
The Symbolic Meaning of Marriage Taboo in Purbalingga and Banyumas Villages

Sugeng Priyadi

History Education Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

DOI:

[10.30595/pssh.v8i.601](https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v8i.601)

Submitted:

August 25, 2022

Accepted:

December 23, 2022

Published:

January 26, 2023

Keywords:

The marriage taboo, social conflicts, incest, social rivalry, legitimate battle, liminal, binary opposition

ABSTRACT

The marriage taboo in the rural community of Purbalingga and Banyumas illustrates the phenomenon of socio-cultural plurality which is based on socio-political legitimacy. The emergence of marriage taboos is caused by social conflicts as the manifestation of incest marriage, social rivalry, and legitimacy battle. In those conflicts, the communities of Onje, Banjarnayar, and Raden Kaligenteng are the troublemakers. In addition, the communities of Sambeng Kulon, Sambeng Wetan, Jompo Kulon, and Jompo Wetan can also be categorized as the troublemakers since they are involved in the internal conflict which made them separated into parts. Those marriage taboos indicate something that can be understood as the shift of cosmos into chaos. The chaotic situation, however, is more dominant because the shift has not resulted in a new cosmos so that it is always in the liminal or threshold position. The position can be explained clearly in terms of relative binary opposition featuring a third party which takes the liminal position.

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Corresponding Author:

Sugeng Priyadi,

History Education Study Program,

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

K.H. Ahmad Dahlan Street PO BOX 202 Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia.

Email: sugengpriyadi1965@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Every human being surely interacts with his material, social, and symbolic environment (Kuntowijoyo, 1987:66), the most interesting of which – for he studies the meaning – is the symbolic one. Basically, society cannot be separated from symbolic world because the relation between the two is like two sides of the same coin. Symbols, in a society, can explain its overall or detailed existence. On the other hand, society can also be used to explain the existence of the existing symbols (Kuntowijoyo, 1987: 67). Therefore, the socio-cultural background of a society is very important for the explanation of symbols still used by the people. All that society produces, such as system of belief, philosophy, arts, science, history (including myths, legends and folktales), and language (Cassirer, 1987: 97) should be carefully observed as cultural phenomena because they may contain local wisdom but using universal symbols. This means that two distant societies or more may use the same symbols to denote the same thing. In that case, similar concepts may belong to one and other culture because the symbols are created as their responses either to material or social challenges which Levi Strauss describes as the realization of subconscious wish, which to some extent are not consistent, not suitable or not in line with the existing daily reality (Ahimsa-Putra, 2001: 79). Therefore, basically the symbols represent the existence of a society because the society has already identified themselves with the symbols that they create.

Among the many cultural phenomena is the myth. Myth always has something to do with the system of belief, philosophy, arts, science, history, and language, and even myth can include them all. This can be easily

understood because society, even the most modern one, always produce myths along with its history. The role a myth plays in a society is the same as that of history in the modern society. Myth always speaks of the past within the mystical times. This means that the problem of time in myths cannot be explained as in the science of history. In history, time is very important because it speaks of time which has become history itself. History regards to space and time as things having interaction with an event. And event reflects man in space and time. Thus, if history views man in his interaction with space and time as something valuable, myth views event as something meaningful. When man gives meaning to an event, he provides meaning to himself. That is why Levi Strauss views myth as having multiple structures i.e. historical myth and non-historical one (Ahimsa-putra, 2001:82)

Myth which has something to do with the world of taboo, especially the marriage ones, are of three kinds namely that of (1) cosmogony (2) origin and (3) the end of the world (Susanto, 1987: 74-78 & 88-90). Three types of myths can be classified into historical and non-historical one because they tell us about the genesis, the new existence and the end of the cosmos. The first type tells about creation as the breaking away of the primordial unit. The act of creating is carried out by separating the established structure (the cosmos) from the chaotic situation (Susanto, 1987:75). The formation of cosmos as belonging to the cosmogonic myth is always confronted with chaos (Eliade, 2002: 12,19,57, & 58). The second type, the myth which tells about the origin of the cosmos, always has a relation with the cosmic one which is the most important model example from all process of creation because it views the world as a new appearance. Basically, this myth is the continuation of the cosmogonic one because it tells about the changing, adding and reducing of the world that the myth of genesis always begins with cosmogonic one (Susanto, 1987: 77) Social conflicts and marriage taboos in Purbalingga and Banyumas villages belong to genesis which tell about how conflicts and marriage taboo arise. Actually, marriage taboo can be classified into the third type of myth, namely myth about the end of the world which should be followed by the emergence of a new world. The destruction of the world symbolizes the process towards the chaotic situation (Susanto 1987:88) which is followed with a renewal in the form of a new cosmos as a pure and fresh world which is full of vitality (Susanto, 1987:89). The concept of cosmos and chaos in the myth of cosmogony has a similarity with that of *yuga* in Indian mythology of cosmogony (Upaddhayaya, 1999:71; Zaehner, 1992:63-64; Soekmono, 1984: 31-32). The concept of *yuga* in *caturyuga* indicates that the era of *Kartayuga* is a cosmos, while that of *Kaliyuga* is chaos. While the era of *Tetrayuga* and *Dwaparayuga* are the processes of the cosmos leading to chaos. When the era of *Kali* is going on, the human being will hope for the coming of *Krta* period as the millennium or the era of prosperity (Kartodirdjo, 1984:14; 1986:84-85 & 1993:29)

The marriage taboo, however, moves more to a chaotic situation without renewal. This situation will last for an uncertain period when a new world will emerge. This chaotic situation which happens in the marriage taboo lies in threshold period including the present so that the myth can be the model and yardstick to see the today's human activity (Susanto,1987:76). Therefore, the important moment in human civilization is at the shift from myth to logos because it is at this moment that ethic will emerge, that is the complexity based on values which determine the totality of life habit of a society (Kartodirdjo, 1999:120). This means that myth can position itself as science and philosophy for modern people because myth gives knowledge about the world (van Peursen, 1988:41).

