

Beyond Words

Some thoughts about how Balinese argue

**For a symposium on
How Indonesians Argue**

**Deddington, Oxfordshire
3-5th. July 2015**

©Mark Hobart June 2015

How thoroughly social argument is remains under-appreciated in at least three ways. How people speak and understand one another—and what constitutes argument—is culturally inflected. When argument is possible, permitted or proscribed hinges upon social relationships and institutions. And who can say what to whom, and who judges it as what, is highly contextual. Almost all philosophers and rationalists of different hues go the great pains to deny or marginalize such considerations, because it would complicate their arguments. However the problems of cultural and social context stubbornly refuse to go away.¹ If what comprises argument in any instance depends on how we understand the society in question, then the prevailing interpretation of what kind of society it is becomes crucial. In the post-war period up to the 1980s, what we might call the hegemonic representation of Bali tightly circumscribed the scope for argument.

Decisions are reached within the council by unanimous agreement of its members, in a Quaker-like meeting in which each man speaks his mind as the spirit moves him

It was a theatre-state in which the kings and princes were the impresarios, the priests the directors, the peasantry the supporting cast, stage crew, and audience. The stupendous cremations, teeth-filings, temple dedications, the pilgrimages and blood sacrifices, mobilizing hundreds, even thousands of people and great quantities of wealth, were not means to political ends, they were the ends themselves, they were what the state was for. Court ceremonialism was the driving force of court politics. Mass ritual was not a device to shore up the state; the state was a device for the enactment of mass ritual. Power served pomp, not pomp power (C. Geertz 1980: 13).

While cultural tourists may cling to this vision—one that most Balinese profess publicly—among scholars the pendulum has swung towards the opposite extreme.

Under the heading '*kasus adat*'—seen as a legitimate form of violence—land and border disputes as well as conflicts about caste and status claims within villages easily explode into violent action. The Balinese journal *Sarad* has estimated that between 1997 and 2003 almost every month a '*kasus adat*' resulted in mass violence (Schulte Nordholt 2007: 34, all emphasis in the original unless otherwise stated).

The new kings of Bali, however, did not see themselves as slave traders and despots. In their eyes this was a romantic time when handsome princes waged war and conquered princesses on the path to kingship. The Dutch 'savage Bali' was not so far from the world of these war-mongering princes in its focus on violence, but the Dutch and the Balinese conceived of this violence in completely different terms...

After the terrible moment of the anti-Communist massacres, Balinese became afraid to express conflicts in a public, political, fashion. The killings signaled the end of a period of overt social tension, since with the removal of a generation of leftist intellectuals and activists, they created an unchallengeable consensus about what Balinese culture should be... The struggle for control also meant creating a blander image for Bali. Just as the political violence of 1950s and 1960s Indonesia had to be cut out of the tourist image, so the most extravagant images of Bali as the 'Island of the Demons' were airbrushed out of the new world of late twentieth-century tourist capitalism (Vickers 2012: 81, 239-240).

Unless we emasculate argument to exclude violence, disputes and the imposition of order, it seems we may have to ask: what counts as argument, according to whom, under what circumstances?

¹ The notable exceptions are the later Wittgenstein (1958, 1969) and Peter Winch (1958). The set-piece debate about the relation between universal as against culturally specific criteria of reason was between Martin Hollis (1970) and Steven Lukes (1970). The latter subsequently retracted his argument (Hollis & Lukes 1982). For some of the shortcomings of ignoring social context, see Overing 1985; Dilley 1999.

² That Hildred Geertz, after subsequent extended fieldwork in Bali, changed her mind confirms rather than denies the grip that such hegemonic interpretations have.

Which Balinese?

There are of course more ways of representing Bali than the Orientalist or its equally straitjacketed antithesis. Most achieve persuasiveness by two related means: translation manuals³ and synecdoche. You proffer a coherent interpretation of one set of terms, symbols or whatever then, ignoring the potential circularity, extend this to embrace a whole ‘culture’ (Clifford 1983).⁴ As each interpretation entails what Bakhtin called ‘chronotopes’ (1981; cf. Rorty 1976; Taylor 1989), that is presuppositions not only about time and space, but also more or less directly about the nature of reason, cause, agency, subjecthood and relationships, each presupposes a version of how argument (in whatever sense), narrative and so forth work. We have no grounds for assuming that different accounts are commensurate. The implications for the study of argument are obvious.

Matters however are more complicated. If we are to inquire into how Balinese argue, we must ask which Balinese, in which circumstances, according to whom, for what purposes? Cultural Studies stresses social divisions according to race, class and gender. For Bali, it might be helpful provisionally to refine these as class, caste, gender, generation and occupation.⁵ It then becomes obvious that opining about ‘Balinese’ *tout court* is to invoke a floating signifier. What follows therefore is subject to several restrictions. I have worked sufficiently closely with neither literary Brahmana, nor with powerful courts, nor *pegawai negeri* to be qualified to discuss whether or when they deploy distinctive styles of argumentation. Nor am I sufficiently familiar with the *Kawi* literature to comment. The examples below deal mainly with the lives of male and female villagers, who were mostly of peasant farming backgrounds, although they practised occupations from actors to *balian* to truck drivers. Especially with the proliferation of mass media, notably radio then television, it would be foolhardy to draw hard and fast lines between peasant farmers and, say, townspeople of different classes.⁶ So I also draw examples from televised theatre and public events. By its nature however, such an inquiry is pointillist. I hope that some of the dots join up.

What do we mean by argue?

The predicate of the symposium’s title raises interesting problems. ‘Argue’ in English

³ Quine argued on theoretical grounds that, for any language, there are alternative schemes for translation, which are each internally consistent, but mutually incompatible (1960). The thesis holds equally for natural scientific explanations and human scientific interpretations.

⁴ Examples include Bateson’s *The value system of a steady state*, Clifford Geertz’s *Person, time and conduct in Bali*, his *Negara*, cited above, or Wikan’s *Managing turbulent hearts*. An alternative is to import an idea and apply it willy-nilly as did Lekkerkerker in *De kastenmaatschappij in Britsch-Indie en op Bali*.

⁵ For present purposes, I think we may treat Bali as relatively ethnically and religiously homogeneous. However issues of religion, ethnicity and the Indonesian state loom in the background as elements of the constitutive outside (Laclau 1990; Staten 1986). I add occupation because arguably whether you are a farmer, *padanda*, *pamangku*, *balian*, teacher, actor, *pegawai negeri*, *dagang*, tourist guide etc., or whatever combination should not be discounted *a priori*.

⁶ Baudrillard once remarked that every time he watched television he was a member of the masses, because television is, by definition, a mass medium. By way of an anecdote, my supervisor Christiaan Hooykaas, who worked almost exclusively with Brahmana and literate court people, advised me to concentrate on Balinese peasants as he had concluded that it was from them that almost everything originated.

I would note two further exclusions here: gender and generation. I have still to analyze in more detail differences in male and female style of argumentation in different situations. And, perhaps it is because of my age, but I have found young unmarried people hard to work with. They probably have more important things to do than to talk to a greying academic.

has a wide fan of references, which do not always square with connotations in popular usage. So, while dictionary definitions stress the deployment of reason for or against a proposition (Appendix 1), the metaphor of ‘Argument is War’ catches connotations of popular English usage (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 4-5).⁷ Except where Indonesians have been schooled in European practice, we have no grounds to presume that words bearing on what we would translate as argue or argument have cognate senses or usage in different Indonesian languages. It seems wise therefore to recognize and embrace the inevitable double discursivity (what is at issue is outlined in the Background Paper). So doing requires offering a provisional sense of what we mean by argue and argument in academic language to be revised in the light of different kinds of Indonesian usage. My aim is to set up a dialogue between two congeries of use rather than, as is all too easy, to impose European terms on Indonesians and find them wanting.

Drawing upon the OED, I shall consider three senses of ‘argue’ in English, which I hope will be adequate. The first, which is close to argumentation, stresses reasoning as in bringing forward reasons for or against a proposition, statement or claim. The second is to discuss a question or issue, which may well involve reasoning in opposition, raising objections, contending or disputing, and so potentially quarrelling. The third is to persuade someone into, or out of, a course of action, an opinion or intention, often by advancing a statement or fact for the purpose of influencing the mind. Like the Balinese expression *mabatis bèbèk* (to have a webbed foot like a duck), ‘argue’ covers a lot of ground.

As the ghost of Aristotle⁸ hovers over European discussion of argument, may I briefly invoke his *Rhetoric*?

RHETORIC the counterpart of Dialectic. Both alike are concerned with such things as come, more or less, within the general ken of all men and belong to no definite science. Accordingly all men make use, more or less, of both; for to a certain extent all men attempt to discuss statements and to maintain them, to defend themselves and to attack others. Ordinary people do this either at random or through practice and from acquired habit. Both ways being possible, the subject can plainly be handled systematically, for it is possible to inquire the reason why some speakers succeed through practice and others spontaneously; and every one will at once agree that such an inquiry is the function of an art...

Rhetoric is useful (1) because things that are true and things that are just have a natural tendency to prevail over their opposites, so that if the decisions of judges are not what they ought to be, the defeat must be due to the speakers themselves, and they must be blamed accordingly. Moreover, (2) before some audiences not even the possession of the exactest knowledge will make it easy for what we say to produce conviction. For argument based on knowledge implies instruction, and there are people whom one cannot instruct. Here, then, we must use, as our modes of persuasion and argument, notions possessed by everybody, as we observed in the Topics when dealing with the way to handle a popular audience... Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself (Aristotle 1954: 1, 6, 8).

Several themes are worth noting in this exposition.

⁷ This raises questions about the pertinent terms in other European and non-European languages.

⁸ As Aristotle comes to us shorn of context and endlessly interpreted, it is perhaps safer to treat him as fulfilling various functions imposed by interpreters. So Foucault’s expression an ‘author function’ (1980: 148) is apt. Hereafter I use ‘Aristotle’ to mean ‘Aristotle function’.

All people argue. Rhetoric is to the masses or ordinary people what dialectic is to trained minds. Both are strictly discursive—be they inductive or deductive—but are about matters of general knowledge.⁹ Both are distinct from demonstration. The use of military metaphors is rife: making statements and dispute are inherent to public speaking. The truth ‘naturally’ tends to prevail. Both rhetoric and dialectic are about convincing other people, who are presumed to need persuading. Persuasiveness depends either on the speaker’s reputation, creating the right mood or the content of the speech. How do you wrestle truth or certainty from such extensive contingency? By means of logic, which is the ultimate persuasive technique because it is true.

In a very English rejoinder, Francis Bacon remarked

When the intellect is left to itself it takes the same way—namely—that it does when following the rules of dialectics. For the mind loves to leap up to generalities and come to rest with them; so it doesn’t take long for it to become sick of experiment. But this evil, though it is present both in natural science and in dialectics, is worse in dialectics because of the ordered solemnity of its disputations...[which depend on defective demonstrations, for] the demonstrations we have in dialectics do little except make the world a slave to human thought, and make human thought a slave to words (Aphorisms 20, 69 [1620] 2010: 5, 19).

There is more here than a simple confrontation of rationalism and empiricism. Bacon proposed an attitude of humility when interrogating the world (‘the interpretation of nature’ as he put it), which will always exceed scholars’ understanding, especially if they make themselves slaves to logic and words.¹⁰

As forms of argument, both dialectic and rhetoric involve persuasion, which require us to consider not just the detached ‘content’, but also the circumstances of speaking and exposition. At this point, the three notionally distinct senses of ‘argue’ above become entangled. While it might make sense for a philosopher to try to extrapolate reason from speech in context, for anthropologists and others it is not only the social circumstances under which people speak, but also the mess, the complexity and situatedness of people’s lives that matters. Forensically dissecting words, or discourse, from all the forms and purposes of human action and their contexts effectively castrates inquiry. On what grounds can we assume that speech has such a privileged position, if not in gaining people’s assent, at least their acquiescence? Conventionally, but importantly, it is not actually words or sentences that are true or not, but propositions (Sperber 1985), which even philosophers often confuse with sentences (Quine 1970: 1-14). The confusion arises because

Meanings of sentences are exalted as abstract entities in their own right, under the name of *propositions*. These, not the sentences themselves, are seen as the things that are true or false. These are the things also that stand in the logical relation of implication. These

⁹ As to how persuasion works,

with regard to the persuasion achieved by proof or apparent proof: just as in dialectic there is induction on the one hand and syllogism or apparent syllogism on the other, so it is in rhetoric. The example is an induction, the enthymeme is a syllogism, and the apparent enthymeme is an apparent syllogism. I call the enthymeme a rhetorical syllogism, and the example a rhetorical induction. Every one who effects persuasion through proof does in fact use either enthymemes or examples: there is no other way. And since every one who proves anything at all is bound to use either syllogisms or inductions (and this is clear to us from the Analytics), it must follow that enthymemes are syllogisms and examples are inductions (1954: 8, 9).

¹⁰ That Bacon’s four idols of the human mind are as pertinent and read as fresh today as they did nearly four hundred years ago gives pause for thought. As the title suggests, *Novum Organum* was intended as a rebuttal of Aristotle.

are the things also that are known or believed or disbelieved and are found obvious or surprising (Quine 1970: 2).

As logicians have long contested the status of propositions, we should step carefully. For example, matters became more complicated when C.S Peirce re-described logic as signs. Unless we treat Indonesians who speak and argue as solipsistic, we may need to inquire into how listeners understand signs and meanings.

Others' presuppositions

What can we take for granted as unproblematic or irrelevant? Can we, for instance, take either logic or signification and semantics to be universal, extra-cultural and unaffected by social circumstances? For the former, problems arise immediately as to whether you are talking about pure or practical reason and about whether the issue is how people should use reason or how they do, let alone consider the different circumstances under which arguments take place. Also what is reason? And why does it matter? Martin Hollis summed it up with his customary clarity.

If anthropology is to be possible, I have argued, the natives must share our concepts of truth, coherence and rational interdependence of beliefs. Otherwise we are confronted as theorists with vicious circles. In other words Western rational thought is not just one species of rational thought nor rational thought just one species of thought (1970: 218).

Unfortunately, while most of the philosophers in the Rationality Debate agreed that reason was tremendously important, they also agreed that it was more than just logic (a delightful Derridean supplement). Unfortunately they could not agree what the 'more than' consisted in (Hobart 1985: 108-9). As with a piece of string: until we know how long it is, what can we say? What is rather charming and self-revelatory about the Rationality Debate and its precursor, the issue of Primitive Thought, is that the proponents of universal criteria of truth, coherence and rationality all assumed that European logics, mostly notionally derived from Aristotle, were the only game in town. So it is slightly unfortunately that there exist long-standing South Asian philosophical schools, which offered rigorous alternatives. Elsewhere I have suggested that Balinese make extensive use in daily life of versions of Nyāya reasoning (1985). Had I not done the ethnographic research before I read about Indian logics, I should have suspected myself of selective use of evidence or even imposing my hopes on the material.¹¹ Interesting as the study of formal logic might be in, say Java or Bali, so much else is going on that we should consider the contexts in which kinds of reasoning are used.

As to meaning, there is a terminal confusion that makes it so appealing and useful (Palmer 1969; Hacking 1975; Hobart 1982). This is not a frivolous exercise. I once asked what the meaning (*arti*) was of the dance movement, *magulu (w)angsul*, to be met with gales of laughter. I had made a category mistake. It had no meaning, but was a matter of quality, skill and delivery. The movement should be *tekek*, firm, precise and *seken*, clear, definite. When Europeans ask about the meaning of something, Balinese draw careful distinctions. They separate out at least eight possible processes at work (Hobart 1999: 126). Furthermore, where we often speak of explaining, interpreting or describing, Balinese again distinguish some twenty kinds of procedure for analyzing statements and

¹¹ Indonesian Customs held up the consignment of my books until shortly before the field trip was finished. The stated reason was that it included Flaubert's *Salome*, the cover of which they worried might be pornographic.

actions (1999: 126-31).¹² It would also be unwise, as did Aristotle in effect, to dismiss audiences as passive or easily swayable (see Ang 1991, Morley 1992, Nightingale 1996). What is more, Balinese differentiate between seven stages of engagement with, say, a speech, theatre or television. These are watching/listening, knowing what is being discussed, enjoying, feeling, understanding, reflecting and acting upon (Hobart 2010a: 213-14). The power of European concepts turns out to owe more, as Quine noted, to their lack of clarity and promiscuity. It is perilously easy to crunch the nuances of how Balinese comment on, judge and reflect upon what people say and do into raw matter for processing by the academic mill. It has a name: hegemony.

