# Pancacuriga As A Tool For Analyzing Social Phenomena Texts

Budi Setiawan Gardapandawa[1]
Universitas Pasundan


Selmabelle Garluyisya Simbar Kencana[2]
ISBI Bandung


Correspondence : Budi Setiawan (budisetiawan@unpas.ac.id)

## Abstrack

Semiotics and discourse analysis serve as intellectual tools for exploring meaning beneath the surface, even unearthing the meaning behind the meaning. Meanwhile, Pancacuriga, also a "tool" for interpreting and understanding something, is more widely known and used by certain groups, such as puppeteers in wayang performances. Semiotics, discourse analysis, and Pancacuriga utilize a specific framework or structure for analysis. This paper examines Pancacuriga as a uniquely Indonesian analytical tool for reading texts and social phenomena. The method used is qualitative with a grounded theory design. Pancacuriga has a methodological cycle. The five elements of Sindir, Silib, Siloka, Simbul, and Sasmita form a communication system and simultaneously an epistemology—a uniquely Sundanese way of knowing and understanding. Pancacuriga, in essence, is the application of the scientific spirit to the humanities and social life. Semiotics, discourse analysis, and Pancacuriga are analytical systems that aim to uncover meaning beneath the surface, but differ in their origins, structure, and philosophical foundations.

**Keywords:**    Semiotics, Discourse Analysis, Pancasuspicious, Text Analysis System

## Introduction

The ruling class possesses the resources to control key institutions, such as education and the media. Through these institutions, the ruling class produces and disseminates values, beliefs, and even worldviews. This dominance of information fosters the ruling class's hegemony over the wider public, including educational institutions and media consumers.

Hegemony is not domination through violence or direct coercion, but rather a much more subtle and effective means of maintaining power. Simply put, Antonio Gramsci (Barker & Jane, 2016) defines hegemony as a process by which the ruling class (economically, politically, and culturally) not only rules but also gains consensus (approval) from the ruled class, so that the ruling class's values, ideology, and perspectives are accepted as "natural," "ordinary," and "correct" by the entire society. Hegemony, according to Gramsci (2013), breeds obedience, an attitude of accepting the situation without critically questioning it because the ideology exposed by the hegemonic class is simply swallowed whole.

Hegemony occurs when various forms of information from the media continuously enter public spaces, even into private spaces (Surachman, 2022: 4.30). Gradually, the wider public unconsciously internalizes these values and beliefs and accepts them, using them as guidelines and guidelines for life. People are unaware or unaware that everything they see is merely superficial. The true meaning is obscured, and even deliberately concealed.

To raise awareness of hegemony, figures such as Ferdinand de Saussure, Charles Sanders Peirce, and Roland Barthes introduced a science known as semiotics, which studies how signs work and produce meaning. Semiotics serves as a lens for understanding the world of signs and the reality they construct. Discourse Analysis, on the other hand, assumes that language is not a neutral system, but rather a tool of power that shapes and is reproduced by social structures, thus creating social reality. Semiotics and Discourse are Western sciences used as tools to analyze how culture, advertising, literature, fine art, and film construct meaning through sign systems.

The world, including Indonesia, recognizes and acknowledges semiotics and discourse analysis as intellectual tools for exploring meaning beneath the surface, even unearthing the meaning behind the meaning. Meanwhile, Pancacuriga, which is also a "tool" for interpreting and understanding something, is more widely known and used by certain groups, such as puppeteers in wayang performances. Pancacuriga is widely implemented in the world of wayang, presenting material related to the values of Sundanese life. Therefore, Pancacuriga is often considered only to discuss moral and spiritual matters. However, Pancacuriga is more than that; it is part of Sundanese local wisdom for understanding the implicit meanings in language, symbols, works of art, and culture.

Semiotics, Discourse Analysis, and Pancacuriga utilize a specific framework or structure for analysis. Semiotics has a sign-signifier-signified structure. Discourse analysis has a macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure. Pancacuriga, meanwhile, has five elements: sindir, silib, siloka, simbol, and sasmita. Based on this background, this paper examines Pancacuriga as a typical Indonesian analytical tool in reading texts and social phenomena.