Apart from the problem concerning the shift from cosmos to chaos, cases in marriage taboo also suggest the *binary opposition* which divides the universe into pair categories having characteristics of being opposites, contrast or on the contrary. Those two categories can be absolute and relative. Opposition, which has the quality of absolute, can be seen in the existence of sky-earth, life-death, human-animal, human-god, man-woman, black-white; while opposition which has relative quality can be seen in the existence of left-right, front-back, relative-outsider, girl-giving relative-girl-receiving relative and so on. The first type of opposition shows that the pair has a permanent and absolute position, while on the second one, one of the pairs is in certain position against the other pair and it positions itself as the opponent of the third party (Koentjaraningrat, 1982: 229)

2. DISCUSSION

The Onje and Cipaku positions show an absolute opposition. And so is the position of the King Namrut against The King Mangkurat Amral or Arsayuda (the descendant of Arsanaka) against the offspring of Dipayuda I (the descendant of Dipamenggala). The absolute opposition in marriage taboo for Onje-Cipaku happening there is not such a taboo between Onje and Pasirluhur. The conflicts which later rose involving Onje's descendant can also be categorized as an absolute opposition because they do not have any conflict with other parties, except Onje's daughter, namely conflicts between (1) Onje against Cipaku, (2) Namrut against Mangkurat Amral, (3) Arsayuda against the descendant of Dipayuda I. Further, relative opposition about the conflicts involving the descendants of Onje (Onje's daughter), Sambeng (Kulon, west against Wetan, east) and Kramat, and Sokaraja and Purbalingga can be seen from the conflicts of (1) Onje's daughter against Raden Ayu Kepugeran I, (2) Onje's daughter against Raden Ayu Kepugeran II, (3) Sambeng Kulon against Kramat, (4) Sambeng Wetan against Kramat, (5) Raden Kaligenteng against Ki Ageng Ngorean, (6) Raden Kaligenteng against Adipati Jebugkusuma, (7) raden Kaligenteng against Raden Kuncung, and (8) Adipati Jebugkusuma against Adipati Kertabangsa.

Onje's daughter, who was in the opposition against Raden Ayu the first, suggested a relative opposition because she was a *selir* (a king's wife whose descendant is not entitled for the throne) while Raden Ayu was a *garwa* (a king's wife whose descendant is entitled for the throne). The first opposition with Raden Ayu the second was a relative opposition due to Onje's daughter's status as a *garwa* (Ratu Wetan, the Queen of the East), while Raden Ayu the second was a *garwa* (Ratu Kulon, the Queen of the West). In that rivalry, Onje's daughter was the Ratu Kulon called Ratu Kencana. Similarly, the status of Kramat as the opponent of Sambeng Kulon and Sambeng Wetan at the same time. Kramat clan was forbidden to marry to any descendant of Sambeng Kulon and Sambeng Wetan. Sambeng Kulon and Sambeng Wetan should be in rivalry in all respects. The case of Raden Kaligenteng was very complicated because he was involved in three conflicts at the same time. Meanwhile, in one side, Adipati Jebugkusuma was in the opposition with Kaligenteng, but he was in peace with Adipati Kertabangsa (in another version he was in opposition). Adipati Kertabangsa, in the conflict between Sokaraja and Purbalingga, was the Adipati, regent of Purbalingga. The name of Kertabangsa was indeed not found in the list of *adipati*, the regent of Purbalingga. This name will remind us to Kiai Singaperbangsa and Wirasaba who led 2.000 people to move to Karawang in 1652 (Wiriatmadja, 2002: 13). The displacement of Banyumas to region with Sunda culture is also mentioned in Kalimanah version in which Raden Kuncung who was defeated by Raden Kaligenteng fled to Sunda territory.

Table of Relative and Liminal Opposition

No	Left	Threshold Position	Right
1	<u>Sambeng Kulon</u>	<u>Banjaranyar</u>	<u>Kramat</u>
2	<u>Banjaranyar</u>	<u>Kramat</u>	<u>Banjaranyar</u>
3	<u>Kramat</u>	<u>Sambeng Kulon</u>	<u>Kramat</u>
4	<u>Sambeng Wetan</u>	<u>Banjaranyar</u>	<u>Kramat</u>
5	<u>Banjaranyar</u>	<u>Kramat</u>	<u>Sambeng Wetan</u>
6	<u>Kramat</u>	<u>Sambeng Wetan</u>	<u>Banjaranyar</u>
7	<u>Jompo Kulon</u>	<u>Banjaranyar</u>	<u>Jompo Wetan</u>
8	<u>Banjaranyar</u>	<u>Jompo Wetan</u>	<u>Jompo Kulon</u>
9	<u>Jompo Wetan</u>	<u>Jompo Kulon</u>	<u>Banjaranyar</u>
10	<u>Jompo Kulon</u>	<u>Blater</u>	<u>Jompo Wetan</u>
11	<u>Blater</u>	<u>Jompo Wetan</u>	<u>Jompo Kulon</u>
12	<u>Jompo Wetan</u>	<u>Jompo Kulon</u>	<u>Blater</u>

The table above shows that relative opposition can create a third party who can be in both positions in a binary pair. The third party can be the intermediate party who has the characteristic of both party in the binary pair by mixing them (Koentjaraningrat, 1982: 229), or in the concept developed by Victor Turner which is called liminal or threshold position meaning something which is neither here nor there. (Winangun, 1990: 31-45). Threshold position can be filled by the three parties involved in a marriage taboo, for example, number 1 to 3 in the table shows the mutual exchange of position among Sambeng Kulon, Banjaranyar and Kramat. And so, does with number 4 to 6, 7 to 9, and 10 to 12. The result is that every party involved in marriage taboo will be in threshold position, namely Banjaranyar (3 times), Kramat (2 times), Jompo Kulon (2 times), Jompo Wetan (2 times), Sambeng Kulon (1 time), Sambeng Wetan (1 time), and Blater (1 time). Threshold position can be explained through the inter-relationship of marriage taboo in the region around the border between Banyumas and Purbalingga. This can be illustrated with a triangle in which everyone in the three parties can be in a threshold position in the three angles. The three triangles represent a regularity (cosmos) as well as irregularity (chaos) in the relation of its three angles. In the region covering three municipalities, namely Kembaran, Sokaraja, and Kalimanah, there were serious conflicts so that marriage taboo involved a lot of parties. In the bordering areas, there were contacts between two cultures or interest with their uniqueness. This can also result in the melting of two cultures which can also cause multi-directional conflicts.

