Middle

Pak Tama of Singapadu represents a midpoint on these continuums of innovation and variation, contact, proficiency, and ideologies of change. A student of both Singapadu masters, like Pak Dewa and Pak Cok he boasts a wider range of patterns than

³¹ Interview, Aug 13, 2011. Cok Alit also admits to changing his style of playing as he ages in order to preserve his waning energy through long performances.

Pak Tut, as we saw in Chapter 3. Yet he does not freely code-switch between the idiolects of his teachers as they do. In many cases bilingual speakers do not code-switch in the manner of the New Ireland Tigaks. Instead, two languages are “used by the same speaker [but] with different interlocutors, often monolinguals; a typical example is the use of one language at home and another language at work” (Thomason 2003: 697). This technique is known in linguistics as code alternation. For Pak Tama the two Singapadu idiolects are each appropriate only in certain musical contexts. We know that his patterns learned from Kredek – patterns similar to those of Pak Tut in Apuan – are only cocok (appropriate) for use with the tabuh telu gong structure. His patterns from Cok Oka Tublen, by contrast, are meant for use with tabuh dua and batel; they cannot be used for tabuh telu. In addition, while Pak Tama’s personal ideologies do allow some variation on these patterns, it is much more limited in scope than in the Peliatan-Pengosekan idiom. A further limit on his code-switching is that, unlike Pak Dewa and Pak Cok, Pak Tama has never studied outside of Singapadu. And although he has performed with musicians all over the island, most of these have been members of groups that he himself has formed (and thus players to whom he has transmitted his own idioms), not professional musicians in Arja Bon groups fluent in other idioms that might have spurred change in Pak Tama’s own dialect.

Additionally, as Milroy and Milroy have shown, “the closer the individual’s ties to a local community network, the more likely he is to approximate to vernacular norms” (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 367), and the more conservative he will be in terms of linguistic innovation – bedfellow of the weak ties theories discussed above. We saw this strong-ties conservatism in the endocentric languages of Lowland Scotland. Jonathan
Marshall’s studies of rural speech groups in northeast Scotland support this theory also. He asserts that speakers “with the most positive orientation to the local group resist change […] whereas those] who have a higher degree of mental urbanization, or an attitude of openness to supra-local norms […] are at the forefront of change” (Marshall 2004: 217). This plays into accommodation theory, the idea that people are motivated to adjust their speech style, or accommodate, as a means of expressing values, attitudes and intentions towards others. […] A shift in speech style toward that of another is termed convergence and is considered often a reflection of social integration (Giles as quoted in Tabouret-Keller 1997: 322).

Pak Tama’s strong ties with the Singapadu tradition (to the exclusion of other traditions) alongside his deep respect for his teachers’ conventions have meant that he has not been susceptible to outside influence or a desire to accommodate in the linguistic sense. Thus he has innovated relatively little within his own idiom, despite the fact that he is quite a prolific composer in other related genres. It is certainly true that by living in Singapadu Pak Tama has been exposed to Arja Bon musicians competent in diverse arja dialects and languages. Location has also given him ample opportunities to both hear and perform related drum genres like the gambuh theatrical form performed in neighboring Batuan village. Yet, unlike Pak Dewa and Pak Cok, Tama has not had the hands-on experience of playing regularly in these different drum languages and dialects, and this peripheral exposure has had no significant lasting influence on his arja improvisations.

Thus, while very proficient in his current Singapadu dialect – a teacher and master musician in his own right, who demonstrates both grammatical and communicative as well as performance competence – in terms of innovation and variation, Pak Tama falls comfortably between Pak Tut’s conservatism and the liberalism exhibited by Pak Dewa and Pak Cok.
5.6 Concluding Remarks

Considering the diffusion of *kendang arja asli* Singapadu in a sociolinguistic framework compelled me to reflect on whether or not I was equating music with language, and if that was appropriate. The question of such an equivalence is one that many scholars of music have grappled with.\(^{33}\) Certainly, the kind of analysis that I have undertaken here does seem to lead us to general questions of cognition. Are music and language cognized in analogous ways, and (perhaps more importantly) am I attempting through the above analysis to somehow prove that they are? Their unmistakable similarities in terms of the questions of diffusion, proficiency, ideology and idiolect perhaps do point to a deeper cognitive connection between them.

But this is not the same thing as asserting equivalence. We can also find similar patterns appearing in studies of many nonverbal cultural activities such as tool-making, art, or techniques for weaving and agriculture.\(^{34}\) Lipo, O’Brien, Collard and Shennan (2006), for instance, have used phylogenetic approaches to trace the diffusion and subsequent independent development of various physical artifacts from pre-historic America, including beads, amulets and projectile points (arrow-heads, etc.) These patterns of diffusion and change, then, appear to be broader tendencies affecting many

---

\(^{33}\) These include some of the following academic trends: 1) Studies written through the 1950s, 60s and 70s drawing from Levi-Strauss’ structuralism (inspired by Saussure’s early 20\(^{\text{th}}\)-century structural linguistics). These include Ruwet’s paradigmatic analyses of Western classical traditions and Arom’s various structuralist analyses of Central African Pygmy musics. 2) Studies beginning in the 1970s, like those of Jean-Jacques Nattiez, concerned with semiotics: the study of music, like language, as a system of signs. These and many other theories of musical meaning are referential – they assert that music has meaning because it communicates the extramusical. 3) Studies such as Meyer 1956 look at absolutist meaning in music: meaning that lies within the context of the work itself. 4) Studies through the 1960s and 70s inspired by Chomsky’s theories of generative grammar, one example being Sapir 1969 (written by a linguist/anthropologist). Each of these branches of music scholarship, to some extent, sought to find connections or equivalences between music and language through their various approaches.

\(^{34}\) I would like to thank John Roeder for pointing me to this line of questioning.
aspects of human life. And so perhaps we can borrow theories and concepts from these
diverse fields without fear of asserting equivalence; we are simply observing the cultural
forces that control the diffusion, preservation and transformation of many human objects
and activities, and in these studies, using all the tools and frameworks at our disposal. As
Roger Lass has said of using concepts from biology to discuss elements of linguistic
evolution:

If I am saying anything of general import […], it is about properties common to historically
evolving systems regardless of their substrates; rather than extending a notion from biology to
linguistics, I am suggesting that the two domains (and others as well, probably, like the evolution
of art styles or political institutions or sartorial fashion) have certain behaviors in common by
virtue of evolving (Lass 1990: 96).

Putting the study in this broader framework is to my mind more exciting than any
attempt to equate music and language in their structural or social specifics. Recent
research linking music with language – including such works as Aniruddh Patel’s Music,
address these behaviors and cultural forces in the broadest possible terms, drawing from
the diverse fields of neuroscience, psychology, and cognitive archaeology, to name a few.
I see these highly interdisciplinary studies as having the potential to lead to more
compelling and far-reaching ideas than some of the questions we have asked in the past,
such as the sticky philosophical inquiries into what makes a thing have meaning (and
whether that meaning is referential or absolute), whether or not linguistic concepts of
syntax and phonemes can aptly be applied to music, or if music is, in fact, a language.

Even more applicable to the current discussion than any of our earlier studies on
the music-language connection, these approaches do more than simply provide a model
for analyzing music. They offer insight into *why* we should use linguistic models to talk
about music, avoiding what Patel calls the “distraction of superficial analogies between
music and language,” and reaching instead for the deeper questions. We can now ask, and perhaps even begin to answer, “to what extent does the making and perceiving of [...] music draw on cognitive and neural mechanisms used in our everyday communication system?” (Patel 2008: 5). And was there a “single precursor for both music and language,” what Steven Brown terms “musilanguage,” as Mithen would have us believe — a “communication system that had the characteristics that are now shared by music and language, but that split into two systems at some date in our evolutionary history” (Mithen 2006: 26)? This study does not claim to address these epic questions. Yet perhaps, in suggesting parallels in the social patterns of variation and innovation of music and language, it resonates with these new and exciting interdisciplinary dialogues.

Even in 1983, Lerdahl and Jackendoff were able to see that a broader application of linguistic concepts to the study of music could lead to far more fruitful discoveries:

> Many previous applications of linguistic methodology to music have foundered because they attempt a literal translation of some aspect of linguistic theory into musical terms – for instance, by looking for musical “parts of speech,” deep structures, transformations, or semantics. But pointing out superficial analogies between music and language, with or without the help of a generative grammar, is an old and largely futile game. One should not approach music with any preconceptions that the substance of music theory will look at all like linguistic theory (Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1983: 5).

And, likewise, there are certainly imperfections in using the types of sociolinguistic models that I have borrowed to discuss evolution in arja drumming, many of them based in the quite significant differences between musical languages and spoken languages, or indeed between music and any of the other human activities and objects studied for their diffusion and change. One of the major differences, of course, is the narrower vocabulary at play in a drum language – both in terms of the sounds that the drums can produce and their various permutations and combinations. Yet there are more and less thoroughly developed spoken languages, too – especially when taking pidgins into
account— and these can all be subjected to this type of sociolinguistic scrutiny. And a handful of subtly varying but quite similar arrowheads from a relatively small area can still tell us something about their spread and development. Why, then, can we not study a small musical language like kendang arja in the same way?

Yet perhaps the biggest distinction between a drum language and a spoken language or collection of arrowheads is the fact that a smaller number of users— often single musicians as opposed to whole communities— means that individual innovation can spur significant changes in a short time-span of a kind rarely seen in language development. However, as Milroy and Milroy have shown, what linguists call “linguistic change” in fact always begins as “speaker innovation.” A single speaker innovates; the innovation may go no further, and thus die with the speaker, or it may spread throughout his local community. In those cases where an innovation spreads to neighboring communities, we then begin to refer to it as “linguistic change” (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 347-8). In the same way, these innovations that I see in Pak Dewa and Pak Cok’s playing may die with them, as the Singapadu style spreads again through Pak Tama’s far-reaching teaching endeavors. Or they may be diffused to the next generation of Pengosekan/Peliatan musicians— as has begun to happen with Rai, Komin, and Ketut— and either remain in that community alone or spread to other villages through education or collaboration in this new generation.

It is clear to me that though all can be traced to the same family tree, the kendang arja dialects of Singapadu, Apuan, and Peliatan-Pengosekan have each taken very divergent paths of development in a way that mirrors patterns of linguistic diffusion and innovation. By examining the development of these three arja drum dialects through
models of language contact, proficiency, and ideologies of change, I hope to have begun to unravel the complex combination of factors that have led to such different levels of preservation and change among these various students of the kendang arja Singapadu language. In many ways what we have here is a small-scale laboratory of musico-linguistic change, ideal in many respects because of its limited size and life-span. First, we have access to some of the specifics of the proto-language, an advantage that linguists can seldom boast of: we know Kredek’s original patterns, and have some understanding of how they differed from Cok Oka Tublen’s. Further, because their direct musico-linguistic descendants (my teachers) are still alive, we have a complete inventory of the other musical influences – be they teachers, other arja performers, or patterns from related kendang genres – that affected each community of drummers at the time of the original Singapadu drum language diffusion. Because of this, we can better grasp the musical interactions – and the strong and weak ties to different communities – of every musician under examination, again a luxury seldom afforded to linguists studying in much larger language pools. Moreover, through interviews, lessons, and other personal interactions we have a firm sense of the varying personal ideologies and proficiency levels that would have differently effected second-generation musico-linguistic change in each community.

It is my hope that these models can contribute to further studies of musical diffusion and change, and that the parallels to existing sociolinguistic models are sufficiently compelling to stimulate similar comparative analyses of regional variation in other music cultures.
Conclusion: Where the Study Goes Now

The Collaboration Begins

"Dear Prof. Babel,

My name is Leslie Tilley, and I am a PhD candidate in ethnomusicology at UBC. A strange person for you to get an email from, I imagine, but I was hoping you might be able to help me..."

This was the shy, stilted beginning of my first cross-disciplinary academic collaboration.

When I began to think about *kendang arja* in terms of the issues of language transmission and diffusion discussed in the previous chapter, I suddenly felt incredibly out of my depth. I didn’t even know which databases would help me to begin, or which keywords to use when searching. What was the RILM of linguistics? And how did I search for studies on a concept, like remnant dialects, for which I did not yet have a name? Enter Molly Babel, a young, enthusiastic linguistics professor at UBC who happened to be teaching the sociolinguistics class that I had taken years earlier from a now-retired professor, and who generously said “yes” when I asked.

It was more of a consultation than a collaboration, really. A series of emails exchanged and a single meeting – long, and very engaging to be sure, but just one meeting. Molly gave me some terms and sources and a place to begin, and I ran from there on my own. Yet this simple exchange sparked in me a desire for more, for further interdisciplinary dialogue and perhaps even a deeper collaboration benefitting both sides.

And in this, I am not alone.
Ethnomusicology’s Interdisciplinarity

In this dissertation, like most ethnomusicologists, I borrow from the theories and research approaches of a network of fields, some very closely related, some slightly more distant. Together these create a web of intersecting knowledge areas, all differently linked to Bali and Balinese music. Yet I claim expertise in none of these fields, and, as with my consultation with Molly Babel, this work has relied on the input of several different kinds of specialists. And this is something that is not only allowable in an ethnomusicological study; it is almost a requirement.

The opening chapter of this dissertation is perhaps the most conventionally “ethnomusicological” in that it depends largely on fieldwork for its information. In the chapter, data from fieldwork transitions into and out of information gleaned from various historical accounts. Here writings by and conversations with figures such as I Madé Bandem and I Wayan Dibia on the history and music of their own Balinese culture were invaluable.¹ The heart of the work, Chapters 3 and 4, was an in-depth musical analysis of improvisation that borrowed not only from other self-defined ethnomusicologists, but from publications in Western music theory as well. In these analyses I received input from music theorists such as John Roeder, a specialist in theories of rhythm and meter. Chapters 2 and 5 both discuss transmission and diffusion – not new in ethnomusicology by any stretch. But Chapter 5 relies on linguistics and sociolinguistics, and Chapter 2 on learning, teaching, and diverse ways of knowing articulated by psychologists,

¹ Both traditional musicians who have been my informants as well my friends, I see these two men also as academics and music historians, and, in the depth of their knowledge, place them on a level with McPhee, Vickers, Tenzer, Robinson, and other Western scholars of Bali.
neurobiologists, and so on. Fieldwork, historical accounts, music analysis, linguistics, psychology… These were my playing fields.

