Padepokan Seni Jugala and the Institutionalization of Jaipongan in Bandung, 1978–2020

Neng Fauziah[1]*, Suparman Jassin[2]
[12]Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University Bandung
*Correspondence : ziaafauziah621@gmail.com
Received: July 31, 2024; Accepted: November 11, 2024; Published Online: December 15, 2024;

Abstract

This article reconstructs the development of Padepokan Seni Jugala in Bandung from 1978 to 2020 by treating the padepokan as a cultural institution rather than merely the setting in which Jaipongan dances were created. Sources include interviews with Jugala family members, administrators, and students; photographs and digital documentation; books; scholarly articles; and academic works. These are examined through heuristics, external and internal criticism, interpretation, and historiography. The sources examined suggest three tendencies, subject to verification of the interview records. First, in its formative phase, Jugala integrated repertoire creation, dance training, karawitan, vocal practice, and performance under Gugum Gumbira and Euis Komariah. Second, the expansion of repertoire, student networks, recordings, and performances transformed Jugala from a creative group into a center for learning Jaipongan. Third, since the early twenty-first century, the institution's orientation has shifted from highly intensive production toward repertoire preservation, regeneration, digital documentation, and preparation for succession. Gugum Gumbira's death on 4 January 2020 ended one period of leadership, but did not end the institution's activities. The article's proposed contribution lies in shifting the unit of analysis from the maestro's biography or the aesthetics of a single repertoire to the historical process of institutionalizing Jaipongan through creation, transmission, circulation, and regeneration at Jugala.

Keywords: Padepokan Seni Jugala; Jaipongan; Gugum Gumbira; cultural institution; performing arts history

Copyright © 2024. Fauziah, N., & S. Jassin.This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provide d the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Performing arts produce not only aesthetic forms but also memory, identity, and mechanisms for transmitting culture. In Sundanese society, the relationship among dance, karawitan, artists, audiences, and performance spaces forms an ecosystem that enables a genre both to endure and to change. Edi Sedyawati situates the growth of performing arts in the relationship between creativity and the social environment, while Jakob Sumardjo stresses that aesthetics cannot be separated from the cultural outlook of its supporting community.[1] This framework matters for reading Jaipongan: it is not simply a new arrangement of movements, but a reworking of elements of Ketuk Tilu, Bajidoran or Kliningan Bajidoran, Topeng Banjet, pencak silat, and Sundanese karawitan amid changes in West Javanese tastes in the 1970s.[2]

Gugum Gumbira Tirasondjaja was central to this reworking. He observed folk arts in Karawang, Subang, Purwakarta, and Bandung, then organized movements, accompaniment, performance structure, and training patterns that came to be known as Jaipongan.[3] Yet an account centered only on a "creator" simplifies the historical process. A study by the West Java Cultural Values Preservation Office, for example, shows Suwanda's contribution to Ja*ipong kendan*g patterns and Gugum's role in choreography and Jugala's organization.[4] Gugum's agency thus operated through relationships with musicians, dancers, sinden, family members, students, recording media, government, and audiences.

These relationships took institutional form through Padepokan Seni Jugala in Bandung. This article begins its analysis in 1978, when the early Jaipongan repertoire and performance activity made Jugala's role more visible; that date is not necessarily the padepokan's founding year. The choice of year is linked to accounts of Ketuk Tilu Perkembangan's appearance in Hong Kong and the emergence of early works that subsequently shaped Jugala Jaipongan's identity.[5] Sources, however, are not entirely consistent about the founding date. Prila Ajeng Minesha's research gives May 1977 for the founding of Padepokan Jugala and 1978 for the beginnings of Jugala Record.[6] This article retains 1978 as the start of its observation period, while treating the reported May 1977 founding as a separate claim requiring confirmation from institutional records.

---

[1] Edi Sedyawati, *Pertumbuhan Seni Pertunjukan* (Jakarta: Sinar Harapan, 1981), 12; Jakob Sumardjo, *Estetika Paradoks* (Bandung: Kelir, 2006), 89–91.

[2] Gugum Gumbira, *Jaipongan: Dari Ketuk Tilu ke Jaipongan* (Bandung: STSI Press, 1999), 3–7; Lalan Ramlan, "Jaipongan: Genre Tari Generasi Ketiga dalam Perkembangan Seni Pertunjukan Tari Sunda," *Resital* 14, no. 1 (2013), 41–55.