## Methods

The method used is qualitative with a grounded theory design, which is a method that explains the differences that arise in generating concepts or theories based on existing data. Grounded theory, according to Martin and Turner (in Bado, 2021), is an inductive theory discovery methodology that allows researchers to develop theoretical explanations of the general characteristics of a topic while basing those explanations on empirical observations of data. Grounded theory is a theory based on data, an inductive methodology that allows researchers to develop a general theoretical study of a topic while also serving as a basis for the study on empirical data observations. One of its goals is to generate or formulate a theory that explains, at a broad conceptual level, the processes, actions, or interactions related to the topic.

## Results and Discussion

In the view of discourse analysis, text is a social practice. Discourse analysis assumes that language is not a neutral system, but rather a tool of power that shapes and is reproduced by social structures. Thus, discourse creates social reality, not merely represents it. The framework of discourse analysis is divided by van Dijk (2001) into structures or levels, namely: a) Macrostructure observing Thematic (what is said?), and Syntax (how is an opinion conveyed?); b) Superstructure observing Schematic (how is an opinion structured and arranged?), and Stylistic (what word choice is used?); c) Microstructure examines semantics (the meaning intended to be emphasized in the text) and rhetoric (how and in what ways is the emphasis achieved?) (Sobur, 2017: 74).

Meanwhile, semiotics assumes that meaning is produced through codes and conventions within a language/cultural system. Texts have an internal structure that can be analyzed objectively. Texts represent reality through a system of signs. The relationship between signs and reality can be arbitrary or based on convention. One semiotic model is known as Peirce's "triangle of meaning." The triangle of meaning consists of a sign, an object, and an interpretant. One form of a sign is a "word." The object is something the sign refers to. The interpretant is the sign that exists in someone's mind about the object the sign refers to. (Sobur, 2017: 114-115).

Peirce's triangle of meaning model is still dependent on culture, thus requiring denotative (designating meaning) and connotative (additional meaning). Denotation explains the relationship between signifier and signified in reality. produces explicit, direct, and definite meaning. Connotation is a second, hidden system of meaning. This stage describes the interaction that occurs when a sign encounters feelings or emotions. The second stage is connotation, and myths emerge from connotative meaning.

A myth is a form of message or utterance whose truth must be believed but cannot be proven. In myths, an ideology is conveyed. According to Barthes, myth in semiotics is not a concept but a way of giving meaning (Sobur, 2017: 127-128). The use of myth in this context does not refer to myth in the everyday sense, such as traditional stories.

Myth, according to Barthes, is "a communication system that is itself a message." Myth lies within a second-level sign system of signification. Once a sign-signified system is formed, that sign becomes a new signifier, which then acquires a second signified and forms a new sign. The first signification construction is language, while the second signification construction is myth. Barthes understands this second-level signification construction as metalanguage (Sartre, 1994: 70).

The elements of Pancacuriga, namely: sindir, silib, siloka, simbol, and sasmita, which can be explained as follows: a) Sindir, is the conveying of meaning by using words containing sarcasm or satire. The goal is to reprimand, remind, or criticize without being confrontational or rude. Good satire is one that makes the person being satirized aware without feeling embarrassed in public (Rosidi, 2011); b) Silib, namely hiding the true meaning behind words, stories, or parables. This meaning is deliberately not conveyed clearly and can only be understood by people who have sufficient sensitivity or knowledge. Silib teaches to read "between the lines", not just "the written word" (Ekadjati, 1995). c) Siloka, namely conveying meaning by using parables or analogies taken from nature, animals, or everyday life. Siloka makes abstract teachings concrete, easy to understand, and memorable (Rusyana, 1982). d) Symbols, namely the use of objects, figures, or signs that have specific meanings that have been mutually agreed upon in Sundanese culture. Symbols are a way to represent a complex idea or value in a simple and powerful form (Wessing, 1978). e) Sasmita, namely the most subtle and indirect form of communication, which can take the form of gestures, codes, body language, or even premonitions/intuition. Sasmita requires a high level of sensitivity to capture unspoken but perceptible messages. The concept of sasmita is closely related to the concept of feeling in Sundanese philosophy, which is widely discussed in local philosophical studies (Setiawan, 2019).