And this is what ethnomusicology has always been: a conglomeration of ideas and methods from a range of related fields through which curious people attempt to unravel the mysteries of music in culture. Through the decades we have been captivated by ideas such as Levi-Strauss’ structuralism, Chomsky’s generative grammar, Geertz’s cultural anthropology, and Appadurai’s theories of globalization. As Becker has observed (perhaps somewhat idealistically):

In each case, ethnomusicologists had the good sense to learn from these movements what was useful to us. In the process we became enriched theoretically and methodologically. Eventually, the realization sets in that this or that approach does not, as first assumed, solve all our problems or answer all our questions. But we move on with a richer arsenal of ways to think about music. We do not discard approaches that once seemed stunning in their ability to reveal insights into music and musical behavior, but subsequently were shown to be partial and vulnerable. Rather, we carry within ourselves, like a palimpsest, each theoretical methodological approach with which we have seriously engaged, and we are richer for it (Becker 2012: 113).

I would like to address here one particular local (but nevertheless complex) aspect of that palimpsest of ethnomusicological interdisciplinarity: the place of music theory and analysis in the field. I touched on this topic in my introductory chapter as a frame for this study. Here, at the close of the study I come back to the topic, like a bookend, but perhaps this time it is the study that will frame the discussion. Probably one of the most long-standing – and seemingly divisive – issues in the field’s rhetoric, music theory and analysis are central to this dissertation’s interdisciplinarity. An ethnomusicologist who always tended toward analysis – in large part because I was trained that way – this was where I felt most at home. Somewhat out of step with the way many ethnomusicologists in North America are trained, however, I am still not a “music theorist” in the commonly understood sense of the word. Not only do I not focus on Western repertoires, I have not
been indoctrinated into the rhetoric of Western music theory, nor am I very familiar with that field’s canon of important writings. This makes interdisciplinarity a challenge.

Though the role of music theory and analysis has been the subject of an ongoing negotiation since ethnomusicology’s inception,\(^2\) the tenor of this dialogue has shifted in recent years. Here I call attention to two conversations in the field to which, through this and future studies, I wish to add my own voice: the importance of placing analysis in the meta-theory of ethnomusicology, as discussed in Solis 2012, and the need for cross-disciplinary collaboration as addressed in Lawson 2012 and Becker 2012.

**Music Theory and Analysis in Ethnomusicology: Solis’ Interdiscipline**

The concluding chapter of my MA thesis, completed one decade ago almost to the day, was titled “Music Analysis in Ethnomusicology – A Defence.” In it I reviewed the place of analysis in the field (which I saw as being relegated to second-class citizenry, or worse), and I called for a self-conscious swing of the anthropology/musicology pendulum to center:

I must believe that there is value in what we as ethnomusicologists do – in all of what we do. We come, as outsiders, to respect and to try to understand, in our own way – there is no other – someone else’s music, and to share that limited understanding with other outsiders. If we do not use all of the available methods, imperfect as they may be, we close a door on a potential understanding.

While the anthropologically-based studies that have largely dominated the field of ethnomusicology for the last fifty years are essential, perhaps it is time to bring the field full circle; to rediscover and expand upon its vital, if misguided, analytical beginnings, now free of the Darwinist, naive ethnocentrism and latent colonialist stereotypes that pervaded most of the early […] studies [in comparative musicology]. It seems time, now, to develop Fillmore and Hornbostel's research of tuning systems and organology, and Bartok's collections and transcriptions, with cultural context and ethnotheory now in mind, into a complete exploration of musical structure, from the cellular to the macroscopic levels (Tilley 2003: 117).

I was younger then, of course – more naïve and perhaps more of an idealist — but maybe not really all that different. I read these words now, ten years later, and I still

---

\(^2\) See Tilley 2003 (Ch. 5) and Solis 2012 for a larger discussion of this historiography.
believe them; what’s more, I still believe that they need to be said. It is true that in the interim music theory and analysis have garnered increased attention in ethnomusicology, at least in certain circles. We have seen the establishment of the Analytical Approaches to World Music (AAWM) journal and conference, both of which rely heavily on the contributions of self-proclaimed ethnomusicologists. Further, Tenzer’s 2006 Analytical Studies in World Music – a compendium of work from both ethnomusicologists and Western music theorists – was successful enough that Oxford University Press released a sister volume five years later (Tenzer and Roeder, eds. 2011). And there has always been a small but steady output of music theory and analysis work being published in our journals. In the British Journal of Ethnomusicology, for instance, about 30% of the recent articles have engaged in some significant music analysis (Solis 2012: 535). Many recent published books and theses – like Marc Perlman’s Unplayed Melodies (2004) and, in a very different way, Thomas Turino’s Music as Social Life (2008) – have also engaged in deep musical analysis.

That music theory and analysis are an integral part of ethnomusicological research seems an already accepted norm, then. Even the tripartite model offered us by Merriam – the ultimate anthropologist in the field’s mid-20th century theoretical “great divide” – includes sound alongside behavior and concepts as our areas of study. And many ethnomusicologists in recent years have written in defense of music theory and analysis,

3 The North American society for ethnomusicology journal has generally been somewhat less well-stocked with analysis in its articles, and Solis argues that “many conference presentations are more oriented toward such work than are articles in the primary journals” (Solis 2012: 535).

4 Many similarly analytical studies from the field have been referenced throughout this dissertation. Solis 2012 discusses many of these works, both historical and recent, and I will not do so here.

5 The reverse is also becoming true to some extent. Some self-proclaimed music theorists are beginning to actively engage the ethnographic toolkit of the ethnomusicologist in their own studies. One such work is Mark Butler’s Unlocking the Groove (2006).
and expounded upon their usefulness far beyond the simple investigation of sound. As

Tenzer puts it:

Once observed, sound patterns can be mobilized for many purposes: to demonstrate or inspire compositional depth or ingenuity, to discover an archetypical sound-structure model on which a music or repertoire is based, to symbolize or reflect a philosophy, social value or belief (of the analyst, the composer(s), performer(s), or their society), to reveal a historical process of change, to unearth suspected connections to music elsewhere, to embody a mathematical principle. Good analysis demystifies by cracking sound codes, better enabling the ear to collaborate with the mind in search of richer experience (Tenzer 2006: 6-7).

Music theory and analysis, then, need not be something that exists outside of social theory, and we have seen this more integrated approach in many recent offerings. In her article “Riffs, Repetition and Theories of Globalization,” for instance, Ingrid Monson presents a “detailed knowledge of musical practice [as] crucial in situating music within larger ideological and political contexts” (Monson 1999: 33). She quotes Paul Gilroy in his claim that “music and its rituals can be used to create a model whereby identity can be understood” (Ibid.: 33). Marc Perlman agrees. In his work on Central Javanese pathet he has tried to show “how very close analyses of ‘the music itself’ need not be divorced from issues of status, gender, or colonial history. The more detailed our technical analyses,” he asserts, “the more opportunities we will have to show how sounds and context are subtly intertwined” (Perlman 1998: 68). Solis, also, claims that “musical analysis, itself driven by a body of theoretical thought, [can be] the basis of, and a necessary driving force for, other theoretical findings” (Solis 2012: 536). He points to a number of studies, like Perlman’s, that have used music analysis as a tool to understand questions of social theory. In David MacDonald’s study of the production of masculinity through the use of certain song types in Palestinian youth culture, for instance, understanding the larger social question demands an understanding of the musical structures (Solis 2012: 536). In my own study, it was the musical analysis of my
teachers’ taught patterns, and the relationships between them, that led me to dig deeper and find their musico-genealogical connections. Music analysis, then, opened the door for linguistic and social analyses.

It is clear, then, that many ethnomusicologists do see the value of musical analysis in their research, and that many include it in their studies. As Solis has said:

Such music theory [...] should be – and, indeed, is – neither of limited value to questions about music as social practice, nor marginal to the discipline of ethnomusicology at large, but rather of central importance in practice and in principle to both (Solis 2012:533).

Yet Solis paints a much more complicated picture, too. He reproaches many ethnomusicologists for giving music theory and analysis short shrift in their own field-defining meta-theory. Solis particularly holds up for examination a recent article by Timothy Rice aimed at delineating the tasks and directions of the field (Rice 2010). While Rice, in his own research, does occasionally engage in what Solis (and I) would term a music theory and analysis of Bulgarian music, in his field-defining writing “he seldom metadiscursively acknowledges the ways that ethnomusicologists engage in theory about musical sound” (Solis 2012: 531). In fact, he even goes so far as to present an “off-hand dismissal of music theory as an exogenous and currently marginal practice to the discipline” (Solis 2012: 532). While Rice is perhaps extreme in his view of music theory’s tangential role, Solis points to “the limited role of explicit language about music theory and analysis” (Solis 2012: 546) and a general lack of deep engagement with these approaches in many of our major field-defining writings as a potentially dangerous precedent. And I agree, wholeheartedly.

---

6 Rice appears to reject both scientific theory and music theory in a single gesture: “In the early years of ethnomusicology, from 1950 to about 1980 (and before 1950, if we count comparative musicology), ethnomusicologists worked within the domains of scientific and music theory. Since the 1970s, however, these forms of theory have been to a large extent supplanted by social theory, although to be sure both scientific theory and music theory continue to have their advocates” (Rice 2010: 103-104).
I once saw a clip from a stand-up show where the American comedian Chris Rock was discussing racial discrimination. In it, he blamed the lasting racism in American culture on the continued existence of the concepts of racism in our language. He joked that “racism” should simply be something that long distance runners get (“Yeah, I got a little ‘racism’ in my knee!”), and that “bigotry” should only be something lumberjacks strive for (“Billy, don’t you cut down that little tree. You wanna cut down a ‘bigga tree’.”) Only when the damaging language had disappeared, he claimed, could we stop being engulfed in these concepts culturally.\(^7\)

The message behind the joke is very real: by calling attention to something, discussing it, or having it in our rhetoric, we give it agency. The opposite can be equally true: if something is manifestly not discussed, it can seem never to have existed. Though many scholars are now doing intensive music theory and analytical work in ethnomusicology, the “metatheoretical ambivalence” (Solis 2012: 541) facing those studies perhaps perpetuates the second-class status of that branch of the field. By neglecting to acknowledge and engage with the music theory and analysis happening in the field on the same level as the social theory, we deny it equal agency.

I am continually surprised at how many ethnomusicologists – when I talk to them at conferences – admit to being interested in music theory and analysis, because I do not hear about it in their papers. It seems almost a case of so-called pluralistic ignorance, where “virtually every member of a group or society privately rejects a belief, opinion, or practice, yet believes that virtually every other member quietly accepts it” (Prentice and

---

\(^7\) Paraphrased. Unfortunately, at the time of writing, I was unable to find a video recording or transcript of this show.
The end result of this meta-theoretical silence on the topic, then, becomes a vicious cycle where each new generation learns from teachers who, themselves, were not trained to do analysis. Absent from our meta-theory, music theory and analysis do not play a large role in most of our “Intro to Ethno” classes or requirements for graduate students. It is singularly noteworthy that themes for SEM conferences do not include music theory and analysis topics. And the cycle continues, largely unchanged despite the inspiring music analysis work of scholars like Arom (1991), Perlman (2004), and McGraw (2005 and forthcoming). As the graduate students in my generation become the next generation of teachers and writers, they will not necessarily think to include music theory and analysis approaches in their own writing or teaching; they have been acculturated into the thought-habits of the last generation. Were music theory and analysis to enter our rhetoric, conferences, and grad programs in a more meaningful way, we would surely see more scholars engaging with music theory as well as social theory. And that deepening can only strengthen and enrich us.

The Trouble with Interdisciplinary Work

The actual implementation of interdisciplinary work is, however, problematic in purely practical ways. When disciplines like music theory and ethnomusicology (or even ethnomusicology and linguistics) mutually engage, the barriers between them will begin

---

8 Thank you to Marc Perlman for his interesting insight into this phenomenon.
9 The theme for the 2010 SEM conference, for instance, was “Sound Ecologies” with paper topic suggestions including 1) Music, Displacement and Disaster, 2) Music, Copyrights and Human Rights, 3) Music and Social Activism, and 4) Film Music. The 2011 conference was themed “Moving Music / Sounding Dance”, and suggested topics included 1) Where music meets dance, 2) Advocacy and outreach, 3) Health and Healing, 4) Interculturalism, and 5) Hybridity. The theme for the 2012 pre-conference symposium was “Crisis and Creativity” (the conference itself, being a joint conference between SEM, AMS and SMT, did not have a theme like other SEM conferences), and the upcoming 2013 conference is titled “Music and Global Health: Toward Collaborative Paradigms.” While there can be space made in many of these themes and topics for specifically music-analytical papers, there is a consistent lack of explicit reference to music theory and analysis in our conference themes, year after year.
to break down. And while that may be a positive development, as the very identity of these fields becomes threatened through their merging, it will raise problems with the established structure of our institutions. At my own institution, the University of British Columbia (UBC), when one of our ethnomusicology professors retires, a new one is hired. Not a musicologist or a music theorist, but specifically an ethnomusicologist. This practice further protects and perpetuates the division of North American music schools into discrete departments. What would happen if these divisions crumbled? Would there be a fair spread of specialists of different musics hired to teach at UBC? Indeed, how we would even begin to judge what a “fair spread” might consist of? And when the system of department division, tenure, and hiring practices needs to be called into question for institutional change to happen, that change will inevitably be slow in coming if it comes at all. Of course these questions are discussed and debated regularly, but resolution is more difficult to come by.

What’s more, even if these institutional changes eventually did occur, the results would not necessarily be positive. I wonder, for instance, if the merging of disciplines unavoidably requires their watering down. For example, in each sub-discipline of music, we presently have canons of important works, concepts, and scholars with which each new student in the field must become proficient. Were ethnomusicology to merge with music theory and musicology, or with anthropology and sociology, what would become the new canon of this interdiscipline? Who would decide what students needed to learn, and how? Suddenly the ethnomusicology concepts that took an entire graduate degree to just scratch the surface of would need to be cut down to one-third their size in order to make room for a similarly reduced collection of music theory and anthropology concepts,
for instance. I am not sure if this development would actually serve new graduate students well.