[3] Endang Caturwati dan Lalan Ramlan, ed., Gu*gum Gumbira: Dari Chacha ke Jaipongan (Ba*ndung: Sunan Ambu Press, 2007; ISBI Press edition, 2020); Putra Gressandy, "Kesenian Jaipongan: Sebuah Revolusi dalam Seni Gerak Tahun 1970–2010" (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2013).

[4]West Java Cultural Values Preservation Office, "Kesenian Jaipong: antara Karawang–Bandung," 15 December 2016, https://kebudayaan.kemdikbud.go.id/bpnbjabar/kesenian-jaipong-antara-karawang-bandung/ (additional online source for verification of the context of creation).

[5] Tubagus Mulyadi, "Gugum Gumbira and the History of the Creation of Jaipongan Dance," *International Journal of Culture and History* 10, no. 1 (2023), 1–21, https://doi.org/10.5296/ijch.v10i1.20670; Gressandy, "Kesenian Jaipongan."

[6]Prila Ajeng Minesha, "Kontribusi Studio Jugala Record terhadap Syiar Islam Tahun 1980–2005" (UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, 2019), repository abstract, https://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/27421/ (additional online source for verification of the chronological discrepancy).

Several studies address Jugala and Jaipongan from different perspectives. Purnama Sultan Dasa Nugraha examines Jugala Group's Jaipongan dance performances, especially form, movement, accompaniment, and aesthetic characteristics.[7] Tatang Taryana, Agus Budiman, and Dewi Karyati discuss the education and management of traditional dance studios in Bandung as nonformal education, but do not reconstruct one institution's development over a long period.[8] Minesha studies Jugala Record's contribution to the dissemination of Islam in 1980–2005, showing recording's function in the Jugala ecosystem, but does not focus on the padepokan's development as an arts institution.[9] Studies by Lalan Ramlan, Edi Mulyana, Diana Novita Sari, Shinda Regina, Ria Dewi Fajaria, Sopian Hadi, and others analyze particular genres or repertoires, including Keser Bojong, *Sonténg,* Ra*wayan,* a*nd Kawu*ng Ant*en, in chor*eographic and aesthetic terms.[10]

These earlier studies are essential for understanding the quality of Jugala's works, but lea*ve a resear*ch gap: few take Padepokan Seni Jugala as a historical unit of analysis connecting its founding, repertoire creation, training, dissemination, artistic identity, media adaptation, and leadership transition in a single chronology from 1978 to 2020. Consequently, causal relationships among works, organization, student networks, and institutional continuity are often scattered across studies of individual repertoires.

This article aims to reconstruct the background to Padepokan Seni Jugala's founding and analyze its development in Bandung during 1978–2020. Its novelty is not a claim that Jugala or Jaipongan has never been studied, but a shift in historiographical focus from the maestro and dance form to the institutionalization of the creative process. With this focus, the article shows how works became teaching material, training became a means of transmission, performance and recording became channels of circulation, and family members and senior students sustained continuity when the founder's leadership ended.

Method

This study is organized around the historical method of heuristics, source criticism, interpretation, and historiography.[11] The manuscript reports fieldwork at Padepokan Seni Jugala and library research at Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University Bandung; the underlying interview recordings and field notes were not

[7]Purnama Sultan Dasa Nugraha, "Seni Tari Jaipongan Jugala Group" (final project, Universitas Komputer Indonesia, 2004); metadata verified through Elibrary UNIKOM, https://elibrary.unikom.ac.id/id/eprint/12151/.

[8] Tatang Taryana, Agus Budiman, and Dewi Karyati, "Pendidikan & Manajemen Sanggar Tari Tradisional," *Journal of Education, Humaniora and Social Sciences* 5, no. 2 (2022): 1457–1469, https://doi.org/10.34007/jehss.v5i2.1455.

[9] Minesha, "Kontribusi Studio Jugala Record."

[10] Edi Mulyana dan Lalan Ramlan, "Keser Bojong: Idealisasi Pencitraan Jaipongan Karya Gugum Gumbira," *Panggung* 22, no. 1 (2012): 37–51; Diana Novita Sari dan Lalan Ramlan, "Tari Sonteng Karya Gugum Gumbira di Padepokan Jugala," *Jurnal Seni Makalangan* 7, no. 2 (2020), https://doi.org/10.26742/mklng.v7i2.1414; Pina Martiana dan Edi Mulyana, "Penyajian Tari Rawayan," *Jurnal Seni Makalangan* (2014): 1–17; Shinda Regina, Ria Dewi Fajaria, and Sopian Hadi, "Estetika Tari Jaipongan Kawung Anten Karya Gugum Gumbira," *Jurnal Seni Makalangan* 7, no. 2 (2020): 107–118.