Pancacuriga has a methodological cycle, as follows: first, Confrontation with the Surface, namely observing the visible text/discourse/signs. Second, Activation of Systematic Peeling, namely by applying the five principles dialectically. Third, Excavation of Layers of Meaning, namely unraveling layers of denotation, connotation, myth, ideology, and power. Fourth, Critical Interpretation, namely constructing an understanding of "what really happened." Fifth, Reflectivity and Evaluation, namely testing the weaknesses of one's own interpretation and opening up space for counter-readings.

The five elements of Sindir, Silib, Siloka, Simbol, and Sasmita form a communication system and simultaneously an epistemology—a uniquely Sundanese way of knowing and understanding. This system emphasizes: first, Depth, namely always seeking meaning beneath the surface. Second, Politeness, namely maintaining the feelings and dignity of the interlocutor. Third, Sensitivity, namely cultivating intuition and feeling as tools for understanding the world. Fourth, Aesthetics, namely conveying messages beautifully and poetically. Therefore, Pancacuriga is not a teaching to be suspicious in the sense of being paranoid about others, but rather a wisdom to be sensitive, intelligent, and prudent in interpreting reality and interacting with others. Pancacuriga is an intellectual heritage that demonstrates the sophistication of Sundanese culture in thinking, communicating, and acting.

Pancacuriga has philosophical aims, including: first, Self-Benefit, which serves as a non-physical self-defense system to avoid loss, deception, and negative influences. Second, Social Relationship Filter, a concept that helps traditional Sundanese people choose friends, future in-laws, or business partners. A person is first assessed based on these five aspects. Third, Harmony Guard, which aims to maintain harmony and social order by avoiding people with negative characteristics. Fourth, Teachings for Introspection, which indirectly encourages each individual to avoid becoming like these five types of people, thus containing teachings for self-improvement.

Pancacuriga, interpreted as Sindir, Silib, Siloka, Simbul, and Sasmita, offers a distinctive Sundanese epistemological framework that emphasizes indirect acquisition, interpretive depth, and sensitivity to context over direct and positivistic truth claims. The five elements of Pancacuriga are not merely rhetorical; they serve as systematic methods for investigating, interpreting, and validating knowledge about reality.

Pancacuriga helps us find the path to truth in a world full of signs. Pancacuriga is a paradigm that questions all surfaces. Pancacuriga is not just a technique, but a fundamental framework. It serves as a lens through which to view all reality, especially reality presented through text, language, and symbols. Semiotics provides depth of understanding, while Pancacuriga provides greater discernment through moral and spirituality.

Pancacuriga, in essence, is the application of the scientific spirit to the humanities and social life. Just as the scientific method advances through skepticism and trial and error, Pancacuriga advances through deconstruction and dissection. Thus, suspicion is not a destination, but a path. A winding, challenging path, but one that culminates in a form of enlightenment—a deeper truth, no longer naive, but aware of its own complexity. It is a truth that makes us not only smarter, but also wiser.

Therefore, Pancacuriga can be said to be an integrative critical paradigm that combines epistemological (theory of knowledge) and methodological (research methods) frameworks to question, interrogate, and dismantle every "surface" of reality—be it text, discourse, symbol, image, or social practice—presented as taken for granted, neutral, or natural.

Pancacuriga is not simply a method, but a way of being epistemically in a world filled with representations. This paradigm places productive doubt as the starting point for knowledge. In the context of the digital and post-truth era, Pancacuriga becomes a vital tool for critical navigation—not to achieve absolute truth, but to avoid passivity to the manipulation of meaning and to continuously open up space for critical dialogue about the reality we share.

In the era of disinformation and simulation, Pancacuriga emerges as a surgical tool for truth that not only dissects reality but also stitches together understanding with the threads of

local wisdom. It is both a scalpel and a medicine—a critique that contains therapy, an analysis that contains healing. Using Pancacuriga is not merely dissecting texts, but rather performing a living autopsy on our own culture—to understand social ills, discover their pathological roots, and prescribe wisdom as a remedy.