After discussing the general symbol, we shall discuss more specific symbols which relate to particular localities. Basically, Onje-Cipaku conflict begins with the change of the system of woman exchange. Van Ossenbruggen (1975: 10) states that the structure of Javanese society is divided into what Rassers calls with two *paros* or *moieties* or *phatries*. The two *paros* consist of one main village on one side and four sub-villages on the other side. The two *paro exogamic* societies exchanged women to married ones (Koentjaraningrat 1982: 204). Onje-Cipaku relationship is seen in the name of the two villages. The name of Onje refers to femininity because the word means giving many fruits which means that the Onje is the party to be conceived due to its fertility. In Shivaic temple, fertility is symbolized with *yoni* which is always in pair with *lingga* as the symbol of masculinity. The word Cipaku comes from the word *paku* which means nail which symbolizes *lingga*. That is why the name

of Dewi Pakuwati means *linggayoni*, a name which is forced upon. He was not a female but a male. Thus, Onje, in the system of exchange, should have been the party giving the woman to the Cipaku party. The obligation had lasted since the system was agreed by the society divided in the two moieties. Therefore, Cipaku (as the male side) should have gotten the female from the Pasirluhur and Onje (both the female side). However, the agreement tried to be reversed in which the Onje was the receiver of the woman both from Cipaku and Pasirluhur. The change was conducted by Adipati Onje who broke the long-term agreement by marrying a Cipaku woman. The proposal of the Adipati was indeed refused by the Adipati Cipaku because with this the latter became the woman giver. The marriage between Adipati Onje and Putri Pakuwati was arranged and allegedly incest one and so was the marriage between Adipati Onje and the Princess of Pasirluhur. That could be seen from the effect of the marriage which ended with the killing of the two wives by Adipati Onje himself. Onje should have been the party receiving woman from parties other than Cipaku. The change of status from the giver to the receiver of woman is a radical one because there must be a taboo which states that Onje's man may not marry Cipaku's woman, but Cipaku's man is not forbidden to marry Onje's woman. To neutralize the taboo, Adipati Onje suggested the system of *tambangan*, in which there was an exchange of pair of brother and sister of each party. With this mutual giving and receiving of woman, it was expected that the old exchange system did not apply. Adipati Onje suggested this *tambangan* system as an improvement of the old system which was regarded as too limiting in exchanging woman. However, this was rejected by Adipati Cipaku stating that Cipaku would never ever be allowed to have their descendants to marry people from Onje. And based on his own experiment, Adipati Onje stipulated a taboo that his men were forbidden to commit polygamy and the woman to be the second wife. Further, it was explained that there were two ways to annul the Onje-Cipaku marriage taboo. Besides *tambangan*, Adipati Onje also proposed *lambangan*. While *tambangan* was done by exchanging pair of brother and sister, *lambangan* was done by exchanging pair of bride-bridgroom. If there was a Onje's bride with his Cipaku bridegroom, there had to be a bride from Cipaku as the replacement. The other way was the obligation for the bride to bring male cow or bull (Sasono & Tri Atmo, 1993: 50). Male cow was the symbol of shiva or *lingga* (masculinity) to replace himself because he had to follow the woman thus belonging to the family of the woman as went the saying *banteng anut ing sapi* (bull follows the cow) in Sundanese society (Ekadjati, 1995: 202). However, the three proposals did not apply to Cipaku society because Adipati Cipaku had stipulated an uncompromised marriage taboo. This meant that Cipaku people were not allowed to have their descendants to marry people from Onje until the end of the world. This could not be bargained by whatever including *tambangan*, *lambangan* and be bartered with male cow. The strong principle of Adipati Cipaku was due to the cruelty of Adipati Onje who killed his two wives. Family quarrel often happened but it had to be settled with killing as if there had not been other solution. What Adipati Onje did was seen as a violation of the marriage taboo. Onje should have the party giving the woman, not receiving. Onje men did not have any right to Cipaku women.

In the past, the system of exchanging women was often based on the prohibition or taboo of marriage of the same blood, incest or endogamy (Bertens, 1987: 102) or prohibition to kill animal totem and to marry a woman of the same clan (Bertens, 1991: xxxiv; Freud 2002). The question is what totem animal is common for Onje and Cipaku people. If it was male cow or bull, the two societies was reminded to respect the rule that Cipaku was the male party receiving Onje's woman, not the contrary as done by Adipati Onje. The act of Adipati Onje was a violation by killing the totem animal and marrying woman from the same clan. Furthermore, bull was also a totem animal which describes the figure of Kamandaka in *Babad Pasir* (the Legend of Pasir). Kamandaka was one of the members of the Pasirluhur-woman receiving party although he actually violated the Sundanese marriage taboo. Sundanese men were not allowed to marry Javanese women. It seemed that Pasirluhur woman (Dewi Kalinggawati) was also regarded as not being allowed to marry Adipati Onje. Therefore, the killing of his two wives was an act to clean himself of the sin of violating the marriage taboo. To cleanse himself, the corpses of his two wives were buried in the north of Paingen River, while he himself was in the south. Paingen was the name of his third wife (Raden Ayu Pinggen, Nyi Paingan, or Rara Paingen), who did not violate the marriage taboo. Hence, here Paingen River, a female river, acted as separator between bad act of violating the taboo and a good act of marrying the daughter of Adipati Arenan thus placing each status in its proper place. The two wives in the north were a symbol of death due to their buried dead body, with the body facing north. North can be symbolized with the Javanese alphabet *ma-ga-ba-tha-nga*, which also indicates the death, while Adipati Onje in the south symbolized blood or the descendant of mother as expressed in the Javanese alphabet *da-ta-sa-wa-la* which shows the conflict position. Because Adipati Onje was the descendant of mother, his marriage with his two wives was an incest one or a marriage with a woman of the same clan. North and south, in this case, was a realization of two moieties which contrasted between Wage and Pahing (Needham, 1979: 11; Bakker, 1979:99) Wage symbolized chaos and Pahing symbolized something which supported the chaos. Therefore, Nyi Paingen or the Paingen River was the threshold or liminal situation. Thus, marriage taboo in the relation of Onje and Cipaku is a chaotic situation with no end or in other words, in the state of a threshold.