[11] Sulasman, *Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah* (Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2014), 101; Dudung Abdurrahman, *Metode Penelitian Sejarah* (Jakarta: Logos Wacana Ilmu, 1999).

supplied for independent inspection. Oral primary sources consist of interviews with Mira Tejaningrum Gumbira as an administrator and successor in leadership; Ineu Dinar Gumbira, Asye Ratna Mantili Gumbira, and Sonda Utami Dewi Gumbira as family members involved in the padepokan; Geugeu as an administrator; and Syarah Wanadiati and Nabila Intania as Gugum Gumbira's students. Visual sources are described as activity photographs held by the padepokan and documentation on YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram @jugala_jaipongan; individual items need dated catalog entries to support a historical sequence.Secondary sources include books, journal articles, undergraduate theses, and master's theses on Gugum Gumbira, Jaipongan, Jugala's works, karawitan, and studio management.

External criticism should check interviewees' identities, roles, interview dates, recordings, and consent, as well as the provenance and dates of visual records; these checks cannot be independently confirmed from the material supplied with this article. Internal criticism assessed interviewees' competence, proximity to events, consistency of testimony, and correspondence with written sources. Family and students' closeness provides access to firsthand experience, but can also yield selective memory. Claims about works and dates are compared where possible with scholarly articles, institutional repositories, and press reports; organizational routines and overseas activities still rely heavily on the cited interviews. Differences in dates for the *creati*on of *Rawayan and* Kawung Anten, for example, are not forcibly made uniform but explained through cross-source criticism.[12]

At the interpretation stage, facts are placed in chronological order and analyzed through Koentjaraningrat's concepts of culture and social institutions. Culture is understood as a learned system of ideas, actions, and works; institutions provide norms, roles, and patterns of action through which knowledge can be transmitted.[13] These concepts frame the proposed interpretation of Jugala's transformation from a creative space highly dependent on Gugum into a training system involving family members and senior students. Interpretation also attends to individual agency, causality, continuity, and change. The historiographical stage presents the findings chronologically and thematically: institutional formation, the development of works and networks, artistic identity, adaptation, and succession in 2020.[14]

Results

Formation of a Creative and Educational Space, 1978–1985

Gugum Gumbira was born in Bandung on 4 April 1945 and grew up in an environment that introduced him to pencak silat and Sundanese arts. His interest in Ketuk Tilu, Topeng Banjet, Bajidoran, Wayang Golek, and social dance shaped an inclination to turn tradition into performances accessible to urban society.[15] Padepokan Seni Jugala emerged from the need for a space that could unite artistic

[12] Martiana dan Mulyana, "Penyajian Tari Rawayan," 1–3; Regina, Fajaria, and Hadi, "Estetika Tari Jaipongan Kawung Anten," 107–108.

[13] Koentjaraningrat, *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia* (Jakarta: Djambatan, 2009), 72, 85.

[14] Marlina Dina, *Metode Sejarah Lisan* (Bandung: Humaniora, 2023), 5; Kuntowijoyo, *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah* (Yogyakarta: Bentang, 2003), 101.

[15] Tubagus Mulyadi, "Gugum Gumbira and the History," 1–21; Caturwati dan Ramlan, *Gugum Gumbira*.

exploration, training, and performance. Euis Komariah, a sinden and Sundanese artist, played an important role in vocal practice and karawitan, so Jugala's training was not limited to dance technique.

Initially, the number of participants was small and activities were simple. Training was nevertheless structured in stages: mastering basic movement, understanding kendang patterns and karawitan, inhabiting a dance's character, learning performance ethics, and repeated evaluation before a work was staged. The cited interviews with Mira and Ineu describe that Gugum rejected training that produced only memorized choreography; dancers had to understand the relationship among movement, rhythm, expression, and cultural values. Integrating dancers, nayaga, and sinden created a method of learning that distinguished Jugala from studios focused only on dance performance.