By contrast with the fairly rich logical, semantic and epistemological vocabulary, so far as I have been able to establish to date, Balinese common terms for arguing are relatively few and overlap with words in everyday use. For example, to argue in the sense of dispute, contradict, assert the opposite (Indonesian *membantah*) is simply *ngalawan*, to oppose. And argument, as in disagreement, (Indonesian *perbedaan pendapat*) is most easily glossed as *pamineh malènan*, differing opinions. Two words were interesting: *mabligbagan* and *majugjagan*. While both are broadly about discussing, they differ in the hoped for outcome. *Mabligbagan* is used in theatre, in documentaries and when working through some issue, if those taking part anticipate they will ultimately reach agreement. *Majugjagan* implies dispute and leaves it open whether agreement will prove possible. Much of what we would call discussion or debate is simply variations on *ngaraos*, talking, such as *ngaraosang* or *ngaraos-ngaraos* (see Appendix 2). All this might not matter if, as Hollis argued, such cultural minutiae are mere icing on the hard rock cake of universal reason. The problem is that theory is under-determined by evidence (Quine 1960). You can find translation manuals that will justify a wide variety of theories. The cost though may be uncomfortably high. In this instance, it requires treating how Balinese (or others) articulate, discuss, comment on, judge and act upon what people say and do as explanatorily irrelevant except insofar as it provides evidence for the working of universal categories, perceptions and reason. It also requires dismissing *a priori* any presuppositions that differ from the author's own.¹³ At this point the reader might echo Oliver Hardy: 'Well, here's another nice mess you've gotten me into'.

A determined universalist might well be unswayed. So let me consider three issues. What are we to conclude if people say nothing? At public meetings and even in family discussions, most people remain silent. Should we dismiss them as ordinary: the uneducated, stupid populace capable only of being passively swayed? To do so would, I suggest, be to miss the workings of power, position and propriety in Bali.¹⁴ Prior to inquiring into what is going on, we risk falling into the familiar trap of intellectuals shaping the world according to other intellectuals or those who have the right to speak or enunciate. The other face of argument is disarticulation: silencing by many means from exclusion to, more subtly, being present, if invisible—being taken for granted, spoken at

¹² To examine how and when Balinese had recourse to the nearest term to meaning, *arti* or *artos* (in low and high Balinese respectively), I did a careful word search of computerized research notes and transcriptions of theatre plays and television broadcasts over some 10 years. Periodically the word would surface. Despite my professed scepticism about invoking meaning, to my chagrin it was almost invariably I who introduced the term, after which those around me obliged me by using it for a few sentences before dropping it completely as they continued their discussion.

¹³ Durkheim (1915) rebutted of Kant's aprioristic argument that the fundamental categories of human thought and reason were universal by noting that such categories and procedures were social.

¹⁴ For complicated reasons many Balinese remain silent during discussions in public meetings, in families and on other occasions. In the later days of the Orde Baru, 'Koh Ngomong' (What's the point in saying anything?) became a popular phrase, its resonance suggested by its appearing on truck mudflaps.

or spoken for. To enunciate requires an audience that cannot answer back. Think of the role of audiences for the interminable speeches of New Order figures. The caricature of how those in power like to imagine the world is exemplified by the set piece *Sendratari* where all the dancers are articulated by a single *dalang*. If people are silent, on what grounds are we to assume that they instantiate the universalism expected of them?

One problem with claims about reason and argument is that it assumes, as Geoffrey Lloyd pointed out for the Greek city-states (1979), singular social and political circumstances. For a start, it assumes that people have the right and are free to speak, will be listened to and may disagree without risk or punishment.¹⁵ As almost anywhere such a state of affairs is more honoured in the breach than in the observance, universalists are dreaming of ideal situations or, more often, are confusing ideology for actuality. An example may make the point.

Some twenty years ago, there was death in the small and unpopular Puri Pisangkaja. At a *banjar* meeting the senior Cokorda descended to inform the members that they were expected to serve (*ngayah*) and to carry the bier at a family cremation that Saturday. The response was ‘Inggih’. On the day by 10 o’clock, Cokordas from across Gianyar had assembled, but the *banjar* did not turn up. Outside in the *Balé Banjar* however, there was a large gathering, idly watching proceedings, but making no steps to work. Eventually the Cokordas had to shoulder the bier and carry it themselves to the graveyard, much to the amusement of the onlookers. The Cokorda made the mistake of thinking ‘Inggih’ meant ‘Yes’, not ‘We have heard’.¹⁶

So what is the relationship between an order, a request and kinds of persuasion?

This brings me to a curious feature of Balinese language. As far as I know, there are few obvious words that have similar connotations to the English ‘persuade’. Balinese terms tend to have fairly specific reference so that employing them outside their normal context of use is often regarded as a category mistake (*solèh*).¹⁷ When I asked Balinese about this, the force of the reply surprised me and reminded me how easily we import our own cultural presuppositions. Those in positions of real power or authority, whether political leaders, the aristocracy or family heads, give orders, which they expect to be obeyed. On this account, the idea of persuasion is not only redundant. It potentially undermines the presuppositions on which power rests. A general does not persuade, cajole or flatter his troops into battle: he orders them.¹⁸

¹⁵ So it is not coincidental that Aristotle was writing about rhetoric in a Greek city-state where all adult free males could notionally participate in public decision-making. Apart from excluding women and slaves, I question whether in practice everyone felt, or was, free to speak.

¹⁶ If I recall my schoolboy French lessons, *oui* is the past participle of *ouïr*, to hear.

¹⁷ For example *ngalomesin* is to soften (up) but to use the term of persuading a meeting to do something would be decidedly odd, as it is used of trying to get someone to have sex with you! The closest rendition to Indonesian *membujuk* is *ngesah*, but the term was little known in Tengahpadang. Of the other Balinese words *ngarayu* ‘to flatter’ is widely used in theatre and elsewhere. *Ngalus-alusin* is to calm someone down; *ngenyor* is to flirt; *ngarumrun* is to court, cf. Kawi *angrumrūm*, ‘to address with words of endearment and love (often in trying to persuade)’ (Zoetmulder 1982: 1570). The other Kawi term is *anwī* or *sinwī*, ‘to insist, urge, press, put under pressure, try to force (into)’ (Zoetmulder 1982: 1889), which has quite different associations. (My thanks to Peter Worsley and Stuart Robson for their advice on literary Kawi and Balinese words.)

¹⁸ To return yet again to my schoolboy days, we were taught that Napoleon had indeed flattered his soldiers by announcing: *Tout soldat français porte dans sa giberne le bâton de maréchal de France* (Every private in the French army carries a field-marshal’s baton in his knapsack). Wellington is reported before Waterloo to have retorted: ‘This army is composed of the scum of the earth, I don’t know what effect these men will have on the enemy, but by God they terrify me!’

In other contexts however, the position seems similar to that of the Greek city-states, as Balinese *banjar* and other local corporate groups reach decisions through deliberation in assemblies of members, who are notionally equal. How does this work? Are matters not, as the quotation from Hildred Geertz above suggests, the ideal social setting for open discussion and argument? There is rather more to it though. Having the right to speak is not the same as being in a position to speak and to be listened to. Skill in speaking, mastery of the appropriate language for public meetings, one's wealth and reputation all come to bear. How different groups work also differs. Irrigation and voluntary associations are more open: the first because each member has different interests and overriding concerns, the second because little is at stake. By contrast, where significant power and resources are concentrated, as in the *banjar* in Tengahpadang¹⁹ at least, much goes on behind the scenes as orators represent the interests of different factions. Things are often not what they seem and the unwary or ignorant risk being ignored or slapped down. There are in effect two assemblages of values, which co-exist and are complementary. In local groups, where officials are elected and may be held to account, the tenor may be democratic and even egalitarian. How it works in practice depends on social organization in any instance. There are other contexts in which notions of hierarchy were—and still sometimes are—to the fore, exemplified in caste and paternalism. Which prevails in which circumstances is complicated. Counter-intuitively, a degree of local democracy may actually serve as an inoculation (Barthes 1973: 150-51) that enables differing kinds of distinction to flourish.²⁰

This discussion still leaves questions about the workings of persuasion in Bali unanswered. One consideration is agency. European accounts locate agency primarily in the speaker whose task is to persuade those listening. However, if agency is held to lie in significant part with the listeners, then it is notionally up to each person to decide for himself or herself. The idea of speakers persuading people militates against such an ideal of agency. Another is, as I shall suggest, that it may be helpful to treat all such social action as performance, in which case being persuasive is part of any performance. In that case, singling out an act as persuasive is redundant. Perhaps these questions are worth taking up in the symposium?²¹

More generally, our language of analysis is skewed to privileging mind, whether reason, thought, propositions or words, over action, spectacle and demonstration: the discursive over the non-discursive. It would take some ingenuity to explain the effects of the highly formulaic speeches by political leaders in terms of their propositional content. Shannon and Weaver noted that 'information relates not so much to what you *do* say, as to what you *could* say. That is, information is a measure of one's freedom of choice when one selects a message' (1949: 8-9). If the freedom of choice is so constrained, so correspondingly is the information. Put simply, such public speeches are effectively devoid of any information. In other words, whatever they do has to be non-discursive. So to escape the traps of the familiar lines of reasoning, I prefer to consider public life in Bali as performances (see Hobart 2010b, 2013). While the speeches of Suharto or recent Governors of Bali may have often been slim on information, they were replete as

¹⁹ The examples are drawn from Pisangkaja, a *banjar* in the *adat* and administrative village of Tengahpadang. At the request of villagers, both are pseudonyms.

²⁰ The co-existence of two quite different principles of organization deserves more study. I understand that Michel Picard may well address the theme in his analysis of the debate between Surya Kanta and Bali Adnjana. A fondness for hierarchy stretches right down to heirs to village compounds, as I know only too well from my affines in Bali.

²¹ I shall be interested in what Old Javanese scholars have to say about the topic, because poetry raises the question of how it is intended to work.

performances, if only in that everyone had to sit through them and try not to fall asleep too obviously.²²

Treating argument as about performance rather than truth has several implications. It shifts the balance from formal logics or truth conditions to what works, whether persuasive or effective. However efficacy or effectiveness conjures up quite different associations from persuasiveness.²³ To limit argument to persuasive speech would miss how people in Bali are quite widely invited or made subject to others' wills in public or private. Performance may also be judged by a much wider range of criteria than the truth or otherwise of argument. Here rhetoric has two faces. It is not just about reasoning, but suggests *inter alia* elegance, ostentation and artifice. Crucially, performance appeals to aspects of human engagement shunned by dialectics. If argument ideally appeals to reason, performance in addition potentially incites feelings of many kinds from pleasure and excitement to fear, horror and awe.

A brief detour through narrative

To avoid closing down discussion prematurely, I have deliberately left the range of sense and reference of 'argue' open to include not only use of logic and argumentation, but also elucidating, expatiating, discussing, commenting, contradicting, refuting and quarrelling. There is however one assemblage of practices that would appear distinct, yet may be used as an effective means of arguing, namely narrating. The example that I shall discuss below is from a *Sendratari* performed at the Bali International Arts Festival. Those I knew treated it as a blistering attack on and argument against corruption. Now much hinges on whether you can satisfactorily close off meaning around an author's—here *dalang*'s—intention and also find out precisely what it was at the time. To do so requires ignoring how audiences, among others, understood what was going on. Any theory looks viable if you eliminate most the evidence.

It would require a very long detour adequately to address the issues raised by various schools of narratology. Nor, I hope, is it necessary.²⁴ Briefly two reasons should suffice here. First, what is the explanatory status of recourse to narrative? To say that it is descriptive or interpretive is uninformative because it begs the question of the criteria used to frame the argument. As I suggested in the Background Paper, if we are dealing with interpretations, then these ultimately turn around to say more about the interpreter rather

²² As I write, the not-entirely-reliable news from North Korea was that Defence Minister Hyon Yong-chol was executed by anti-aircraft guns for falling asleep during an event attended by Kim Jong-un. That is one way to end an argument.

²³ The OED defines rhetoric as 2b. 'Speech or writing expressed in terms calculated to persuade; hence (often in depreciatory sense), language characterized by artificial or ostentatious expression'.

²⁴ Drawing on Bakhtin's critique of narrative theories, Morson and Emerson's summary applies to more than narrow Formalism.

The many Formalist studies in this tradition describe how narratives are 'made' by 'deforming' everyday narrative much as poetry is 'made' by deforming everyday language. They developed an arsenal of techniques and concepts that are by now familiar: *fabula*, *siuzhet*, repetition, retardation, parallelism, morphology, substitution, motivation, and baring the device.

But as numerous theorists of our own tradition have pointed out, although these techniques seem more or less adequate for analyzing folk tales, detective stories, and utopias, they appear wanting when applied to short stories and novels. As Thomas Greene has observed, they are powerless to explain what makes *The Decameron* stories different from hundreds of others with similar plots. The interest and life of Boccaccio's stories derive not only from their plots, but from something harder to specify, the manner of their telling. Formalism and narratology, Greene concludes, give us 'nouns and verbs,' but we need 'adverbs.' In Bakhtin's view, Formalist plot analyses were even more inadequate when applied to great novels—not only because there is much more to a novel than plot, but also because plot itself cannot be properly understood as a collection of narrative techniques (Morson & Emerson 1990: 27).

than the subject matter interpreted. Alternatively, if analyses claim to be explanations in a strong sense, they face two different kinds of problem. If, following Quine, explanations are never really more than particular translation manuals, what exactly is it that they really add to our understanding? This critique of the adequacy of explanation and interpretation suits me well, because, as I understand it, one purpose of this symposium is to consider how useful a pragmatist approach might be in addressing issues surrounding argument in different Indonesian societies. So it is not a matter of whether one account is true and another false. That is a trap I wish to avoid. Rather the question is how well such an approach works for Bali, Java or elsewhere?²⁵ Also much confusion surrounds what is meant by explanation.²⁶ Second, short of reworking practice without residue through some external frame of reference, the accounts of the practitioners matter. When people are occupied with formulating, disseminating, commenting on, judging, criticizing and acting upon what one another say and do, it seems high-handed to interpret away or ignore how they understand, engage and act. So I propose to rephrase the distinction between the context of discovery and the context of justification as one between the context of use and action as against the context of rationalization or justification. My concern is not to prioritize the former, simply to prevent it being swallowed whole.

The second reason for concern is related. The question is how much can descriptive, interpretive or explanatory frameworks tell us either about how people tell or act stories or how different listeners or spectators enjoy them in different places on different occasions? Let me take a sophisticated theory of narrative, namely Ricoeur's in *Time and narrative* (1984-88). Ricoeur undertook a masterly reworking of Aristotle's *Poetics*. In the light of Becker's direct challenge to the imposition of Aristotelian ideas on Java (1979), this alone should give us grounds to pause. However, we can get closer to what a Ricoeurian approach would look like in action. Not only was the work of Clifford Geertz on Java and Bali deeply Ricoeurian, but Ricoeur endorsed Geertz's understanding and anthropological use of his ideas.²⁷ Now the problem with Geertz's work is that, while his statement of purpose of understanding from the native point of view was promising, in practice he ignored his own agenda by taking a few interesting ethnographic details then reframing them using hegemonic academic concepts that directly contradicted how the people in question set about understanding what was going on. Geertz claimed not to flinch from the problems of double discursivity—then promptly did. To get the complicated model that Ricoeur and Geertz need off the ground requires a vast battery of culturally specific presuppositions, some thought through, some commonsensical. By virtue of his disciplinary background, the task was impossible for Ricoeur. It proved so also for Geertz. In the end, such an approach begs so many questions that it reduces much of Bali to mendicancy.

²⁵ Working well would be judged by multiple criteria. *Inter alia* these would include: does the approach further understanding of evidence previously marginalized or ignored? Does it make possible questions that prove interesting or informative that other approaches cannot? Do the findings make sense to the people who are engaging in the practices?

²⁶ 'Suppose I give this explanation: "I take 'Moses' to mean the man, if there was such a man, who led the Israelites out of Egypt..." - But similar doubts to those about "Moses" are possible about the words of this explanation (what are you calling "Egypt", whom the "Israelites" etc.?). Nor would these questions come to an end when we got down to words like "red", "dark", "sweet". - "But then how does an explanation help me to understand, if after all it is not the final one?"' (Wittgenstein 1958: #87).

²⁷ Ricoeur approvingly cited Geertz (1973: 12): 'culture is public because meaning is' (1984: 57). However this only works on an arguably circular, definition of both culture and meaning, with which I would take issue.

To address the problem of double discursivity in a less reductionist way requires a model closer to Bakhtin's on chronotopes. Theoretically its weakness appears to be that it considers only the history of European genres. In fact this is its strength. The model makes no claim to universality, but is culturally specific and derives its categories in part from its subject matter. So it is eminently suitable for rethinking how people in different societies invoke different presuppositions in telling and in listening to stories. Leaving aside the theoretical case for being sceptical of narratological claims, there is an obvious problem. Most Balinese theatre is extemporized from a plot that is often minimal. Somewhere P.G. Wodehouse summed up the issue in his succinct version of Hamlet, which went something like:

There was this prince who thought his father's ghost told him his brother had murdered him to gain the throne. He tried to find out if it were true by putting on a play, but failed. He drove his girlfriend mad. She committed suicide. In the end everyone was killed

Having sat through many pre-performance meetings when the lead actor summarized the plot, it was rarely more. Not only did the actors rely on shared knowledge, but also each performance has to be tailored to that particular audience that night. Once, to compare performances for television as against those with audiences, I commissioned two theatre troupes to perform the same play they had done for television before a live audience at a temple festival in Tengahpadang. The outcomes were wildly different each time, as the actors invented dialogue, inserted or discarded scenes, reworked others and so on, to fit their sense of each audience on the occasion (for a brief summary, see Hobart 2011). A problem with accounts that generalize is that they concentrate on one aspect and studiously ignore much of interest. I am reminded of the sit-com about two East End London tailors titled *Never mind the quality, feel the width*.

