

“Kemoq” as A Traditional Method of Sasak People Explaining and Interpreting Literary Texts

Nuriadi

Universitas Mataram, Indonesia

nuriadi@unram.ac.id

Abstract

This article examines how the application of 'kemoq' as a method of explanation and interpretation in literary discourses/texts in the Sasak ethnic group and looks at its position in relation to the concepts of literary criticism that have developed in modern literature. Sasak are ethnic groups or tribes that inhabit the island of Lombok, NTB. Most of the Sasak people are Muslim, so Islamist culture is quite visible in the literary texts that developed in the area. These texts play a fairly central role in the process of spreading religious teachings in the area and usually the parties who carry out the transformation process are community leaders who are recognized as having broad abilities and understanding of religion and the concept of life in general. These community leaders have been present and played a role before the presence of the teachers who currently play a very central and dominant role. The texts, which were read in the Mewacan (Mocopatan) program, are still written on palm leaves with the inscription Jejawan. To understand it, these figures usually apply the Kemoq method. This method is closely related to the play of words and sounds as long as it has a meaning that is more or less supportive of the initial concept of the interpreter, so that the meaning is very subjective, relative, and situational. However, with the application of this method the text message will develop and be easily understood by the audience.

Keywords

kemoq; traditional method; interpretation; subjective; relative; literary text



I. Introduction

It should be noted beforehand that the Sasak people are ethnic or native to the island of Lombok, a small island located east of the island of Bali and is part of the province of West Nusa Tenggara. It is called 'Sasak' because the language it uses is Sasak language which according to experts is part of the Austronesian language family and consists of a number of dialects, namely the kuto-kute dialect (north of Lombok), ngeno-ngene (middle east, west central Lombok), meriak-meriku (south, central Lombok), ngeto-ngete (northeast Lombok), meno-mene (central Lombok) (Mahsun, 2007). However, in my view, judging from the glossary or the vocabulary used, the Sasak language is actually a continuation of the Javanese and Balinese languages. Meanwhile, in terms of the appearance of the figures of the Sasak people, they are part of the Malay nation so that generally they are not much different from the figures of the people of Sumatra, Java, Bali, or others in western Indonesia. Related to the general phenomenon of the Sasak people, the traditions and culture that they develop actually have a number of similarities with similar things that develop in other tribes or ethnicities.

If this is the case, the 'kemoq' tradition developed or developed by the Sasak people is more or less the same. That is, this paper agrees with the opinion stated above regarding the Othak Athik Gathuk tradition. This tradition, according to the old people who until now

often use it, says that 'kemoq' or 'memoq' has appeared for a very long time, and has been passed down from generation to generation as a habit in oral discourse in the Sasak community. He is alleged to have existed since the beginning of the existence of the Sasak people. There was even a moment when the Sasak language itself was the language of communication for the Sasak people. This opinion is considered quite acceptable because Kemoq originally appeared in the communication act of the Sasak people and until now it has become a tradition that is generally used by Sasak elders. In other words, People who mememoq generally are those who have high influence and intellectual power. Thus, his thoughts will be easily accepted and become new knowledge for the people around him, especially those thoughts are sourced from Takepan (lontar stories).

In this regard, this paper will try to dissect 'kemoq' as a way or method of the Sasak people in discourse and then will relate whether or not kemoq is a method of literary criticism. In this regard, this paper will review the relationship between the chemoq model and the principles of literary criticism theory that have developed so far, especially those from the West. However, this paper does not dare to say that the model and concept of 'kemoq' is a proper method of interpreting discourse or literary criticism considering that this requires a more in-depth study. This paper simply tries to look at the position of 'kemoq' in the map of the theory of literary criticism that has developed, so that it deserves to be an alternative model.

II. Review of Literature

Tradition is something that is passed down from the heritage of the ancestors to the next generation in a relay descends performed by the indigenous communities that have become deeply entrenched the culture in life. (Purba, N. 2020)

One of the traditions or cultures that have similarities with similar things in Javanese society is Kemoq. Although this tradition looks quite distinctive and unique in Lombok, this 'kemoq' tradition turns out to have similarities with the Othak Athik Gathuk tradition in Java. The resemblance lies in the way he says it, which is both playing with words that have the same sound, with efforts to link the meaning of one word to another. According to one source, Othak Athik Gathuk is a model of Javanese Semiotic interpretation. With a bit of primordialism or ethnocentrism, this source says that long before Roland Barthes, Ferdinand de Saussure, or Umberto Eco theorized about Semiotics, Javanese society had already implemented such a language expression pattern known as 'Othak Athik Gathuk'.(Mahsun, 2012).