Works were the most visible markers of early development. *Keser Bojong* and R*éndéng Bojong (*1978) established the repertoire's fou*ndation; S*etra Sari *(1981), To*ka-To*ka and Kuntul* Mangut (1*982), Kang*sreng (1983*), Oray We*lang (1984), and *Sonténg* and *Ringkang Gumiwang* (1985) broadened its choreographic range. This production meant more than a growing list of titles. *Keser Bojong,* for example, served as basic material to equip aspiring dancers with Jaipongan technique and aesthetics; Sonténg bro*ught ch*oreography, accompaniment, makeup, and costume together in its repertoire identity.[16] By making works into teaching material, Jugala transformed individual creativity into transmissible knowledge.

Performance also widened Jugala's reach. Ketuk Tilu Perkembangan's appearance in Hong Kong in 1978 introduced Gugum's experiments to audiences outside Indonesia.[17] At home, invitations to festivals, government events, and television increased public familiarity with Jaipongan. This relationship among creation, teaching, and performance attracted participants from beyond Bandung and confirmed Jugala's role as a nonformal arts education institution.

Repertoire Consolidation and Network Expansion, 1986–2000

In 1986, Put*ri Persada, R*am*payak, an*d Penc*ug/Pencug Bojong demo*nstrated productivity and a wider range of repertoire characters; Pencug *Bojong foregro*unded a Sundanese male figure and movements drawn from pencak silat.[18] Based on the oral traditions cited, the *Rawayan* performance dates back to 1987—a timeline consistent with records from a 2015 study by UPI and the ISBI catalog. In contrast, Martiana and Mulyana place its creation in the early 1990s. A dated creation document is needed to resolve the conflict. Its meaning is relatively con*sistent*: rawayan, or bridge, signifies connecting traditional values with new circumstances.

Ronggeng Bandung *emerged in 1990*. The manuscript's chronology gives both 1992 and around 1991 for Kawung Anten. An ISBI Bandung article places its creation around 1991 for Ati Sumiati's final examination; the more specific date remains subject

[16] Mulyana dan Ramlan, "Keser Bojong," 37–51; Sari dan Ramlan, "Tari Sonteng."
[17] Gressandy, "Kesenian Jaipongan"; Mulyadi, "Gugum Gumbira and the History," 28–29.
[18] Caturwati dan Ramlan, *Gugum Gumbira*, 58–63; Tubagus Mulyadi, "Pencak Jaipongan by Choreographer Gugum Gumbira," *Acintya* 16, no. 1 (2024): 1–12.

to confirmation from the examination record.[19] *Kawung Ante*n expanded Jugala's creative sources from folk arts to the story of a woman from Sumedang Larang and use*d a d*uhung as a prop. Choreography, character, music, makeup, costume, and props functioned as one dramatic whole.

Table 1 groups the repertoire documented in the cited sources. Rawayan's creation date remains disputed, and Kawung Anten is placed around 1991 on the basis of the ISBI article.

Period	Recorded repertoire	Institutional significance
1978–1985	Keser Bojong, Réndéng Bojong, Setra Sari, Toka-Toka, Kuntul Mangut, Kangsreng, Oray Welang, Sonténg, Ringkang Gumiwang	Establishment of an aesthetic foundation and training material
1986–early 1990s	Putri Persada, Rampayak, Pencug/Pencug Bojong, Rawayan, Ronggeng Bandung, Kawung Anten (1991)	Diversification of themes, characters, and performance forms
2005–2009	Nyi Ambet Kasih, Tawadhu	Continuing creativity and broader moral-spiritual themes
2015–2019	Alas Grombyang, Jalak Ngejat, Kuntul Mangut 2, Kanialaga	Renewal of repertoire and material for regeneration

Jugala's development during consolidation was not determined by repertoire alone. Mulyana and Ramlan identify dancers associated with the Jugala repertoire. The further claim that each named dancer later became an instructor or established activities across West Java and Jakarta needs individual career evidence.[20] The presence of student networks indicates possible routes of transmission beyond the main training space, although their geographical reach has not been systematically mapped here.

Circulation also took place through Jugala Record. The studio recorded Jaipongan, Cianjuran, Kliningan, and religiously inflected songs. Minesha's research shows that recordings extended Jugala's ecosystem from live performance to the production and dissemination of sound, although studio activity declined in the early 2000s because managers were busy and cassette piracy posed problems.[21] Cassettes and recordings were thus more than supplementary elements; they were infrastructure that carried Jugala's style beyond the padepokan's physical boundaries.