An *embarras de richesses*

As so much of social life involves argument in some sense, choosing examples requires selection. I shall allow myself to be guided by the villagers in Pisangkaja. When I arrived to do fieldwork in 1988, I asked how people reproduced society and themselves. The answer was surprisingly quick and unanimous: *nunas baos*, meetings and theatre.²⁸ Although my concerns here are different, the answer nicely indicates three quite different kinds of setting where argument is central. Each offers distinct uses of argumentation from forensic in private, indeed intimate, to expository before a large, even mass, audience, to dialogic and argumentative with peers. These examples enable me to test Aristotle's comments above on modes of persuasion. 'The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself'.

While *nunas raos* (requesting communication from *niskala*, the non-manifest) may be highly public and political, as when a problem is referred to such intervention, most—and those that the villagers meant—are private consultations with *balian* of different kinds. These are usually *balian tapakan*, who are *katapak*, impressed upon by *niskala* agents. By

²⁸ Their order was: meetings, *nunas baos* and theatre. I have changed the order for convenience of exposition. After a couple of months, the villagers in question came apologetically and said that, with the advent of mass media, television was rapidly challenging theatre. As the most popular programmes at the time were Balinese theatre on the Denpasar channel of state television, the shift was not yet so significant. A few years later, with commercial television stations displacing TVRI, by their own accounts, their world changed radically. *Sakadi katak di betèn tempurung*: like a frog under a coconut shell. (If the shell is kicked over, the frog suddenly realizes the size and diversity of the world.)

their nature, issues of truth are central: how to establish that the *balian* is not faking dissociation and how to determine whether what is said is the case. For public *nunas baos* strictly the genuineness of the state should be tested and validated, conventionally by applying a burning brand of coconut husk to the medium's cheek. For private séances the petitioners depend partly on the medium's reputation, partly on a convincing performance, partly on verifying what is said by other means. For theatre, whether televised or not, the spectators must each decide for themselves whether what is said matters beyond the moment. Here the actors' or *dalang*'s reputation is relevant for the more thoughtful, while an entertaining performance is likely to appeal more broadly. For meetings, those of *banjar* often being the most important, I am hesitant to generalize. Meetings vary too much between different assemblies. As the *banjar* in Pisangkaja did not permit me to record meetings,²⁹ the examples I choose below do not depend on verbatim transcriptions, but make their point in other ways.

The credibility of reality

In 1988-89, I worked with several *balian*, chosen as the ones whom people in Pisangkaja most often consulted. Two stood out. Both were highly intelligent. The first was a remarkable young woman who, on the premature death of her parents and the compound *sanggah* catching fire, rebuilt it, became its *pamangku* and devoted herself to celibacy. She did not dissociate, but saw images in the smoke from a burning brazier of dried coconut shell (*kau*), which emitted such dense smoke that everyone near coughed uncontrollably. In all sixteen sessions that I studied, the petitioners expressed themselves satisfied not only to the *pamangku*, but to my research assistant who chatted to them outside afterwards. An example may give an idea.

When I first visited, a Chinese woman from Surabaya was presenting offerings with a very large cash *sari*. Afterwards she was anxious to explain to me. She had come a month earlier because she had heard of the *pamangku*. Her reason for seeking help was that a family friend was being driven in her Mercedes, when he asked the chauffeur to stop and buy him some cigarettes. The latter left the keys in the ignition and the friend promptly drove off in the car, both the car and friend disappearing without trace. During the consultation, the *pamangku* said that she could locate the car. She could not see a street name (it turned out there was none), but would give precise instructions to recover the vehicle. The car was duly found left empty in a remote corner of Surabaya and the Chinese woman had come to fulfil her promise.

The waiting clients were duly impressed.

The second was in her early thirties and a very popular *balian tapakan* from Banjar Lantang Hidung in Batuan. I consider one case as it is exemplary of how she worked. The full text and translation are given in Appendix 3. Here I note some significant features.

A husband and wife had come from Br. Sayang Kutuh, Kadéwatan in Gianyar. As is usual, the only information they gave was where they came from and their caste status. The rest was up to the *balian*. Slightly unusually, they had not brought an independent witness, experienced in such matters.³⁰ The *balian* diagnosed the trouble as various kinds of confusion caused by a *papasangan* (a sorcery device) buried in the compound by an unspecified out-marrying woman (a common source of trouble). She introduced the

²⁹ As I discovered, they did so for good reason. Key figures did not want a record.

³⁰ The reason is that petitioners are usually badly troubled and so uncritical. The task of the experienced interlocutor is to ask sharp questions and recall the details of the speech.

father/father-in-law of the couple, apparently by his correct name of I Mustika, who seemed to be on very good terms with both of them. She prescribed various steps to remedy the situation. Below I note some salient features.

Clients from Kadéwatan consult the Balian Tapakan Br. Lantang Hidung

In what follows, Kawi words are in bold; Indonesian words are underlined>.

<i>The opening.</i>	
<p><i>Balian:</i> Now whether you will get advice (literally: speech) or not is not yet sure. Whether you will be successful or not, we share (responsibility for what happens) together. Is that acceptable? <i>Clients:</i> Yes.</p>	<p>Agreeing the terms of the complex agency, which consists of the clients, the <i>balian</i> and various beings from <i>niskala</i>.</p>
<i>Addressing Niskala.</i>	
<p><i>Balian</i> presents offerings: I beg indulgence (and request not to be cursed by) Your Highness the Divinity, and the Purified Dead, of the Temple of Origin who live in the world of Sayan Kutuh. You are invited by the medium of Lantang Hidung. Descend Your Highness(es) and install Yourself(/ves) on the offering (a <i>daksina</i>). I beg forgiveness if anything is short or in excess on my part. These, Your slaves, beg to present themselves to their Father (here: the deified dead) today. Whether the substance of what is said is fitting or not fitting, I beg of you to go ahead and start inquiring.</p>	<p>Formally addressing the various parties named, with a careful, but common, proviso. The aim is remove any ambiguity as to who is speaking and the nature of the subject matter.</p>
<i>Expressingly introducing the issue of truth or falsity.</i>	
<p><i>Balian:</i> If the family Guardian Deity and the (other) Purified Dead will grace us and reflect on the truth or falsity of what we here on earth have wondered about.</p>	<p>The <i>balian</i> is not only including the dead in the complex agency in the discussion, but raising questions of veracity.</p>
<i>Checking that the clients have understood.</i>	
<p><i>Balian (emerging briefly from trance speaks directly to the clients):</i> Have you understood?</p> <p><i>Later:</i></p> <p>Because the petitioners do not ask a question, the healer has to instruct them in the proper way of inquiring, and so phrases the next series of questions for them.</p>	<p>Meta-lingual function: the <i>balian</i> is checking that the clients understand the code, here the distinctive vocabulary widely used by <i>balian</i>.</p> <p>To ensure that the session works, the clients must ask pertinent questions. As they are unskilled, the <i>balian</i> has to speak for them and temporarily assume their agency for them.</p>

<p><i>Establishing the grounds for balian's credibility:</i></p> <p>1. <i>Through a critical comparison with conventional medicine.</i></p>	
<p><i>Balian:</i> What is more the ill person is unaware of being confused. It is no use referring this to a doctor. The doctor will be at a loss to work out what is the problem (i.e. the doctor will be as confused as they are).</p>	<p>The start of an elegant depiction of an alternative world which Western medicine is incompetent to handle.</p>
<p>2. <i>Through a demonstration of the balian's command of several languages and so overall competence. (Examples are given in the Appendix.)</i></p>	
<p><i>Balian:</i> That is just the illness of the oldest (she uses the Kawi werdah, Sanskrit <i>wrddha</i>, and so explains), in other words old, do you know werda?, it is old.</p>	<p>Here there is the neat use of the aesthetic function (Jakobson) by noting that her <i>discours</i> is old/mature.</p>
<p>3. <i>Through the detail of specifying the exact nature of the symptoms and the source.</i></p>	
<p><i>Balian:</i> When the [sufferer] is out in public, they are quite capable of sorting out East from West; but as soon as they <u>enter</u> the compound, they are worse than a chicken under a clay water pot. If one says the person is mad, do not think this is sent from God, if so they would be mad both in the streets and at home. They are not mad, but ill. However, this is not an ordinary illness; it is different; it is called not well, not ill.³¹ ...that <u>means</u> it is a <i>papasangan</i> (a specially placed device), the device has been placed just inside the gateway to the compound. It contains: pubic hair, a sheet inscribed with people fighting, a <i>timbul</i> flower (a kind of breadfruit), eleven grains of rice in the husk, wrapped around with three-coloured thread.</p>	<p>The <i>balian</i> provides verisimilitude through a detailed description, first using picturesque imagery and a specialized use of logic (not well, not ill), then a forensic account of the source of trouble.</p>
<p>4. <i>By incorporating contemporary imagery.</i></p>	
<p><i>Balian:</i> ...it is like a <u>guided missile</u> (which has almost reached its destination) because it is about to explode (literally it is on your <u>doorstep</u>).</p>	<p>Through the widespread availability of television, Balinese had become familiar with such images.</p>
<p>5. <i>Through the use of practical and compelling reason.</i></p>	
<p><i>Balian: (Speaking as the ancestor).</i> If you had been <u>convinced</u> (by a doctor's diagnosis), you would now be dead. Now what is the use of dead followers to Me?</p>	<p>The dead without living family to care for them are in a parlous state.</p>

³¹ This is also a way of talking about illness of the thoughts, which is considered quite different from insanity.

6. <i>Showing extraordinary intimate knowledge.</i>	
<i>Balian:</i> I Mustika who is ascending (onto the offering) to speak, isn't he your dead relative? <i>Pet:</i> Yes. He is.	Naming the dead father, apparently accurately.
7. <i>Using word play to make a point.</i>	
<i>Balian:</i> What is the meaning of daughter-in-law? If (one says) daughter-in-law, the name is <u>like helper</u> !	The pun is between <i>mantu</i> , daughter (or son)-in-law, and the Indonesian <u>pembantu</u> .
<i>An intimate moment.</i>	
<i>Balian:</i> Well! Well! (To his son:) Did you bring a bit of betel-nut? (To his daughter-in-law:) Did you bring a bit of betel-nut, Wèng? <i>Clients:</i> There isn't any. <i>Balian:</i> Ah! There isn't any. Take my hand for a moment! Why should you just feel sympathy (affection for me), but stay tongue-tied? <i>Clients:</i> I am sorry (for failing to anticipate the deity's wishes) <i>Balian:</i> Touch me! <i>Clients:</i> <i>Both man and wife scrabbling forward to take the healer's hand:</i> Just a moment. We have done so. We have done so.	<i>Wèng</i> is an affectionate term of address to younger woman. The clients seem embarrassed and upset. The request was not usual, so there is no way they could have anticipated it. I Mustika asking as he seems to have in life for betel makes them so upset and gives the session a sense of credibility.
<i>The balian's prescription—highly technical.</i>	
<i>Balian:</i> The counter-device to be placed at the compound entrance—you've noted it? Ash, ginger, salt, drumstick tree leaves, fat from a pig with white-flecked flesh, a young green coconut. The body of the sufferer to be cleansed with a full range of kitchen implements.	The <i>balian's</i> aim is to ensure that they write down correctly the ingredients to be used.

The session is instructive in several ways. As is proper when important matters are discussed, the precise terms of what will transpire should be stated before beginning. This includes the shared recognition of complex agency and explicitly raises questions of the veracity and the scope of what may occur. The *balian* also removed a further source of ambiguity by specifying who is invited to speak. As her clients were inexperienced and did not respond clearly, at several moments, the *balian* spoke normally to check that they had understood and agree. At other moments, when they failed to inquire, she posed clear questions for them. The villagers experienced in dealing with *balian*, with whom I worked through the materials, thought that she handled the session very well by being *seken*, clear and unambiguous. Mediumship works largely by ambiguous reference, so that clients may read in what they wish. Here the *coup de grâce* was the *balian* naming the client's father.³²

³² Whether this was the dead man's actual name is not entirely certain. As the petitioners were inexperienced and evidently deeply moved, they may not have objected on the spot. However the villagers I consulted pointed out that it would have been risky to be so precise about the name, as the petitioners might have balked. Because there were as usual several other groups of clients waiting and listening, the impact of getting it wrong would have been considerable.

The *balian* also used distinctive styles of argument. One is standard, namely the use of a specific vocabulary largely unknown outside séances. More interesting was her use of different language registers, notably *Kawi* and also Indonesian, which suggested that she was educated and also *au fait* with what was going on in the world. This was reinforced by her use of contemporary imagery like the *papasangan* resembling a guided missile. Her language was elegant. She used puns (the most obvious is *mantu/pembantu*) and other plays on language, which showed both sophistication and that she could use *raos wayah*.³³ Just as you might expect a good doctor to specify precisely the symptoms and underlying medical conditions, so the *balian* specified the symptoms (with some vivid imagery), the details of the device and intimated who the perpetrator was. The same holds for the prescription at the end. Perhaps the most interesting feature though was her use of a singular logic:

1. It is no use referring this to a doctor. The doctor will be at a loss to work out what is the problem.
2. If you had been convinced (by a doctor's diagnosis), you would now be dead. Now what is the use of dead followers to Me?

The *balian* neatly anticipated and disposed of the main alternative model of healing. The nature of the problem was beyond Western medicine and showed up its inadequacy. Later the *balian* reflected on what would have happened had her clients consulted a doctor. The compelling proposition was that the dead would be in a parlous state without descendants to provide offerings. Therefore not only was it in their interests to ensure the latter's welfare, but it also justified their intervention. A touching scene counterbalanced this effective reasoning³⁴ when I Mustika asked for betel nut and to hold the hands of his son and daughter-in-law.

As the theme is argument, it is worth noting in passing that arguably the *balian* defied the so-called Three Laws of Thought.³⁵ First, according to the Law of Identity, if the *balian* is a living person, she cannot be, or speak as, a dead person. Second, following the Law of Non-Contradiction, I Mustika is either living and can speak or he is dead and cannot. The most interesting is the Law of Excluded Middle. When the *balian* says: 'this is not an ordinary illness; it is different; it is called not well, not ill', in the context it is clear that she is deliberately distancing herself from the conventional possibilities, which do not feature in her epistemology. Now it is always possible to defend the Laws of Thought because they can be interpreted in so many ways. It is also easy to dismiss the *balian* as precisely the sort of quack whom logic is there to expose. This may be dandy if you are a hard-line naturalist; it is counter-productive if you are interested in cultural nuance.

If we invoke Aristotle's three modes of persuasiveness, what stands out is the third, the apparent proof provided by the words of the speech itself. However the reasoning used is distinctly Balinese, even if fairly easily comprehensible with some explication. The second—putting the audience into a certain frame of mind—works if we extend this to include all the refinements of idiom and style. Or do they underwrite the personal character of the speaker? However that is problematic, because it was not always clear which of several people were speaking. But what about the key criterion of

³³ Literally 'mature/old speech', this denotes indirect speech, which refers to more than the ostensible reference (see Hobart 2015: 9-12).

³⁴ This is not my interpretation, but that of my research assistant, other waiting clients and the villagers with whom I discussed the case.

³⁵ For a discussion of these laws and their applicability to Bali, see Hobart 1985: 115ff.

persuasiveness? It is interesting that, when the *balian* needed a word, she used the Indonesian *yakin*, convinced. However the stress of the séance as a whole was on factual statement, not persuasion. The *balian* made a battery of claims and assertions, many of which (apart from the device, the relative responsible and value of the prescription) were verifiable. What strikes me is how rhetorical techniques of persuasion were downplayed in favour of statements that were *seken*, clear, unambiguous, in principle open to disconfirmation. When I replayed the tape to experienced villagers, their response was forensic. Was what was said *seken*? Did they—and more importantly should the petitioners—believe all or part of what was said? They concluded that this was a matter entirely for the petitioners, but that they could not have been presented with anything clearer. What they believed and how they chose to act was up to them. Two points are worth noting. First, agency lay in the end with those who *nunas baos*. As the instrument, it was the *balian*'s task to lay out the evidence for the clients to decide. Second, the commentators stressed it was a matter of belief. Here what is at issue may be less persuasiveness than credibility.

Public excoriation

When I arrived in Bali in July 1991, I was met by a vanload of villagers. We had barely exited the airport when they told me that, as soon as we reached Pisangkaja, I must watch a *Sendratari*, Pandawa Asrama, which had recently been performed at the International Bali Arts Festival and broadcast on TVRI. What excited them was that the *dalang*, Déwa Madé Sayang, had carried off an elegant and extended *sesimbing*, an indirect criticism in which the ostensible and intended targets are quite different. In the play, shortly before the Pandawa brothers were exiled to the forest, Begawan Byasa offered them advice on how to be good rulers and how to exercise circumspection. He warned against various kinds of misrule and its consequences.³⁶

If you are the leader of a people, if you rule over them, you cannot live too well. You must not have too luxurious a life-style, but should live simply. You are such a leader. Now none of your subjects should be allowed to be corrupt — that is what you must command. But this must be seriously observed in practice. It should not just take the form of words: you order the masses to obey, but then it turns out that you did not do so yourself. That is the difficulty of becoming a ruler. It is easy to give orders; it is hard to put them into practice. That is the first thing to grasp.