Fan conflict represents a triangle conflict of Sambeng, Banjarnayar, and Kramat. This conflict created a triangle marriage taboo which is developed further by the split of Sambeng into Sambeng Kulon-West Sambeng

and Sambeng Wetan-East Sambeng. In the surface, it looks like a simple conflict. Fan was indeed only a toy. Man is created as *homo ludens*, a creature who likes playing (Huizinga, 1990). However, something which was not serious could become serious and further result in a conflict, violence, and even war (Huizinga, 1990: 125-147). Fan has the synonym of windmill, namely something rotating. Windmill is usually in the middle of the ricefield to know the wind direction and drive away the birds. If fan is something meaningful, it must be not an ordinary one. There are two things that suggest rotation, *chakra* and *swastika*. Chakra can mean a weapon *dedamel akra, ider, ubeng, songsong, cipta, galindingan* (Winter & Ranggawarsita, 1985: 27). Chakra is also a round thing, wheel, or weapon in the form of gear rotating (Prawiroatmodjo, 1988: 54), whereas Mardiarsito (1979: 132) describes chakra as the weapon, wheel, disc, and area of Wisnu. Or to be clearer, chakra has the form of wheel or disc, Wisnu's weapon is the weapon which is round and sharp (Zoetmulder & Robson, 2000a: 152)

Thus, charka can be described as (1) wheel, disc, round thing, and circle, (2) thought, (3) area, (4) Wisnu's weapon (sharp-gear-rotating weapon), (5) umbrella. The first meaning has similar function with fan, the second meaning relates with the work of brain to produce thought or mind namely how to overcome Maribaya and his children who were notorious as robbers. The thought was obtained after Raden Umar lived as a hermit in an isolated place so long that his body was covered with *ramat* (nest of spider). This made the village where he lived as a hermit called Kramat which was within the territory of Sambeng. The problem of territory as in the third meaning of chakra had something to do with fan conflict. The fan which belonged to Adipati Ngesam was installed in Karangkedawung village in the territory of Banjarnyarn known as the haven of robbers, was stolen and it stood to reason that he accused Banjarnyarnese had done it. Karangkedawung lied in the boundary between Kramat and Banjarnyarn and so Kramat people felt involved in the conflict which later leads to triangle marriage taboo among the people of Sambeng, Kramat, and Banjarnyarn.

The fourth meaning related to Wisnu's weapon, which in the wayang story is the weapon of Khrisna who is regarded as the reincarnation of Wisnu (Anderson, 2000: 27-28). Adipati Ngesam seemed to be regarded as the reincarnation of Wisnu as the savior of the world because it was he who destroyed Maribaya and his children, thus changing the people from evil to goodness. Adipati Ngesam was told to kill his wife, Dewi Trikusumawati, when she was taking a bath on the day of Jumat Kliwon (Friday Kliwon) after she got up from her nap. In his eyes, he did not see her as his wife but a deer (*sangsam*) which he then killed her with his arrow. This was like the killing of a golden deer by Rama in the forest of Dandaka (Sunardi, 1997: 53-54), so people identified him as the reincarnation of Wisnu because Rama was the reincarnation of Wisnu.

The fifth meaning is *songsong* or umbrella. *Songsong* is a symbol of a leader who should protect the people. The leaders in this triangle conflicts were Adipati Ngesam, Brawijaya, and Kiai Trenggiling Wesi. These were frontier leaders who created the change. Sambeng and Kramat came from the same era, while Brawijaya came from the older one. Adipati Ngesam changed the evil Maribaya people into good ones so that there were called Sambeng (from *Sangsam* or Ngesam). Brawijaya transformed *Bumi Ngesrael* into a new society and it was then called Banjarnyarn. Kiai Trenggiling Wesi together with Dewi Melathisari and Dewi Kunthisari changed the bad and ugly people into better ones because they together with Adipati Ngesam (Raden Umar) lived as hermits there until they were covered with spider's nest. All of them changed the black territory who were involved in the conflict.

Fan, besides it means chakra, it also means *swastika*. The word *swastika* comes from the word *swasti* which means safe, welfare, and prosperous (Prawiroatmojo, 1989: 225), or safe, prosperous, safe and happy (Mardiarsito, 1979: 555), whereas the word *swastika* means anything which gives good luck or benefit (Zoetmulder & Robson 2000b: 1171). The triangle territory was inhabited by evil people who expected to live safely with welfare, prosperity and happiness. However, the shift from chaos to cosmos was disturbed by Pandung Aguno who stole the fan and threw it in Purbalingga territory. This caused them to accuse each other resulting in social conflicts leading to a marriage taboo. This had shifted the cosmos to chaos. This triangle conflict involving Sambeng, Kramat and Banjarnyarn did not end there because a similar case arose between Banjarnyarn and Jompo Kulon and Jompo Wetan which was followed by Blater. Banjarnyarn and Blater claimed to have equal social status. They claimed that Prabu Brawijaya or Panembahan Gedhe were their ancestors who belong to noble family, while Jompo Kulon and Jompo Wetan people felt that Kiai Jompo, their ancestor, was from low social strata or layman. Noble people were often called as *trahing kusuma*-having royal blood, *rembesing madu*-having the essence of honey, *wijining atapa*-the fruit of good meditation, *tedhaking andana warih*, or the descendants of teak wood (*tunggak jati*), while wong cilik (ordinary people) were the *pidak pejarakan* (the descendants of jarak tree) (Moedjanto, 1987: 17-24 & 26). Teak wood is of good quality, durable, and look nice, while jarak wood is of low quality, easily got rotten and decayed. It is true that a certain social status sometimes creates arrogance that the members of that society think that other people are of lower quality. They do not realize that people's life quality may improve as a result of hard work.