III. Results and Discussion

3.1 The Form of 'Kemoq' as a Model of Explanation and Interpretation

The term 'kemoq' comes from the Sasak language, especially from the variant or dialect of the Sasak language meriak-meriku in the south-central part of the island of Lombok. 'Kemoq' can be interpreted lexically as 'a person who likes to store raw food ingredients complete with spices in a tightly closed container so that within a certain time the food ingredients are cooked and mixed with the spices'. In addition, the word 'kemoq' actually morphologically consists of two parts, namely 'ke-' which is equivalent in Indonesian as a form of affix 'di-' or 'ter-', while 'moq' usually means and acts as a conjunction in English. Sasak which means 'then, then, then, hence from that' in Indonesian. Thus 'kemoq' can then be interpreted as '(something) which is connected or connected with (something) another so that it becomes (something). In the Sasak language,

this word or term is close to the word 'komoq' which means harmonious or united. In this context, the concept of 'komoq' certainly implies the presence of several elements, parts, or materials that are united or combined so that they become a unified whole and give rise to new forms, forms, values and tastes. Once combined, it is stored in a certain place. In this regard, the 'kemoq' model is no more like that in its practical model, namely, someone tries to combine one part with another part with a certain purpose or purpose, so that his thoughts look clearer and easier to understand.

There is no definite explanation of who, when, and where this term was introduced to the wider community. However, firstly, since this term is known more generally in the Sasak people who have the dialect of 'meriak-meriku', it can be ascertained that it was brought up by users of the Sasak language 'meriak-meriku', because in other places, based on my brief survey, the term This is also known as 'ngerice'. Second, the party or person who introduced the term for the first time is an influential person, a person who is heard, and a person who is elder or characterized. The reason is sociological because the Sasak people are generally paternalistic in character, who are quite reverent towards what are the thoughts, attitudes, and words of the person portrayed. The reverent people then become agents who slowly and surely use the thoughts and words of the person they characterize each time to express their thoughts at other times with different audiences. As a result, the term 'kemoq' became well-known and could become a common term in every Sasak community in South Central Lombok in particular. This process can be ascertained to have been going on for a long time so that it eventually became a tradition/habit in both formal and informal discourse or dialogue activities.

Informal discourse is usually done when parents have a slightly serious discussion in certain places such as in the *berugak* or *lesehan* in the living room which takes place spontaneously with an unspecified topic. Meanwhile, formal discourse is generally carried out by parents or Sasak intellectual groups which are carried out in a planned manner such as "*mewacan Takepan Lontar*" or "*Nyاهر*" activities in the context of "*Sangkep*" or celebration events at certain moments. They are considered the smartest or most knowledgeable, both general knowledge and Sasak tradition and religious knowledge, who are asked to act as discourse or interpreters or interpreters of meaning for a series of text readings in *takepan lontar*. This habit was then continued when the Sasak people spoke informally in certain places. This has been the case until now, so that this paper was finally written.

In my view, as an observer of this activity, this 'kemoq' actually appears in the series of interpretations or explanations, not the whole series of interpretations. Nevertheless, it is interesting because it appears frequently and prominently in a series of interpretations. Thus, in my view, this 'kemoq' can be regarded as one of the methods or strategies used by the Sasak people in explaining and interpreting the *lontar* text in the context of existing facts or phenomena (for formal discourse activities). , as a strategy to explain various facts and phenomena that occur (for informal discourse activities).

As for the form of explanation that shows how to do this *kemoq*, Pak Aswandikari Surengane can show it in the following quote when he explains one of the concepts about 'komoq' in *Takepan Markum*:

"Mok komoq eto SIMpenan, savings account SIMpenan eto dalem gati taokn, don't know how to answer the question of wine and SIM card...because we already have a SIM, where's the SIM? But if you get a SIM, this is a certificate, ato pipil, belliyet, pipil dumadiye sekabeh, arak kun brought together... as a letter, come back kun Allah ta'ale. However, this is not the end of this letter. Moq nani needs nanon kun dikt eto letter is sirr

kun dikt. Man arofa nafsah... when we know that sirr self, then that is a requirement to know Allah"(Endraswara, 2003)

The quote above is an example of someone's disclosure using the "kemoq" method in the process of explaining or interpreting something. Based on the quote, there are several things to note about 'kemoq' when it is practiced.