When a ruler is not honest, the world goes to rot. No way may you do that. This is what it is to be just. You have to strive to be fair and just to all of your subjects. On what do you base fairness? On the Four Kinds of Circumspection: Even-handedness (*Sama*), Discrimination (*Béda*), Generosity (*Dana*) and Strictness (*Danda*). Even-handedness: you should give to your subjects equally. The Kingdom of Indraprasta flourishes — who is responsible? All the subjects, all the officials, are the reason. All the armed forces are the reason. Because the ruler treated them all equally. If people should perhaps struggle to make a living, give those more — that's called *Sama*.

Begawan Byasa then turned to the arts and urged good leaders not to favour one group of artists over another. Otherwise those neglected will be angry; gossip will start and the

³⁶ I have published a short discussion of this in an article on commentary (Hobart 2006). The use of theatre as a means of social and political criticism is well known in Java and Bali. My point here is to consider how this might count as argument.

ruler will be discredited. He then remarked that generosity and punishment should be judged by worth, not by family or favour.³⁷

At first sight this might seem like a fairly straightforward homily as part of a familiar narrative. That is not how people in Pisangkaja understood it, nor, as I subsequently learned, did others. They treated it as a blistering, but carefully modulated, argument against President Suharto and family as well as the Governor of Bali, Ida Bagus Oka. The reference in the coda about the arts, suggested a further target was Professor Madé Bandem, then Rektor of STSI. By contrast to the *balian*, the facts were generally known, if still little aired in public. What Déwa Madé Sayang laid out was a *panglèmèk*, a moral case drawn from a respected and valued source, but phrased entirely in his own words. The argument consisted in juxtaposing what should be the case with what was. The dalang ‘carefully adhered to the proprieties of commentary on rulership in ancient India or Bali. At once he condemned a paternalistic corrupt régime, yet deferred to the audience as to how they chose to interpret his words’ (Hobart 2006: 511). In short, whether something is adjudged argument or not depends in significant part on how it is understood by spectators or readers. The dalang did not try to persuade in the sense of sway the audience by rhetoric, but almost the opposite. He laid the issue out dispassionately, leaving it to them to decide for themselves. At about that time, Déwa Madé Sayang was starting to develop a name as one of the few people in Bali who would publicly voice criticisms, when almost everyone else from academics to journalists found it safer to keep their heads down. However it was this performance that did much to cement his reputation. Elsewhere in Indonesia, other actors, like Putu Wijaya and Butèt Kertaradjasa, were making similar arguments in more explicitly political fora.

The limits of information

By way of light relief, I wish briefly to consider a form of speech perfected under the New Order régime: the public address by government officials. The example chosen is pretty representative. The speaker, Ida Bagus Oka, then Governor of Bali, had been a professor, Rektor of Universitas Udayana and the target of Déwa Madé Sayang above. I give the full transcription of his televised address in June 1996 before the Vice-President, Tri Sutrisno, and members of the cabinet in Appendix 4. My question is simple: what information did the speech contain? I do not mean information casually and commonsensically, but as having communicative significance. The earlier quotation from Shannon and Weaver bears repeating: ‘information relates not so much to what you *do* say, as to what you *could* say. That is, information is a measure of one’s freedom of choice when one selects a message’ (1949: 8-9). In this sense, the Governor said very little. The opening and closing paragraphs—and indeed much of the content—were boilerplate for such public addresses. In a relatively short address by standards, apart from repeating the name of the event, the 18th. Arts Festival eleven times, the Governor referred to the Vice-President nine times and to the members of the cabinet present four times. Likewise reference to the importance and necessity of preserving the excellence of culture and the arts is obligatory on such occasions. So there was no real choice.

Only in a few sentences did the Governor impart any information, such as groups from which countries were taking part. He mentioned that the year’s theme was Panji Werdi

³⁷ As with the *balian*, the effectiveness of Déwa Madé Sayang’s exposition depends on breaching the Laws of Thought. Begawan Byasa is mythical (or historical, according to some Balinese) with the attendant limitations on his speaking. Moreover at once it is Begawan Byasa and the *dalang* speaking. Equally the addressees are the Pandawa, the audience and, *in absentia*, the President of Indonesia, the Governor of Bali and the Rektor of STSI.

Sura Wangsaja,³⁸ but then lapsed into default formulae, as when he returned to Panji as a cultural hero and the origin moment of ‘*keagungan seni budaya persatuan dan kesatuan bangsa Indonesia*’ before the equally obligatory nod to ‘*mendorong dan mengembangkan kreatifitas seni budaya bangsa*’. After that he managed to get in promoting trade, industry and economic activity. Strictly, as the speech contained propositional argument, presumably it has potential value whereas the *balian*’s did not. However to me it makes more sense to treat the speech as a performance to be judged by quite different criteria. At that point, considering Ida Bagus Oka’s subsequent fall from grace, another performance comes to mind, perhaps he was just

a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

Public debate

Finally let me turn to where argument in almost any sense is rife: Balinese village life. As I noted, at first sight, Balinese *banjar* meetings have similarities with assemblies in Greek city-states. In both decisions are made by majority votes. And in both certain individuals are recognized as skilled public speakers. However there were no anthropologists around during the latter to inquire in detail what was going on. Two examples are worth briefly rehearsing.

The decision about collective harvesting in Br. Pisangkaja

Banjar have the right to harvest communally rice land owned by their members and exact a tax for the treasury. However this had been subject to abuse, because the headmen were suspected of granting preference to a political faction comprising mostly landowners, of helping their friends evade the tax and of misappropriating the funds. So the leaders of two factions, both comprising a mixture of tenant and subsistence farmers, wished to stop the arrangement; while the remaining faction headed by the local prince, family and retainers was neutral. An assembly meeting was scheduled for shortly before harvest. As the outcome was in the balance, it could not be agreed quietly beforehand and had to be debated publicly.

A well-known orator, Ketut Mara, speaking for those who wished to stop harvesting, apologized for mentioning the matter. However, in the past the ward had performed harvesting. As the crop was now ripe what was the intention of members? There was a brief pause and he added that he had heard that the system was being abused and quoted the case of a high-caste man who had refused to let the *banjar* reap his rice, claiming it was still green and next day had paid labourers a lower rate to cut it. Ketut Mara concluded that he did not know what the meeting wished to decide but he would, of course, agree with it. His friend seated on the opposite side of the meeting then said that he did not want to raise the matter, but rumours were being spread privately that many members’ fields had been in part left, forcing them to work at the end of the day. Such rumours were bad and should be brought out into the open. Incidentally, had any members had this most unfortunate experience? There were murmurs of assent. Another spokesman for the rich farmers added that he did not wish to comment further on what the headmen had already said but was it not better to work for the community than for money? And, if they stopped, the beneficiaries would be labourers from other villages

³⁸ I need to inquire whether Pañji’s magnificent Sanskritic appellation is original or recent. Zoetmulder (1982) gives Wṛddhi as prosperous, having many offspring; Śūra as heroic; Waṅsaja as of noble birth.

while nothing would be contributed to the welfare of Pisangkaja? Another spokesman promptly countered this by noting that, although it was not a serious consideration in view of the importance of the issue to the community, many members owned no riceland and harvesting got in the way of their making a living and meant excessive work (arguments against communal work are always popular).

One of the village officials spoke (on behalf of the rich farmers) and said that, while it was not up to him to decide on behalf of the meeting, with the capital from past harvests, it had been possible to restore several public buildings and the ward now had large sums to lend to its members. Cooperative work made the ward like a single family. How could they be united if they did not work together? In this matter though he would be guided entirely by the assembly. After further discussion the village officials, sensing that the majority clearly opposed the system, asked if it were agreed that harvesting should be stopped. To this there was a low chorus of *Inggih*. So the head of the *banjar* (*klian dinas*) announced the system ended and members free to decide their own arrangements.

This was about as transparent as debate ever was during my time there. The reason is that every single farmer had a stake in the outcome. So discussion was more open, direct (*beblakasan*) and raw (*nguda*) than usual. Even so, to take the argument at face value is to miss much.³⁹ The reason the issue was discussed publicly was because the heads of the factions, the patrons, had been unable to wrestle a sufficient majority one way or another behind the scenes. On the whole, patrons much preferred to avoid public debate because the outcome is always uncertain. A good orator can often throw a spanner into the best-oiled machine. What transpires in public is, if you will permit an untropical metaphor, the tip of the iceberg. Leaving aside Balinese penchant for indirect reference (e.g. Hobart 2015), even such a simple example suggests how little conventional criteria of reason elucidate without invoking cultural and social context so extensively as to be vacuous.

From the example though, the contrast is stark between, say, Ciceronian grand oratory and the brief, self-apologetic murmurs of Balinese speakers. Should I refer to the latter as orators? It depends on how you define orator. The relevant entry of the OED reads: ‘One who delivers a speech or oration in public; a public speaker, esp. one distinguished for oratorical ability; an eloquent public speaker’. Unless you equate eloquence with verbosity, the definition fits both. To understand the difference requires a brief sortie into differences in the two kinds of society. As Basil Bernstein argued, in societies where shared knowledge and experience cannot be taken for granted, speakers must use what he called ‘elaborated code’, which spells out the argument at length in detail using complex, carefully crafted sentences. By contrast, where people know one another well, to do so would seem ridiculous or arrogant. There ‘restricted code’, which is brief, succinct and full of shared allusion, is usual and more effective (Bernstein 1971). It is also considered arrogant to hold forth at length. So self-deprecation rather than virtuoso flourishes work better.⁴⁰ Furthermore, *pace* Anderson’s rose-tinted vision of community, as M.N. Srinivas once remarked, a village is ‘a back-to-back community’. Or, as Max Gluckmann pointed out, in local communities quarrels often date back generations. To make sense of and to contribute to argument in such communities requires shared knowledge and a certain delicacy in speaking and acting.

The issue that I have left in abeyance so far is whether argument is exclusively or necessarily discursive, in the sense of articulable verbally. Insofar as the efficacy of the *balian* or, more obviously, Déwa Madé Sayang depended on establishing a mood and

³⁹ The case and the background are discussed in detail in Hobart 1979.

⁴⁰ The irony of government officials holding forth at length, often self-importantly and vapidly, is not lost on most village Balinese.

carrying off a spectacular performance, it would seem not. An example may help.

The widow's coffee-stall and the siting of a shrine

Jèro (Jem)piring had been the wife of a leading member of the PKI, who was tortured to death in 1965. Shortly afterwards she became the mistress of his leading local political opponent. With the PNI's sharp decline in Pisangkaja, once again she shifted her allegiance to the soldier who had executed the communists in 1965 and who had recently become Perbekel of Tengahpadang. She had built a very smart coffee-stall of brick and concrete in the main square on village land under a large *waringin* tree, where her lover would come quite openly to visit her. While her actions were widely considered unpalatable, to say he was disliked would be an understatement. Feelings simmered.

Pisangkaja had been a former centre of the PKI. Together with other misfortunes that had befallen, there was an inchoate sense that matters needing putting right somehow. Relatives of the murdered PKI members and other villagers, shocked by the brutality, grouped around the *pamangku* of the Pura Dalem Kauh, who rose with the decline of the PNI. The *pamangku* saw a neat way to kill two birds with one stone. With his knowledge of Balinese geomancy, he realized the obvious solution was a public shrine and the ideal site was under the *waringin* where the stall was.

At a *banjar* meeting, it was agreed to invite the advice of a respected *balian wisada*. When he came and surveyed the village, he agreed reluctantly that the ideal site was indeed where the stall stood; but requested that no personal loss result from the erection of a shrine. As the Perbekel was an outsider and Jèro Piring thought unsavoury, the orators of the *pamangku's* faction and others ignored the *balian's* injunction in his presence and requested the meeting to adopt a resolution to build the shrine under the tree. Jèro Piring was then ordered to demolish her stall, which comprised her sole capital. The orators were unanimous and effusive in expressing their regrets at her loss, but they stressed that the spiritual welfare of the community was at stake. As the stall stood on public land, she was also obliged to pay for the demolition. The shrine was duly erected. She rebuilt her stall slightly to the west at great expense, which was met by her lover. To add insult to injury, the *banjar* then proposed that a small ornamental pond should be dug beside the shrine two paces from her door. Not only customers but even the owner and her lover had to be very careful, especially at night, not to step straight into the pond.

The example involves argument in two senses. It concerned a dispute between most of Pisangkaja and the widow and her lover, prosecuted through cultural reasoning about misfortune and geomancy. That the means was circuitous makes it more pertinent not less, because it is not only Indonesians who deploy indirectness, as any student of academic politics knows. Restricting argument to situations where only logic developed through elaborated code would be self-defeating. Here words, while a precondition to action, were secondary to the public act—indeed spectacle—of paying to destroy someone's means of livelihood, being obliged to rebuild it, then to risk getting wet every time anyone entered or left the dwelling.

The articulable and the visible

By definition, deliberative assemblies and séances involving *niskala* depend for their formal workings on discourse, in the sense of what is sayable. However, as the extracts from Pandawa Asrama and the Widow's Stall suggested, there is a strong element of spectacle. The aftermath of placing a pond beside the displaced stall was that customers at the several other stalls in the village square enjoyed the free daily show of the widow and her lover having to tiptoe carefully in and out of the room behind. Then there are the rites from temple festivals to cremations, which impact on several senses at once. The great

royal cremations in Bali have grown to be extraordinary spectacles, which demonstrate status, wealth and power as no verbal statement easily could. The obvious question is: under what circumstances is argument visible rather than articulable? Deleuze reflected thoughtfully on how Foucault wrestled in much of his writing with the relationship of the discursive and non-discursive or, in Deleuze's terms, the articulable and the visible, as irreducible (1988). So can we talk about arguing as publicly doing or demonstrating something? My last two ethnographic examples deal with events which led to the loss of political position and power by both the Tengahpadang and Pisangkaja branches of the Cokorda Sukawati family.

Uncapturing a bride-to-be

In the early 1950s, in Pisangkaja a local *jaba* (commoner) clan started to mount challenges to the power of the Puri. A celebrated orator, I Kebet (later tortured to death after G30S), at great risk to his life ran off with the wife of one of the Cokordas. Shortly afterwards his beautiful sister Ni Kelepon fell for the prince of the Puri Tengahpadang. They arranged a mock capture, after which the Cokorda summoned the Perbekel for her to confirm that she had gone willingly.

On learning of this, a large delegation of family and others from Pisangkaja immediately presented themselves. This includes the girl's mother, Ni Kripit, a formidable oratrix, and I Geningan, a rich farmer known for his extraordinary strength. On being told that the girl was there of her own accord, her mother begged to be allowed to embrace her daughter one last time. No sooner was she brought out than Ni Kripit shoved her off the high *balé* to her waiting father, which was the signal for I Geningan to pick her up and dash bodily out of the Puri before the astonished aristocrats could lift a finger. She was married off almost immediately after to a wealthy commoner from another *banjar*.

The Cokordas became the laughing stock of much of Gianyar. And, although they had controlled key public offices right up till then, they were never re-elected. Apart from Ni Kripit's *cri de coeur*, almost no word was spoken. The convention of mock capture of a low caste woman by a Cokorda was turned into a confrontation with wider ramifications. It is possible, as I have here and elsewhere, to describe what happens in words. But an *ex post facto* articulation lacks the punch of the original. You can devise scenarios in which the orators of Pisangkaja might have laid out a comprehensive case against the Cokordas' monopoly of position, power and privilege. However, even at the height of the PKI, political speeches changed little. Efficacy lay in doing and so demonstrating.

My final example is amusing and was wordless.

Irritating underpants

During the Japanese occupation of Bali, there was great material hardship. This was exacerbated by the fact that the village head, who had been proposed by the Puri Pisangkaja, ensured that the Puri and the small coterie of high castes and rich villagers who had backed him, had the lion's share of available rations. Items in short supply included cotton. So ordinary villagers relied on barkcloth, which Balinese are not skilled at making, while the privileged few had a surplus.

One villager, Ketut Mara, found barkcloth underpants irritating in two senses. He and other orators raised the matter in the *banjar* assembly, but to no avail. So he visited an old friend who was a clerk in the sub-district office responsible for issuing licenses. Armed with a ration of fifteen metres of cotton cloth purchasable in Ubud to the south, without telling anyone, Ketut Mara went off and bought five metres each of red, white and blue fabric. Early that afternoon, a strange figure entered Pisangkaja from the south, bringing crowds out as Ketut Mara processed picturesquely to the central square festooned in the cloth which trailed behind him on the ground. Arriving in front of the

Puri, he ordered a coffee at a stall and sat drinking it leisurely. When the headman found out, he was furious. Not only had he been bypassed, but his authority had also been challenged. The headman died shortly after. The event crystallized the opposition to the clique of the Puri and rich that the *banjar* proposed its own candidate against the wishes of the court, which was forced to bow to the strength of the opposition.