Buffalo, land, and poverty were the causes of marriage taboo for Banjarnyarn and Jompo people. Buffalo fighting between the two villages was a symbol of conflict between the leader of those two communities. Since the era of Majapahit or before, Buffalo had been used for the name of a person, either taken from the Javanese

word *kbo* or *kebo* meaning buffalo (Prawiroatmojo, 1988: 221) or old Javanese *mahisa* or *maesa* with the same meaning (Mardiarsito, 1979: 336). *Kebo Hijo*, meaning green buffalo, for example, it was mentioned in *Pararaton* (Padmapuspita, 1966). He was the victim of blasphemy by Ken Angrok through the kris named Purbalingga Empu Gandring (Slametmuljana, 1983: 57). Other names, Mahisa Wunga Teleng (Bhatara Parameswara) and Mahisa Campaka (Narasinghamurti) were the descendants of Ken Angrok and Ken Dedes, two important figures in the era of Singhasari (Slametmuljana, 1983: 73). The name of this animal was also used for figures in Sundanese pantun, poetry, such as Munding Laya di Kusumah or Mundinglayadikusumah (Harsoyo, 1985: 302; Rosidi, 1984: 144; Sutaarga, 1984: 16) as a name which indicates a belief in totemism (Tedjowirawan, 2004: 295-296) because the word *munding* in Sundanese means buffalo (Sumantri et al., 1983: 303). The word *munding* was also used for the name of Sundanese King as written in texts on West Java history, such as Mundingkawati who was mentioned as the father of Prabu Anggalarang and the grandfather of Prabu Siliwangi as written in *Babad Pajajaran*, *Babad Galuh*, and *Sejarah Galuh* (Sutaarga, 1984: 26). Besides being used as a symbol of a leader, buffalo was also known as an important food ingredient as mentioned in inscription in the word of *hadannagan* which means buffalo (Haryono, 2002: 180) and *maesa* in *Serat Centhini* (Haryono, 1998: 95), or used as *pasek-pasek* (gift) in the *form* (Haryono, 1999: 17) or offering in sima ceremony in the form of *kandas* or *tandas* (buffalo head) (Haryono, 1999:20). Thus, in Javanese and Sundanese culture, Buffalo is an important animal because it is often used for various names such as the name of gending- Javanese musical composition- (*kebo giro*), the shape of house (*kebo jerum*), the name of turtle (*kebo bukur*), the name of necklace form (*kebo menggala*), or used in an expression of *kebo kobong* (buffalo as a result of theft), *kebo lawung* (buffalo which is not intended to work) and *kebo pelen* (someone who likes quarrel) (Prawiroatmojo, 1988: 221). The last expression indicates a phenomenon of social conflict which happens between Banjarnayar and Jompo people. This conflict further grew to conflict between the leaders, namely Brawijaya (although in Majapahit kingdom no king bore name of buffalo as in Sundanese society) and Kiai Jompo (the founder of weak Jompo society; that Jompo's buffalo was defeated by that of Banjarnayar in a fight). The fight in Jompo River could explain that Jompo's territory was threatened. Therefore, the land dispute also became a complicated one because Banjarnayar tried to annex Jompo's land. The annexation was because Jompo's buffalo was defeated in a fight and the leader of Jompo was weak. This led to the subordination of Jompo. This made it clear that Jompo's people were too weak and poor to overcome both internal and external conflicts (the one involving Jompo Kulon and Jompo Wetan).

Besides social conflict which was ended in marriage taboo, there was a tradition of washing feet or toes conducted by the people of Sambeng Kulon, Banjarnayar, and Jompo Kulon. People of Sambeng Kulon recorded their experience by imposing an obligation to wash their feet before coming to or leaving Banjarnayar. This meant that people from Sambeng Kulon did not want to wash the feet of Banjarnayar people although they were noble people. According to Banjarnayar people, if Banjarnayar people were invited to attend a party, the host should provide things needed to wash their toes in the evening, because it was in the evening, they would attend it. Otherwise, Nalagareng, who was regarded as the loyal henchman of Prabu Brawijaya, would disturb the party by spilling or eating up the food being served. Meanwhile, people from Jompo Kulon and Sambeng Kulon viewed it differently. The feet of leader of the guests from Jompo Kulon who wanted to attend the party in the neighboring village had to be washed by the host three times. This seemed to be done so that Jompo Kulon equaled Banjarnayar. In the Javanese tradition, feet is part of the body which has the same status as that of the head. That is why Banyumas people have an expression like *sikil nggo endhas, endhas nggo sikil* – feet for head, head for feet (Koderi, 1991: 154). This expression means that if someone wants to have a better life, he has to work hard. In this case, the head which has a respectable status is put where feet are located, which is not sacred. However, the result of this equation of position, both head and feet become the symbols of respect which has a relation with power. This was the reason why the King of Tarumanegara, Purnawarman, made an inscription with his footprint which historian called Inscription of Sang Hyang Tapak (Slametmuljana 1980: 21-23). One of the inscriptions, Inscription of Ciaruteun contained a script which said that the footprint of Purnawarman is the same as that of Wisnu (Sumadio 1984: 9; Yudoyono 1984: 28). This indicates that he regarded himself as the reincarnation of Wisnu. Concerning the triangle of foot washing among the three parties, each of them seemed to be rivalry among them or wanted to be recognized by their neighbors. This rivalry in the form of feet or toe washing was a sign of legitimation for Banjarnayar and Jompo Kulon and resistance from Sambeng Kulon.

The conflict above was basically between Sokaraja (Banyumas) and Purbalingga. In this part, there will be a discussion concerning on the conflict between Sokaraja and Purbalingga which is based on *Babad Purbalingga-Sokaraja* in Sokaraja version and compared to Kalimantan version. According to the Kalimantan version, Purbalingga was founded by two legendary figures, Kiai Purbasena and Kiai Linggasena (Kelana & Murdadyo, 1999: 57). While *Kidung Reksawedha* says that there was a ghost who inhabited Purbalingga, namely Drembamoha (Tjakraningrat, 1979: 111). In Prambanan legend, the ghost was a man-eater. This had caused a perception that Purbalingga men were the descendants of evil giant who always created conflict. This can be seen

from the many marriage taboo in Purbalingga village, including those living in the border between Purbalingga and Banyumas, namely Sokaraja.