Performances expanded from local and national events to cultural missions abroad. The cited family testimony mentions participation in government programs, the Asian-African Conference, Organization of Islamic Cooperation events, the Asian

[19] Regina, Fajaria, and Hadi, "Estetika Tari Jaipongan Kawung Anten," 107–108, 113; Aprilyan Isnawaty Agita, "Tari Kawung Anten Karya Gugum Gumbira" (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2015).

[20] Mulyana dan Ramlan, "Keser Bojong," 38–39.

[21] Minesha, "Kontribusi Studio Jugala Record," repository abstract.

Tourism Forum in Bangkok, World Music in Taiwan, an Indonesian Arts Festival in the United States, and missions to Malaysia, South Korea, Japan, Laos, the Netherlands, Germany, France, and Australia. Program dates, organizers, and archives are not provided for many of these events, so the list remains an unverified oral-history inventory rather than a verified calendar.A reported "Rolling Stones concert" needs correction: the Jakarta performance in 1988 was a Mick Jagger solo concert, not a concert by the Rolling Stones.

Artistic Identity as an Institutional System

Jugala's identity emerged from deliberate repetition, not one defining feature. In choreography, pencak silat movements—stances, steps, strikes, blocks, and changes of level—meet the suppleness of Ketuk Tilu and the dynamism of folk dance. The result can be firm, agile, masculine, or gentle according to the work's character.[22] Differences *among Keser* Bo*jong, Setra* S*ari, So*nt*éng, Raw*ayan, *and Kawung An*ten show that "Jugala style" is not a uniform movement formula, but a creative practice that retains Sundanese sources while working through different themes and forms.

In karawitan, changes of tempo and kendang patterns signal movement transitions, requiring dancers and nayaga to respond to one another. Kendang, rebab, bonang, saron, flute, vocals, laras, and r*umpaka* form a distinctive musical organization. Ismet Ruchimat and colleagues show that Jugala's innovation appears in its treatment of laras and rumpaka, moving *from th*e metaphorical expressions of older traditions toward flexible verbal-musical expression responsive to context.[23] The direct link between dance and music training enables this knowledge to be transmitted as practice, not only as notation or recording.

Makeup and costume reinforce themes while allowing movement. Early costumes remained strongly influenced by the kebaya, sinjan*g cloth,* and s*ampur o*f Ketuk Tilu. As stage performance developed, materials, colors, accessories, and costume shapes were adapted to choreographic needs without abandoning Sundanese markers. In Ka*wung Anten, o*rnaments and t*he duhu*ng clarify characterization; in other repertoire, stage makeup sharpens expression without replacing a dance's character.[24] Because movement, music, makeup, and costume are taught together, artistic identity becomes an institutional standard that can be learned, assessed, and maintained.

Preservation, Digital Adaptation, and Leadership Transition, 2001–2020

From the early twenty-first century, Jugala's orientation shifted. New works continued to appear through Nyi *Ambet Kasih (2*005), Tawa*dhu (2*009), Alas *Grombyang and* Jal*ak Ngejat (*2015), and Kuntu*l Mangut 2 and* Kania*laga (2019*), but the cited interviews describe an increasing emphasis on repertoire maintenance, performance

[22] Mulyadi, "Pencak Jaipongan," 1–12; Tati Narawati, *Wajah Tari Sunda dari Masa ke Masa* (Bandung: P4ST UPI, 2003), 118–128.

[23] Ismet Ruchimat, R.M. Soedarsono, Timbul Haryono, and Djoko Surjo, "Laras dan Rumpaka dalam Garap Karawitan Jaipongan," *Panggung* 23, no. 4 (2013): 431–440; Asep Saepudin, *Garap Tepak Kendang Jaipongan dalam Karawitan Sunda* (Yogyakarta: BP ISI Yogyakarta, 2013).

[24] Sari dan Ramlan, "Tari Sonteng"; Regina, Fajaria, and Hadi, "Estetika Tari Jaipongan Kawung Anten."

quality, and regeneration; comparative program records would be needed to measure the shift. Changing interests among young people, the range of modern entertainment, and the long process of training a dancer posed challenges. Jugala responded by maintaining direct training while allowing students creative space, provided they did not eliminate the works' structure, character, and underlying values.