Ketut Mara's *coup d'éclat* had other significance. His choice of three colours was an explicit reference to the high castes, *triwangsa* or *triwarna*. Trailing these on the ground made the cloth doubly polluted. It was no longer *sukla*, as it had been worn by a *jaba* and they were dirty, *daki*, from the dust.⁴¹ By wearing a surfeit of cloth, he was highlighting how a few families had hogged the whole *banjar*'s cloth allowance. The further implication was that they were in breach of their caste duty, *darma*, to redistribute surplus not accumulate. So they had lost the right to respect and subservience, or undercut the then accepted view that they were somehow superior to ordinary villagers. Such proved the case. In this instance, we can compare the articulable and visible directly, because the best speakers in the *banjar* had argued against the abuse of position to no effect. A wordless performance proved most efficacious. Some thirty years later, I was regaled with accounts of Ketut Mara's action to the great amusement of all present. Some human responses—be they awe, excitement, astonishment, admiration, being moved, laughter—seem invoked as much, or indeed more, by non-discursive means.

This discussion brings us back to what I mean by discourse. Putting aside the British determination to reify the term,⁴² the French *discours* has different senses depending on the author, or even the work. Here I draw on Foucault's usage, which changed, and Deleuze's comments. In *The order of discourse*, Foucault was fairly clear.

In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality (1981: 52).

This control, he suggested, works through procedures of exclusion, of classifying and distributing, and restriction of access. For Bali I have noted how people are excluded and how access is restricted in various ways. Indeed, a society without any procedures would be a free-for-all. It does not follow though that the production of discourse works in the same way in Bali as it did in Europe, in each case of whatever period. Part of a more thorough discussion of argument would require rethinking how the notion of discourse might apply in different Indonesian societies. To take just one example: consider the formidable authority of the Catholic Church and then the role of universities and the professions throughout much of Europe's history. There is no equivalent in Bali. *Padanda* and *pamangku* were not part of an overarching disciplinary order, nor did they ever exercise such hegemony or domination. The more you look into the details of Foucault's accounts of how such procedures worked in Europe, what is striking is their relative absence or how differently things worked in Bali. For instance, the Balian Lantang Hidung could dismiss the entire Western medical apparatus out of hand without seeming odd. And, if the researcher ever gets in far enough to discover something of what goes on sexually in a Balinese community, it is reminiscent of Foucault's Europe before normalization, regulation and disciplining. Applying European ideas about discourse uncritically to other parts of the world is naïve and plain bad method. So we need to start

⁴¹ If you like elegant interpretations, he was degrading the high castes homonymically.

⁴² A delightful example is 'discourse analysis', which is a great favourite in film and media studies. As there are umpteen incompatible accounts of discourse, prior to rigorous definition, the expression is vacuous and simply highlights the superficiality of its proponents.

afresh in thinking about how ideas of the discursive—and so the non-discursive and argument itself—might apply. On this account, Bali is a good case study, because the visual, spectacular, ceremonial, theatrical and musical are so highly developed as styles of performance.

Perhaps the end of the beginning

The aim of this piece has been to reflect on how we might understand ideas around argument in Bali. Granted the logocentric hold that scholars have used Aristotle to exercise over discussion of reason and rhetoric, I have taken time to show that use of the derivative canons would straightjacket understanding how Balinese speak, act, engage with, judge and comment on what people say and do. Various questions arise. What is the relationship of demonstrating or exemplifying as against enunciating or claiming? How should we start thinking about spectacle in a society where it plays such a prominent role?⁴³ Theatre might seem easy to talk about because it is partly verbal. But what sorts of relationships hold between words, actions, music, sounds and the general ambiance in different settings? And what about dance or gamelan performance? To omit these because they are hard to articulate verbally—or declare them irrelevant to a study of argument—looks like a failure of nerve and imagination. How should we rethink the relationship between the articulable and the visible, if indeed the terms are helpful? Far from knowing almost everything there is to know, it seems we know little and comprehend less. Perhaps we should not allow ourselves to be so bedazzled by the brilliant screen of discourse. If we are to understand argument in Bali, we may need to go beyond words.

Bibliography

- Ang, I. 1991. *Desperately seeking the audience*. London: Routledge
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. Forms of time in the chronotope of the novel. In *The dialogic imagination: four essays*. trans. C. Emerson & M. Holquist, ed. M. Holquist, Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Barthes, R. 1973. Myth today. In *Mythologies*. trans. A. Lavers, London: Paladin.
- Bateson, G. 1949. Bali; the value system of a steady state. in *Social structure: essays presented to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown*. ed. M. Fortes, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Becker, A.L. 1979. Text-building, epistemology and aesthetics in Javanese shadow theatre. in *The imagination of reality: essays in Southeast Asian coherence systems*. eds. A.L. Becker & A.A. Yengoyan, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Bernstein, B. 1971. *Class, codes and control: theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Clifford, J. 1983. On ethnographic authority. *Representations* 1, 2.
- Deleuze, G. 1988. *Foucault*. London: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Dilley, R. 1999. Introduction: the problem of context. In *The problem of context*. Oxford: Berghahn.

⁴³ By spectacle I mean not just large-scale performances such as Sendratari or Kècak, or even the great rites of Déwayadnya or Pitrayadnya, but also the massacres following G30S, the impact of which is still felt.

- Durkheim, E. 1915. *The elementary forms of the religious life*. trans. J.W. Swain, London: Allen & Unwin.
- Foucault, M. 1980. What is an author? In *Textual strategies: perspectives in post-structuralist criticism*. ed. J.V. Harari, London: Methuen.
- 1981. The order of discourse. trans. I. McLeod. In *Untying the text: a post-structuralist reader*. ed. R. Young, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Geertz, C. 1966. *Person, time and conduct in Bali: an essay in cultural analysis*. Yale Southeast Asia Program, Cultural Report Series 14.
- 1973. Thick description: towards an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- 1980. *Negara: the theatre state in nineteenth-century Bali*. Princeton: Univ. Press.
- Geertz, H. 1959. The Balinese village. In *Villages in Indonesia: local, national and ethnic loyalties in village Indonesia*. ed. G.W. Skinner, Yale: Univ. Cultural report series.
- Hacking, I. 1975. *Why does language matter to philosophy?* Cambridge: Univ. Press.
- Hobart, M. 1982. Meaning or moaning? an ethnographic note on a little-understood tribe. In *Semantic anthropology*. ed. D.J. Parkin, London: Academic Press.
- 1985. Anthropos through the looking-glass: or how to teach the Balinese to bark. In *Reason and morality*. ed. J. Overing, London: Tavistock.
- 1999. As they like it: overinterpretation and hyporeality in Bali. In *The problem of context*. ed. R. Dilley, Oxford: Berghahn.
- 2006. Just talk? anthropological reflections on the object of media studies in Indonesia. *Asian journal of social science* 34, 3: 492-519.
- 2010a. Rich kids can't cry: reflections on the viewing subject in Bali. Special issue *Audiencing: the Work of the Spectator in Live Performance*. *About Performance* 10.
- 2010b. What do we mean by 'media practices'? In *Anthropological perspectives on media and practice*. eds. B. Bräuchler & J. Postill, Oxford: Berghahn, pp 55-75.
- 2011. Live or dead? Televised theatre and its audiences in Bali. In *Genre in Asian film and television: new approaches*. eds. F. Chan et. al. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 2013. When is Indonesia? In *Rethinking Asian media and film*. ed. M. Hobart, Special issue of *The Asian Journal of Social Science*, Brill.
- 2015. Beyond the Whorfs of Dover: a study of Balinese interpretive practices. *Heidelberg ethnology, occasional papers* 1.
- Hollis, M. 1967. The limits of irrationality. *Archives Européennes de sociologie*. VII, Reprinted 1970 in *Rationality*. ed. B. Wilson, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hollis, M. & Lukes, S. eds. 1982. Introduction. In *Rationality and relativism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laclau, E. 1990. New reflections on the revolution of our time. In *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.
- Lekkerkerker, C. 1926. De kastenmaatschappij in Britsch-Indie en op Bali. *Menschen maatschappij*, 2.
- Lloyd, G.E.R. 1979. *Magic, reason and experience: studies in the origins and development of Greek science*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.

- Lukes, S. 1967. Some problems of rationality. *Archives Européennes de sociologie*. VIII, reprinted 1970 in *Rationality*. ed. B. Wilson, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Morley, D. 1992. *Television, audiences and cultural studies*. London: Routledge.
- Morson, G.S. & Emerson, C. 1990. *Mikhail Bakhtin: creation of a prosaics*. Stanford, Ca.: Univ. Press
- Nightingale, V. 1996. *Studying audiences: the shock of the real*. London: Routledge.
- Overing, J. ed. 1985. *Reason and morality*. London: Tavistock.
- Quine, W.V.O. 1960. *Word and object*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- 1970. *Philosophy of logic*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall.
- Palmer, R.E. 1969. *Hermeneutics: interpretation theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press.
- Ricoeur, P. 1984. *Time and narrative*. trans. K. McLaughlin & D. Pellauer, Volume 1. London: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- 1985. *Time and narrative*. trans. K. McLaughlin & D. Pellauer, Volume 2. London: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- 1988. *Time and narrative*. trans. K. Blamey & D. Pellauer, Volume 3. London: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Rorty, A. 1976. A literary postscript: characters, persons, selves, individuals. In *The identities of persons*. ed. A. Rorty, Berkeley: California Univ. Press.
- Schulte-Nordholt, H. 2007. *Bali: an open fortress 1995-2005*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Shannon, C. & Weaver, W. 1949. *The mathematical theory of communication*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Sperber, D. 1985. *On anthropological knowledge*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.
- Staten, H. 1986. *Wittgenstein and Derrida*. London: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Taylor, C. 1989. *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Vickers, A. 2012. *Bali: a paradise created*. 2nd. edn. North Clarendon VT: Tuttle Publishing.
- Wikan, U. 1990. *Managing turbulent hearts: a Balinese formula for living*. London: Chicago Univ. Press.
- Winch, P. 1958. *The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wittgenstein. L. 1958. *Philosophical investigations*. trans. G.E.M. Anscombe, 2nd. edn, Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1969. *The blue and brown books: preliminary studies for the philosophical investigations*. 2nd. edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. 1982. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. 2 Vols, (with S. Robson) The Hague: Nijhoff.

Appendix 1

The Oxford English Dictionary on Argue, Argument, Argumentation

Argue, v.

4-; also 4 arguwe, 5 argwe, 6 argoue, argew.

[a. OF. argue-r:—L. argūtāre, freq. of argu-ĕre to make clear, prove, assert, accuse, blame; of which latter Fr. arguer and Eng. argue are now taken as the equivalents.]

I.I To bring evidence, convict, prove, indicate.

†1.I.1 To make good an accusation against, prove wrong or guilty, convict. Const. of Obs.

†2.I.2 trans. To accuse, impeach, arraign, find fault with, call in question. Const. of Obs.

3.I.3 To prove or evince; to afford good ground for inferring, show weighty reasons for supposing; to betoken, indicate. (Passing from prove in early use to evidence or imply in modern use.) a.I.3.a a person or thing to be so-and-so.

b.I.3.b that it is.

II.II To bring reasons, to reason, dispute.

4.II.4 intr. To bring forward reasons concerning a matter in debate; to make statements or adduce facts for the purpose of establishing or refuting a proposition; to discuss; to reason.

b.II.4.b Hence, To reason in opposition, raise objections, contend, dispute.

c.II.4.c Const., with (in general sense), against (in direct opposition to the position of), an opponent; for or against a proposition; about (of obs.) a matter under discussion.

5.II.5 trans. To bring forward the reasons for or against (a proposition, etc.); to discuss the pros and cons of; to treat by reasoning, examine controversially.

6.II.6 With subord. clause. To maintain, by adducing reasons, the proposition or opinion that.

7.II.7 trans. To bring forward as a reason (for or against), to use as an argument. arch.

8.II.8 to argue (a thing) away, off, etc.: to get rid of by argument.

9.II.9 to argue (a person) into or out of: to persuade him by argument into, or out of, a course of action, an opinion or intention.

Argumentation

[a. F. argumentation, -acion (14th c. in Littré), ad. L. argūmentātiōn-em f. argūmentāri: see argument v.]

1.1 The action or operation of inferring a conclusion from propositions premised; methodical employment or presentation of arguments; logical or formal reasoning.

2.2 Interchange of argument, discussion, debate.

3.3 A sequence or chain of arguments, a process of reasoning; = argument 4.

Argument

[a. F. argument (13th c.), ad. L. argūment-um, f. arguĕre (or refashioning, after this, of OF. arguement, f. arguer): see argue. For use of the L. form, see 3 c.]

1.1 Proof, evidence, manifestation, token. (Passing from clear proof in early, to proof presumptive in later usage; cf. argue 3.) arch.

2.2 Astr. and Math. The angle, arc, or other mathematical quantity, from which another required quantity may be deduced, or on which its calculation depends.

3. a.3.a A statement or fact advanced for the purpose of influencing the mind; a reason urged in support of a proposition; spec. in Logic, the middle term in a syllogism. Also fig.

b.3.b Const. (to obs.), for, a conclusion; hence (of later origin) against the contrary.

c.3.c In certain phrases borrowed from the formal terminology of the schools, the L, argumentum is in current use, esp. in argumentum ad hominem. argumentum e (or ex) silentio, an argument from silence: used of a conclusion based on lack of contrary evidence.

4.4 A connected series of statements or reasons intended to establish a position (and, hence, to refute the opposite); a process of reasoning; argumentation.

5. a.5.a Statement of the reasons for and against a proposition; discussion of a question; debate.

†b.5.b transf. Subject of contention, or debate. Obs.

†6.6 Subject-matter of discussion or discourse in speech or writing; theme, subject. Obs. or arch.

7.7 The summary or abstract of the subject-matter of a book; a syllabus; fig. the contents.

Appendix 2 — Words for Argument etc. in Indonesian and Balinese¹

English	Indonesian	Balinese	Indonesian Dictionary Translations ²
Argue	Memperdébatkan	Majugjagan	Debate (Etym: Dutch or English)
	Menangtang		challenge. (etym: Jav. via Minangkabau)
	Membantah	Ngalawan	<i>membantah</i> bantah Examples show all 3 local 2 remote 1 to contradict, assert the opposite of (what someone else has said), deny someone's statement, argue. 2 to dispute (a fact, etc.), contest (a point), challenge (a statement); to oppose (a proposal), go against. 3 to refute. 4 to deny (God's existence).
Argument	Perbédaan Pendapat	Pamineh malènan	1 difference, distinction. 2 disparity. 1 opinion, idea, thinking (about something). 2 conclusion.
	Percékcokan		1 quarrel, squabble, disagreement, discord, bickering, wrangling (Jav. Jkt)
	Uraian		1 explanation, account, clarification. 2 description. 3 anatomical dissection. 4 analysis, breakdown, details. 5 (<i>Ling</i>) parsing.
	Penjelasan	Keterangan	1 clarification, explanation, elucidation, information.
Argumentation	Uraian		
	Pembuktian		1 proving, verification. 2 proof, evidence.
	Arguméntasi		1 argumentation. (Dutch)

¹ I do not know the equivalent terms in Javanese or other Indonesian languages that might possibly be relevant.

² From Stevens & Schmidgall-Tellings 2004.

Argumentative	Suka menantang/ mendébat		
Discuss	Membicarakan	Mabligbagan	1 [Usage obsolete] to discuss, debate, argue, talk about, deliberate.
	Merundingkan	Ngaraosang	1 to discuss, debate, dispute, argue about, negotiate, consult about. Runding: 1 classical literature calculation, computation. 2 discussion, deliberation.
		Ngareringa	1 to deliberate, close to mabligbagan, but with an additional emphasis upon reflecting carefully on the evidence (<i>nyaringin</i>)
Discussion	Pembicaraan		1 talk, discussion, conversation. 2 (telephone) call
	Diskusi	Pikolih bligbagan	1. Discussion (Dutch)
	Perundingan		1 negotiations, talks.
Debate (n)	Perdébatan	Majugjagan	1 debate, debating, deliberations. 2 the subject of debate. (Dutch/Eng.)
	Pembahasan	Mabligbagan	1 discussion. 2 criticism, debate. 3 investigating, looking into.
	Diskusi	Ngaraosang	
	Perbincangan	Ngaraos-ngaraos	1 discussion, talk, deliberation. 2 meeting, conference

Appendix 3: The credibility of reality

Petitioners from Br. Sayan Kutuh, Kadéwatan, Gianyar seeking advice
from a *balian* from Banjar Lantang Hidung, Batuan.

BLH = Balian Lantang Hidung

Pet = Petitioners/Clients.

The body of the text is Balinese. Words in italics are untranslated Balinese. Underlined words are Indonesian, and those in bold type Kawi.