The conflict of Raden Kuncung against Raden Kaligenteng during a jemblung wayang show in Watukumpul caused the latter to get stricken by a kris named Setan Kober, a legendary one from the Aria Penangsang, an adipati (regent) from Jipang Panolan. In that combat, Raden Kaligenteng changed into a dragon. In Javanese culture, snake or in Javanese *ula* always has a negative meaning as is used in the expression of *diula* (done trickily), *diula-ula* (to be made difficult) (Prawiroatmojo, 1989: 291). In an inscription, snake was used to curse someone who dares to cancel the status of sima with an expression of *yan apara paran umaliwal ing tgal sahuten dening ula mandi* (I hope when you walk across a field, you will be bitten by a poisonous snake) (Haryono, 1999: 19) The curse in the inscription concerning the status of sima was an effort to frighten everyone so that no one would be dare towards the norm stipulated at the sima ceremony which was symbolized with the breaking of an egg and the cutting of a chicken neck to be dedicated to Sang Hyang Kulumpung so that the status of sima would last forever (*mne hlem teka dlaha ning dlaha*) (Soekmono, 1877: 230; Haryono, 1999: 15). In the Javanese society, snake is feared because of its smartness as is seen in the Chinese culture. Chinese society views snake as the symbol of smartness and intelligence so that those who are born under the *shio* of snake are seen as having high intelligence. Smartness and intelligence of a snake is seen from a negative point of view in the sense of evilness. That is why evil person is often called *ula*, snake.

In mythology, snake is a symbol which exists outside of a man like a stain. The crime done by a snake precede the existence of human being, so if a man commits a crime, he has followed the example of snake. Snake in the Hebrew mythology is regarded as the smartest of all animal living on land created by God (Bertens, 1985: 451). According to Ricouer, the shift from good to evil happens because of the deed of one person, one act, at one moment, namely that of Adam who ate the forbidden fruit so that he fell when committed the sin. The fall of human being was not only as the result of the act of Adam but also Eve and snake. A snake tempted Eve and she tempted Adam. Therefore, the origin of sin is not in man, but in the sinner, namely snake which preceded the sin of man (Bertens, 1985: 450-451; Silitonga-Djojohadikusumo, 1984: 67). Snake, besides being used as a symbol of evil, is also used as a symbol of a chaotic situation, one without shape and form because when a snake move its head strongly, the world will break into pieces (Eliade, 2002: 19-20). Thus, Raden Kaligenteng had to accept his transformation into a snake as a consequence of his bad conduct. The transformation from man into snake or dragon is a chaotic situation. Raden Kaligenteng was in a shapeless situation so he was required to meditate as an act of repent.

The last conflict of Sokaraja and Purbalingga was between Adipati Jebugkusuma and Adipati Kertabangsa. Other oral versions did not mention the conflict. They even told of a peace accord between Sokaraja and Purbalingga. The name of Jebugkusuma means the flower of old *pinang* (areca tree) because the word of *jebug* itself means old *pinang* (Prawiroatmojo, 1988:182) or old *jambe* (fruit of areca tree). In the south-east asian society, including Indonesia, *pinang* fruit and *sirih* (betel) are foods which function for socializing in daily life. *Pinang* and *sirih* can calm the mind and central neural system. Besides, they can postpone thirst and hunger, and revitalize soldiers' strength and bravery (Reid 1992: 49-50). They also had closely related with rites ceremony of death, birth, healing, engagement, and wedding. Because *pinang* and *sirih* can make fragrant and tranquilizing breath, they can be used as natural foreplay for sexual intercourse, intimate service of a woman to a man, symbol of engagement or wedding, sign of invitation to sexual intercourse, or symbol of the intercourse itself (the mixture of warmth of *pinang* fruit and the coolness of betel leaf). Betel leaf is a symbol of masculinity, while *pinang* is a symbol of fertility (Reid, 1992: 51-52). Therefore, Adipati Jebugkusuma was described as symbol of fertility so he got the support of Ki Ageng Ngorean, but he could not overwhelm Raden Kaligenteng who jumped into a river, where he changed into a turtle (*pelus*). The river was then named Pelus River. Pelus River is a symbol of *lingga* (penis) which fought against *yonni* (vagina). However, *lingga* could not overcome *yonni* so that Raden Kaligenteng returned to Purbalingga. The son of Adipati Jebugkusuma, Raden Kuncung, demonstrated his masculinity because *kuncung* (forelock) was a symbol of masculinity. That is why in wayang story, the masculinity character of Semar is often questioned. He is said to be male because he has a *kuncung*, but he can also be said as female because he has a big breast. However, Semar is not a hermaphrodite (Mulyono, 1982: 58-59), due to his forelock, he is a real man. Basically, Raden Kuncung-Jebugkusuma is the symbol of *lingga* and *yonni* from Sokaraja.

Adipati Kertabangsa was a name which suggested a founder of a dynasty because the name came from the word of *kertawangsa* or vansakarta (Sumadio, 1984: 32). The founding of a dynasty was often marked with a monument or *lingga* within a temple. If Kertabangsa was a symbol of *lingga*, and was Raden Kaligenteng. Thus, conflict between Sokaraja and Purbalingga was also the conflict between *lingga* and *lingga*. When conflict arose between Jebugkusuma and Kertabangsa and they were *sampyuh*, both of them were killed. Soon afterward an heirloom which was then called Umbul Waringin appeared. It can be said that the heirloom is a symbol the uniting of *lingga* from Purbalingga and *yonni* from Sokaraja, Raden Kuncung appeared as the representation of *lingga* from Sokaraja, while Kaligenteng, as the other *lingga* from Purbalingga, had to live as a hermit. Umbul Waringin became the heirloom of Sokaraja as the symbol of *lingga* and *yonni*. When Jebugkusuma and Kertabangsa made a

peace, accord followed by a marriage taboo for the people of Sokaraja and Purbalingga, so that the uniting of *lingga* and *yoni* did not happen between the two. This made the two, *lingga* from Purbalingga had to live as a hermit to achieve a perfect life, while Raden Kuncung returned to his status as the *lingga* who had authority of the other two *linggas* from Purbalingga although his spouse (*yoni*) had been known yet because the father who represented the *yoni* had already got his spouse, namely kris called Setan Kober. Therefore, the kris and Adipati Jebugkusuma were the union of *lingga* and *yoni* in Sokaraja leaving Adipati Kertabangsa having no *yoni*. In other words, the *yoni* from Sokaraja (Adipati Jebugkusuma) refused to unite with the *lingga* from Purbalingga (Kertabangsa) which caused the marriage taboo with Kertabangsa and its descendants.