Digital technology changed how works were documented and introduced. Photographs, performance recordings, YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok enabled access without physical presence at a performance. According to the cited interviews with Mira and Geugeu, these media support publicity and documentation, but do not replace face-to-face training because technical details, musical response, ethics, and interpretation still require direct guidance. Digital adaptation thus expands circulation, while core transmission continues through teacher–student relationships.

The cited retrospective interviews describe a gradual change in the division of labor before 2020. He reduced his routine involvement and acted increasingly as a mentor and artistic guide, while family members and senior students handled daily training and management. Mira Tejaningrum Gumbira took on a larger role; Ineu, Asye, Sonda, administrators, and instructors helped maintain activities. On that testimony, succession began before the founder's death; dated administrative records would strengthen the chronology.

Gugum Gumbira died in Bandung on 4 January 2020 at the age of 74. His death marks a historical boundary because it ended more than four decades of founder leadership. Reports of continued training after his death support institutional continuity, but the scale and consistency of activity need dated program or enrollment records. The interviews suggest that family and students retained parts of his repertoire and teaching practice.

Discussion

The findings above show that Jugala's development was not a straight line from "traditional" to "modern." It was a simultaneous process of continuity and change. Elements of Ketuk Tilu, pencak silat, karawi*tan, ru*mpaka, kebaya, *and s*ampur were retained as sources of cultural legitimacy; at the same time, they were rearranged through stage choreography, thematic diversification, recorded production, festivals, and digital media. Innovation did not negate tradition, but became a strategy for keeping it functional in a changing social environment.

Koentjaraningrat's concept of culture helps explain why Jugala is better understood as a cultural institution. Gugum's ideas about the relationship among movement, rhythm, and character were realized in training practices; those practices produced works, performance standards, and social relationships that could be learned. Culture, in other words, appeared as mutually supporting ideas, activities, and artifacts.[25] The institution's function is visible in four mechanisms: selection of repertoire as curriculum, integration of dancers, nayaga, and sinden, evaluation by

[25] Koentjaraningrat, *Manusia dan Kebudayaan*, 72–85.

instructors, and training students to become teachers. These mechanisms allow creativity to be reproduced without turning it into an entirely fixed canon.

Here, Gugum's agency was decisive but not solitary. He set the artistic direction and controlled quality, while Euis Komariah strengthened the vocal and musical dimension; Suwanda made an important contribution t*o kendang pat*terns; dancers tested choreography through their bodies; Jugala Record widened distribution; government and festivals provided stages; family and students turned experience into a system of transmission. This relational reading avoids two reductions: treating Jaipongan solely as one maestro's work, or erasing the role of personal leadership in building the institution.

Periodization reveals changing functions. In 1978–1985, Jugala's legitimacy was built primarily through productive creation and the introduction of Jaipongan. In 1986–2000, repertoire, generations of students, recordings, and performance networks enlarged the organization's scale. From the 2000s, as the genre spread, the cited testimony suggests a greater emphasis at Jugala on its role as a source of repertoire: preserving Gugum's works, teaching their performance character, and responding to new media. The transition approaching 2020 then tested whether the institution could endure once its founder no longer handled daily activities.

These changes also show that an arts institution's development cannot be measured only by the number of new works. In the 1980s, the frequency of creation was a strong indicator because Jugala was forming the genre's vocabulary and legitimacy. Once the repertoire had been accepted, disseminated, and used by many students, development appeared instead in the ability to repeat works at a consistent standard, expand the pool of teachers, and adjust the division of responsibilities. The evidence permits an interpretation of greater emphasis on maintenance and artistic memory, but does not establish a measured decline or rise in production. In that process, repertoire served two purposes: as an archive of movement preserving traces of creation and as open material renewed whenever a new dancer learned it. The tension between fidelity to Jugala's character and room for student creativity became an important mechanism for preventing continuity from turning into mechanical repetition. In this way, change could still occur within the bounds of institutional identity, rather than outside it or through a break with the founder's legacy.

These results extend the research of Taryana, Budiman, and Karyati. Whereas their study emphasizes planning, organizing, directing, and supervision in studio management, Jugala's history shows that continuity also depends on the formation of artistic authority and the transmission of embodied knowledge.[26] Skill cannot be transferred completely through documents; it requires corrections to movement, responsiveness to kendang, repetition, and example. Digitalization is therefore effective for documentation and reach, but has not replaced direct practice.