<p>BLH: From where do you come to seek advice? What banjar (ward)?</p> <p>Pet: From Br. Sayan Kutuh.</p> <p>BLH: From Sayan Kutuh. May I ask your position (caste)?</p> <p>Pet: I am low caste (kaula. lit: servant/slave).</p> <p>BLH: Good. Now whether you will get advice (literally: speech) or not is not yet sure. Whether you will be successful or not,ⁱ we share (responsibility for what happens) together. Is that acceptable?</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: <i>Presents offerings using following words</i>: I beg indulgence (and request not to be cursed by) Your Highness the Divinity, and the Purified Dead, of the Temple of Origin who live in the world of Sayan Kutuh. You are invited by the medium of Lantang Hidung. Descend Your Highness(es) and install Yourself(/ves) on the offering (a <i>daksina</i>). I beg forgiveness if anything is short or in excess on my part. These, Your slaves,ⁱⁱ beg to present themselves to their Father (here: the deified dead) today. Whether the substance of what is said is fitting or not fitting, I beg of you to go ahead and start inquiring.ⁱⁱⁱ</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: If the family Guardian Deity and the (other) Purified Dead^{iv} will grace us and reflect on the truth or falsity of what we here on earth have wondered about. <i>Starts to speak as from Divinity</i>: If what has happened, if the calm of the family (has been disrupted), you still have food. This is not arrogance, because you have remained fixed on a proper path.^v <i>Speaks directly</i>: Have you understood? <i>Because the clients fail to speak, the healer phrases the question for them</i>. Because there are some</p>	<p>BLH: {Pakulun Paduka Batara Hyang-Hyang} Kaminitan malingga malingih, ring Jagat Penegara Sayan Kutuh, kaundang antuk Pedasaran Lantang Hidung, Tedun temurun Paduka Batara malinggih ring puruaning daksina, tuna liwat tuna langkung antuk titiyang umatur ampura. Ainggih puniki pèrmas mapinunas sepedek tangkilé ring angganing Ajung rahinané mangkin, gumanti cocok ten cocok sedagingin pawucana, raris nyen iraga matur inggih!</p> <p>Pet: Ainggih.</p> <p>BLH: Niki yan kemanah ben di lemah pada, suwécan Ida Hyang Guru, suwécan Sang Raja Déwata Iraga sané suba ninggalin mati, dadi maruang mamusuh dané encèn, nah! Yèn okasan yen ketentraman iraga satu kaka,</p> <p>BLH: Yadian merta amangkinan nah! Sing ja iraga bakal sombong sumbung, tepat ring sasaran, sampun Jèroné ngerti? Sané ten kepineh antuk, meled masih manahé apang maan matembung raos ngajak Sang Raja Déwatan Iraga abuku. Apang dadi sakité sing maran-maraning dina, dané makada apa kadèn, sing ja enyenang buka cara ules siapé sing mapilih tekèn ules, Tua sakit, cenik sakit, nah! tuwahéja enu hidup dong</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

matters they do not understand, they would like a word (literally, a word, *abuku*) with the Purified Dead. So that the illness does not go on from day to day unendingly, what do you think is the cause? *The healer seems to start speaking again as if from the dead.*^{vi} There are no indications, as with a fighting cock, as to which is chosen (as to whom is struck down). The old are ill, the young are ill. The living can make no sense of it: that is the nature of the illness. Have you understood?

Pet: We have.

BLH: But, as for broken bones or wounds, in fact there are none. Now this is the nature of the illness: to start with the eldest, their thoughts are far away (i.e. they are very confused), they can't hear properly (not because they are deaf, but they do not seem to take in what is said), their heart is pounding (a frightening feeling for the patient), all their joints are numb and they feel pain in the marrow of their bones. What is more the ill person is unaware of being confused. It is no use referring this to a doctor, the doctor will be at a loss to work out what is the problem (i.e. the doctor will be as confused as they are).^{vii} The reason is that there are no clear symptoms. That is just the illness of the oldest (she uses the Old Javanese **werdah**, Sanskrit *wrdhha*, and so explains), in other words old, do you know **werda**?, it is old. Now it is like this: if you say the person is well, they are well, if you say they are ill, they are ill. (This is a formula widely-used in Balinese society. It suggests something which does not neatly fit categories: the patient is both/neither ill or well. Here perhaps better: the categories 'ill' and 'well' do not really fit.) So long as it is between monthly offerings at the house shrine (*rerainan*), the person's thoughts are clear but, as the date of the offerings approaches, the person becomes confused and has dreadful dreams. When the person is out in public, they are quite capable of sorting out East from West (to be confused over directions in Bali is the acid test of deep confusion); but as soon as they enter the compound, they are worse than a chicken under a clay water pot. If one says the person is mad, do not think this is sent from God, if so they would be mad both in the streets and at home. They are not mad, but ill. However, this is not an ordinary illness; it is different; it is called not well, not ill.^{viii} So, those are the nature of the signs (of something unusual) in your compound now. Have you understood?

Pet: Yes.

BLH: *Because the petitioners do not ask a question, the healer has to instruct them in the*

sing masih makejang bakat rambang, kèto enyen kuwalitait sakité, suba Jèroné ngerti?

Pet: Sampun.

BLH: Nah! kuwala yèning sakit elung, matatu, sajaan enyen singada, jani kèni kuwalitait sakité, ené mara dané werda ené abesik, ejeg uli deduwuran malelayangan, karna uwus, ulun dada dumetar,

BLH: Sebuku-buku meluang manyajah yèn pecik sing kena baana ngerasayang sakit, yèn suba rasanga ditulang sumsum wat jajah sakitné, apa buin iraga dané ngelahang mirib sing mèngong baana otaké memikir, kadirasa Dokteré baang nanganin masih mèngong baana Dokteré, awinan kèto, sakité nyata gejalané sing ada. Ento mara abesik sakit werda, Tua ento, tawang werda, tua? Nah! jani, kèné iraga lantasan, orang ragaé seger, seger, orang ragaé gelem, gelem. Kasal suba embang rerainan, rasané jeg bisa iraga ngelah keneh cerah, kuwala eya magpag rerainan, jeg bisa butek ipian saling pajelèkin ajak makejang, yèn suba iraga dimargaé encèn kangin, encèn kauh, terang baan minehin ragané, kasal masuk ka pekarangan jelèkan tekèn siap matekep baan gebeh, yèn orang rageé buduh apang eda bènjul Widié, di margaé buduh jumah buduh,

BLH: Ajaniané apang eda bènjul Widié buduh bena tusing. Nah! ento ané seger ento singja dané sakit yen entoa, anak sakit lènja sakit, ento sing seger sakit adané ento. Nah! Kèto kwalitait cirié jani dipekarangan. Suba Jèroné ngerti?

Pet: Sampun.

BLH: Nah! mawinan asapunika, dané makada ten nika tiyang ngerti. Nah apa nyenang ada tiang salahang kawitan, apa enyen ada Hyang Gurun tiangé nyisipan, apa sang Pitran tiangé sané ninggalin mati mirib sing beneh baan

proper way of inquiring, and so phrases the next series of questions for them. What is the reason for this? It is what is the cause that I do not understand. Have I done wrong to (the deities of) the central family shrine?^{ix} Have I been judged at fault by my family Guardian Deity? Have the cremated dead (*pitra*) felt I have been lacking in my attention (here in not completing the lengthy series of mortuary ceremonies)?^x If that is so, may we speak about it first? Apart from my Guardian Deity, may I also have a word with my cremated relatives? Isn't that what you want to ask?

Pet: Yes. It is like that. That's it.

BLH: Ah! It's like this, my descendants.^{xi} People are talking a lot in public. There are people who say that you have not yet escorted the cremated back;^{xii} there are people who say that the compound is dangerous (*tenget*, contains unusual, and invisible, powers which affect the living); there are people who say that you have done wrong to (the deities of) the central family shrine. Do not carry filth from the streets back home (i.e. do not bring gossip back).^{xiii}

Pet: Yes.

BLH: If one says the compound contains unseen forces, where, I wonder, is there a compound that does not contain unseen forces? It is somewhat so, but should be made good by the performance of the usual, appropriate rites in the house shrine. This is not linked to antagonism from the dead, nor linked to antagonism from (the deities of) the central family shrine; nor linked to antagonism from your Guardian Deity, whom indeed I am. Now in fact this is the work of an ordinary human, from the visible world (*lemah pada, sakala*). If, of course, someone had fallen prey to poison (here targeted at an individual by a specialist), only they would have suffered. It wouldn't be like the mishmash it is (with everyone feeling the effects),^{xiv} that means it is a *papasangan* (a specially placed device), the device has been placed just inside the gateway to the compound. It contains: pubic hair, a sheet inscribed with people fighting, a *timbul* flower (a kind of breadfruit), eleven grains of rice in the husk, wrapped around with three-coloured thread.^{xv} It lies there, like a buried antique, on guard (forgotten but still active). Its effect is worse than a household where no one performs any rites at all.^{xvi} Have you understood?

Pet: We have.

BLH: Ah! If it is about the dreams, do not give it thought. Why should that be so? If I take an illustration, it is like a guided missile (which has almost reached its

tiyang ngastitayang, nah mangkin yèn sampun kènten nika raosang dumun, kuwala disamping baos Hyang Guru, apang bakat tiyangja masih Sang Déwatan tiyangé ajak tiyang ngeraos abuku sing kèto enyeté?

Pet: Ainggih, kènten sampun, asapunika sampun.

BLH: Nah! jani kéné enyen damuh, sewirèh raos anak di jalané liyu, ada anak ngeraosang baan Pitraé koné kondèn tutun, ada anak ngeraosang karangé koné tenget, ada anak ngeraosang salah kawitan, apang eda lulun jalan bakat suwun mulih.

Pet: Ainggih.

BLH: Yèning karang tenget dija koné karangé tusing tenget, anaké kadèn ngalih karang tenget, tengeté tuwah atengit suba benèh baan nyungsung, ené anak tusing menyangkut paut, lawan Pitra, tan menyangkut paut lawan Kawitan, tan menyangkut paut lawan Hyang Guru anaké buka nira. Nah! jani pèr mulana pegaèn jelema lemah, kuwaleté lemahé ento, yèn mulaning iya kena cetik, enyènja kenea ento iya ngeronot pedidiana, sing enyak kéné cara urab uyah sera, berarti pepasangan eni, genah pepasangané di pemesuan, ditu ada bulun prana, jeluwang ulantaga marajah jelama mapalu, kecècèlan bungan timbul, jijih solas besik mabebed benang sri datu, jagea bena baan barang antik, sangkal jelèkang tekèn anak sing makardi porosan tuh atanding. Suba bena ngerti?

Pet: Sampun.

BLH: Nah! yèn bagi ipian eda ento anggona keneh, apa mawinan kèto, yèn andéyang nira cara peluru kendali, sewirèh suba adané diambang pintu, apang eda sampai menèmbak, anak Nira mula ngulgul panjak duwèn Nirané, Sang Raja Déwata, Sang Raja Pitraé ketog Nira.

BLH: Tundèn Nira ngulgul perti sentanané apang ènggalang

destination) because it is about to explode (literally it is on your doorstep). In order that it doesn't reach the point of your being shot, in conjunction with the purified dead and the recently cremated dead, I have let loose my servants (invisible followers, *babutan*) to visit you with disturbances (like the dreams, of a kind) which would make you quickly seek clarification. This was in order that you would not be just convinced by a doctor. If you had been convinced (by a doctor's diagnosis), you would now be dead. Now what is the use of dead followers to Me?^{xvii} This is why I sent bad dreams, even to the smallest toddlers. Have you understood?

Pet: We have.

BLH: Now, who is disturbing you? I will not give you the name, but an indication to think about.^{xviii} If (you ask if it is) within the household (or compound), it certainly isn't; it is an arrangement^{xix} between a woman and a man. The male has no family connection at all, he is being paid to do this. As for the woman, she has a family connection but is not able to inherit (from the people under attack). The reason she cannot inherit is that, although she grew up in the compound, she now belongs to someone else (i.e. she has married out) who is not in a position to inherit (i.e. who is not closely linked by ties of descent), but she is still related to you.

Pet: We have heard.

BLH: First, she wants to succeed in bringing ruin (to you all); second, she wants to make you ill; third, she wants to bring death. Now if I consider these three as an example, she has failed on two scores. The family is not yet in ruins; no one is yet dead; it has only reached the stage of a person who was well feeling muddled, lacking direction, feeling unable to think clearly; that is the extent of illness which she has succeeded in inducing. Have you really understood, my descendants?

Pet: We have.

BLH: Now what I have not revealed is that we shall ask assistance from the Deity of the one who is helping you (i.e. the healer) (by) first releasing Its emissaries to counter-attack.^{xx} In a moment It will bestow gifts (*walanugrah*, Skt. & O.J.: **anugraha**) upon you (consisting of) both a counter to the device planted, a counter to the confused thoughts, which will bring health and allay bad dreams, as well as medicine against the illnesses. Have you understood?

Pet: We have.

BLH: In a moment It will give these.

iya ngalih galang, apang eda iya yakin tekèn Dokter dogèn, yèn suba iya yakin tekèn Dokter dogèn, kadung mati panjak Nira kalkudiang Nira ngidupang panjak mati, sangkal kanti cenik pecèh-pecèh baang Nira ipian suba bena ngerti?

Pet: Sampun.

BLH: Nah! Dané mabisèkang ento nyen, adané tusing icèn Nira nangingté anggong pedoman dikeneh, yèn ané ajak satu kaka di natah saja tusing ada, ené dadua sekané abesik eluh abesik muani, dané muani tusing bena makadang kendat, iya nengepupah ento, yèn ané eluh enu ada hubungan keluarga ajak waris saling waris iya tusing dadi, awinang tusing dadi sewirèh eluh entikné di pekarangan irageé, suba kegelah ben anak lèn dong dadi ajak waris saling waris, dadiné tusing apragatan ento dogèn bena manyama.

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Iya edot iyené abesik apang nyidang pecah belah, dadua apang nyidang sakit, tetelu apang nyidang mati. Nah, jani yèn andèyang Nira cara bacakané tetelu, dadua batal, pecah belah nyen bena anak tondèn, mati nyen bena anak tondèn, ené mara ragené ané seger jeg budeg rasa tusing ngelah jurusan,

BLH: Rasa tusing nyideyang mangembang otaké, nyen sakit mara amonto nyen ané nyidayang manyerang. Suba bena ngerti damuh selir?

Pet: Sampun.

BLH: Nah! jani, api tusing ada ngaku agem, patut bena nunas ica, amongkèn kesidi sesuwunan anak enu masih dadi penampih, caling Niraé malu adokang, nah! bin akejep Nira bakal ngicèn walenugrah, wiadin pengeleburan pepasangan, pengeleburan keneh budeg, dané seger-seger pengeleburan ipian ala, wiadin ubad sakit. Suba bena ngerti?

<p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: But now I shall be followed by a family member of yours who has died...</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: who will speak to you now.^{xxi}</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: Now he is accompanied by his wife but, as the saying goes, like an end-of-year cockfight, she has just come along as required.^{xxii} You can ask her to speak, but afterwards. I Mustika who is ascending (onto the offering) to speak, isn't he your dead relative?</p> <p>Pet: Yes. He is.</p> <p>BLH: Now, you, as children, should speak to him like a senior relative, as you did when he was alive.</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: He will speak like an elder relative to his children <u>by way of his idioms of speech</u> (his style, but also level, of language use). Have you understood?^{xxiii}</p> <p>Pet: We have.</p> <p>BLH: Ah! Lord Guardian Deity is ending. My Lady, wait! (reference to I Mustika's wife, who is told to wait and not speak.) My Lord. Your Male Lord is coming. <i>I was told that the healer was still katapak (lit: impressed upon, in trance) during these comments. Hereafter she speaks with the quavering voice of I Mustika.</i> Good and bad cannot be separated. Why is that so? What your Guardian Deity said is so, but that is the situation of you who are still living. Now, after I left the earth (on death) for the invisible (literally: for the old/mature) world, summoned by Sang Jogor Manik (the judge in the underworld who decides the fate of the dead)^{xxiv} and arrived to be greeted by Sang Kala Pati (the Being who is delegated to meet the dead). I found the path (through the underworld) was good, but I had to make my own way carefully past all the obstacles. Now I am happy with a wonderful feeling beyond description.^{xxv} But, when I think of my living descendants, the older people, let alone my grandchildren, (because I died young) I did not get to take care (lit: run around after) of my children, far less take care of my grandchildren to whom I owe (an unpayable debt) two hundred times greater.^{xxvi} Now I (and your other forbears) feel deep sympathy for those who are still living for the heavy tribulations you are enduring. Now, about the ceremonies that are called cremation and the twelfth day rite,^{xxvii} I have appreciated these fully. It is true that people in</p>	<p>Pet: Sampun.</p> <p>BLH: Malih ajebos Nira mapica.</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Jani tugtuga bena tekèn Sang Raja Déwata Pitraé dané ninggalin.</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Kan ajak anaké ngeraos jani!</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Nah! jani, apija mai dané eluh, anak eluh sing cara sinonggané cara tajen kesanga maragatang uran dadija idihin raos kuwaleya dorian, Mustika dané menèk ngeraos ten Hyang Raja Déwatan iraga dané muani?</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Jani iraga pianaka sekadi ngajak rerama idepan enu idup.</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Irerama sekadi ngajak pianak seolah-olah paribasa idup, suba ngerti?</p> <p>Pet: Sampun.</p> <p>BLH: Nah! Ratu Batara Hyang Guru mararian, Sang Pawètri jantos! Jèro Sang Raja Lanang. Hyang-Hyang Raja Lanang pedek ketangkilin, nah! dadi suka lan duka tuwareja dadi belasang apa mawinang, nah! manut baos Ida Batara Hyang Guru sakéwaleté keadakan cainé dané enu idup, nah sepetinggalé uli di mercapada ngalih gumi wayah apan kartué kebitanga tekèn Sang Jogor Manik, dadi teka lantasang Sang Kala Pati magpag, marga beneng tepuk, yatnané lempang dadi bakat entasin, liangé kadi rasa nyucuk mèru, nah yèn inget tekèn tetungkakan rupaka apa buin kéné macucu nyen bakal ketugtugan ben asal mapianak tusing ketugtugan ben macucu satak esingan, nah dadi ané enu idup bakat pangenang, kéné dadi gegodané gedéné, nah! yèn buat upekareé dané maadan pengabènan, dané</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

the streets are saying that the problems are due to you not having performed Nuntun Déwata (the same as Mendak Nuntun), but I feel no lack; however this talk troubles my thoughts. Now it is correct that, according to religious practice, it should be: cremation, secondary cremation, escorting the dead back. But, even if you had only offered a single *canang* (a tiny daily offering), I would have been happy to rest in the earth (lit: to pray to/in Ibu Pretiwi [the goddess of the earth], Skt. & O.J.: **prthiwi**) uncremated.^{xxviii} In short, none (of your dead family) is harming you. That I why I feel sad and tears of sympathy sting the eyes of your parents (**rupaka** again) first, to hear what people are staying in public, second I feel deep affection for you and wish you well (a truly good place). Ah! Ah! If that's how it is, what do you wish? Just let me know and I shall speak.