Cross-disciplinary work requires frameworks relevant to each discipline involved. At the first AAWM conference in 2010 Simha Arom raised an incendiary matter, infuriating most of the people in attendance. In a plenary session entitled “Ethnomusicology, Music Theory, and Music Analysis” Arom made the contentious claim that if we wished to examine the concept of meter cross-culturally, we needed to provide the most neutral possible framework. Meter could not be defined as intrinsically multi-level and hierarchic as the growing consensus on the matter since the publication of Lerdahl and Jackendoff (1983) asserted, because Arom did not see African music as having more than a bare skeleton of a hierarchy which, moreover, did not meet other accepted criteria for meter (typified by things such as Lerdahl and Jackendoff’s “preference rules”). Accounting for African meter in any encompassing definition meant abandoning what Arom suggested were biases favoring the structure of European musics. While I was one of the less angry listeners in the plenary session that day, I do recognize the import of what Arom was suggesting: that if we wanted to say anything universal or cross-cultural (or, by extension, cross-disciplinary), we could only go for the minimal. Did this contention mean that cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary studies needed to be shallow? Or, perhaps more realistically (but equally scary), did it mean that every scholar wishing to participate in cross-disciplinary work must abandon all the presuppositions of his/her own musical and academic training?

Whether or not we wish it were so, each field to some extent speaks its own language and has its own assumptions and priorities. How do we do work in a
multidisciplinary project that speaks faithfully to each field involved? While many of the papers given at the AAWM conferences – to a mixed audience of music theorists, mathematicians, ethnomusicologists, computer scientists, and linguists – prove that this can be done to some level of success, it is certainly an enormous challenge.

My analyses in this work, I am sure, are richer because I branched out. Yet I have also experienced, in partnerships with Babel and Roeder, some of the difficulties of interdisciplinarity. In working with Roeder, for instance, I often found myself butting heads with a much stricter representation of meter than I was accustomed to. Not generally as regimented in ethnomusicological transcriptions, this metrical representation à la Lerdahl and Jackendoff (1983) appears to be very widely accepted among music theorists. I often wondered, like Arom, if their strict hierarchical conception of meter – where beats at each new level in the hierarchy could only encompass either two or three beats from the previous level – was wholly relevant to an analysis of kendang arja, or to the Balinese musicians that I had worked with. Did these musicians conceive of the half-beat as I have transcribed it? In batel structures, certainly; but what about in the sparser structures? Is the half-beat still a relevant concept? I am not entirely convinced. And though I have toed the line, as it were, in this study, the experience was not fully satisfying. Part of this, of course, had to do with my own lack of experience with and exposure to concepts of meter, and how I might aptly apply them cross-culturally. I could not engage with Roeder at his level, and really address all the subtleties of what we were trying to discuss together, because I was relatively unversed in his framework – a weakness of my own cross-disciplinary aspirations.
Even this seemingly simple question of representation brings up myriad intractable problems. We are forced to face questions of the universality of cognitive structures and the ontology of meter and its perception. Is the model of meter that Lerdahl and Jackendoff (1983) suggest actually universally applicable? Is there something in our cognitive processes as humans that makes us perceive meter in a multi-level hierarchical way as opposed to the less hierarchically-driven way suggested by Arom? Or is the problem simply one of language and not of perception? Should we be using culturally loaded terms like “meter” to define both the innately hierarchical experience of listening to Western classical music and the quite different experience of listening to some of the African genres that Arom discusses in which metrical hierarchy is weak? If we do, perhaps this term needs to be stripped of all its accumulated connotations beyond, as Arom would say, the simple idea of pulsation. And this brings us to the larger, more self-reflexive question of the value of comparative analysis itself. Is the divide between music-cultures and fields of music study too vast to cross to fruitful results? I continue to maintain – or at least to hope – that it is not.

This divide becomes greater still when merging ideas from more divergent fields. Dan Sperber, in his 2003 “Why Rethink Interdisciplinarity,” gives the example of a research project crossing the borders between anthropology and psychology:

More generally, it turns out that the only way to have interdisciplinary work paid attention to, and, even if often misunderstood, at least not right away dismissed is to produce different versions of it for each of the disciplines concerned. You submit, say, one article to a psychology journal, with streamlined introduction and general discussion, a standard detailed experimental section, thorough references to the psychological literature, and using all the disciplinary buzz words in the right way. You develop basically the same argument for an anthropology journal with, mutatis mutandis, the same strategy, which this time involves providing a mere summary of the experiments, what psychologists would call anecdotal evidence, and much longer theoretical sections anticipating the objections most anthropologists tend to have to any naturalistic approach (Sperber 2003: 5).
These problems of priority, language use, and representation grow in size relative to the distance between the varying disciplines being bridged. Molly Babel would probably present the material from my Chapter 5 in a different way for an audience of linguists. And I question, also, how I would even begin to approach some of the problems of cognition addressed in Chapter 3. I would certainly be sorely ill-equipped to do so to a cognitivist’s satisfaction; I simply do not have the fluency in cognitive science. Thus I feel that concentrated collaboration – between different branches of music scholarship, as well as between more divergent fields – must become the future of this kind of interdisciplinary research.

Collaboration: The Troublesome Solution?

Steven Brown in his proposal for a new comparative musicology suggests a study of music that blends classification and a search for universals with a study of migrations, biological evolution, and cultural evolution (Brown 2012). Yet, while some scholars like Victor Grauer (2011) and Jared Diamond (1999) boldly synthesize ideas from quite divergent fields in their writings without the help of collaborators, Brown freely admits that most of us cannot hope to become experts in all of these branches; we must instead build working partnerships with specialists in other fields (Brown 2012). Whether the interdiscipline we choose is one between different branches of music scholarship, as much of mine has been, or an interdiscipline of branches crossing the science-humanities divide as Brown suggests in his new comparative musicology, this idea has begun to sneak its way into ethnomusicology’s dialogues.

---

10 See CompMus.org for further details on Brown’s New Comparative Musicology.
In a recent “Call and Response” in the journal Ethnomusicology, Francesca Lawson addresses what she calls the “music-scientific divide” (Lawson 2012: 86) with a call for increased cross-disciplinary research between the sciences and the humanities. She first examines two multidisciplinary works hailing from the neuroscience community – Aniruddh Patel’s abovementioned Music, Language and the Brain (2008) and Steven Mithen’s The Singing Neanderthals (2006). Following this overview, she approaches a handful of topics raised by each of these scholars from her own humanistic perspective through case studies from her particular area of expertise: Chinese music performance.

Particularly relevant to this discussion, however, are Lawson’s closing remarks:

Perhaps by working collaboratively in isolated areas of mutual interest and designing empirically significant, historically informed, and culturally appropriate experiments, humanists and scientists can move beyond the scholastically-imposed barriers and plan projects that will utilize the expertise of empiricism, ethnography, and historiography (Lawson 2012: 107).

Three years ago Judith Becker contributed an article to another Ethnomusicology “Call and Response” that considered cross-disciplinary work between the humanities and the sciences. In it she discussed a study that she had undertaken blending empirical with ethnographic research methods and concepts in order to support a hypothesis from her 2004 Deep Listeners stating that religious ecstasies and so-called “deep listeners” both “experience[d] strong deep-brain emotional responses when listening to music they experience[d] as emotionally affective” (Becker 2009: 478). To corroborate this hypothesis through the scientific method, Becker performed an experiment involving sixty participants: a mix of Pentecostal Ecstatics, other Pentecostals, other Protestants, self-defined Deep Listeners, and general students from her university community. She attached GSR (galvanic skin response) electrodes and a pulse transducer to participants’ fingers and thumbs as they listened to a variety of musical examples – from their own
chosen music to Becker’s “control” pieces. These measuring devices recorded each participant’s changes in reaction (and their intensity levels), and these Becker compared across all the groups. Her findings supported her original hypothesis in a number of enlightening ways.11

But Becker encountered problems both in securing funding through her university and in getting her work published in the Psychology of Music journal. After many attempts at both, she was unable to accomplish either. I wonder, had Becker managed to receive collaborative support from colleagues in the University of Michigan Department of Psychology (which she attempted, but was unable to secure), if the result might have been quite different. A full collaboration with a psychology specialist would not only have given Becker’s study the appropriate rhetoric and frame for an audience of psychologists, but may also have given it increased cachet with the review panels for the journal and university funding board.12

I see the similarly-themed work of interdisciplinary scholars like Elizabeth Margulis (2005, 2007, and 2010) as proof that Becker’s study has a willing audience base among psychologists and cognitivists as well as music scholars, given the proper frame and a wide range of participating specialists.13 A music theorist, but also the Director of the Music Cognition Lab at the University of Arkansas, Margulis is a scholar who

---

12 Of course one of Becker’s major problems with the journal review committee was that her study dealt with trance. This may have been an impassable obstacle for a psychology audience, but I would like to think that given the right collaborator, this and other obstacles could have been surpassed. It is clear that Becker worked very hard both to secure a collaborator in psychology and to make changes to her article that would satisfy the review committee, and I do not fault her for being unable, in the end, to do so. My only suggestion here is that a willing partner in the field of psychology might have changed her luck significantly.
13 The same might be said of the slightly more “popular science” work of authors like Daniel Levitin (2007) and Steven Pinker (1997).
regularly crosses the music-science divide. Though she teaches music, she has started a campus-wide cognitive science group and has received two grants to develop interdisciplinary courses at the university.\textsuperscript{14} Margulis’ mixed specialization – and doubtless her particular university’s receptiveness to it – has opened doors to her that were perhaps kept closed to Becker. Her work, which mostly focuses on musical expectation and surprise, has been published in such diverse music-related journals as the \textit{Journal of Music Theory}, \textit{Music Perception}, \textit{Psychology of Music}, and the \textit{Computer Music Journal}. Yet she has also been extensively published outside of music academia, including in the \textit{Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences}, the \textit{Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience}, and \textit{Frontiers in Auditory Cognitive Neuroscience}.

For a scholar who in her training and specialization straddles the science-humanities divide, such work seems to be in high demand. Yet for others like Becker and myself, who perhaps do not move comfortably through both of these worlds but still wish to engage in similar research, the kind of open collaboration called for by Lawson may our best option. This sort of equal partnership between scientists and humanists, a partnership that both requires and benefits each contributing discipline equitably, seems the most fitting response to Becker’s struggles. Much like Solis’ ideal interdiscipline, however, the acceptance of these kinds of widely cross-disciplinary collaborations, as Becker says of any attempts at interdisciplinary study, must begin with enabling language, enabling models, and enabling attitudes.\textsuperscript{15} And these, unfortunately, are not entirely in place. My impression, though, is that through scholars like Margulis, the process is beginning.

\textsuperscript{14} http://music.uark.edu/people/faculty/margulis_e.php, accessed Jan. 20, 2013.

\textsuperscript{15} For more discussion on these concepts, see Becker 2009: 494-96.
Regardless of the inherent challenges involved in their execution, I believe that these kinds of collaborations are not only possible but wished for in many different fields. Certainly music scholars like Lawson, Becker, and Margulis are not the only ones calling for collaboration across the music-science divide. In fact, Lawson’s article was itself inspired by biologist Edward O. Wilson’s *Consilience* (1998), an ambitious work in which he calls for the unification of all branches of human knowledge through use of the scientific method. Patel, too, makes a case for interdisciplinary collaboration across the sometimes seemingly un-bridgeable science-humanities divide:

> The study of music-language relations is one area in which scientific and humanistic studies can meaningfully intertwine, and in which interactions across traditional boundaries can bear fruit in the form of new ideas and discoveries that neither side can accomplish alone (Patel, as quoted in Lawson 2012: 86).

It seems, then, that the door is open – at least a little – and we need only create opportunities to walk through it. In my own work, collaboration seems the best possible way forward. I envision this dissertation as being a springboard for future studies, yet most of these will require cross-disciplinary collaboration to fulfill their potential. Here I will sketch three such projects.

I see this study as being ripe with possibilities for developing cross-cultural theories of improvisation, as Bruno Nettl touched on back in 1974: building taxonomies of improvisation types and seeking to find cross-cultural connections between diverse concepts of variation and improvisation. Such a study would require a specialist’s level of knowledge in various genres and music styles studied by ethnomusicologists, musicologists, and music theorists alike. As previously mentioned, paradigmatic analysis of a kind similar to that used in this study has also been used to examine improvisation techniques in various genres of Sub-Saharan African music. These genres, which exhibit
similar methods of variation within simple periodic structures, might provide the closest comparative frameworks. Yet in my comparative studies I would also like to examine improvised musics that seem entirely different from these, seeking collaboration with experts on melodic variation techniques in Indian raga improvisations, for instance, or scholars studying jazz improvisations. Only then could a broad taxonomy emerge. Eventually these studies could be pushed even further down the interdisciplinary rabbit hole by incorporating expertise from linguists studying the parameters of linguistic style improvisation, or go even farther afield to concepts of improvisation in areas like organizational studies. Collaboration, surely, is the only tenable way to work towards such a wide-reaching goal.

A more distant cross-disciplinary collaboration that I would like to tackle involves questions of cognition among kendang arja musicians. In Chapter 3 I began to ask about musicians’ responses to specific kendang patterns and moments in improvisation. In such a fast-moving genre of music, moment-to-moment responses identifying wayah (deep or complex) patterns on the one hand, and mistakes on the other, are almost impossible to discover through dialogue alone, particularly as regards the interlocking of the two drums. I envision experiments similar to those undertaken by Becker and Margulis, where musicians are attached to GSR electrodes (or other more sensitive equipment) and played excerpts of their own and other drummers’ arja improvisations. From their reactions we would compile a collection of moments in improvisation that

---

16 I mentioned Arom and Nattiez’s studies above. Maisie Sum (2012) uses similar techniques in her study of the music of the Gnawa people of Morocco.

17 In his 1998 article “Introductory Essay – Improvisation as a Mindset for Organizational Analysis,” for instance, Karl Weick uses jazz improvisation as the framework to explore the forms and degrees of improvisation and the cognitive processes involved in it. He then applies these findings to concepts of organizational improvisation.
seemed to stand out, then hypothesize based on the theories explored in this dissertation what might have caused those various reactions. We would then take that range of patterns back to the musicians, play them one at a time, and ask each musician’s opinions on their quality. By playing each musician a mix of their own and other drummers’ interlocking patterns we could begin to develop a deeper understanding of the amount of tabrakan (collision) tolerated in kendang arja, and whether or not that level of tolerance changed from village to village or drummer to drummer. We would also be able to begin an inventory of levels of wayah (complexity) in patterns and their interactions from different drumming styles, and to understand how much of that aesthetic of wayah is based on personal taste and how much on the specific idioms of the larger kendang arja asli Singapadu style. In such a project, collaboration with cognitive scientists would provide a level of expertise in these experiments and their analyses, not to mention opening up the possibility of grants for the equipment that would facilitate the most effective experiments to answer these questions. My expertise in kendang arja, not to mention my fluency in the Indonesian language, would make me an equal partner in such a study.

