

Title	Remarks on Some Systematic Aspects of Forms of Life
Sub Title	
Author	Duff-Cooper, Andrew
Publisher	三田哲學會
Publication year	1992
Jtitle	哲學 No.93 (1992. 1) ,p.373- 396
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	"One option...is to learn from skeptical comparison the feasibility of an unprecedented independence, a defiant resilience in the face of implacable forces and inscrutable ends". Rodney Needham (1981: 109)
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00150430-00000093-0373

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Remarks on Some Systematic
Aspects of Forms of Life

Andrew DUFF-COOPER*

“One option... is to learn from skeptical comparison the feasibility of an unprecedented independence, a defiant resilience in the face of implacable forces and inscrutable ends”.

Rodney Needham
(1981: 109)

* The author was formerly a visiting scholar at Keio University and died an untimely death in August, 1991, in London

I

Background

In a recent study, a way of ordering the different forms of social organisation that Balinese villages not only on Bali but on Lombok and in southern Sulawesi also evince is proposed: To weigh the preponderances or to sort into a cline of priority relations discernible in aspects of these forms of life (Duff-Cooper 1990a).

This proposal was made towards the end of a summary assessment of an attempt (Howe 1989) to assign Balinese social organisations on Bali to three contiguous zones on the island, along geographical lines. The attempt fails for a number of reasons: It is too narrow, being confined to Bali; it postulates zones, and relationships among them and proffers an explanation of how they come to be as they are, which do not (and in my view could not) take account of forms of social organisation that the argument employs as exemplary; it lumps together social facts that have some resemblances one to another, but among which there are differences that are arguably as important as, if not more so than, their conceived similarities; and it oddly promotes “hierarchy” to an analytical position over “equality”—oddly, because all the available evidences, which the study mainly does not take publicly into responsible account, suggest that “hierarchy” is more properly considered as analytically subsequent to “equality”. The schema of the zones, moreover, is based upon an outmoded method (akin to that of Radcliffe-Brown (1931)) that employs crude substantive classes, of which one is taken to be more or less paradigmatic (see sec. IX below) and the others to bear more or less attenuated resemblances to this.

The alternative method proposed (Duff-Cooper 1990a,) which has a number of advantages which are there spelt out and which has

been employed before in the analysis of aspects of Balinese life as it is in Pagutan, western Lombok (e.g. Duff-Cooper 1985, 1986a, 1987, 1988a, 1988b, 1990b, forthcoming-b; Yohida and Duff-Cooper 1989), is far from new.⁽¹⁾ In its essentials it was proposed nearly three-quarters of a century ago by Lowie, taking his cue from Kroeber (1909); thus he suggests (Lowie 1917: 107, 119, 150-2, 172; cf. Needham 1969) that relationship terminologies he analysed by reference to the principles that molded them, and compared by reference to the intricate combinations of those principles that in fact constitute them. One authority comments: "Perhaps this will not seem like very much, but it was a great step to take and I do not think that essentially we can do much better" (Needham 1974: 60).

The principles of order revealed by those analyses of aspects of Balinese life are: Modes of division of an entity into generally from two to eleven aspects. These aspects may be related symmetrically or asymmetrically or both, in different contexts (Duff-Cooper, forthcoming-a), and by one of the three modes of reflexivity and of transitivity. These relations may be dynamically expressed as modes of periodicity (Duff-Cooper 1986b), or may be reversed or inverted. Analogy and homology integrate the aspects into a system of analogical classification which may be symbolised as having horizontal and/or vertical aspects. Combinations of the relations that have been found to hold among aspects of a divided entity are listed in Table 1 (after Duff-Cooper 1988b, Table; forthcoming-b).