Thus, Semiotics, Discourse Analysis, and Pancacuriga are analytical systems that share a similar goal (uncovering meaning beneath the surface) but differ in their origins, structure, and philosophical foundations. Semiotics and Discourse Analysis are described as universal intellectual tools, while Pancacuriga is an integrative local Sundanese critical paradigm (combining intellectual and sometimes spiritual dimensions).

Pancacuriga has both denotative and connotative meanings, but at the first level (denotative) it seems to be "emptied" of its specific history and content and filled with new ideological meanings. Therefore, Pancacuriga is an ideology. Meanwhile, referring to Barthes's semiotics, Pancacuriga is at the second level of meaning, namely "connotation." Connotation is the cultural, ideological, emotional, or associative meaning attached to a sign. Its meaning itself is not universal, but is shaped by history, culture, social class, and context, transforming it into myth.

However, as its function, myth empties reality and fills it with the meaning desired by the dominant culture. Therefore, Pancacuriga, as an ideology, does not seem to be a scientific ancestral teaching. Pancacuriga is like a mere myth, empty of reality but filled with the meaning desired by the dominant culture. This presents a challenge to operationalize Pancacuriga methodologically and to dialogue with it on an equal footing with established traditions of semiotics and discourse analysis.

## Conclusion

Pancacuriga is an analytical method, like semiotics and discourse analysis, that operates with skepticism and trial and error. Pancacuriga advances through deconstruction and dissection. Pancacuriga, which is also an ideology, does not seem to be a scientific ancestral teaching, as it is considered to be at the second level of meaning, namely 'connotation' in Barthes's semiotics. The meaning of Pancacuriga becomes less universal and turns into a myth. It is a challenge to operationalize Pancacuriga methodologically and dialogue with it on an equal footing with the established tradition of discourse analysis.

## References

Bado, Basri. (2021). *Model Pendekatan Kualitatif: Telaah dalam Metode Penelitian Ilmiah*. Tahta Media Grup

Barker, Chris., & Jane, Emma A. (2016). *Cultural Studies (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.

Gardapandawa, B. S., Wastap, J. B., & Saleh, S. (2023). Implementation of Panca Curiga as a Method of Interpretation of Rumpaka Texts in Sundanese Culture. *PANTUN: Jurnal Ilmiah Seni Budaya*, *8*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.26742/pantun.v8i2.2725

Gramsci, Antonio. (2013). *Catatan-Catatan dari Penjara*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Griffin, E. M. (2012). A First Look at Communication Theory: Eight Edition. New York: Mc. Graw Hill.

Putriana, I. (2012). *Peran Gender Perempuan Militer dalam Majalah Korps Wanita Angkatan Darat Melati Pagar Bangsa*. Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia, Vol. 1 No. 1, 23-29.

Rosidi, A. (2011). *Sisindiran: Puisi Rakyat Sunda yang Terlupakan*. Bandung: Kiblat Buku Utama.

Rusyana, Y. (1982). *Sastra Lisan Sunda*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Sartre, Jean-Poul. (1994). *Literatur and Existensialism*. New York: Carol

Setiawan, H. (2019). *Panglawungan: Merenungi Jati Diri dan Filsafat Sunda*. Bandung: Kelir

Siswati, Endah. (2017). *Anatomi Teori Hegemoni Antonio Gramsci*. JURNAL TRANSLITERA, EDISI 5/2017. https://doi.org/10.35457/translitera.v5i1.355

Sobur, Alex. (2017). Analisis teks media: Suatu Pengantar untuk Analisis Wacana, Analisis Semiotik Dan Analisis Framing. Bandung: Remaja Karya.

Surachman, Akhmad Yani. (2022). *Komunikasi Internasional (Edisi 4)*. Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Terbuka

Van Dijk, T. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. UK: SAGE Publications.

Wessing, R. (1978). *Cosmology and Social Behavior in a West Javanese Settlement*. Ohio University Center for International.