The three heirlooms in the form of spear called Narasoma, Setan Kober, and Umbul Waringin could give an explanation about their relationship with the conflict between Sokaraja and Purbalingga. Setan Kober was the heirloom of Ki Ageng Ngorean which became the heirloom of Sokaraja so in Sokaraja there was a union between *lingga* and *yoni*. In Purbalingga there were two *linggas*, namely Adipati Kertabangsa and Raden Kaligenteng. Adipati Kertabangsa, in the scripture of Kalimantan version, was named Adipati Purboyo Wirokusumo who also represented the *lingga* (wira means male, masculine). Purboyo Wirokusumo got the backing of the heirloom belonging to Ki Ageng Pekandhangan, Baribin Wironoto (the third *lingga*), namely the spear named Narasoma (the fourth *lingga*). This Kalimantan version did not only mention two *linggas* but four. Therefore the conflict between Sokaraja and Purbalingga was the conflict of four against two *linggas* (Raden Kuncung and Setan Kober) fighting for one *yoni* (Jebugkusuma). The two *linggas* were defeated and the *yoni* could be conquered. Adipati Panolih from Sokaraja was stabbed with Narasoma spear by Purboyo Wirokusumo. That is why the Kalimantan version explained the union of *lingga* and *yoni* with the stabbing conducted by Purboyo Wirokusumo. The history of Setan Kober kris and Narasoma spear was not good as suggested by the owner and their names. Setan Kober was the heirloom belonging to Aria Penangsang, a name which has a negative connotation. Narasoma was also a name of knight with bad quality because he married Setyawati without accepting Bagawan Bagaspati as his father in law (Anderson, 2000: 16; Magnis-Suseno, 1988: 161). Therefore, Umbul Waringin had more positive values than Setan Kober and Narasoma had.

The peace accord between Adipati Jebugkusuma and Adipati Kertabangsa became one of the causes of marriage taboo among the descendants of Sokaraja and Purbalingga. The taboo also explained that the union of *lingga* from Purbalingga with *yoni* from Sokaraja was failed because the *yoni* had already found its partner, namely Setan Kober. Meanwhile, Sokarajanese folklore told that there were other causes of the taboo, namely the requirement of tumpeng uceng by Purbalingga party when Sokaraja party proposed a Purbalingga woman. Tumpeng uceng was not known as Javanese dishes. Javanese had nine types of tumpeng (1) tumpeng tutul, (2) tumpeng lugas, (3) tumpeng kendhit, (4) tumpeng pucuk lombok bang, (5) tumpeng megana janganan, (6) tumpeng megana iwak ayam, (7) tumpeng rajeg dom waja, (8) tumpeng tigan ing pucung, and (9) tumpeng sembur (Haryono 1998: 94). This showed that tumpeng uceng did not belong to those types. Normally, tumpeng is made of steamed rice formed into a cone, tutul tumpeng uceng is made of very small river fish. Uceng can also mean the village administrator who is responsible for water distribution, or sub-village head. Uceng is also the name of melinjo flower (Prawiroatmojo, 1989: 288).

Tumpeng would be difficult to make because uceng was a rare type of fish. Uceng seemed to be the symbol of *lingga*. The requirement for this tumpeng uceng was seen as a humiliation by Sokaraja party. They thought that Sokarajanese *lingga* was limited in number so that Sokaraja party interpreted tumpeng uceng as normal tumpeng decorated with uceng not tumpeng of which the ingredient were all uceng. This interpretation was of course not what the Purbalingga party wanted because the tumpeng (symbol of erection) only had a little uceng. The failure to meet the requirement by Sokaraja party made it unqualified to marry Purbalingganese woman, so that the Sokaraja party declared a marriage taboo against Purbalingga. The requirement was only a soft refusal because they knew Sokaraja's *lingga* did not exist. In other words, Sokarajanese uceng could not form tumpeng. However, this misinterpretation became a new tradition in Sokaraja. They began to use normal tumpeng with uceng in it as a requirement for proposing a woman. The Sokaraja party wanted to show that one piece of uceng was enough. One uceng (one *lingga*) was enough as long as it could erect.

3. CONCLUSION

The meaning of marriage taboo in Purbalingga and Banyumas villages can be explained within the framework of mythology theory and binary opposition. The theory of mythology which contains marriage taboo is a transition from cosmos to chaos. The chaotic situation seems to dominate and deconstruct the cosmos, the period after when a new cosmos has not been born. This is a threshold period, not leading to cosmos nor stopping. Or it can be said as an extended-endless chaotic situation. The main type binary opposition is that with a relative characteristic which creates the third party who positions himself in the threshold period. This can be illustrated in the form of a triangle which shows the interaction of three elements, two in binary opposition and one in threshold position.