Pet: If I may, that the disruption would end. Speak to me about how I should bring this to an end. I am unable to speak properly.

BLH: Ah! Now it's like this. Look for a means of destroying what has been put in the entrance of your compound: ash, ginger, salt, leaves of the drumstick tree (Bal: *kélor*, Lat: moringa pleryogasperma), fat from a pig with white flecks in its flesh,^{xxix} a young green coconut.^{xxx}

Pet: Yes.

BLH: Now, above the head of your bed, I shall give you a weapon, but do not put it in the house shrine...

Pet: Yes.

BLH: a *santun* with a complete set of contents...^{xxxi}

Pet: Yes.

BLH: but don't put a coconut in it (a usual ingredient)...

Pet: Yes.

BLH: put a coconut shell in the middle instead...

Pet: Yes.

BLH: Inside the coconut shell, include a sliver of bamboo.^{xxxii}

Pet: Yes.

BLH: If you put it in place, do not take it down in three, or ten days...

Pet: Yes.

BLH: Do not think of it as to eat. Think of it as put their by Father to guard the children and to guard the grandchildren. Leave it there (as a weapon of the family deities).

Pet: Yes.

maadan pengerorasan, tuwija buka raos anaké di jalané bena oranga ben tusing nuntun pitra koné nuntun Déwata bena nemuang kèni, nah! ento dané sakitang ati buka jani, yèning tata agama anak mula amonto, abèngang sekah tuntun, sakéwaleté enèké mara nyen nyidang bena ngaé canang atanding, saudja canang atanding tuwara nyideyang suka kenehé enu miasa di Ibu Pertiwi, cendek tusing ada ngadukung, eniké awinang rasa ngetèl eyèh matané madalem rupaka cara jani, abesik madingehang raos anak di jalan, daduwa anaké buka cai bakat pedalem, yèn tongos saja melah. nah!-nah! yèn kèto kènkèn jani pengidihé, nah timbalin tuwah Bapa ngeraos!

Pet: Yèn dados ban tiyang apang uwusanja tiyang buwut, icèn tiyang baos apuputang tiyang ten keni baan tiyang ngeraos.

BLH: Nah! jani kèni nah!, emu kemu alihang awaké! Anggon ngelebur nyen pemesuané, aon, jaé, uyah, don kèlor, lengis cèlèng berasan, bungkak gadang,

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Nah! seduwur cainé masaré baang ngidih senjata abesik eda enyen di Sanggah.

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Santun sakéwalaja ètèh-ètèh santun lengkap.

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Eda nyen ejina enyuh!

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Ejin beruk tengahné!

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Di tengah beruké ento apang misija engad!

Pet: Inggih.

BLH: Nah! Eda nyen jaanga jani, bakal telahina buin telun, jaanga buin telun telahina buin dasa lemeng!

Pet: Inggih.

<p>BLH: That is it. Did you get it? Pet: Yes. We did. BLH: Ah! Now, I see that my daughter-in-law has come along. Father doesn't want to speak of you as daughter-in-law. Pet: Yes. BLH: What is the meaning of daughter-in-law? If (one says) daughter-in-law, the name is <u>like helper</u>! (This relies on a pun between <i> mantu </i>, daughter (or son)-in-law, and the Indonesian <u> pembantu </u>, helper, assistant.)^{xxxiii} Pet: Yes. BLH: My daughter-in-law is like a real child (i.e. I feel towards her as affectionately as my own child). Ah! What is more, my debts towards you are on my mind. I have left you no dry fields, I have left you no rice fields. What advice could I then to offer my children to do as to what they do? (I have been able to produce children, but have produced nothing to leave to them. There is a sense of ironic despair here.)^{xxxiv} After having children, my children have had children, that is grandchildren. I have not been able to pay (to remove) the feeling of dirt on birth (in this instance, not paid the cost of tooth-filing, because) I was quickly old (i.e. I died) leaving (before even seeing) my grandchildren. Pet: Yes. BLH: Ah! Do not think of Father as dead (but as still living). Wherever you are whether at home or out in the village, how I shall watch over you (help you), so I know for certain that your <u> lives </u> are <u> safe </u>. Don't bother to offer a <i> canang </i> (the small offering referred to), just ask me for help (i.e. you do not have to pay the costs of either a ceremony or going to a healer). Pet: Yes. BLH: Well! Well! (To his son:) Did you bring a bit of betel-nut? (To his daughter-in-law:) Did you bring a bit of betel-nut, Wèng?^{xxxv} Pet: There isn't any. BLH: Ah! There isn't any. Take my hand for a moment! Why should you just feel sympathy (affection for me), but stay tongue-tied?^{xxxvi} Pet: I am sorry (for failing to anticipate the deity's wishes) BLH: Touch me! Pet: <i> Both man and wife scrabbling forward to take the healer's hand: </i>Just a moment. We have done so. We have done so.</p>	<p>BLH: Eda anggapa santuné ento malakar baan eyuh taluh, anggaplah anaké buka Bapa ngengehang cucu, ngengehang pianak. Pet: Inggih. BLH: Kèto nyen, suba kena baan cai? Pet: Inggih, sampun. BLH: Nah! jani, mantué nyen eni teka, Bapa anak tusing enyak ngorahang mantu. Pet: Inggih. BLH: Apeiya artin mantué, yèn mantu sebagai pembatu adané! Pet: Inggih. BLH: Mantu panak sejati, nah! apa buin inget tekèning utang, tusingja ada utang tegal, Utang carik tusing ada, apa koné pawané ngardi pianak, disuba ngelah pianak, ipianak ngelah pianak ada cucu, rasané dakiné ané digalaré tusing ngidang mayah, ènggalan suba awaké Tua ngalin cucu. Pet: Inggih. BLH: Nah! ento enyen. Nah, jani eda idepanga Bapa mati, nah dijeja bena apa buin enyen jumah, disaud di jalané, nah! Kak, kènkènja baan Pekak ngatehang anaké buka icang, kènkènja baan Bapa ngatehang anaké buka icang gumanti apang icang nawang idup selamat. Edeja kanti nyemak canangnyena. Pet: Inggih. BLH: Men-men jani cai ngaba basé abedik, nyai ngaba basé abedik wèng? Pet: Ten wènten. BLH: Nah! suba tusing, usud naké Bapa abedik ngudiangmen bena makangen-kangenang kin mabengong-bengong. Pet: Sinampurang naké awaké! BLH: Usud Bapa! Pet: Malih jebos, suba-suba.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>BLH: That is fine, you may return (to where you were sitting: I Mustika is satisfied). Both your male and female dead relatives feel ashamed (at leaving debts). Now, do not feel that you should do the complete (mortuary rites), isn't that the point?</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: If you perform <i>pangenteg linggih, pamendak panuntun</i>, how can one say it is enough, because you have not yet done it? But I do not wish you to do so. Have you understood?</p> <p>Pet: We have.</p> <p>BLH: Ah! If I had not been asked, (I would have not have requested anything). I have been cremated. After cremation there is secondary cremation. <i>nyekah</i>, escorting the dead to their place, seating Them, but you shouldn't do so for me. If you can manage it, I do not want these large ceremonies, but a proper festival (<i>piodalan</i>) in the house shrine instead. However this misfortune, this illness, has no connection with mortuary rites (<i>Pitrayadnya</i>), rites to Divinity (<i>Widhi Widana, Déwayadya</i>) or purificatory rites (<i>Kalayadnya, Butayadnya</i>). Have you understood?</p> <p>Pet: I have.</p> <p>BLH: <i>The healer starts to explain:</i> Take <u>one subject</u> at a time: the misfortune and illness. When things are going well at home, then you can think of finishing the rites (for the dead).</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: That is all. Your dead relatives have finished speaking, your Guardian deity has finished, ended.^{xxxvii} Let me close this discussion by <u>summarizing</u>. The <u>risk</u> (responsibility) belongs to you, the petitioner.^{xxxviii} If it is appropriate, write down what follows. (Notice again how the responsibility is placed on the clients.)</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: The counter-device to be placed at the compound entrance – you've noted it? <i>The healer's aim is to ensure that they write down the ingredients to be used.</i> Ash, ginger, salt,^{xxxix} drumstick tree leaves,^{xl} fat from a pig with white-flecked flesh, a young green coconut.^{xli} The body of the sufferer to be cleansed with a full range of kitchen implements.^{xlii} If you carry out a cleansing using these, (include) both the sufferer and the healthy; if the medicine for the ill person (only). Have you got it? <i>Referring to them writing down the details. She repeats:</i> The cleansing device, use on the body of the ill person; the full range of kitchen implements.</p> <p>Pet: <i>Mumbles something which is inaudible. The responses throughout of the</i></p>	<p>BLH: Amonto lan mulih. Salitin arsa Yang Raja Lanang, Yang Raja Istri, nah! Jani apang eda nyen makejang kadèn Jèro genep ten kènten niki?</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Yèning buat pengenteg linggih pemendak penuntun, kènkèné iya ngorang genep, mapan iraga kondèn ngelaksanang ento, kéwala iraga tusing tagèna suba Jèro ngerti?</p> <p>Pet: Sampun.</p> <p>BLH: Aa, emen yèn ten tiyang nika tagèna, anaké kèto tepuk tiyang, ngabèn anaké tepuk tiyang suwud anaké ngabèn nyekah, suwud anaké nyekah mendak nuntun, ngelinggiyang Déwa Hyang yèn tiyang ten dadia? Yèn suba bena nyidayang Niraé tusingja ngarsang nyatur dadi ngaturang piodalan, angingké buwuté ené, sakité eni, esing manut lawan Pitra yadnya, Widi widana, Kala Yadnya. Suba bena ngerti?</p> <p>Pet: Sampun.</p> <p>BLH: Jani ané satu jurusan jemak, buwuté, sakètè nah! buin pidan suba bena selamatan ditu, awak dadi jelema naktara bakal suwud mayadnya.</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Nah! amonto, Hyang Raja Déwata uwus mamaos, Ida Batara Gurué uwus putus, Nah! kesimpulan baos niki metutup, rèisiko Jèro sang keberatan ngelah, lamun manut nganda lantassuraté!</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Pengeleburan di pemesu, sampun? Aon, jaé, uyah, don kèlor, lengis cèlèng berasan, bungkak gadang. Raga sang kebuwutan lukat antuk perabot Brahma genep, yèn malukat nika ajak onyangan, anak buwut encèn orahang seger, yèn ubad nika ané sakit, kènten inggih! Serana pengelukatan, ngelukat raga sang kebuwutan, alat Brahma genep.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><i>petitioners makes it clear that they are unused to such sessions.</i></p> <p>BLH: The cleansing device for the body of the ill person. Got it?</p> <p>Pet: Yes, I have.</p> <p>BLH: The full range of kitchen implements; the offering for the ill person - a <i>Tebasan Pangenteg Bayu</i>^{xliii} to be given to the ill person. This one is also for everyone who is affected. Isn't that so?</p> <p>Pet: Yes.</p> <p>BLH: Once again, for the sufferer. A brew of young <i>dong saba</i> banana stem,^{xliv} turmeric, sandalwood water,^{xlv} <i>tengulun</i> bark,^{xlvi} red rice and drumstick tree bark as a salve for the feet,^{xlvii} and for the head, <i>sirih</i> leaves, the refuse from a betel-chewing box and <i>masuwi</i>.^{xlviii} That is the suggestion of the dead. Write it down again? It is only one <i>santun</i>.</p> <p>Pet: Let me write it, to be sure.</p> <p>BLH: The request of the dead: above the sleeping-place, above the ill person, that's what it means. One <i>santun</i>, containing in the middle a coconut shell, in the coconut shell a bamboo sliver. Before they are well, you mustn't throw it away. Now, if they have recovered, then you can take it away. You do not need to choose a propitious day for installing it. Whether it's tomorrow, or in two days time, for example, you may (put it in place). Have you got that? Fine.</p> <p><i>End of session: the healer takes the contents of the offerings they have brought, including the sesari, a cash payment (usually of the order of Rp. 1-5,000 [1 = Rupiah 3,000 before the sterling crash]; Rp. 2,000 is a good daily wage) and return the bamboo basket to the petitioners, who depart after asking permission of the healer.</i></p>	<p>Pet: Baos kirang galang.</p> <p>BLH: Srana pengelukatan raga sang kebuwutan, sampun?</p> <p>Pet: Sampun.</p> <p>BLH: Perabot Brahma genep, pebayuh raga sang kebuwutan, tebasan pengenteg bayu, bebayuh raga sang kebuwutan. Niki wawu sareng sami ané maadan buwut ten kènten?</p> <p>Pet: Inggih.</p> <p>BLH: Ané maadan sakit ampura malih jebos, loloh panak biyu gedang saba, kunyit, mayèh eyèh kayu cenana, babakan tengulun borèh maadan odak, odak ulun. Odak cokor bas barak, babakan kèlor, tèmbe! duwur basé, lulun pabuan, masuwi.</p> <p>BLH: Nah! nika pengidih Hyang Déwataé. Malih matulis? Nika santun dogèn abesik.</p> <p>Pet: Tulis tiang mangda keni antuk.</p> <p>BLH: Pengidih Sang Déwata, duwur masirep diduwur iraga sakit kèto artiné, santun abesik, ditengahné maisi beruk, di tengah beruké maisi engad, setondèné iraga maadan seger dadi juang, nah! lamun iraga maadan seger dadi juang, yèn ngejang nika ten ngenal duwasa, nah! yadian buin mani, yadian buin nyanan kèto umpama dadi suba inggih.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ⁱ The word used is not *sida*, but *Sadiya*, which connotes both successful and happy. The unstated, but widely appreciated, implication is that, if the session is successful one should not be excessively happy or excited (*suka*), if unsuccessful not excessively sad or angry (*duka*).

ⁱⁱ *Pèrmas* is the term used and refers strictly to the descendants of high caste deities. The term for low castes here is properly *semut barak*, red ants, which are small and insignificant. The healer is being polite towards her clients.

ⁱⁱⁱ Two points should be noted here. First, the decision as to what to ask and whether what is said makes sense, or should be accepted or not, rests solely with the petitioners. Second, the substance of what is said (*sadagingin pawacana*) is carefully phrased to have an indirect double reference. It covers both those who are supposed to speak and the medium's own utterances, the judgement of authenticity being left again to the petitioners.

^{iv} The terms are Ida (or Batara) Hyang Guru and Sang Raja Déwata respectively. The former may be identified with either the apical figure(s) of a localized lineage (hereafter called the central family shrine as opposed to the domestic or house shrine), or with the deity of a clan temple. The latter are more recently purified, or at least cremated, dead. As the nature of Balinese descent, and the status of ancestors, is the subject of debate, I avoid imputing too much to the terms by using a less loaded term for Ida Hyang Guru. There is a significant similarity in title between this kin deity and Batara Guru, a common title for Siwa.

^v I.e. it is not arrogant to speak this way, because the material welfare of the house, as a matter of fact, is sufficient. To have stated this, without evidence, would have been a fairly serious error in a setting where a commitment to telling the truth is paramount. The dead cannot lie; and it is exceptionally foolhardy to lie to them. *Sasaran* is objective, aim etc.