A final collaboration that I would very much like to undertake would be one with a computer scientist. Interest in the analysis of world music traditions has definitely reached the computer science world, as evidenced by Godfried Toussaint’s recent contributions. Toussaint uses computational analysis to trace phylogenetic connections between various different so-called “timeline” rhythms (Toussaint 2010; Toussaint, Campbell, and Brown 2011). Phylogenetics would be an incredibly rich approach for kendang arja pattern analysis – particularly as regards tracing the roots of patterns from
Pak Cok and Pak Dewa back to their various teachers.

Such a collaboration involves the creation of software suited to the acoustic challenges of *kendang* recording and able to transcribe and analyze a much larger corpus of recorded improvisations. Even more interesting would be a capacity to analyze connections and levels of similarity between different variations per Toussaint. This type of program, in fact, does already exist. It is being used at the University of Victoria both to transcribe and to analyze “similarity and variation in melodic formulas in cadences as they occur in recorded examples of […] oral/semi-oral traditions” (Biró, Van Kranenburg, Ness, Tzanetakis and Volk 2012: 1). This could provide a basis for a program specific to *kendang arja*, and its use might be extended to aid in the cross-cultural analysis of improvisation discussed above.

Central to each of these collaborative aspirations is the question posed by Becker in her response to Lawson’s call for collaboration: “Can an ethnomusicologist and a scientist design an empirically-based research project that draws upon the strengths of both disciplines but that does not violate the foundational beliefs and practices of either?” (Becker 2012: 112). Perhaps the reasonable answer to that question is “no.” In this, however, I refuse to be reasonable, to betray that idealist who wrote my M.A. thesis ten years ago. I know that collaboration is fraught with challenges, and that deeply cross-disciplinary collaboration will be even more so. But communication and compromise is always possible even between antagonists, as long as we do not expect too much change too fast. And I also know, with almost absolute certainty, that what we lose by not trying would be worse.

18 The melodic variations currently under examination include “cadences found in Torah trope, strophic melodies from the Dutch folk song collection *Onder de groene linde* and Qur’an recitation” (Biró, Van Kranenburg, Ness, Tzanetakis and Volk 2012: 1).
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Appendix 1: CD Track List


**Track 2.** *Angsel lantang* for *batel* structure, *lanang*. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 1.31). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 3.** An improvised *tabuh dua* passage. Drummer: I Cokorda Alit Hendrawan. (see Figure 1.35). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 4.** Peliatan/Pengosekan style *angsel lantang* for *tabuh telu*, following two cycles of improvisation. *Lanang*. Drummer: I Cokorda Alit Hendrawan. (see Figure 2.23). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 5.** Peliatan/Pengosekan style *angsel lantang* for *tabuh telu*, following two cycles of improvisation. Composite. Drummers: I Cokorda Alit Hendrawan (*lanang*) and I Dewa Nyoman Sura (*wadon*). (see Figure 2.22). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 6.** Singapadu style *angsel lantang* for *tabuh telu*, following two cycles of improvisation. *Lanang*. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 2.26). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 7.** Singapadu style *angsel lantang* for *tabuh telu*, following two cycles of improvisation. Composite. Drummers: I Wayan Tama (*lanang*) and I Ketut Buda Astra (*wadon*). (see Figure 2.25). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 8.** Peliatan/Pengosekan style *angsel bawak* for *tabuh telu*, following two cycles of improvisation. *Lanang*. Drummer: I Cokorda Alit Hendrawan. (see Figure 2.33). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 9.** Singapadu style *angsel bawak* for *tabuh telu*, following two cycles of improvisation. *Lanang*. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 2.36). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 10.** The four Apuan patterns, composite. Cycled twice. Drummers: I Ketut Bicuh and partner. (see Figure 3.94). Recorded July 2011 in Apuan, Bangli.

**Track 11.** Pak Tama *lanang* improvisation 1 for *batel*. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.16). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Track 12.** Pak Tama *lanang* improvisation 2 for *batel*. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.27). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.
Track 13. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 3 for batel. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.32). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 14. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 1 for tabuh dua. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.41). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 15. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 1 for batel marah. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.45). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 16. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 2 for batel marah. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.48). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 17. Pak Tama lanang improvisation 3 for batel marah. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.50). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 18. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 1 for batel. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.52). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 19. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 2 for batel. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.69). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 20. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 1 for batel marah. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.74). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 21. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 1 for tabuh dua. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.78). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 22. Pak Tama wadon improvisation 2 for tabuh dua. Drummer: I Wayan Tama. (see Figure 4.87). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 23. Pak Dewa lanang improvisation 1 for tabuh dua. Drummer: I Dewa Nyoman Sura. (see Figure 4.116). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 24. Pak Cok lanang improvisation 1 for tabuh telu. Drummer: I Cokorda Alit Hendrawan. (see Figure 4.120). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 25. Pak Dewa wadon improvisation 1 for tabuh telu. Drummer: I Dewa Nyoman Sura. (see Figure 4.135). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

Track 26. Peliatan/Pengosekan style improvisation for tabuh telu. Composite of Tracks 24 and 25. Drummers: I Cokorda Alit Hendrawan (lanang) and I Dewa Nyoman Sura (wadon). (see Figure 4.142). Recorded Aug. 2011 at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.
Appendix 2: DVD Track List

**Clip 1.** Passage leading to *angsel lantang* for *batel* gong structure, associated with Figures 1.32 (instructions) and 1.33 (transcription). Dancer: Ni Nyoman Candri. Drummer: I Wayan Tama (*lanang*). Recorded June 2011, at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.

**Clip 2.** *Angsel dobel* for *batel* gong structure, associated with Figure 1.34. Dancer: Ni Nyoman Candri. Drummer: I Wayan Tama (*lanang*). Recorded June 2011, at Banjar Mukti, Singapadu.
Appendix 3: All 4-beat Taught Variants

Lanang Variants

Dasar
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(e) _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e

Pak Dewa Lanang 7
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(1) _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ T _

Pak Tama Lanang 0 (intro)
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 8
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(1) _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ T _

Pak Cok Lanang 0 ("intro")
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 6a
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(1) _ _ _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 10
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 6
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 11
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 9
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e _ e _ e _

Pak Cok Lanang 5
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ T _ e _

Pak Tuta Lanang Dasar 1
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _

Pak Dewa Lanang 1
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ e _

Pak Tuta Lanang Dasar 2
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _ _

Pak Dewa Lanang 1a
(4) - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
(_)_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ e _

450
Pak Tama Lanang 7
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)e__eT___e__eT_ (4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4

Pak Dewa Lanang 5
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)e__eT__e__eT__ e__eT_ (4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4

Pak Tama Lanang 2
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)e__eT__e__eT__ e__eT_ (4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4

Wadon Variants

Dasar
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)o__o__o__o__o__o__o__

Pak Tama Wadon 0 (intro)
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)o__o__o__o__o__o__dD__

Pak Tama Wadon Variant 1
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)o__o__1_1_1_1_1_1_1

Pak Dewa Wadon 0
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)o__o__1_1_1_1_1_1_1_1

Pak Tama Wadon Variant 1a
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(_)o__o__1_1_1_1_1_1_1_1

Pak Dewa Wadon 3
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(o)dD__D__D__o__o__o__

Pak Dewa Wadon End Variant
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(o)dD__D__o__D__D__D__o

Pak Dewa Wadon 0a with Dag delay:
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(o)___o__1_1_1_1_1_1_1_1

Pak Dewa Wadon 2
(4)-●-1-●-2-●-3-●-4
(o)_dD__D__oD_D__D__D__o
Pak Dewa Wadon 4
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D _ o d D _ o d D _ D _ D _ o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 5
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D o d D o d D o d D o D o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 6
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) d D _ o _ D _ o _ d D o _ D _ o _ o

Pak Dewa Wadon 1
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D _ o o D o D _ o o D _ o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 2
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 3
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D o d D o D o d D o D o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 4
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D _ o d D _ o d D _ D _ D _ o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 7 (not taught)
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D _ o o D o D _ o o D _ o o

Pak Dewa Wadon 8 (not taught)
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(o) D _ o o D _ o o D _ o o

Pak Tama Wadon Variant 4:
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(_o o d D o d D o D _ o o _ o _ o _ o _

Pak Tama Wadon Variant 6:
(4)- ● 5 - ● - 6 - ● - 7 - ● - 8
 _o D _ o _ o o D _ o o D _ o o

Pak Tama Wadon Variant 2:
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(_o D _ o _ o o D _ o o D _ o o

Pak Tama Wadon Variant 3:
(4)- ● 1 - ● - 2 - ● - 3 - ● - 4
(_o D _ o _ o o D _ d D _ o o _
Appendix 4: Full Patterns from Recording Sessions

Session Pak Dewa Pak Cok Bu Candri

1 Kendang at a Time

*Lanang – Pak Cok*

*Batel*

0:08

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(r)l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r

0:11

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(r)l l l T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r l r T r U _ T _

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(l)T l r l e e T r l l T r e e T r l l T r U _ r l r r U _ r l r r

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(r)U U r l t r U U _ P _ U U U U U _ P _ (D)

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(r)_ e _ _ T e T e _ P _ U U U U U _ P

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(r)_ r e e T e T e _ P _ (D) r l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T r

0:23

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(r)e e T e T e T r l l T r e e T r l l T r e e T r l l T r e e r l

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G

(l)r l l r e e r l r l l r e r l r e r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)e e T e T e T r e l r r U _ r l r r U _ r l r r U U r l l T r U U

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(U)_ P _ U U U U _ P _ (D) r _ r e e T e T e _ P _ (D)
0:36
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)e e T e T e T r l l T r e e r l l r r U _ T r e e T r

0:41ish
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)e e T e T e T r l l T r U _ r l r l T r e e T r l l r r U _ r l

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(l)r r U _ r l r U U r l r U U U U _ P _ U U U U U _ P _ (D)

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)_ e _ _ T e T e _ P _ U U U U _ P _ (D) r l r e e T e T e

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(e)_ P _ (D) (2x) r l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T r
0:51.62
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)l l T r e _ r l r l T r e e T r e e T r e e T r l l l T r e e r l

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(l)r l l r e _ T r l l T r e e T r e e T e T e T r e l l T r U _ r l

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(l)r l l r r U U r l l r l r U _ r l l T r U _ r l l T r U U r l l T r U U
1:01
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(U)_ P _ r U U _ P _ (D) (6x)
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e Tr

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)l l T e _ r l T e _ r l T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

1:11
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)l r l r e e T r e r e r e e T r e e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

1:16:66
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)l l T r e e r l r l l r e _ T r l l T r U _ r l T r e _ r l l r

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)u _ r l t r U _ r l t r U U r l r P _ U r U U _ P _ (D) r

1:24
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)_ r e e T e T e r P _ (D)(+1) r _ r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)l l T r e e T r l r l r e e T r l r l l r e e T r e e T e T e T r

1:28:27 ?????????
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)l l r r U _ r l T l T r e e r l r l l r r e e r l r l l r r l r

1:31:77
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)e r l r e e T r l r l r e e T r e e T e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T e T e T e T r

1:36 f
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (l)T r e _ r l r r U _ r l r r U _ r l r r U U r l T r U _ r l t r

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r)u U r U T U U U _ P _ C U C U U _ P _ (D) r e e T e T e
Tabuh Dua

2:06:55
(G)---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G
(T) _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T

2:11 ?????????????????????????????
(G)---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G
(T) _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T _ _ T

2:14:14
(G)---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G
(?????????????????????????????????????????????????????????) r__r__reeT_eT_eP(D)

(G)---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- n---- G
(r)__reeT_eT
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)e l T r e e T e _ r e e T e T r l l T r e e r l r l r e e T r
2:24:64  2:26:11
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)e e T l T r e e T r l r U r l t r e r l t r U r U U
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(U)r P r U U U _ r P_ T r l l T T_ _ T_ _ T_ _ (D) (2x)

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)_ e_ _ T e T e T e T P_ _ l l_ _ T T_ _ T_ _ (D)

2:38
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(l)_ r e e T e T e _ P_ (D)_ _ _ l_ r e e T e T e T e T e T r

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)l l T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e r e e T e T r

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)l l T r e e T e _ r e e T e T r l l T r e e r U r l l r e e T r
2:45:66
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)l l r e e r U U r e e T e T r l l T l T r e e T e T r

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)e r l r e e r l r e e r e e l r e e r e e r l r e e r l

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(l)r l l r e e r l r e e r e e T r l r l r e e e T r e e T e T r

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)e e T r e e T r e e T e T e T r e l t r U _ r l l t r e e T r

(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)e l T r U r U U P _ T_ e_ _ T T_ _ _ T_ _ _ P_ _ (D)

458
3:00:55

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) e ?????????????? gong screw up T T T T (D)

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) ree TeTer P _(D) __ r ree TeTeTeTeTr

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) l l ree rTe r l l l l l l l l l r l l l l l l l

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l

3:18

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) elTeTe el Tr l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l

3:25

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(T) l l T T __ T __ (D) __ r __ e __ TUTUTUTTrP _ T _

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(_e lTT _ _ T __ (D) __ l ree TeTrP ___ (D) ___ l

3:29

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(l) ree TeTeTeTeTr l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l

(G) n n pu n G n pu n G
(r) l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l

459
Tabuh Telu

3:52
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

4:00
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

4:11
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

4:17
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

mp or mf only

Tabuh Telu

3:52
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

4:00
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

Tabuh Telu

4:11
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

4:17
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
5:02:45
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)UrlreereeetrllTeereereeeeT

5:09:19
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)llTeereereeltlreerlreerlreerlreetr

5:21
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
rreeTeTeTeTeetr

5:22:86
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)llTeereeeettTeetrllTeereeeTeetr

5:36
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)e1TeerlrlreereetreeTeTreeTeTreeTeetr

5:49
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)e1TrUU_rP_TllTT_T_T_T_T_T_T_D

462
Batel Marah

5:57
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G e__TeTe_P_CUCUU_P(D)_---

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r)Ur UUTUTUTETETetrerUr_rrlrUrU

6:04ish
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (l)rtrU_rrlrtU_rltrUrUlUU_1t1Ul_1Ur

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (l)rrUr_ltrUrUrpUtrUU_UrUrUU_P(D)

6:06
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) e__ TU UTU_P_rUrUU_P(D) _ r

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (l)reeTeteTeteTeTeteTm1rlrUr_r1l

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (l)rtrereTrelrrUUrlrlrrU_r1rlrUr_r1l

6:24
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (l)rllrrereTr1lrrUr_r1lrltrUurlrltrU_r1l
6:27:78
(G) - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G

6:30
(G) - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G
slow.