First, this 'chemoq' model appears in a long series of explanations or statements. Pay attention to the words in italics (italics) in the quote above, namely: komoq--SIMpenan—surat—condition. The words that are considered part of the effort to mememoq appear in one big discourse as part of the discourse. However, its presence cannot be separated from other discourses, because when viewed in detail, 'kemoq' is the 'body' of the discourse. That is, the discourse exists because of the words that become the material for 'kemoq'.

Second, in connection with this, he appeared spontaneously, without premeditated. Its appearance like this is adjusted to two things, namely (a) the sound that is close between one word and another, and (b) its meaning is related or similar between one word and another. In this case, the first word becomes the reference for the next word. The first word stimulates the presence of the next word. The proof, in terms of the similarity of meaning, the word 'komoq' stimulates the presence of the word 'simpenan', because according to the interpreter (Aswandikari), 'komoq' has the same meaning as 'simpenan' or things that are stored after being put together; whereas, in terms of sound similarity, the word 'simpenan' encourages the emergence of the word SIM (driving license). This SIM is stimulated by the SIMpenan syllable in the first word. Then, SIMpenan and SIM both mean that both are kept as valuables by the owner. Another example, the word 'letter' (a paper containing writing for a specific purpose such as a driver's license) simulates the presence of the word 'laden' (condition or basis or cause), in this case the two words have similar sounds even though they have different meanings. Then from the word 'laden' it gave birth to the idea of the word 'sirr' (which is lonely, quiet, and secret).

Third, when viewed from the point of view of the arrangement of words that are used as 'kemoq', then the interpreter seems to have a very conspicuous personal freedom in the process of explanation or interpretation. This personal freedom seems dominant in generating other ideas. In other words, the subjectivity of the interpreter looks very dominant. In fact, the subjectivity of this interpreter becomes a "guideline" in the interpretation process, so it is suggested that the existing literary facts try to follow whatever the interpreter thinks. Subjectivity, of course, in this case, is at the level of things that can be accepted by logic and other people's thoughts. How could it not be, as the proof, the word 'simpanan' suddenly gave rise to another idea, namely 'SIM'. Only because of the 'sim-' syllable in the word 'simpenan', then the interpreter spontaneously remembers the word 'SIM' and coincidentally, in the interpreter's mind, the two words have a similar meaning or function. However, the presence of this 'personal freedom' is precisely that the interpretation or explanation seems irregular and has a coherence and/or cohesive side because all the words that are the material for chemoq can appear in one part of the discourse.

Fourth, in connection with the above thought, the linear and systematic model of thinking as required in the modern discourse style of expression or writing is less applicable. On the other hand, in the 'kemoq' tradition, the model of thought offered is circular and jumps from one idea to another which ends up returning to the main idea. For example, Amaq Sukendar once tried to explain the concept of God and where God is in his personal understanding. She says:

"But Grandmother Eto, at first I didn't know myself until I was knocked out, neq. Neq eto dirikt, pendoekt, keep asking sak mento finger neneq, isint sak excited to call neq neq neq so that finger neneq. Yes finger remembrance. Neneq eto ya dirikt kun dalem dirik, crew. Neneq eto kun dalem batinth"(Endraswara, 2003).

In this quote, Amaq Sukendar explains that God is Neneq, in the Sasak language. Why is it said so? Because God is identical to be part of everyone's property, which then resides in every Sasak person or heart. Thus, in the view of Sasak spiritualism, to be able to know God, a person must first know himself where God resides. This view is in line with the statement: "man arofa nafsahu faqod arofa robbahu".