Some people may not see the point of all this, agreeing with an anonymous reviewer that these, and other, findings do not contribute to what s/he calls "live issues".⁽²⁾ Those who do, though, would be very much in error, as is our anonymous reviewer: The principles discovered frame, and are thus more fundamental than, matters of what "we" call economics, politics, ideology, etc., for

Remarks on Some Systematic Aspects of Forms of Life

Table 1. *Combinations of Symmetrical or Asymmetrical Relations, Mode of Reflexivity, and Mode of Transitivity*

<i>Symmetry/Asymmetry</i>	<i>Reflexivity</i>	<i>Transitivity</i>
Perfectly symmetrical	Totally reflexive	Transitive
Symmetrical	Reflexive	(none)
Asymmetrical	Reflexive	Transitive
Asymmetrical	Reflexive	Intransitive
Asymmetrical	Irreflexive	Transitive
Asymmetrical	Irreflexive	Intransitive
Symmetrical	Non-reflexive	Non-transitive
Symmetrical	Non-reflexive	Non- or intransitive
Symmetrical	Reflexive	Transitive
Asymmetrical	Non-reflexive	Transitive

instance, which one is given to understand by our reviewer are live issues. They are the principles, that is, with their associated symbols and values (e.g. Duff-Cooper 1988a, sec. V; 1990c: 46 n.2) which most members of any society are unconcerned with and unaware of but which the business of life is ordered by and its problems explained and perhaps solved by. "It is the duty of the social anthropologist to identify and to reveal these underlying principles" (Rivière 1969: 283).

Relating the principles one to another, moreover, contributes to a history of, in this case, Balinese ideology. It is, true, a history without dates, events of the past in all their details, and particular personages; it is a "structural" history (e.g. Needham 1970: lix). But as Wittgenstein points out (e.g. 1977: 8-9), this way of explanation is just as historical explanation more conventionally conceived, and *a fortiori* as speculation and conjecture of the kinds that, for instance, Howe's piece (1989) employs (which are, though, the butt of savage criticism by such writers as Radcliffe-Brown (e.g. 1922: vii) and later Beattie (1964: 8).⁽³⁾

Furthermore, of course, the analytical terms employed in an analysis to a great extent determine the kinds of findings to which it leads. In the dialectic between an analysis, the findings to

which it leads, and subsequent analysis, informed by those findings, the analytical terms are themselves subjected to the kind of scrutiny that is essential if work is not to be vitiated by an uncritical and unreflective reliance upon terms that for historical, linguistic, and/or conceptual reasons may well not be up to the job they are required to do (cf., e.g. Needham 1980a: 76).⁽⁴⁾ If such scrutinies, exemplified most recently by *Counterpoints* (Needham 1987a), which considers "opposition", and on a far more modest scale by "For and Against 'Degrees of Asymmetry'" (Duff-Cooper, forthcoming-c; cf. *idem* 1990a, n.2), are not "live issues", it is hard to see what could be.

The present study, then, is a contribution under each of these three heads to what are very much live issues. (It does not address matters—economics, politics—which our reviewer says are of interest to anthropologists (the *really* live issues perhaps) because in the first place these classes of facts are not discriminated by Balinese ideology: In such circumstances, "what *we* think has nothing to do with the matter, but only what the people we are studying think" (Hocart 1970: 217).) Since, moreover, the main books—Charras (n.d.), Guérmonprez (1887), Schaareman (1986)—upon which the work that will replace Howe's gross generalisations with a finer, more exact and perspicuous scheme of Balinese social organisational variation will be done have yet to arrive from Europe, the opportunity is being taken now to consider matters that, had those books now been available, would have been addressed after their analysis along the lines proposed in section IX below.

II

Tasks

The matters just alluded to are aspects of a general task, to establish a cline of priority among the principles that order Balinese

life.

Some of this work has been done. Thus it is not fortuitous that "modes of division" heads the list of principles above. These modes must be prior to all the other principles, for at least three reasons: The latter are relations that hold among aspects of a divided entity, and these could clearly not hold if there were no aspects for them to hold among; or the latter are operations that are carried out upon variously related aspects of divided entities, and again the operations could not be carried out if there were no related aspects to carry them out upon; or, finally, the latter are relations that hold among the variously related and in some cases operated upon aspects of divided entities. The same justifications as those twice already adduced here again support the priority of modes of partition.