(Wadon – Pak Dewa)

Batel

7:35
(G) - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G
(r) o d D l r o o r o d D _ _ _ r l r l r o o D r o o D o r o o

7:47
(G) - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G
(o) D r o o D r o o D r o o D o o D o o D o D o D o D o D o D r

7:50
(G) - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G
o _ D _ o o r o d D l r l r l r P _ D _ o o r o d D _ _ _

7:55
(G) - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G - - - Pu - - - G
(r) o d D _ r l r ...... ?? (1x) r r o o d r o r l r o o d r o r
mess up (beat lost-ish)……

Tabuh Dua

8:29

(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(r)l r o o D _ o o D o d D _ _ _ r l r o r o D _ o o D _ _ o l

8:02:16

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)o o d D o r o o D r o o D D o o D r o o r o d D o r o o

8:07:04

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(D)o r o o D r o D r o o D r o o D _ D _ D _ r r l r l l d r l r

8:10:49

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)l r o o d r o r o o d r o r o r o r o r o r o o d D o r o o

mess up (beat lost-ish)……

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(o) _ P _ _ D o _ o _ D _ D (1x) r _ d _ D _ _ _ o _ D _ o _ D _ D

Tabuh Dua

8:29

(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(r)l r o o D _ o o D o d D _ _ _ r l r o r o D _ o o D _ _ o l

8:02:16

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(r)o o d D o r o o D r o o D D o o D r o o r o d D o r o o

8:07:04

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(D)o r o o D r o D r o o D r o o D _ D _ D _ r r l r l l d r l r

8:10:49

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G
(o)D r o o D r o r l r o o D r o r l r o r l r o o r o d D _ r o o

8:29

(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(o)D r o o o D r o o D o _ o d D _ r r l r o o r o d D o _ o o
Tabuh Telu

10:11:43
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

10:22
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

messy here............
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

10:32
(G)- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

468
10:43
(G) n t n t n pu n t n G
(r) l r l r o o o d D l r o l D r o o r o o r o o r o d D l r o d

(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r o o o r o D l r o o D r o o D l r o o D l r o l

(G) n t n t n t n G
(1) D r o r l r o o r o D r o o r o l r r o o D D o o D 1 D 1 D 1 d

10:57
(G) n t n t n t n G
(o) r r o o D r o o D r o o D l r r ....messy...................... o D D r mess...

(G) n t n t n t n G
(......messy............. o o r o D _ r l l D r o o D o D r o o D o r o l

11:08
(G) n t n t n t n G
(1) D r o r l r o o r o D o r l l D _ d D _ D o o D 1 D d D 1 D 1 d

(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r o o o r o D _ P _ D _ o o D o D r o o D.

11:18
(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r l r o o o D l r o o D o D D l r o o D D l r o o D d

(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r l r o o o D l r o o D D l 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 d

(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r l r o o o D l r o o D D l 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 d

(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r l r o o o D l r o o D D l 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 d

(G) n t n t n t n G
(d) D l r r l r o o o D l r o o D D l 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 D 1 d
Batel Marah

12:20
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) o o D o D r o o d D _ _ _ r _ o o D _ _ _ r l r o r o o D r

12:23:20
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) o o D r o o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r o o o D r

12:28
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r o o o D o D r o o o D r

12:31:38
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) _ o o D _ o o r o D o r o r _ _ P _ _ D _ o o r o D r

12:34:14
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) _ o o D o D r o o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r

12:36:84
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) o o D o D r o o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r

12:39:71
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) o o D o D r o o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D o o

12:43:93
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (o) D r o o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r o o D o D r

12:48:92 → L = Dag sound w/ lh
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G (r) _ L d D _ r o o D o D _ _ _ r o o D o D r o r l r o r o o
Lanang – Pak Dewa

Batel

13:32:87

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T r l r l r e e T r e r l r e e T r

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e e T r e e e T e T e T r l r l r e e T r e e T e T r

13:38:40

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

13:49:05

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) U r l r U U _ U _ P _ r U _ U U _ P _ (D) (4x)

13:51:78

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r e e e T e T e T e T e T e T r e e e T r e e T e T e T r

13:54:52

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

13:57:30

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r U _ r l r r e r l r U U t r l r l r U _ _ r l r U _ r l t r
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G (r) e r l r U U r U _ P _ U U _ U U _ P _ (D) (1x)

14:05:60

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) _ r e e T e T r _ P _ r l r U U _ P _ (D) _ r

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e r e e T e T e T e T e T e T r e r e e T r l r e e T e T e T r

14:10:41

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e T r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

14:15:93

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r l r l r e e l r l r l r e e T r

14:18:75

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r l r U _ _ r l r U _ l r t r

14:35:98

(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r l r l r e e T r e e T r

Tabuh Dua

14:35:98

(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) l r e e T r l r e e T e T r l r l r e e l r e l r e l r e l r e _ r

Tabuh Dua

14:35:98

(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) l r e e T r l r e e T e T r l r l r e e l r e l r e l r e l r e _ r
(G) n n n G n n G
(rp)ee Te Te Te Te Te Te Te Te
15:20:88
(G) n n G n G n G
(rp)1 r r e e T r r r U _ r r r r T r U r r U U r

(G) n n G n G n G
(rp)1 r r U U C U C _ P _ P _ T _ T _ T _ T _ T _ T _ T _ ?D

Tabuh Telu

15:34:58
(G) n n n G n n G
(rp)r e r l r e r l r e r l r e e T r l r l r l r e e T r

15:38:63
(G) n n G n G n G
(rp)1 r l r r e e l r l r e e T r l r e e T r

15:46:36
(G) n n G n G n G
(rp)1 r l r e e T r e e T r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r

15:53:85
(G) n n G n G n G
(rp)1 r l r e e T r l r e r l U _ P _ U U U U P _ (D) (1x)

16:01:36
(G) n n G n G n G
(rp)r e e T r e e T r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r
16:08:53
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) l r l r e e T r l r e e T e T r l r e r l r r e e T r

16:15:80
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) l r l r e e T r e r l r e e T r l r t r e e T e T e T r

16:22:93
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) l r e e T e T e T e T r P _ T e _ T T _ T _ T _ _ T__ (D)

16:26:47
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) r e e T e T e T e T r P _ T l _ _ T T _ T _ _ T__ (D)

16:33:35
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) e r e e T e T r l r l r e _ _ r l r e _ r l t r e e T e T e T r

16:40:36
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) l r l r e r l r e l r l r e e T r l r e r l r e e T r

16:47:35
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- (G)
(r) l r l r e _ _ l r e l r e r l r l r e r l r e e T r
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r e e T r l r e e T e T e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

16:54:27

(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) e e T r e e T e T e T e T r e e T e T r e e T e T r e e T r e e T r

(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r l r e e r l r l r e e T r l r e e T r l r e e T e T e T r e e T r

17:01:12

(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r e e T e T r P _ T _ P _ T T l T l T l T l l T _ _ _ (D)

(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) r _ _ r e _ l _ e _ l _ _ T _ _ _ (D)

Batel Marah

17:17:68

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r e l r l r e e T r l r e e T r l r l r

17:21:10

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l r e e T e T r l r l r U _ _ r l U _ _ r l t r e r l r u u t r

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r l r l r U _ _ r l l r l r e e T r

17:25:87

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l r l r U U r r l _ U _ r P t r U r l r U U _ U _ P _ r U _ U U

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(U)_ P _ (D) _ _ _ r l r e e C U C U r P _ (D) _ _ _ r

17:30:64

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l r e e T e T e T e T e _ r l r l r e e T r l r e e T e T r
Wadon – Pak Cok

Batel

18:12:45
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G ro_ D o o r o d D _ _ _ r o o d _ _ _ r o o D _ D _ l

18:19:87
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G l D _ D o o r o d D _ r o r l r o o D r o r l r o o D r o r

18:22:64
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G r o o D l r o o D l D _ r o o o r o o D D _ D _ l D o o D _ o r

18:26:84
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G D r o r l r o l r o r o r o o D l l D r l l D r o o

18:28:96
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G r o o D l r l l _ r P _ D _ o o r o D . (2x)

18:32:50
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G ro_ D o o r o d D _ _ _ r o o d _ _ _ r o o D _ D _ l

18:39:45
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G l D _ l D _ o o r o d D _ r o r l r l o D r o r l r o o D r o r
18:40:89
(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (r) l r o o D r o o D _ r o o d D _ r o o l r o o D r o o D r o o D r o o D r o o D r o o D r o o

............messy...............................
(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (r) l r o o D r o o l r o o D r o o l r o o d D _ r o o d D _ r o o

18:46:49
(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (r) l r o o D r o o l r o o D r o o l r o o D _ r o o d D _ r o o

18:53:56
(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (o) D r P _ D _ l l r l d D (4x) l r o o D _ o o r o o d D _ r o o

(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (r) o o d D _ _ _ r o o d D _ D _ l D _ l D _ o o r o o d D _ r o o

18:59:28
(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (r) l r o o D r o o l r o o D r o o l r o o d D r o D r o o D r o o D r o o

(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (o) r o o d D _ D _ r o o d D _ r o o D r o o l r o o r o o d D _ r o o

(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (1) D _ o r l r o o D _ o r l r o o D _ o r l r l l D r o l r l r o u

19:06:36
(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (u) r o o d D _ r o o d D _ o D r o o o d D _ r o o _ r P _ D _ o o

(G) - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G - - pu-- G (o) r l d D. 2x ______ D D _ D _ l _ D _ l _ d _ D

Tabuh Dua

19:25:34
(G) - - n - - pu-- n - - G - - n - - pu-- n - - G o _ D _ l d D _ l d D _ l D _ l l l _ d D _ D _ l
20:43:06
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(o) d r o r l r o r l r o d D l r l l d D l r o l D r o l D r o l

(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(1) d D _ D _ D _ o o r o r l r o o d D l r o l D r o o d D l r o o

20:49:18
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(o) d r o r l r o o d r o r l r o o d r o r l r o o d r o r l r o o

20:52:18
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(1) d r o r l r o l d r o r l r o o d D r o o d D r o r l r o l D r o l D r o l D r o l

20:55:30
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(1) d r o r l r o l d r o r l r o o d D r o o D o r r l l d D r o r l r o o d D l r o o

20:59:91
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) l l d D o r o o d r o r o r o o d D r l D r o o r o o D _ r o o

21:01:39
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(o) r o d D _ D _ P _ d D _ D _ l D _ l l D _ l D D l l d D r 1 d D

Tabuh Telu

21:10:27
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
r o o d D _ _ _ r

21:15:03
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r o l D D l r o r l r o o d D l r o l D _ 1

21:18:96
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(1) l l D _ r o r l r o o D _ r oo d D _ D _ D _ o o r o r l r o o
(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(o)r o D D_ r_ r l r P_ D_ l l r l d D. 3x

22:54:58 ???????
(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
D_ P_----- D_----- r_o D_----- r o D_ o_ D

22:57:80 ????????
(D)_ d D_--- r_o D_--- r l r o o l D r o D r o o D r o r

23:00:37 (G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)o o D_--- l_ r o D r o D r o o D_ r o o D_ D_o

23:02:35 (G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(o)D r o D r o o D_ r o l D r o l r o o D r o o D r o l

23:07:73 (G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)_ r P_ D_ l l r l d D_----- r P_ D_ l l r l d D_----- r

23:10:51 23:12:44 (G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)_ o D_--- r_l D_ o D_ o D_--- r_ r o D_ l D

23:15:82 ?????????????????????????????????????????????????
(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(1)D r o l l l D r l l D l r o l r l D o r o o D D r l

23:15:82 ?????????????????????????????????????????????????
(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(1)D r l l D r o o o D D r o r l r P_ D_ l l r l d D.

23:15:82 ?????????????????????????????????????????????????
(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(1)D r l l D r o o o D D r o r l r P_ D_ l l r l d D.

23:15:82 ?????????????????????????????????????????????????
(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
D_----- r_ D_ l_ d_ D

487
Together – Pak Dewa Wadon Pak Cok Lanang
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0:06:13
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l)_ r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r
r o d D _ _ _ _ _ r l r o o _ D _ _ o _ d D _ r o o

0:08:82
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T e T e T r l l T r e _ T r l l T r e e T r l l T r l r l r l e T r
(o)d D o r o r o r o r o o D o D r o o D o r o o D o r o o D o D r

0:11:49
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T e T e T r l l T r U _ l l l T r e e T r l l T r T r e e
(r)o o d D l r l l d r o o D r o r l r o o d r o r l r o r l r o o

0:14:26
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(e)T e T r e e T r l l l t r U _ l l T r l r U U r U U T r U _ r l t r
(o)r o o D o r o o D r o o r o _ o _ d D _ r o o D l r o o D D

0:16:93
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)U U r l l t r U U _ P _ r U r U U _ P
2x
(D)_ r o o d D _ o D r o o D o d D r o D D o D D. 2x

0:20:35
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)_ e _ _ T e T e _ P _ r U r U U _ P
r _ o d D _ r o _ D o d D _ _ _ D

(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)_ r e e T r T e _ P _ _ _ _ _ _ _ r _ r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r
(D)_ o d D _ r l ???? d D _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ r l r o o D r o o
Tabuh Dua

1:25:82
(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(r)l l l r e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r l l l t r e e r l l l l r e e e T r
r _ o d D _ r o d D l r r l r o o r o d D r o d D

1:28:95
(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(r)l l l r e e r l l e T e T r l l l t r e e r l l l l r e e r l
(D)l r o o d D l r o o d D l r l l d r o r l r o l d r o r o r o l

1:32:05
(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(l)r l l r e e r l l l r e e e T r l r l r l l r e e e T r e e T e T r
(l)d r o r o l d r o r o l d r o l d r o o d D l r o o d D r o r o r o r o d

1:35:16
(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(r)l r l r e e T r l r l l r e e T r l r l r l l r e e e T r e e T r e e T r
(d)D r o r o r o o r o d D l r o o d D l r o o d D l r o o d D l r o o d D r l

1:38:26
(G)---n---pu---n---G---n---pu---n---G
(r)l r l r e e r e e r e e e T e T r e l T r e e l T r e e l r e e e e r l
(l)D r o o D r o o r o D D l r l l D r o o D r o r l r o o D r o r
1:41:35
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(l)r l r e r l r e r l r e r l l r e r lk r l l r e r Tr
(r)l r o r l r o r l r o o d D l r o r l r o o d D o r o o

1:44:44
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l T r e T r e T e T e T r l l T r U U _ r P _ T _ l l T T
(o)d D o o o D o D o D o D o D r l o d D. 1x

1:47:60
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(T) l l _ T _ T _ _ T _ _ 1x
(o)D o D o D o D o D r l o d D.