Fifth, looking at the general phenomenon when the 'kemoq' model appears, there are two interesting things to note, namely: first, the people who generally become the perpetrators of the tradition of this method are people who are considered 'knowledgeable' by the community. What is meant by 'knowledgeable' here is a person who has a fairly broad knowledge of religion, in this case Islam. Thus, this person acts as a 'figure' in his community or community. As proof, Aswandikari Surenggane is a person who is considered 'knowledgeable' in his community because he is the representative of his master teacher (Badal) in making the pledge of the Naksabandi tariqot followers in his area. Amaq Sukendar is also considered 'knowledgeable' and characterized by the community because he not only acts as the head of the hamlet (kadus) in his community, but also often becomes a traditional leader and even a shaman. Second, when this kemoq is presented as a method of explanation or interpretation in discourse, then generally the situation is a serious situation and the topics discussed are usually about Islamic religious knowledge, especially religion in the perspective of Sufism. As proof, when Aswandikari explains about 'komoq' (see the first quote), he mentions Simpenan and then associates it with SIM to know his true self. Meanwhile, Amaq Sukendar also explained that "neneq" (God) (see second quote) is personal property (neq) because "neneq" is within every human being, especially religion in the perspective of Sufism. As proof, when Aswandikari explains about 'komoq' (see the first quote), he mentions Simpenan and then associates it with SIM to know his true self. Meanwhile, Amaq Sukendar also explained that "neneq" (God) (see second quote) is personal property (neq) because "neneq" is within every human being, especially religion in the perspective of Sufism. As proof, when Aswandikari explains about 'komoq' (see the first quote), he mentions Simpenan and then associates it with SIM to know his true self. Meanwhile, Amaq Sukendar also explained that "neneq" (God) (see second quote) is personal property (neq) because "neneq" is within every human being.

3.2 The Position of the 'Kemoq' Method in the Theory of Literary Criticism

In general, there are three divisions of focus and emphasis in literary criticism theory, namely, first, literary criticism which focuses on the alignment and involvement of the author's thoughts and life background; second, literary criticism which focuses on ergocentrism, namely literary works as an autonomous world, which is free from the influence of extrinsic elements, and, third, literary criticism which focuses on the dominance and power of the reader or interpreter in interpreting or understanding the content and intent of a work. literature.)Abrams (1976) said the first with the term "expressive" approach, the second with the term "objective", and the third is closer to the term "pragmatics" even though it is not fully meaningful and conceptualized as such, because the involvement of the reader's dominance is not only in the context of use (pragmatics). literary works, but more broadly than that.

In connection with the existence of “kemoq” as a model of thought and/or method of explanation and interpretation of the Sasak ethnic group, if it follows the concept mentioned above, then this 'kemoq' model refers to the third division domain, namely the involvement and domination of the reader as the main actor. in interpreting and/or concretizing the contents of literary works. Thus, in the theory of literary criticism, 'kemoq' is another manifestation of the concept of “Reader's Response” which has been developed by Western theorists. Why is that? The reason is that, as described in the previous section, the character 'kemoq', 'kemoq' is present because of the reader or interpreter. In other words, The interpretation and explanation of the content of a literary work depends entirely on the depth of the reader's understanding of the content of the work he reads as well as the breadth of horizons and knowledge he has. The wider the reading and understanding of the reader or interpreter, the more meaningful the literary work studied or read will be, even though the meaning expressed is actually the personal opinion or subjectivity of the interpreter.

Thinking models such as making the "kemoq" method are in line with the concept ofLuxembourg et al. (1989), which says that “our interpretation of a work and our experience of its value are mutually dependent, and each depends upon what might be called the psychological 'set' our encounter with it”. From this view, "kemoq" implies that the interpretation of literary texts is highly dependent on the experience of the reader or interpreter. Endraswara (2003) also reinforces this concept by saying that the more mature the researcher or the interpreter, the more reliable his psychological maturity in interpreting will be. The experience and breadth of the interpreter's horizons are the main strengths of his interpretation.