This article also changes the place of repertoire studies in historiography. Studies *of Keser Bojong, Sonténg, Rawa*yan, or *Kawung Anten* no longer stand merely as separate descriptions of works, but become evidence of how an institution produces

[26] Taryana, Budiman, and Karyati, "Pendidikan & Manajemen Sanggar Tari Tradisional," 1457–1469.

artistic differentiation alongside continuity. *Keser Bojong* became basic material; Son*téng sho*ws the integration of three aesthetic elements; *Rawayan* formulates the passage between tradition and m*odernity; Kawu*ng Anten extends themes and the use of props. This sequence explains the institution's development more powerfully than simply counting dances.

The study's historiographical novelty thus lies in uniting four processes: creation, pedagogy, circulation, and succession. Nugraha addresses Jugala Group's performances; Minesha explains recordings and their da'wah function; studio management studies discuss nonformal education; choreographic research analyzes specific works. This article places all of them within the long-term transformation of an arts institution in Bandung. This position does not replace earlier studies, but connects them in an institutional history.

Source limitations must also be acknowledged. This analysis draws only on materials available by 31 October 2024. No pre-cutoff interview recordings, transcripts, or complete archive catalog were supplied for independent verification of each event's date, organizer, and program. The differing dates reported for Jugala's founding and the creation of Rawayan and Kawung Anten also require careful distinction. Sources available by the cutoff place Kawung Anten's creation around 1991 and document Gugum's death, while Rawayan's creation date and the extent of the organizations' international activity remain insufficiently documented. These matters are treated as limits of the evidence rather than resolved through unsupported certainty.

Conclusion

Padepokan Seni Jugala developed from 1978 to 2020 through close relationships among Gugum Gumbira's and Euis Komariah's leadership, repertoire creation, training of dancers–nayaga–sinden, performance networks, recordings, and regeneration. In the early phase, works and performances established Jaipongan's legitimacy. During consolidation, works became teaching material, students expanded networks, and recordings enlarged circulation. From the early twenty-first century, Jugala increasingly emphasized maintaining its repertoire, digital documentation and reported preparation for succession, with their extent dependent on the interview record.

Gugum Gumbira's death on 4 January 2020 ended the founder-led period, not the padepokan's existence. Reported continued activity is consistent with some transfer of repertoire and responsibility to family members and students; dated institutional records are needed to establish the scale of that transfer. The study's principal contribution is to show that Jaipongan's history is also an institutional history: creativity can endure when transformed into a collective practice transmitted, circulated, and negotiated across generations. This is the article's novelty in Sundanese performing arts historiography.

Sources

Abdurrahman, Dudung. *Metode Penelitian Sejarah*. Jakarta: Logos Wacana Ilmu, 1999.

Agita, Aprilyan Isnawaty. "Tari Kawung Anten Karya Gugum Gumbira." Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2015.

Astri, Indriani Devina. "Kajian Etnokoreologi Tari Jaipongan Toka-Toka Karya Gugum Gumbira." Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2016.

Caturwati, Endang. *Jaipongan: Tarian Pergaulan Sunda*. Bandung: Sunan Ambu Press, 2004.

Caturwati, Endang, and Lalan Ramlan, ed. *Gugum Gumbira: Dari Chacha ke Jaipongan*. Bandung: Sunan Ambu Press, 2007; ISBI Press edition, 2020.

Dina, Marlina. *Metode Sejarah Lisan*. Bandung: Humaniora, 2023.

Gressandy, Putra. "Kesenian Jaipongan: Sebuah Revolusi dalam Seni Gerak Tahun 1970–2010." Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2013.

Gumbira, Gugum. *Jaipongan: Dari Ketuk Tilu ke Jaipongan*. Bandung: STSI Press, 1999.

Koentjaraningrat. *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Djambatan, 2009.

Kuntowijoyo. *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Bentang, 2003.

Dewi, Gina Meilinda Shintia. "Tari Rawayan Karya Gugum Gumbira Tirasondjaya di Padepokan Jugala." Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2015. https://repository.upi.edu/20264/.

Martiana, Pina, and Edi Mulyana. "Penyajian Tari Rawayan." *Jurnal Seni Makalangan* (2014): 1–17.

Minesha, Prila Ajeng. "Kontribusi Studio Jugala Record terhadap Syiar Islam Tahun 1980–2005." UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, 2019.

Muad, Salman. "Tari Jaipongan Setra Sari Karya Gugum Gumbira di Padepokan Jugala." Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2019.