1:50:98
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r)_ e _ _ T e T e T e T r P _ T _ l l T T _ T _ l T _ _
             r _ o d D _ r K _ D _ o o D o D r o o d D _ _ _ r

1:54:03
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(l)_ r e e T e T e T e T r P _ _ 1 l r l e T e T e T e T e T r
(r)_ o d D l r o o D o D d _ _ _ r l l r o o d D o r l l

1:56:99
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l l T r e T r e e r e e r l l r l l r e e r e e r e e T r
(l)d r o _ r r l l r o _ r r l l r l l r o o d D o r

2:00:03
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l l r e e e e T e T r e T r e e T r r l l r e e T e T r
(r)r o l r o r l l r o o d D l r l l d r o r l l d r o r l l l

2:03:05
(G) - - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l l T r e T e _ r e e T r l l T r e e T r l l T r e e T r
(l)d r o l r o r l l r o o D o o D r l l l r o o r o o d D o r o o
3:46:58
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)erlreerlrrrreertrrrreertrrreertrr
(d)DlrroroordDrrellDroroordDlroo

3:49:70
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)llTrUU_{r}P_{T}_{llTT}_{tT}_{T}_{tT}_{T}_{T}_{T}_{T}_{T}
(o)DodoD1dDlrodDroodDodoDodoDodoD1D.

3:54:73
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
\textcolor{red}{rreeTTeTTeTTeTTeTr}
\textcolor{red}{r_oodD_}\_

3:56:34
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lltreerereerlrrrreertrrlrrtreertrr
(r)lroodDrorlroodDrorllrlrooroddDlroo

3:59:58
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lltreerlreerlrreereerreeTeTr
(o)DrorlroodDrororoldDrorooordDrorororod

4:02:77
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lTtreerrrreertrrrreertrrlreerTeTr
(d)DorrorororodDoroloDodoDoroloDrorororor

4:05:97
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)erreeT1_reeTeTrerlreerT1_reeTeTr
(r)orororororororodDorrororororodDorodorod

4:09:23
(G)n---t-n---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)elTreerrrreertrrrreertrrlreerT111T1Tr
(d)DorrorororodDorllDldDorrorororodDld
Batel Marah

4:54:89
(G) - - - pu--- G - - - pu--- G - - - pu--- G

4:55:46
(G) - - - pu--- G - - - pu--- G - - - pu--- G
(r) l r e e T
Pak Tama Pak Buda Bu Candri

1 Kendang at a Time

Lanang – Pak Tama

Batel

0:14:40
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)_ e _ r e e r e r e _ r _ _ _ r l r e r e r e r e r e r e r e T r

0:17:16
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r l r l r e e T r e e T r e e e

0:20:02
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(e)T e T r e e T r l r l r e e T r e r e e e T r _ U _ R _ U r U

0:22:92
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(U)r U R U r e T r l r e e e T r e r e e e T r _ _ U _ _ _ r

0:25:73
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r U U _ U _ r P _ T r 1x r _ l _ r _ e _ r u r u r e e T r

0:29:43
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r e r e e e T r e e e T e T r

0:32:45
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T r e T e e T r e e e T l _ r e e e T r e r e e e T r

*angkat*
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)_ e _ r _ e r e e r e r e r e T r l r l r e e T r e r e e e T C

0:38:30
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(C)_ _ U _ U _ _ r l r U U _ U _ r P _ T r _ e _ r l r e e e T r
??????

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) P _ T r r _ e _ r 1 r e e T r e e T r e e T r

0:44:33

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

0:47 *angkat*

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) _ e _ r _ e r e r e r e T r l r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

0:49:97

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e T r e r u u T r u u T u T r e r e e T C _ _ U _ U _ _ r

0:52:88

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) 1 r U U _ U _ r P _ T r 3x e _ r l r l r e e T r

0:58:19

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

1:01:13 *angkat*

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) 1 r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

1:04:08

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e r e r e T r l r l r e e T r e r u e e T C _ _ U _ U _ _ r

1:06:99

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) 1 r U U _ U _ r P _ T r 6x r _ e _ r _ e r e r e r e T r

1:14:43

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) 1 r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

1:17:33

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e r e e T e T r e e T r e e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

1:20:22 *angkat

(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) e r e r e e T r e r e e e T r _ U _ r _ U r U r U r U r e T r
1:23:15
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) ur u r e e T r e r u r e e T C _ _ U _ _ _ r l r U U _ U _ r

1:26:04
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) P _ T r _ _ _ P _ _ U U _ U _ _ r _ l _ T _ U

Tabuh Dua

1:53:30 – the P are soft, like “l”
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) _ e _ r e e r e r e r e e T r l r l r e e T r e r e e T e T r

1:56:23
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) e e T r e r e e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T e T r

1:59:27
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) e e T T e T e e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T e T r

2:02:30
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) e e T r l r e e T e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T e T r

2:05 *angkat
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) _ e _ r _ u r u r u r u r e T r e r l r e e T r e r l r U _ _ _ r

2:08:18
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) l r U C U U _ r P _ T _ r l r l l l T l l T l l r P _ T r

2:11:24
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) e e r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T e T r

2:14:34
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) l r l r l r e T r e e T e T r e e T T e T e e T r e e T e T r

2:17:40
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(r) e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r e e T T e T e e T e T e T e T r
*angkat

2:20:51
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e T r _ e _ r _ e r e r e r e r e T r

2:23:40
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e T r e T r e e T e T r e e T r

2:26:36
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) e r l r e e T r u r u C U _ _ r l r l r U U _ r P _ T r _ l T r

(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l l T l T l r P _ T r _ _ _ r l r U U r U r U r l T r _ _ _

2:32:38
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) e r l r e e T r e r e e T e T r e e T e T r e e T r

2:35:43
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e T e T r e e T e T r e e T r

2:38:46
*angkat
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e T r _ e _ r _ e r e r e r e T r

2:41:40
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l r e r e e T r u r u u T u T r e e T r u r u u T u T r e e T r

2:44:37
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) u r u e e T r u r u C U _ _ r l r U D U U _ r P _ T r _ l T r

2:47:22
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) l l T l T l r P _ T r _ _ _ r l r e r e r e r P T _

2:50:32
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) e r l r e e T r e r e e T r e e T r e e T e T r e e T e T r

2:53:34
(G) - - n - - pu - - n - - G - - n - - pu - - n - - G
(r) e r e r e e T r e r e e T r e e T T e T e e T e T e T e T r
2:56:42
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) e e T r e e T e T e T e e T r e e T r l r e e T r

2:59:46
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) l l l l e T r e e e T r e r e r e r e r e r e T r

3:02:42
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) l l r u C U r l r U C U U r P T r l l T r

3:05:29
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) e e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r

3:08:31
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) r l l C U r u U r U U r P T r

3:11:21
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) e e T T T T T T e T e T e e T r e e T r

3:14:22
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) l l l l e T r e e e T e T e T e T e T r

3:17:29
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) l l l l e T r e e e T e T e T e T e T r

3:20:36
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) e e T T e T r e e T e T e T e e T r

3:23:43
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) l l l l e T r e e e T r e r e r e r e r e T r

3:26:38
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) l l l l e T r l C U r l r U U r l l T r l l T r

3:29:29
(G) n n pu n G n pu G
(r) e T l l P T e T e l l e e e T r e e T r
3:32:30
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r u r e e T e T r e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r
3:35:30
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)e r e r e e T r e e T e T r e e T e T e e e T e T r e e T r
3:38:33
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r u r u r U _ r l r l r U U r l _ T r _ l T r
3:41:22
(G)--- n--- pu--- n--- G
(r)l l t T _ T _ T _ T _ T _

Tabuh Telu (Empat)

4:11:86
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e r e r e r e r e T r
1 - 4:15:66
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e e T r e e T e T r
2 - 4:19:23
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r e e e T e T r e e T l r e e T e e T e T r
3 - 4:22:70
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r e e e T e T e T r
4 - 4:26:14
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)e e T r l r e e T e T r e e T r e e T l T e e T e T r e e T r
1 - 4:29:57
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e e T r e e T e T r
2 - 4:33:00
(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e T u r e e T u r e e T r
angsel: 5:15:83

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l C U U _ r P _ T r _ l T r l l t T l T l r P _ T r 1x

5:22:54

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e e T r

1 - 5:25:76

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e T e e T r

2 - 5:28:90

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e T r e e e T r e e T e e T r e e e T r e e T e e T r

3 - 5:32:04

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e T r u e e T e T r e e T r e e e T r e e e T e T r

4 - 5:35:17

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)e e T r l r e e T e T r e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e T r

angs el: 5:38:34

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r u C U U _ r P _ T r _ l T r l l t T l T l l T _ T _ T

Batel Marah

5:57 - e is consistently lower (half u)

(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(P)____ U U _ P _ c _ U ______ P _ r U U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ r

6:00:91

(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)l r u e e T r e e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r

6:03:56

(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)l r l r e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r _ U _ U _ U _ r

6:06:20

(G)--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)l r U U _ U _ r P _ T r 5x C _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ r
6:11:73
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) l r U U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ rerere eT r e r e eT e T r

6:14:36
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) e e T r e r e e T e T r e e T r l r l r e e T r e r e e T r

6:17:03
*angkat
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) e r e r e e T r e r e e e T r _ U _ r _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ r

6:19:69
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) l r u r e e T r e r e e T C _ _ U _ U _ _ r l r U U _ U _ r

6:22:30
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) P _ T r 4x P _ _ U U _ P _ r _ U _ ______

6:27:03
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) U _ U _ _ _ _ _ U _ U _ _ r _ _ _ _ _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ _ r

6:29:49
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e e T r e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r

6:32:00
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) l r l r l e T r e r e e e _ P _ _ U U _ P _ _ U _ _ 8x

6:39:69
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(P) _ _ U U _ P _ c _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ P _ C _ U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ _ r

6:42:13
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) e r e r e e T r e r e e e T r e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r

6:44:70
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e e T r e e T r e e e T r e e e

6:47:21
(G) - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G - - pu - - G
(e) T e T r e e T r e l r e e T r e r e e U _ r l r l r e e T r
Wadon – Pak Buda

Batel

8:55:68
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
r_ o d D _ _ _ l_ o_ o D_ o o r o d D o r o o

8:57:49
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(o) D_ r o o D o D_ r o o D o r o r l r o r l r o o d o D o r o o

9:00:13
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(o) D_ r o o D o D_ r o o D s_ _ _ l o d D o r o r o r o r o r r

9:02:88
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r o D o r o o D o r o r o o r o d D l r o r

9:05:62
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r o D o r o o D o r o r o o r o d D _ _ _ r

9:08:31
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) _ l d D l D _ _ l r K d D. 5x r_ K d D _ _ _ l

9:14:02
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(l) _ o r l r o o r o D l r o o D l r o o D o D r o o D o r o r

9:16:85
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o _ d D o r o r l r o r l r o o r o D o r o o

9:19:66
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(o) D_ l r o o r o o D o r o l r r o r l r o o r o D o r o o

9:22:43
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(o) D_ l l d D l l d D l l d D_ r l r l r l r o r l u _ D _ _ _ r
9:25:19
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(r) r 1 d D 1 D _ 1 r K d D. 2x o _ D ___ r r 1 d D 1 r o r

9:29:43
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(r) o r o r l r o o r o D o r o o d D o r l r o o r o D 1 D r o

9:32:23
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(o) d r o r l r o o r o D r o r o r l r o o r o D 1 D _ 1 r K d D.

9:35:00
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(r) _ o _ r l r l l r l d D _ _ l r o d r l r o o r o D _ r L l

9:37:80
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(l)d D 1 l r o o r o D o r o r l r o r l r o o r o D o r o o

9:40:57
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(o) d D l r o o r o D _ _ _ l r l d D _ _ _ l r l d D _ _ _ l r D l D _ 1

9:43:32
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(l)r K d D. 1x o _ D _ o o D o r o o o o D o r o o o D o r o r

9:46:88
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(r) l r o r l r o o r o D o r o o D r o o o D o D r o o o D o r o r

9:49:70
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(r) o r o r l r o o r o D o r o o r o r o o r o o o D o r o o

9:52:60
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(o) d D o r o o o o D o r o r l r l r o o r o o o D o r o o

9:55:47
*angkat
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(o) D r o o D o D r o o o D o r o o r o o o D o r o o

9:58:30
(G)--- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G --- pu--- G
(1)r o d r o o o o D _ _ _ l r l r D 1 D _ l r K d D.

513
10:01:08
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(1) d D r o r o o r o d D _ _ _ l _ o d r o r o o r o d D L D _ l

10:03:85
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(1) r l d D l D _ l r K d D. o _ _ d D _ _ d D ??d D r o d

10:09:66
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(d) D o r o o r o o d D o r o r o r o l r o o r o d D o r o o

10:12:56
*angkat mess......................
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(o) D r o o D o D r o o r o l r o o r o o D o r o o

10:15:36
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(o) d D l r l r o o r o d D _ _ _ D _ l d D l D _ l r K d D.