Indeed, there are many theories, concepts, or approaches that fall into the third realm, namely those that put forward the power and dominance of the reader in understanding literary works. If mentioned, such as reception aesthetic theory, phenomenology, semiotics, dynamic structuralism, genetic structuralism, hermeneutics, intertextual, and so on. However, in the author's view, 'kemoq' tends to be closer to the theory of literary criticism of phenomenology and hermeneutics, even though the twin brother of 'kemoq' in Javanese society named Othak Athik Gathuk is grouped by several experts close to the concept of semiotics, as mentioned in the Introduction section of this paper. The reason is that the two theories above are sufficient to provide 'free space' for the involvement of the reader's subjectivity, so it is suggested that, with the use of this theory, What is dominant is the result of the reader's thoughts and interpretations rather than the appearance of literary facts of a work. These literary facts are more or less only a "stimulant" in generating the interpreter's ideas. 'Kemoq' also more or less requires this, so that the result of its interpretation is not bound by the meaning of the text alone, but can jump to the meaning of the context according to the view of the interpreter.

In the view of literary phenomenology, Wolf says that literature starts from the concept of Lebenswelt's philosophy (Faruk, 1994). This philosophy refers to two things, namely: first, the meaning of the individual world is a pre-existing social meaning, obtained through social interaction and socialization of the individual concerned. Second, individuals are not alone in life but share with others so that they are present in the social world. With this view, the individual understanding of the interpreter as a reader of literary works has become a 'logic' and social awareness. As a result, no matter how sophisticated the interpretation and concretization of the interpreter, it can still be understood by others, because his true understanding is still within the scope of the collective consciousness of the community where the interpreter is located.

In this regard, no matter how sophisticated the process and result of interpretation in the context of 'kemoq', this process and interpretation remains within the logic of the Sasak people, because whatever is a series of interpretations in the form of 'kemoq' is already seen as words and interpretations. common objects known by the Sasak people. This interpretation is still in the corridor of "collective consciousness" of the Sasak people. It is impossible for the interpreter to interpret (kemoq) by using foreign words and objects, which the Sasak people have never heard of or seen. If this happened, for example, it would be impossible for the results of 'kemoq' to be accepted and applied as a general reference for the wider community. Thus, the results of the interpretation (kemoq) are in the contextuality of the life of the Sasak people. On this side, 'kemoq' is close to the concept of phenomenology in the sense that literature acts as a symptom that has an objective reality. Reality can give you an idea about it(Endraswara, 2003).

Related to the hermeneutic view, Receour said that hermeneutics seeks to understand the literary meaning behind the structure(Endraswara, 2003). Understanding meaning, not only on symbols, but also views literary works as texts. In this text there is a polysemic context. For this reason, readers of interpreters or reviewers should examine the text and its context simultaneously in order to achieve a complete and holistic understanding. In this process, the involvement of subjectivity appears to be quite dominant. This subjectivity refers to the personal freedom of the interpreter in interpreting any existing text. Besides that,Endraswara (2003)added that hermeneutics is a paradigm that seeks to interpret texts on the basis of linguistic logic. Linguistic logic will make an explanation of literary texts and understanding the meaning by using 'meaning of words' and then 'meaning of language'. The meaning of the word is more related to the semantic concept of literary texts and the meaning of language is more cultural. In this way, the understanding of literary hermeneutics is not a research paradigm that seeks to explain literary phenomena, but an attempt to understand phenomena.

In connection with the hermeneutic view above, 'kemoq' always stands for literary texts, but these literary texts are not only interpreted in the realm of the text and its context, but are always associated with the contextual realm by bringing up words that are similar to the word that is used. written in literary texts. For example, the word "seneq" in a literary text is then associated by the interpreter with the word "seniq" (here, while pointing to the human self or mind) and is associated with another word, namely "senine". That is, to have complete ownership of something (seneq), then it should be associated with the involvement of love in the soul or mind (seniq) like the love of a husband for his wife (senine). The appearance of words outside of the word 'seneq' but related phonetically to the word such as 'seniq' and 'senine' is a manifestation of the process of contextualizing the meaning of things that exist in literary texts. Thus, 'kemoq' seeks to closely link the text and context, but the shrewdness of this linking or linking effort depends entirely on the world of the interpreter's subjectivity. This subjectivity is the fulcrum in the process. When this goes on, then kemoq intersects with the concept of hermeneutic theory. Even in this process, the link between the text and the context remains in accordance with the cultural logic of the interpreter and has become the collective consciousness of the community. He will not interpret it casually,

With chemoq in a phenomenological and hermeneutical pattern, both of which emphasize the power of the reader, the truth of the process and outcome of 'chemoq', whether we like it or not, tends to be more relative and situational. It is said to be relative, because the truth that is offered may not necessarily be accepted by others acclamatively, and its meaning may change if it is done by someone else and occurs at a different moment. However, this relativity and situationality does not matter, because the interpreter

tries to show his argument when interpreting. This actually makes the understanding of that one text richer. Isn't one of the characteristics of a literary work multi-interpretation? The Sasak people, with the 'kemoq' model, have positioned literature on this characteristic.