REFERENCES

- Ahimsa-Putra, Heddy Shri. 2001. *Strukturalisme Levi Strauss: Mitos dan Karya Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press.
- Anderson, Benedict R.O'G. 2000. *Mitologi dan Toleransi Orang Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Qalam.
- Bakker, J.W.M. 1979. "Epistemologi Indonesia," dalam AMW Pranarka & Anton Bakker. *Epistemologi Kebudayaan dan Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Kelompok Studi Filsafat.
- Bertens, K. 1985. *Filsafat Barat Abad XX: Jilid II Perancis*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Bertens, K. 1987. *Panorama Filsafat Modern*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Bertens, K. 1991. *Sigmund Freud: Memperkenalkan Psikoanalisa*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Cassirer, Ernst. 1987. *Manusia dan Kebudayaan: Sebuah Esei tentang Manusia*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Ekadjati, Edi S. 1995. *Kebudayaan Sunda (Suatu Pendekatan Sejarah)*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Eliade, Mircea. 2002. *Mitos Gerak Kembali Yang Abadi: Kosmos dan Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Ikon Teralitera.
- Freud, Sigmund. 2002. *Totem dan Tabu*. Yogyakarta: Jendela.
- Harsoyo. 1985. "Kebudayaan Sunda," dalam Koentjaraningrat. *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Djambatan.
- Haryono, Timbul. 1998. "Serat Centhini sebagai Sumber Informasi Jenis Makanan Tradisional Masa Lampau," dalam *Humaniora*, No. 8, edisi Juni-Agustus. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Haryono, Timbul. 1999. "Sang Hyang Watu Teas dan Sang Hyang Kulumpang: Perlengkapan Ritual Upacara Penetapan Sima pada Masa Kerajaan Mataram Kuna," dalam *Humaniora*, No. 12, edisi September-Desember. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Haryono, Timbul. 2002. "Menguak Macam-macam Makanan pada Masa Mataram Hindu: Kajian dari Sumber-sumber Tertulis," dalam *Jurnal Kebudayaan Kabanaran*, Volume 2, edisi Agustus. Yogyakarta: Retno Aji Mataram Press.
- Huizinga, Johan. 1990. *Homo Ludens: Fungsi dan Hakekat Permainan dalam Budaya*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Kartodirdjo, Sartono. 1984. *Ratu Adil*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.
- Kartodirdjo, Sartono. 1986. *Ungkapan-ungkapan Filsafat Sejarah Barat dan Timur: Penjelasan Berdasarkan Kesadaran Sejarah*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Kartodirdjo, Sartono. 1993. *Pembangunan Bangsa tentang Nasionalisme, Kesadaran dan Kebudayaan Nasional*. Yogyakarta: Aditya Media.
- Kartodirdjo, Sartono. 1999. *Multidimensi Pembangunan Bangsa: Etos Nasionalisme dan Negara Kesatuan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Kelana, Yatim & Murdadyo. 1999. *Purbalingga: Antara Potensi dan Harapan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pradhata.
- Koderi, M. 1991. *Banyumas: Wisata dan Budaya*. Purwokerto: Metro Jaya.
- Koentjaraningrat. 1982. *Sejarah Teori Antropologi I*. Jakarta: UI-Press.
- Kuntowijoyo. 1987. *Budaya dan Masyarakat*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
- Magnis-Suseno, Franz. 1988. *Etika Jawa: Sebuah Analisa Falsafi tentang Kebijaksanaan Hidup Jawa*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Mardiarsito. L. 1979. *Kamus Jawa Kuna-Indonesia*. Ende-Flores: Nusa Indah.
- Moedjanto, G. 1987. *Konsep Kekuasaan Jawa, Penerapannya oleh Raja-raja Mataram*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Mulyono, Sri. 1982. *Apa & Siapa Semar*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.
- Needham, Rodney. 1979. *Symbolic Classification*. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.
- Padmapuspita, J. 1966. *Pararaton Teks Bahasa Kawi, Terjemahan Bahasa Indonesia*. Jogjakarta: Taman Siswa.
- Prawiroatmojo, S. 1988. *Bausastra Jawa-Indonesia, Jilid I*. Jakarta: Haji Masagung.

- Prawiroatmojo, S. 1989. *Bausastra Jawa-Indonesia, Jilid II*. Jakarta: Haji Masagung.
- Reid, Anthony. 1992. *Asia Tenggara dalam Kurun Niaga 1450-1680: Jilid 1: Tanah Di Bawah Angin*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Rosidi, Ajip. 1984. "Ciri-ciri Manusia dan Kebudayaan Sunda," dalam Edi S. Ekadjati (editor). *Masyarakat Sunda dan Kebudayaannya*. Jakarta: Girimukti Pasaka.
- Sasono & Tri Atmo. 1993. *Mengenal Purbalingga (Banyumas): Daerah Tempat Lahir Jenderal Sudirman*. Jakarta: Paguyuban Arsakusuma.
- Silitonga-Djojohadikusumo, Kartini. 1984. *Mitologi Yunani*. Jakarta: Djambatan.
- Slametmuljana. 1980. *Dari Holotan ke Jayakarta*. Jakarta: Yayasan Idayu.
- Slametmuljana. 1983. *Pemugaran Persada Sejarah Leluhur Majapahit*. Jakarta: Inti Idayu Press.
- Soekmono. 1977. *Candi Fungsi dan Pengertiannya*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.
- Soekmono. 1984. *Sejarah Kebudayaan Indonesia 2*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Sumadio, Bambang. 1984. *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia II*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan-Balai Pustaka.
- Sumantri dkk., Maman. 1985. *Kamus Sunda-Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Sunardi. 1997. *Ramayana*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Susanto, Hary PS. 1987. *Mitos menurut Pemikiran Mircea Eliade*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Sutaarga, Moh. Amir. 1984. *Prabu Siliwangi*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Tedjowirawan, Anung. 2004. "Persejajaran Unsur-unsur Autochton dalam Cerita Panji Angreni dengan Cerita Pantun Mundinglaya Dikusumah," dalam *Humaniora*, Volume 16, No.3, edisi Oktober. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Tjakraningrat. 1979. *Kitab Primbon Atassadhur Adammakna*. Yogyakarta: Soemodidjojo Mahadewa.
- Tjakraningrat. 1980. *Kitab Primbon Betaljemur Adammakna*. Yogyakarta: Soemodidjojo Mahadewa.
- Upaddhayaya, Ved Prakash. 1999. *Nabi Muhammad SAW dalam Weda, Purana, Bibel, & Al-Qur'an: Pendekatan Hermeneutik dan Semantik*. Jakarta: Bale Kajian Tafsir Al-Quran Pase.
- Van Ossenbruggen, F.D.E. 1975. *Asal-usul Konsep Jawa tentang Mancapat dalam Hubungannya dengan Sistem-sistem Klasifikasi Primitif*. Jakarta: Bhratarata.
- Van Peursen, C.A. 1988. *Strategi Kebudayaan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Winangun, Y.W. Wartaya. 1990. *Masyarakat Bebas Struktur: Liminalitas dan Komunitas Menurut Victor Turner*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Winter Sr., C.F. & R. Ng. Ranggawarsita. 1988. *Kamus Kawi Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Wiriadmadja, Rochiati. 2002. *Pendidikan Sejarah di Indonesia: Perspektif Lokal, Nasional, dan Global*. Bandung: Historia Utama Press.
- Yudoyono, Bambang. 1984. *Sang Prabu Sri Adji Djojobojo 1135-1157*. Jakarta: Karya Unipress.
- Zaehner, Robert C. 1992. *Kebijaksanaan dari Timur: Beberapa Aspek Pemikiran Hinduisme*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. & S.O. Robson. 2000a. *Kamus Jawa Kuna-Indonesia, Bagian A-O*. Terjemahan Darusuprta & Sumarti Suprayitna. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. & S.O. Robson. 2000b. *Kamus Jawa Kuna-Indonesia, Bagian P-Z*. Terjemahan Darusuprta & Sumarti Suprayitna. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.