10:18:23
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(1) _ d _ D _ _ _ C _ l _ C _ d _ D

Tabuh Dua

10:36:10
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(2) r o d D _ _ _ l _ o _ r d r o o D o d D l r o o

10:39:29
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(o) D r o o D o D r o o D o r o r o r o r o o r o o D o r o o

10:42:40
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(o) D r o o D o D r o o D _ _ _ l _ o d D l r o r o o r o o D l d

10:45:51
(G) - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - G
(d) D r o o D o D r o o D l r o l r o l r o o r o o D o r o o
Tabuh Telu (Empat)

12:53:53
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
1 d D _ _ _ r r 1 d D _ _ _

1 – 12:57:41
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(l)r o r l r o r l r o o r r o r l r o r l r o l d D 1 r

2 – 13:01:01
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)o r l r o r l r o r l r o o r o D 1 r o r o D 1 d D 1 r

3 – 13:04:54
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)l r o r l r o o r l r o o r o D 1 d D 1 D r o r o r o r
4 – 13:07:98
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)o d D 1 r o r l r o o D d D o o D o D r o o D 1 d D 1 r

1 – 13:11:40
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)l r o r l r o r l r o l r o r l r o o r o D 1 d D 1 r

2 – 13:14:77
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)o r l r o o r o r l r o l r o r l r o o r o D 1 d D 1 D o r o r

3 – 13:18:15
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)l r o r l r o o r o o r o o r o o D 1 d D 1 D o r o d
4 – 13:21:52
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(d)r o d D 1 r o r l r o o D d D o o D r o o D r o o D 1 d D 1 r

1 – 13:24:89
........mess.....
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(r)l r o r l r o o r o o D o o D o o D o D r o o r l D _ _ 1

2 – 13:28:29
(G) – – n – – t – – n – – pu – – n – – t – – n – – G
(l)r o r l r o o r o r l r o o r o D 1 r o o D 1 d D 1 d D 1 r
1
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r r o r l r o o r l d D l d D l r K d D.

14:14:62
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
d D _ _ _ r l d D _ _ _ r o r

1 - 14:17:96
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r r o r l r o o r o o o o l D l r

2 - 14:21:20
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r r o r l r o o r o o o o l D l r

3 - 14:24:47
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r r o r l r o o r o o o o l D l r

4 - 14:27:76
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) r o o D l r o r l r o o D l d D r o o D o D r o o D l r o r

1 - 14:31:04
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r .................... mess...............................................

2 - 14:34:30
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r r o o r o o o o l D l r

3 - 14:37:60
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o o r r o o r o o o o l D l d D o r o r o D l d D o r o r

4 - 14:40:88
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) r o o D l r o r l r o o D l d D r o o D o D r o o D l r o r

1 - 14:44:13
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r l r o l r o o o o l r o o o o l r o o D l r

2 - 14:47:42
(G) - - n - - t - - n - - pu - - n - - t - - n - - G
(r) l r o r r l r o r l r o o o o l r o o o o l r o o D l D l r
Batel Marah

15:42:11
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
(K) o K D l D l D l D l D l

15:44:75
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
(l) d D l r l D l r l r l r l r l o o o r o o

15:47:20
mess

15:49:62
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
(o) D l r o o o r o D o r o o D r o d D r

15:57:73
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
16:00:35
(D) d D r l d D l d D l D l D l D l

16:02:95
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
16:05:64
(D) r l D l D l D l D l D l D l D l r

16:08:31
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
16:11:01
(K) r o o K d D d D l D

16:13:71
(G) pu G pu G pu G pu G
16:18:19

522
16:16:20
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ d _ D _ K _ _ _ D ______ o r o r r l r o o r o r o r l

16:18:79
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ _ d D _ K _ _ _ D ______ l d _ D ______ l d _ D ______ l

16:21:38
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ _ d _ D _ l _ _ D _ l _ D _ r l _ r o r l r o o d r o r o o

16:23:88
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(o)r o r r l r o o r o d D _ _ _ r l _ l D _ _ _ l r K d D.  4x

16:29:27
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ _ C r _ l _ d _ D ______ l d _ D _ l _ D _ l _ D ______ l

16:31:88
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ o_r l r o o r o d D _ _ _ L _ d _ D ______ L _ l D l r o r

16:34:43
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(r)l r o o r o d r o o r o r o d r l r o r l r o o r o r o r o r l

16:37:02
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)r o d r o r o l _ _ d D ______ l r K d D l D _ l r K d D.

16:39:61
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ r l l _ K _ d _ D ______ l r l d D _ l _ d _ D ______ l

16:42:20
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ d _ D _ l _ d _ D ______ l d _ D _ l _ D _ l _ D ______ l

16:44:70
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(1)_ o_r l r o o r l d D _ _ _ l d r l d D _ l D _ r l d D_o

16:47:32
(G)- - - - G - - - - - - - - - - G - - - - - - - - G
(o)r o r r l r o o r o d D _ _ _ r l r l r l D _ l D _ K_r _ r _ r l l

523
Wadon – Pak Tama

16:49:93
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
(1) __ D ____ 1 D _ 1 d _ D

Batel

17:02:99
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:05:02
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:07:76
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:10:44
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:13:02
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:15:82
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:18:45
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:21:20
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
17:23:92
(G) - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G - - - pu - - G
(r) o o d D _ _ _ r l r o o r r o o d D _ _ _ r l r o o D r o o D r o o D r

524
17:30:14
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(1) _ r o _ D r l r l _ o _ D r l r l _ o _ D r l r l _ o _ D r l r r
17:33:01
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) u u D l r o o D r o o D u r r u u D _ r o l r l r l r o l
17:35:79
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) l r o r l r l r o r l r o o o D L D o o D r o o D o D r
17:38:58
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) u u D _ r o l r l r l r o l l d D o r o o D r o o D r o o D r
17:41:35
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) l r o o d o d r u o o D o d r u u D _ r o l r l r o l r r
17:44:17
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) o o o d D o r o l D r o o o D r u u D _ r o l r l r o o d r o r
17:46:93
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) l K d D r 1 D r 1 K d D. 3x l _ r o l r l r o l d D _ _ _ l
17:51:93     17:53:32
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(1) D r o r l r o l o D l r l r l K d D l o D r l K d D.
17:54:70
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
     r _ o _ l d r o _ d r o r l r o r l r o o D o r o o
17:57:53
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(o) D r o o o D r o o D _ r o l r l r o r l r o o D o r o r
18:00:40
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r) o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l o D l r o o
18:03:26 *angkat
(G)- - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(o) D r o o D o D r o o D _ _ _ r l r o l r o o D o r o o
18:44:62
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r o r 1 r o o o D o r o r l r o r 1 r o o o D 1 D 1 l l

18:47:43
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(1)D r l 1 D 1 D r l 1 d D _ r o r l r 1 r o r l r o r

18:50:23
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l l d D o r o o D r o o D o D r o o D o r o o D r o o D r o o

18:53:03
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(o)D r o o D r o o D r o o D r l r l o d D _ r o r l r 1 r o r 1 r

18:56:53
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r o r l r o r l l d D 1 D o o D r l r o o D r o l d D _ r o r

18:58:61
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r o o r l r o o D l r l r l K d D 1 l l D r l K d D _ _ _ K

19:01:33
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(K)_ _ u u _ u _ u _ D _ K _ d _ D

Tabuh Dua

19:15:29
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
1 d D _ _ _ r l r o r l r o o o D l r o o

19:18:56
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(o)D r o o r o D r o o D _ r o r l r l r o r l r o o o D l D o o

19:21:74
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(o)D r l r o o D l r o o D r l r o o D l r o o D l r o o D l l

19:24:87
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(l)D r o o r o D r o o D l D o u D r u u d D u u d r u u d D u u
20:05:35
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(r) l r o o o D 1 r o o o D 1 l D 1 r l r l r l r l r l r

20:08:47  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
*angkat
(r) l r o r l r o o D _ _ _ r l r o r l r o o o D o r o o

20:11:50  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(o) D r l l r l d D 1 r l l D _ _ _ r l l d D 1 r K r _ l _ D _ l _ l

20:14:52  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(1) D 1 D 1 _ l D r 1 K d D _ _ _ r l l d D 1 r l r l K d D.

20:17:60  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
1 _ r _ o _ r l r o r o r l r o r l r o r o o D o r o o

20:20:64  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(o) D r l l r l d D 1 _ o _ D r l r l r o r l r o o o D 1 D l l

20:23:78  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(1) D r l r o o o D l D 1 l D r l r l l d D l r l l l d D l l D r o o

20:26:88  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(o) D r o o o D r o o o D l r o l D r l r o r o o D r l r l r o o

20:30:01  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
*angkat
(o) D o D r o o o D r o o o D _ _ _ r l r o r l r o o o D 1 D l l

20:33:01  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(1) D r u r u u D 1 r l l D _ _ _ r l l d D 1 r K r _ o _ D _ l _ l

20:36:50  
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G  
(1) D 1 D 1 _ l D r l l D D 1 l l D
Tabuh Telu (Empat)

20:49:47
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r l r o r o r l r o r l r o r l r o o d D l r

1 - 20:53:04
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r l r o r o r l r o r l r o r l r o o D D l r o o o D

2 - 20:56:36
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r l r o r l r o r l o D r l r o o D K D D D r o r

3 - 20:59:73
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r l r o r l r o r l l D r l r l l D l D l D l D r o r o r o r

4 - 21:03:04
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l o D D l r o r l r o o D o D o D r o o o D r l r o o D l d

1 - 21:06:35
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(d) D r l r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r l o D l r

2 - 21:09:56
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l o D l r

3 - 21:12:90
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r o r l r o o D D l r o o D D l D D l D D r o r o r

4 - 21:16:17
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l o D D o r l r o D D l l D r l l D D l D D D r o o

1 - 21:19:40
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(o) r r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l o D l r

2 - 21:22:67
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r o r l r o r l r o r l r l l D r o o o D l D D D l D D r o r

530
Batel Marah

22:40:81 \(\rightarrow\) many o more like u
\(\text{(G)}\) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
\(\text{(K)}\) _ rl _ rl _ d _ D _ _ _ _ r _ 1 d D _ _ _ r _ 1 d D _ _ _ r

22:43:50
\(\text{(G)}\) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
\(\text{(r)}\) l r o r l r o d D l r o r o o d D l d d d

22:46:17
\(\text{(G)}\) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
\(\text{(d)}\) D r 1 l r 1 D r 1 d D l r o r l r o o d D o o o D r o o D r o o D r 1 r o o D r

22:48:87
\(\text{(G)}\) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
\(\text{(o)}\) D r o o r o d D l D o o D r o o D r o o D r 1 r o o d D r

22:51:54
\(\text{(G)}\) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
\(\text{(r)}\) u u d D l r o r l r l d r l r l K d D l l D r l K d D. 3x

22:56:23
\(\text{(G)}\) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
\(\text{(K)}\) _ D l D _ K _ _ _ D _ _ _ _ r _ 1 d D l r l r l L l d D _ _ _ r
22:58:89
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l r o r l r o r l r l r l r o o d r l r l l r l l d D.

23:01:52
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l r l l d r l l d D l r l l D r l r l l d D _ _ _ r

23:04:13
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l r o _ D r l r o r l r l r l l d D l D l l D r l r l D r

23:06:75
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l l d D l r o r l o o r l r K _ D l D _ K _ _ _ D _ _ _ _ l

23:09:39
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) d _ D _ K _ d _ D _ _ _ _ K _ d _ D _ _ _ K _ d _ D _ _ _ r

23:11:91
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l l d D r l l D r l l D _ _ _ r l l d D _ _ _ _ r

(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l r o r l r o r l l d D l r l l D r l r l l D r l l d D _ _ _ r

23:16:36
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l l r l r r D K _ D l D _ K _ _ _ D 6x

23:22:29
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (K) _ D l D _ K _ _ _ D _ _ _ _ _ r _ l d D r l l d D r l l D _ _ _ r

23:24:89
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l K d D _ _ _ r l r l r l r l r l l d D l r o r l r l l d l r l r

23:27:39
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l l d D l D l l D r l r l l D r l l d D l r o r l r l l d r

23:29:89
(G)---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G---pu---G (r) l l d D _ _ _ r l r l l D r l r l l D r l r l l d r _ K
23:32:34
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(K)_ D l D _ K _ _ _ D _ _ _ _ _ K _ d _ D _ K _ d _ D _ _ _ _ _ l

23:34:87
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(1)_ d _ D _ l _ d _ D _ _ _ _ _ K _ d _ D _ d _ D _ d _ D _ _ _ _ _ r

23:37:29
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l l d D _ _ _ r l r l l d r l r l l d D l r l l D r l r l l D r

23:41:00
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l l d D l r l l r l l r l l D l D K _ d D _ K _ _ _ D 2x

23:44:85
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(K)_ d _ D _ D _ _ _ D _ K _ d _ D

Lanang – Pak Buda

Batel

23:58:46
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)_ e _ r l r e e r e T r l r l r e e T r e r e e r e

mess up til:

24:02:66
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e r e l r e T r e r e l r e l T r T l

24:05:40
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l) r e T r e r e l T l T r l e T r e r e e r e l r e l T r T l

24:08:21
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l) T r e r e e T r e r e e e T r e r e e r e r e r e r e r e
24:48:85
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r U U _ U r r P r T 1x l r l t r e _ r l r l r e _ r l
24:52:53
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l)r l r e _ r l r l t r U _ r l r l t r e _ l r e _ r l r e e
24:55:29
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(e)r e r l T r T l r e T r e l r e T r e e P _ U U U _ U t r
24:58:13
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)P t T r 2x r e _ r l r e e r l T u
25:01:63
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r l r e e T r e e e e T r e e e e T r e e e e T l r u T l r e t r
25:04:45
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r l l l r l r e e e e P _ r U U _ U _ r P t T r
25:07:21
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l)r l t r e e l r u t r e e l r e T l r e T r e e e e T l r l l T r
25:10:05
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l l T l r l T l r e T l r e T r e e e e r l l T 1 T l T l T l
25:12:83
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l)r r e e e T r u r l r e e e T r u r u u r u r l l l r l T l
12:15:66
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l)r e T r e e T l T r l l T l r e T r e e l r l r e e t r
25:18:46
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e r l r e e _ P _ _ U U _ _ _ r U r U U _ U _ r P t T r 1x
25:22:05
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(l)r l t r U _ r l l t r e _ r l r l t r U _ r l l t r e _ r l
25:24:84

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) e _ r l r e r l e t r l r e l r e r l T l T l r e T r e r l l

25:27:65

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r) e r e l T u T u e T r l u T l r e T r e r l r e e T r

23:30:50

(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(P) U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ r P t T r l _ _ U U _ U _ U _

(G) - - - pu- - - G
(_ ) e _ T _ r _ e

Tabuh Dua

25:49:03

(G) - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(r) e _ r l r e r e T e _ _ _ r l r l r e e T r e r e e T r