V. Conclusion

'Kemoq' is one of the traditions of reasoning, interpretation, and explanation that is owned by the Sasak people to this day, especially that carried out by the Sasak people with the shouting-meriku dialect in South Central Lombok. This kemoq can be done when discussing informally or freely discussing and when discussing formally by interpreting old literary works in lontar. When the process takes place, it usually takes place in a more serious manner, so the person who acts as the teacher is usually someone who is knowledgeable, has strong logic, and is well-known in the community. The results of the interpretation with the kemoq model are then enjoyed as a message or content rather than what he reads, which are generally related to the science of truth or religious knowledge. However, during this process, the power of the interpreter's subjectivity is quite demanded and very dominant. However, he will never escape the general concepts and meanings of the text. The aesthetic value of this 'kemoq' tradition is the skill of the interpreter in playing words with one another that have the same or similar sound and meaning association. In this position, 'kemoq' is nothing more like the tradition of Othak Athik Gathuk in Java which is close to the concept of Reader's Response, especially hermeneutics and phenomenology. Thus, this matter should be studied further so that it can become a separate literary theory. The aesthetic value of this 'kemoq' tradition is the skill of the interpreter in playing words with one another that have the same or similar sound and meaning association. In this position, 'kemoq' is nothing more like the tradition of Othak Athik Gathuk in Java which is close to the concept of Reader's Response, especially hermeneutics and phenomenology. Thus, this matter should be studied further so that it can become a separate literary theory. The aesthetic value of this 'kemoq' tradition is the skill of the interpreter in playing words with one another that have the same or similar sound and meaning association. In this position, 'kemoq' is nothing more like the tradition of Othak Athik Gathuk in Java which is close to the concept of Reader's Response, especially hermeneutics and phenomenology. Thus, this matter should be studied further so that it can become a separate literary theory.

References

- Abrams, M.H. 1976. *The Mirror and the Lamp*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Afriadi, Z., Arifuddin, A., & Nuriadi, N. (2021, May). The Implementation of Authentic Assessment in Speaking Skills at MTS As-Suyuthy Ireng. In *2nd Annual Conference on Education and Social Science (ACCESS 2020)* (pp. 241-244). Atlantis Press.
- Endraswara, S. 2003. *Metodologi Penelitian Sastra: Epistemologi, Model, Teori, dan Aplikasi*. Cetakan Ketiga. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Widyatama.
- Faruk, H.T. 1994. *Pengantar Sosiologi Sastra; dari Strukturalisme Genetik Sampai Pos-Modernisme*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Jannah, R., Putri, B. G. Y., Samsudin, S., Rahman, Y. A., & Nuriadi, N. (2021). Promosi Dan Pemasaran Dalam Pengembangan Taman Wisata Edukasi Jabal Rahmah Desa Jango Kecamatan Janapria. *Jurnal Pengabdian Magister Pendidikan IPA*, 4(1).
- Luxemburg, JV, dkk. 1989. *Pengantar Ilmu Sastra*. Alih bahasa oleh Dick Hartoko. Jakarta: Gramedia.

- Mahsun, M.S. 2007. *Dialektologi*. Yogyakarta: Gama Media.
- Mahsun, MS. 2012. "Othak Athik Gathuk: Semiotika ala Jawa". Diakses dari www.wordpress.com.2012/02/23.
- Nuriadi, N., & Melani, B. Z. (2021). The ways of self-reliance development: comparative study of the old man and the sea and Robinson Crusoe. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1533-1547.
- Purba, N. (2020). The Use of Simalungun Language by Anak Boru Sanina in the Simalungun Wedding Ceremony (Sociolinguistic Studies). *Lakhomi Journal: Scientific Journal of Culture*. 1-7
- Zain, M. I., Muhaimi, L., & Nuriadi, N. (2022). The Maintenance of Sasak Alus Language in Noble Families at Kotaraja Village. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(12), 639-646.