^{vi} As will be clear from the transcript and the tape, it is not always evident exactly when the healer is speaking direct or as a vehicle.

^{vii} The *balian* distinguishes Balinese practices of knowing from Western, so making a mockery of Western medicine's omniscient pretensions.

^{viii} This is also a way of talking about illness of the thoughts, which is considered quite different from insanity.

^{ix} The dead for whom the complete mortuary ritual, *pitrayadnya*, has been carried out.

^x The commentary on the session by experienced old people goes into far more detail about the kind of omissions which bring such repercussions. They also refer explicitly to the fact that such questions are being asked *ring pamargi*, in public, in the streets.

^{xi} *Damuh* is literally dew, an affectionate term for one's descendants, used especially in sessions of this kind.

^{xii} Mortuary rites in Bali are long, complicated and very expensive. After cremation *ngabèn* (in Low Balinese, *palebon* in High), royalty may perform a secondary cremation (*nyekah*), but it was considered presumptuous for villagers to do this until recently, with the rise of a class of wealthy low caste people. What is possible though, even if prohibitively expensive, is *Mendak Nuntun*, to escort the dead to their proper places with the other deities in the central Balinese temple of Besakih, on the slopes of the main volcano. It is followed by *Pangenteg Linggih*, fixing the place of the dead, who are also then invited and escorted back from Besakih to their natal shrine.

^{xiii} Gossip is compared to the rubbish lying around in the streets. The term for carry here, *suwun*, is to carry on the head, especially out of respect. The implication is of elevating the trivial out of its proper place. Reporting gossip is said to be a common source of domestic strife and upset.

^{xiv} The expression used is *urab uyah sera*, a mixture of salt and *terasi* (fermented prawn paste) used in cooking.

^{xv} The pubic hair belongs to the perpetrator, not the victim. *Jeluwang ulantaga* is an important and very expensive ingredient of cremations, which include a cloth inscribed by a Brahman high priest. There are restrictions on the use of *timbul* flowers, which may be eaten as vegetables by most people. Eleven here is the number of the complete set of cardinal points, centre, zenith and nadir. The three-coloured thread, *benang sri (tri) datu*, consists of white, red and black strands, representing Iswara (Siwa), Brahma and Wisnu respectively and is wrapped around a white cloth enclosing the other ingredients.

^{xvi} Literally: worse than a person who does not even made a dry *porosan* (the smallest and humblest ingredient of the large offerings required for the various rites required in a compound). Note the reference to antiques and tourist trade. Apparent double reference: 1) to making forgeries 2) to having something that someone regards as of value, but not you. The odd tastes of tourists.

^{xvii} Note the use of practical reason. The deity had to send illness (dreams) of a kind that doctors cannot explain, which would leave the clients unsatisfied, and make them inquire further. He then explains the grounds and manner of his intervention. Who wants dead - therefore no - followers? Where shall I find others?

^{xviii} It is customary not to name the person. Legally the healer would be liable either to slander or, if the family took action such as killing the purported offender, of incitement to manslaughter. Experienced commentators make the point that the deity who speaks is protecting the healer both from such problems and from the risk of the

named person using devices to kill the healer. It is possible to name the perpetrator, whether in cases of theft or disturbance of this kind, if the healer uses some instrument like a vessel of water in which the clients see an icon or index of a person. Usually a small child is used to look.

^{xix} A *sekaha*, a voluntary association, used of any group of people who agree to come together for a common purpose.

^{xx} The Guardian Deity speaks of *caling*, literally tusks. These are invisible subordinates of the deity whom It orders to carry out counter-attacks.

^{xxi} These other deities are on hand, because prior to going to a healer, one should inform one's domestic, central family shrine and clan deities, by going to pray at each site in turn, and inform them of the planned consultation and the reason. If they are not properly informed, the healer's attempts may be abortive, as there is no one to speak to or give direction. I have heard another consultant, the priestess of the Pura Madya, Batubulan, on being unable to get in touch with the clan deities, ask if they had been informed. On being told they had not, she told the clients that, without these deities, she could see nothing and to go and inform them first.

^{xxii} A notional cockfight of three rounds is held on the day of *Nyaga Raga*, just before the day of silence, *Nyepi*, which marks the New Year. All household heads are required to bring a cock, but most do so as a matter of propriety, not because they will take part. Experienced commentators argued that the woman was probably silent because, in this case, it was the man who had had the authority during their lifetimes.

^{xxiii} Note use of Kawi/Skt. **paribasa**, indicating that the elder generation is still properly Balinese, and this Bali has power to do things which the new Bali cannot, and doesn't even know about properly any more.

^{xxiv} The expression used for summoned was to have my card turned over, a reference to the idea that death occurs when Sang Jogor Manik, or more usually Sang Suratma, the being who determines the moment of human death, writes or turns over a letter with the person's name on, as the final summons. NBK: clear references to the dead having special knowledge of a world which only they have, which is neither available to the living nor to foreigners.

^{xxv} Like the feeling of being on top of a *méru* (the high pagoda-like shrines in Balinese temples), a superb state by all accounts.

^{xxvi} Older people is a gloss of **guru rupaka**, commonly in Balinese parents, those who gave one form. This is one of a number of kinds of *guru*, teacher or person to be venerated. The list is variously constructed but commonly also includes: *guru wisésa* one's superiors, usually a synonym for the king, or now government; *guru pangajian*, one's school teacher or instructor in some kind of learning; *guru jaya dijaya*, the Supreme Divinity, Ida Sang Widhi Wasa; and *guru asi-asian*, someone who helps one in great need, including healers who have successfully treated one.

^{xxvii} *Pangrorasan* is the rite twelve days after cremation. Thereafter offerings to the dead may be placed on a high shelf in the Eastern pavilion of the compound. There is a series of rites, which should follow in the course of purifying the dead so that they can attain their proper status and receive offerings in the house shrine, but few ordinary people can bear the costs beyond *pangrorasan*.

^{xxviii} There is – a presumably deliberate – slight ambiguity here. On one reading, I Mustika would have been happy with the simplest token of remembrance by his children and grandchildren. The other is that he would have been happy with the simplest possible cremation in recognition of the difficulties facing his family. The formula of a single *canang* may be used to describe the most humble (*nista*) level of any ceremony. One needs certain offerings made in order to be able to offer them to the guards in the next world who one meets at regular stages on one's journey. Without these one cannot proceed. In either case, he is very amiable and sympathetic towards the living, recognizing his own failure to pay his debts, which are discussed below.

^{xxix} Occasionally on butchering a pig is found to have white flecks, *baberasan*, like big rice grains in its flesh. Such a pig has been attacked by witches (*manusa sakti*), and is unfit for use in offerings. One puts lime on the anuses of pigs about to be carried to slaughter to prevent such attacks. Some people are prepared to eat this flesh when cooked though. It is, however, meat which is set apart and is quite often used in magical devices.

^{xxx} NBK: note the arcane ingredients which distinguish Balinese theo-medicine, with both their imagery and the sense of other worlds of power, from western secular medicine which is merely techniques.

^{xxxi} A *santun* is a largish offering, which includes a *daksina* and is used at the start of some serious activity.

^{xxxii} A sliver of bamboo, *ngaad*, made by tearing a thicker piece so it tapers, is used for a variety of purposes, including in the past cutting the umbilical cord between mother and new-born child. It is notoriously easy to cut one's hands on, and so may be a sort of weapon. Reference to the effects of bamboo slivers is not uncommon in kin relations: the dangerous marriage of sister exchange between two males is known as *makedengan ngaad*, pulling a sliver through one's hands, i.e. cutting oneself.

^{xxxiii} The homonymy is partly across languages. The usual Low Balinese for child-in-law is *mantu*, and (me)*nantu* in Indonesian; *pembantu* is Indonesian. The linguistic connection is used to indicate that the dead person did not think of his daughter-in-law as merely an in-marrying woman (with whom there can be substantial tension), but as someone much closer and more supportive. NBK: the capacity to tame Indonesian, by showing the punning possibilities with Balinese; also demonstrating the command (= knowledge) of the *balian*.

^{xxxiv} I Mustika is expressing his misery at leaving his family destitute. This is not just in terms of livelihood but, as I Mustika makes clear below, of completing the life-cycle ceremonies, *manusayadnya* which a parent owes to a child, in return for which the child owes the performance of mortuary rites.

^{xxxv} *Wèng*, short for *Kuwèng*, is an affectionate term of address in Low Balinese to a girl of younger age. Here he is asking for a little gift from his children. They quite evidently feel embarrassed during the session and look at one another upset. This is not a usual request, so there is no way they could have anticipated it. It seems to be the touch of familiarity in I Mustika asking as he seems to have in life for betel, which both makes them so upset and gives the session a persuasive sense of reality.

^{xxxvi} As one cannot directly grasp the hand of the deceased, it is the healer's hand, which is grasped. It is not unusual for the dead to wish to touch the living in this way.

^{xxxvii} She actually says *Ida Batara Guru* which is ambiguous, as it is strictly a title of Siwa.

^{xxxviii} The term used is *Jèro Sang Kaberatan*, the first two words are honorific, *kaberatan*, to raise objections because one feels imposed upon, aggrieved, carrying too heavy (*berat*) a load. NBK: Indonesian to show how modern the *balian* is, but she encompasses Balinese, Indonesian and Kawi, so showing her command of different media. Command as key notion.

^{xxxix} These three often occur as a group in medication (and with *don kèlor* in treating attacks of the kind concerned here). Ash is used in certain agricultural rites against rice pests and diseases; and against nausea. Ginger is a vital ingredient of unguents that heat the body. Salt, in combination, again is used against stomach aches.

^{xl} *Don kèlor* are used *inter alia* against conjunctivitis. Ash is associated with Brahma (fire); ginger with Ibu Pretiwi (earth); *don kèlor* with Sang Hyang Embang (the sky) and the visible world; salt with Wisnu (sea, water). There is therefore an apparent attempt to reassert completeness.

^{xli} This is commonly considered cooling. It may be used for lustration, but cannot be used in offerings.

^{xlii} *Prabot Brahma*, the instruments of Brahma, the divinity associated with the kitchen, i.e. kitchen implements. This is a common formula used by healers. The relevant implements include: large cooking spoon, tongs, bellows and bamboo rice steamer. As fire consumes things, the aim seems to be not just to cleanse, but to destroy the source of attack. The implements in question are considered dirty: one counters dirt with dirt.

^{xliii} This is one of a large class of offerings *tebasan* which redeem or pay off (*nebus* some debt. This particular variety is an offering for fixing/ensuring the energy and contains the blood of either a chicken or a pig.

^{xliv} This is often used as medicine for children, as it is considered cooling. It is also used in washing the corpses of dead high caste people. Among varieties of banana, it is significant for being the kind into which the wife of Rawana was turned when she was cursed by Baladéwa and Krsna. Again the theme may be meeting dirt with dirt.

^{xlv} Turmeric has a wide range of local medical uses. Water in which sandalwood has been soaked is used to soothe bruises.

^{xlvi} *Tenggulun* is *Protium Javanicum* Burm., a well known remedy against dysentery mixed with coriander; neither hot nor cool.

^{xlvii} This is a well-known mixture of a cool (red rice) and a hot (drumstick bark) ingredient, which is held to produce a state of balance.

^{xlviii} These three are well known as ingredients of medicine which heats the body.

Appendix 4: The Governor of Bali's Speech to the Opening of the International Bali Arts Festival 1996

Speech by Ida Bagus Oka

Yang Terhormat Bapak Wakil Presiden Republik Indonesia dan Ibu Tri Sutrisno. Bapak-Bapak dan Ibu-Ibu Menteri Kabinet Pembangunan Enam yang saya hormati. Saudara-saudara anggota Muspida Propensi Daerah Tingkat I Bali masing-masing beserta istri. Para Budayawan, seniman, dan undangan yang kami cintai.

Om Swastiastu. Sebagai insan yang beragama marilah kita memanjatkan puji dan syukur dihadapan Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa/Tuhan Yang Maha Esa. Bahwa atas rahmatnya kita semua dapat bersama-sama dengan Bapak Wakil Presiden Republik Indonesia dan Ibu Tri Sutrisno serta Bapak-Bapak Menteri Kabinet Pembangunan Enam masing-masing beserta istri untuk menghadiri Upacara Pembukaan Pesta Kesenian Bali yang ke-XVIII. Tanggal 8 Juni 1996 di depan Gedung Jaya Saba Denpasar ini. Atas nama seluruh masyarakat dan pemerintah daerah Bali kami menghaturkan terimakasih yang setulus-tulusnya kepada Bapak Wakil Presiden yang telah berkenan untuk membuka secara resmi Pesta Kesenian Bali yang ke-XVIII tahun 1996 ini dan demikian juga kepada para Menteri Kabinet Pembangunan Enam beserta istri yang telah memenuhi undangan kami guna menyaksikan upacara Pembukaan PKB yang amat bersejarah bagi kami.

Kami semua merasa bangga karena pemerintah pusat dan Bapak Wakil Presiden memberi perhatian yang amat besar terhadap masalah-masalah seni budaya. Dan hal ini memperkuat tekad kami untuk membangun bangsa dan sumber daya manusia yang bermakna kebudayaan. Bapak Wakil Presiden dan hadirin yang kami cintai. Perkenankanlah pada kesempatan yang baik ini kami melaporkan secara singkat, bahwa Pesta Kesenian Bali yang ke-XVIII tahun 1996 yang akan berlangsung selama satu bulan dimulai pada tanggal 8 Juni sampai dengan 8 Juli 1996 mengambil tema Panji Werdi Sura Wangsaja. Panji sebagai wujud semangat bangsa. Sebuah tema yang menggambarkan kelestarian dan pengembangan nilai-nilai kultural yang berakar pada kepribadian dan jati diri Indonesia.

Sebagai sebuah kesusatraan cerita Panji muncul di Jawa Timur pada abad ke XIV dan berkembang di seluruh Nusantara bahkan sampai ke Tailan, Kamboja, dan Asia Tenggara lainnya. Panji sebagai tokoh sentral pada cerita itu adalah seorang pahlawan kebudayaan. Ahli memainkan gambelan, pengarang sastra, penari yang tampan, dan ahli pedalangan. Dengan keagungan seni budaya persatuan dan kesatuan bangsa Indonesia telah dimulai saat itu.

Berdasarkan tema itu Pesta Kesenian Bali yang Ke-XVIII akan menampilkan berbagai jenis kegiatan yang meliputi pawai adat, pameran seni rupa, perlombaan-perlombaan seni kerajinan, seminar kebudayaan, dan pementasan berbagai seni pertunjukan. Kini tercatat sekitar 120 pementasan kesenian dan didukung oleh pameran seni lukis serta pameran wastra Bali yang untuk pertama kali dilakukan dalam Pesta Kesenian Bali. Untuk menampilkan kesenian khas daerah setiap Kabupaten dan Kota Madya diberi waktu sehari penuh untuk menampilkan keunggulan keseniannya masing-masing dan hari itu kita namakan Seni Budaya kabupaten Sehari.

Tahun ini Pesta Kesenian Bali diikuti oleh ribuan seniman dan seniwati baik yang berasal dan dalam maupun luar negeri. Diantara kelompok-kelompok seni yang tampil meliputi mereka yang berasal dari Jawa Timur, Jawa Tengah, Jawa Barat, Ceju Korea, Jepang, Amerika Serikat, Brasilia, Tailan dan Myanmar.

Bapak Wakil Presiden dan undangan yang kami cintai. Sesudah diadakan evaluasi setiap tahunnya oleh tim penilaian Pesta Kesenian Bali terus menunjukkan kemajuan-kemajuan yang sangat berarti. Dan ternyata kegiatan akbar ini mampu mendorong dan mengembangkan kreatifitas seni budaya bangsa. Memberi perluasan dan promosi usaha-usaha dibidang perdagangan, perindustrian, dan kegiatan perekonomian pada umumnya. Serta mampu mengembangkan industri kepariwisataan dan memberi hiburan yang sehat bagi masyarakat di khususnya di Indonesia dan lebih khusus lagi daerah Bali. PKB akhirnya mampu mengimplementasikan amanat dari GBHN tahun 1993 khususnya dalam bidang pelestarian dan pengembangan seni budaya bangsa.

Bapak Wakil Presiden dan hadirin yang kami hormati sebelum berakhir laporan ini ijinlah kami sekali lagi untuk mengucapkan terimakasih kepada Bapak Wakil Presiden dan Ibu Tri Sutrisno beserta para Menteri Kabinet Pembangunan Enam beserta Ibu atas kehadirannya pada upacara pembukaan Pesta Kesenian Bali yang ke-XVIII tahun 1996 ini. Akhirnya dengan segala kerendahan hati kami mohon kiranya bapak Wakil Presiden berkenan memberi sambutan dan membuka secara resmi Pesta Kesenian Bali yang ke XVIII ini. Atas berkenan Bapak Wakil Presiden kami menghaturkan terimakasih yang tiada terhingga.

Sekian terimakasih. Om Santi Santi Santi Om.