25:52:15

(G) - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(r) e e T r e r e r l T l T l T r e e e T r e r e l T l T l

25:55:24

(G) - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(l) e T r e r e e T e T e r e T r e e T r e e e T e T e r e T r

25:58:36

(G) - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(r) e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r e r e e e T r

26:01:48

(G) - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(r) e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r e r e e e T r

26:04:58 - all the e til a gsel are a bit u

(G) - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
(r) e e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T e T r
Tabuh Telu (Empat)

28:15:30
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G

1 - 28:19:08
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e e T r e e T r e e r e r e r l T l T l

2 - 28:22:57
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l) t r l r e e T r e r e e e r e r e r e r e r l T l r l r l T l

3 - 28:26:13
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l) t r l r l e T r e r e e r e r e r e r e r e r e r e r e r e r e r T l T l T T l

4 - 28:29:60
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l) r e T r e e e T e T e r e e T r e e T e T e e T e T e e T r

1 - 28:33:09
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r l r l e T r e r e e e T r e e T r e e T r e e r e r e r l T l T l

2 - 28:36:52
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l) r r l r e e T r e r e e r e r e r e r e r e r e r e r e T l r l r l T l T l

3 - 28:39:97
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l) t r l r e e T r l r l r l r e r e r l r l r e r e r e r e r e r e r e T l T l T l

4 - 28:43:42
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l) r e T r l r e e T l T l T e T e r e e T l T e e T e T e e T r

angsel - 28:46:88
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(r) l r l r e e t r e r e e e r e P c U U U _ U r r P t T r

28:50:29
(G) - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - pu - - - n - - - t - - - n - - - G
(l_e_ r l r e e r e r e r e r e T r
Batel Marah

(G) - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
U _ _ _ _ _ l _ c U U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ _ _ _ _

30:02:74
(G) - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(1)r l r l r e t r l r l r e e T r e r e e e T l r e T l r e T r

30:05:25
(G) - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r)e r l r e e T r e r e l r e t r l r e l r e l r e l _ _ r U _ _ r

30:07:85
(G) - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(r)l r U U _ U _ U r r P _ ?????????????? T r _ _ _ 1x

30:10:50
(G) - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(P)_ r U U _ P _ _ _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ l _ r _ U U _ U _ U _ U _ _ _ _ _ _

30:13:01
(G) - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G - - - pu-- - - G
(1)_ U _ U _ U _ _ _ U _ U _ _ U _ _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ l r e l r e l r
30:15:44
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(P)_ r U U_ U r P t Tr ___ _lr ler ler ler ler ler ler ler Tr

30:18:02
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)ler ler eTr er er eTr eTreeTr eTreeTr ler ler ler T__

30:20:65
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(_)_ U_ U_ U_ U_ U_ U_ ur e r ler ler ler ler ler eTr eTr

30:23:08
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)ler ler ler ___ _U_ U_ _ler ler U U_ U_ _ler ler ler Tr _

30:25:57
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(P)_ c U r_ P_ c_ U_ ___ u_ c U r_ P_ C_ U_ ___ _

30:27:98 missing 1 beat
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(1)_ C U r_ P_ C_ U_ ___ ___ P_ ?____________ U_ U___

30:30:06
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(_)_ U_ U_ ___ ___ U_ U_ U_ U_ U_ U____

30:31:84
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(1)rer ler ler ler ler ler ler ler ler l_ C U U_ U_ _ler ler ler ler Tr ___

30:34:28
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(_)_ ___ e___ r ler ler ler ler ler ler ler l_tr U_ _ler ler ler ler ler ler

30:36:85
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(_)_ U_ U_ U_ U_ U_ U_ ___ ler ler ler ler ler ler ler ler

30:39:13
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
(r)er ler ler ler ler ler ler ler ler P_ C U U_ U_ _ler ler ler ler Tr 1x

30:42:23
(G)- - - pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G--- pu--- G
1x 1_e____ r ler ler U_ _ler ler ler ler ler ler

544
Together – Pak Buda Wadon Pak Tama Lanang

Batel

L in wadon = dag sound with LH

Together – Pak Buda Wadon Pak Tama Lanang

Batel

L in wadon = dag sound with LH
0:18:00
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T r l r e e Te T r e e Tr e r e e e T r
(o)D r o o D o d r o o d D l r l r o l d D l r o r l r o o r o r r

0:20:69
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(C)_ _ U _ U _ _ r l r U U _ U _ r P t T r _ _ _ _ 5x
(r)L r o r L r o o r o D l D ?? r K d D.

0:26:42
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
_ e _ e e r e r e t r _ e _ r l r l r e e T r e r e e e r P
L _ d D _ _ _ l _ o _ r l r o o r o D o r D D

0:29:13
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(P)_ C U U _ U _ _ r P t T r _ _ _ _ _ _ _ r _ e t r e r e e T r
(l)d D l r l r l l r K d D. o d D l r l l

0:31:92
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e t r e e e e T r e e Te T r e e Tr e r e e e T r
...m e s s y ......
(l)_ D _ r l r o o r o D o r o r l r o r o r o o r o D o r o l

0:34:74
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)e e T r l r e e T r l r e e T r e r e e T r e e T r e e e
??????
(l)D r o o _ D o o _ D _ D r o r r o l r o l r o l r o l

0:37:58
*angkat
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(e)T r e e T r e e r l r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e e T r
(l)r r o l r o l r o D l r r o l r o l r o o o r o D D l D r o
1:50:73
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(C) __ U __ U __ r l c U U U __ r P t Tr __ e __ r l r U U r U r U
(o)r l d D __ _ _ 1 r l d D l D r l r K d D.      D r ??? 1 1

1:53:45
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G (cont’d)
(U)r P Tr   r_e__r l r l r e e Tr
( )r o d D __ 1 __ d D __ 1 __ 1

1:56:34
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r)e e T r e e T r e e T e T r l r l r e e T r e e T e T r
(l)r l D __ _ l r l r D l r o r l r o r l r o o r o D l r o o

1:58:47
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G (cont’d)
(r)e e T r e e T r e e T r
(o)D r o o D l D r o o D o D o o

1:59:87
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r)e r e e T r e r e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T e T r
(o)d D o __ d D o o D o o D o o d D l r l r o o r l d D l r o r
2:02:73  *angkat
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r)l r l r e e T r e r l r e e T r __ r_e_r e r e r e r e T r
(r)l r o r l r o o r o D l D l_l r o r l r o o r o d D __ _ 1

2:05:48
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r)l r l r e e T r e r l r e e l __ U __ U __ r l r U U U __ U_r
(l)r l D l r o l D D l r l r D _ D _ r _ 1 d D l D _ 1

2:08:19
(G) - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G - - - pu - - - G
(r)P t Tr  2x r __ r __ e _ r l r l r e e T r e r e e T r
(l)r K d D.      D _ l r l r l d D l r l r o r l r o l
2:34:38 *angkat
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)l l r e e T r _ e _ r _ e r e r e e T r
(D)l r o o r o l r o d D _ _ _ _ 1 D D l r l r o o r o d D l D l o
2:37:16
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)e r l r e e T C _ _ U _ _ _ r l r U U _ U _ r P _ T r _ e _ r
(o)r r o r l r o o r o d D __ __ l r l D D _ 1 r K d D._ l
2:39:87
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)l r U U r U r U _ P T r _ _ _ _ r _ e _ r l r l r l r e e T r
(1)_ D l r l l l r l d D. d D l r o r
2:42:74
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r l r l r l r e e T r
(r)l r l l l r l r l l d D l r l r o o d D l r o r r o d D l r o r
2:45:56 *angkat
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)e r e e T r _ e _ r _ e r e r e r e e T r l r l r l r e e T r
(r)r o o d D l r o o d D r l D r l l d D l _ __ loses a whole beat here
2:48:32
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)e r l r e e T C _ _ U _ _ _ r l r U U _ U _ r P t _ T r _ e _ r
somewhere…………………………..d D _ _ _ l r l D D _ _ l r K d D._ _ _ _ l
2:51:02
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)l r e e r e r e r l r l r l r e e T r u r u r e e T r
(1)_ D l r l l l r l l d D _ _ _ _ l r o _ r l r l l r o d D l D l r
2:53:78
(G)–––pu–––G–––pu–––G–––pu–––G
(r)l e T r u r u e T r e e T r l r l r e e T C _ _ U _ _ _ r
(r)l r o r l r o o r o d D l r o l D D l r l r o o r o d D l D _ r
2:56:54
(G)- - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
(r)l r U _ U _ r Pt Tr P _ _ U U _ U _ r _ l _ T _ e
(r)l r _ D l D _ l r K d D. d _ D _ _ l _ D _ l _ d _ D

Tabuh Dua

3:14:91
(G)- - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G - - - n - - - pu- - - n - - - G
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(r)l r e e r e e r e e r e e T r l d D _ _ _ l

562
1 - 7:50:95
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lr1reeTrerereeTreetTeTrr1rorlrollerodDldr1

2 - 7:54:18
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lr1reeTrerereeTreetTlreetTlreeTr
(l)r or l r or l r or l r or l r or l r or l r o l r od Dldr1

3 - 7:57:40
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lr1reeTeTreetTeTreetTeTeTr
(r)l r o l l r or r o o r o o Dldr1Dldr1Dldr1Dldr1r

4 - 8:00:66
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)eeTreelrreeTeTreetTlreeTeTreetTr
(r)r o d Dldr1r l o Dldr1Dldr1D o DroodDldr or or or

1 - 8:03:92
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lr1rlrleeTrerereeTreetTrerereeTreetTeTr
(r)l r o l r o l r or l r or l r or l r or l r o l r 1Dldr1

2 - 8:07:18
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lr1reeTrerereeTreetTlreetTlreeTr
(r)l r o l l r or r o o r o o Dldr1lr1l1Dldr1Dldr1

3 - 8:10:41
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lr1reeTeTreetTeTreetTeTreetTr
(r)l r o l r o l r or r o o r o o Dldr1Dldr1Dldr1Dldr1r o o r o o

4 - 8:13:63
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)eeTreelrreeTeTreetTlreeTeTreetTr
(d)r o d Dldr1r o o Dldr1Dldr1Dldr1DroodDldr or
short angsel – 8:16:85

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l re e Tr e re e e r P_r U_U_U_r P_t T r l x

(r)l r o r l r o l r r o r l r o l r r o r l r l r K d D.

8:23:47

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)e e e e r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r
d D ___ l r l d D l r o r

1 – 8:26:75

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r e e e Tr e e e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r
(r)l r o r l r o l r r o r l r o l r r o o r o r l d D l r

2 – 8:29:99

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l e e e T r e e e T r e e e T l r e e e T e e e T r
(r)l r o r l r o l r r o o o D l r o r l d D l D d D l D l r o r

3 – 8:33:22

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)e e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T e e e T e e e T r
(r)l r o r l r o l r r o o o D l D d D l D o r o o o d

4 – 8:36:44

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r
d r o D l r o r l r o o D l D D l D o D r o o D D l r o r

1 – 8:39:70

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)e e e e T r e e e T r e e e T r l r e e e T r e e e T r
(r)l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o l r l r l r l d D l r

2 – 8:42:95

(G)--- n--- t--- n--- pu--- n--- t--- n--- G
(r)l r l e e e T r e e e T r e e e T l r e e e T l r e e e T r
(r)l r o r l r o l r r o o o D l r o r l D l D d D l r o r
3 - 8:46:21
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)ereereTeTreeTeTreereeteTeTr
(r)lorlrorlorlorlorlorlorlorlor

4 - 8:49:43
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)ereereTeTreeTeTreeTeTreeTeTr
(r)ooooD1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1roororor

1 - 8:52:62
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlor
(r)D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1

2 - 8:55:84
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlor
(r)D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1

3 - 8:59:09
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlor
(r)D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1

4 - 9:02:35
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)ereTeTreeTeTreeTeTeT1r1rurU___r
(d)ooooD1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1

angsel - 9:05:60
(G)---n---t---n---pu---n---t---n---G
(r)lorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlorlor
(r)D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1D1

(is this because he didn’t notice it was ending?)
Batel Marah

– most of Tama’s e = almost u

9:21:90
(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
   r_ _ _ _ C _ _ _

9:25:18
(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
   (P) _ _ U U _ P _ C _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ _ P _ C U U _ U _ U _ U _ U _ _ r
d_ D _ _ _ _ _ _ 1 _ _ d D_ l _ D _ l _ D _ _ _ 1

9:31:01
(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
   (r) _ _ _ U _ _ _ r l r u u T r l r u u Tr e e T r e e T r e e T r e e T r
   (l) r l d D _ _ _ l r l d D _ _ _ l D _ r l r l l l d D l r o r

9:31:66
(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
   (r) _ U _ r _ U _ U _ U _ U _ r l r l l l e e T r e e T e T r e e T e T r
   (l) r l d D _ _ _ l r l d D _ _ _ l r l d r l r l l r o d D l r l l

9:34:29
(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
   (r) e e T r e e T e T r e e T r l r l l l e e T C _ _ U _ U _ _ r
   (l) d D _ _ r l r o r o d D l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r l r o r

9:36:99
(G) - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G - - - pu- - - G
   (r) l r U U _ U _ r P t T r 5x  r _ _ _ U _ _ _ P _ _ U U _ P _ c
   (r) l r  l D l D r l r K d D.
beat and pung messing up a lot through here, so may be very inconsistent.

9:53:89
(G) - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G
(P) U U P U U U U U U 6x (partially b/c beat lost it)
(D) l r o r D _ _ _ D _ _

9:59:41
(G) - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G
(r) U _ _ _ _ _ _ r l r U _ _ _ U _ _ _ _ _ _ r l r l r U _ _ _
d D _ _ _ _ D _ _ _ _ _ _ l r l d D l _ _ _ l l
10:02:04
(G) - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G
(r) l r l r e e T r e r e e e T r e e T r e e e T r e e e T e T r e e T r e e
(l) r l d D _ _ _ _ _ r l r l d D l D l r _ l d D l r o r l r o r l r l l

10:04:67
(G) - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G - - - pu-- - G
(r) l r e e T r e r l r e e T r e r e e e T r e r e e e T r _ _ _ U _ U _ _
(l) r o d D l r o l d D l r l r o o o r o d D l D l r l r l l r l l d D
11:08:58
(G)---pu---G---pu---G
(l)___UUUUr_PTe

D_1DK_d_D