Mulyadi, Tubagus. "Gugum Gumbira and the History of the Creation of Jaipongan Dance." *International Journal of Culture and History 10, no. 1 (2023): 1–21. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijch.v10i1.20670.*

Mulyadi, Tubagus. "Pencak Jaipongan by Choreographer Gugum Gumbira." *Acintya* 16, no. 1 (2024): 1–12. https://doi.org/10.33153/acy.v16i1.6026.

Mulyana, Edi, and Lalan Ramlan. "Keser Bojong: Idealisasi Pencitraan Jaipongan Karya Gugum Gumbira." *Panggung* 22, no. 1 (2012): 37–51. https://doi.org/10.26742/panggung.v22i1.34.

Narawati, Tati. *Wajah Tari Sunda dari Masa ke Masa*. Bandung: P4ST UPI, 2003.

Nugraha, Purnama Sultan Dasa. "Seni Tari Jaipongan Jugala Group." Final project, Universitas Komputer Indonesia, 2004.

Ramlan, Lalan. "Jaipongan: Genre Tari Generasi Ketiga dalam Perkembangan Seni Pertunjukan Tari Sunda." *Resital* 14, no. 1 (2013): 41–55. https://doi.org/10.24821/resital.v14i1.394.

Ramlan, Lalan. "Ngigelkeun Lagu: Model Kreativitas Kepenarian dalam Jaipongan." *Jurnal Seni Makalangan* 3, no. 2 (2016).

Regina, Shinda, Ria Dewi Fajaria, and Sopian Hadi. "Estetika Tari Jaipongan Kawung Anten Karya Gugum Gumbira." *Jurnal Seni Makalangan 7, no. 2 (2020): 107–118. https://doi.org/10.26742/mklng.v7i2.1416.*

Ruchimat, Ismet, R.M. Soedarsono, Timbul Haryono, and Djoko Surjo. "Laras dan Rumpaka dalam Garap Karawitan Jaipongan Jugala." *Panggung* 23, no. 4 (2013): 431–440.

Saepudin, Asep. *Garap Tepak Kendang Jaipongan dalam Karawitan Sunda*. Yogyakarta: BP ISI Yogyakarta, 2013.

Sari, Diana Novita, and Lalan Ramlan. "Tari Sonteng Karya Gugum Gumbira di Padepokan Jugala." *Jurnal Seni Makalangan* 7, no. 2 (2020). https://doi.org/10.26742/mklng.v7i2.1414.

Sedyawati, Edi. *Pertumbuhan Seni Pertunjukan*. Jakarta: Sinar Harapan, 1981.

Soedarsono, R.M. *Sejarah Tari*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1997.

Soepandi, Atik. *Seni Pertunjukan Jawa Barat*. Bandung: Pusat Kebudayaan Jawa Barat, 1988.

Sulasman. *Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia, 2014.

Sumardjo, Jakob. *Estetika Paradoks*. Bandung: Kelir, 2006.

Taryana, Tatang, Agus Budiman, and Dewi Karyati. "Pendidikan & Manajemen Sanggar Tari Tradisional." *Journal of Education, Humaniora and Social Sciences* 5, no. 2 (2022): 1457–1469. https://doi.org/10.34007/jehss.v5i2.1455.

Tresna, Herdiyanti. "Tari Jaipongan Keser Bojong 17 Karya Gugum Gumbira." Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2019.

Additional online sources for verification

ANTARA. "Maestro Tari Jaipong Gugum Gumbira Wafat." 4 January 2020. https://jatim.antaranews.com/berita/342579/maestro-tari-jaipong-gugum-gumbira-wafat.

West Java Cultural Values Preservation Office. "Kesenian Jaipong: antara Karawang–Bandung." 15 December 2016. https://kebudayaan.kemdikbud.go.id/bpnbjabar/kesenian-jaipong-antara-karawang-bandung/.

Digital Library UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. "Kontribusi Studio Jugala Record terhadap Syiar Islam Tahun 1980–2005." https://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/27421/.

Elibrary Universitas Komputer Indonesia. "Seni Tari Jaipongan Jugala Group." https://elibrary.unikom.ac.id/id/eprint/12151/.

Jurnal Seni Makalangan. "Tari Sonteng Karya Gugum Gumbira di Padepokan Jugala." https://jurnal.isbi.ac.id/index.php/makalangan/article/view/1414.

United Press International. "Thousands Riot at Mick Jagger Concert." 31 October 1988. UPI archive.