Perhaps, though, a qualifying reservation should be entered: Ida Sang Hyang Vidhi, the high or the highest god of the Balinese, as Sunya, the Void, is One but also dual. It is true that the two aspects of this duality are devoid of content and are identical one with another and each with what they constitute. Nonetheless, a mode of division is evinced, and this is prior to the relations that can be said to hold between the One and Its two identical aspects.

Whether Vidhi is seen as the simplest or as the most complex aspect of Balinese ideology (and both arguments have their merits), Vidhi is its basis. It is, therefore, not illicit to see bipartition as prior to the other modes of division. These, from division into three to division into eleven, are subsequent one to another (four to three, five to four, and so on to eleven which is subsequent to division into ten). This is in accordance with the assertion that "the basic type of...classification by partition is that ordered by dualism" (Needham 1979: 7); an assertion that reiterates a fundamental point made by Kant in 1787: "All *a priori* division of

concepts must be by dichotomy" (1964: 116). By this account, "dichotomy is the formal paradigm of the pure concept of classification" (Needham 1987a: 219). As such, it is prior to all the other modes of classification including classification by numerically more complex divisions.

Of the relations, perfect symmetry and symmetry are prior to asymmetry rather as Sunya, which expresses perfect symmetry, is the basis of Balinese ideology. This conclusion does not require further argument: it receives support from the contentions (Needham 1987b: 188) that "the simplest conceivable type of social structure is symmetric prescriptive alliance based on two lines" and that "the expansion to three lines permits an asymmetric articulation of the lines...". The Mamboru system of prescriptive alliance, which is asymmetrical, is thus "an example of the second simplest type of social structure conceivable...". It is true that this example rests on tacit criteria of simplicity or economy; but it is nonetheless cogent: It is consonant with Weyl's suggestion, which I have relied on before (Duff-Cooper 1990c: 42), that "in an asymmetric design one feels symmetry as the norm from which one deviates..." (1952: 13); and with the meaning of "asymmetry" as "absence of symmetry" (e.g. Shubiknov, Belov. and others 1964: 171). It is consonant also with the schemes of evolution of government proposed in the 1930s by Hocart (e.g. 1970: 292) in which an egalitarian organisation of social functions gave place to "a vertical hierarchy".⁽⁵⁾ A cline has thus far been established (here and below, ">" is to be read as "is (are) prior to"): Modes of division > symmetry > asymmetry.

The three constituent principles of the (quaternary) structure of analogy are opposition, analogy, homology. "These stand in an order of logical priority: first opposition, than analogy, and subsequently homology" (Needham 1987a: 221-2, 222 Fig. 6). Opposition here obtains between two terms that may be equally or

unequally valued. Let us say that another way of putting this fact is: The two terms may be related symmetrically or asymmetrically. (The citation (p. 223) of Beck's "correct" view that "it is difficult to find any conceptual antithesis which is truly symmetric except in a formal sense" (1973: 421 n. 15) supports the licitness of this alternative wording.) The cline now established so far is: Modes of division > symmetry > asymmetry > analogy > homology.

Work already done can be of specific assistance no further. The rest of this essay, then, is given over as follows: section III establishes definitions of the modes of transitivity and of reflexivity and also says something about the notions of reversal and modes of periodicity that will be relied on in sections IV-VII which integrate these two sets of three modes of relation, the operation of reversal, and the dynamic modes of division into the cline last given. Section VIII, then, summarises the final cline arrived at, and section IX concludes the study by commenting on the cline presented in the previous section and setting the scene for work that will employ the findings of the present study analytically.

III

Definitions⁽⁶⁾

The definitions of the modes of transitivity and of reflexivity employed below (secs. IV, V) naturally are those adopted when the combinations listed in Table 1 above were discovered. These definitions are repeated below as they appear in places that are not easily accessible.

"Suppose that a is north of b , and that b is north of c . Here, the phrase 'is north of' designates a relation that is transitive, for it must be the case that the relation that obtains between a and b and between b and c obtains also between a and c ". An

intransitive relation is designated by the phrase “is mother of” in the following example: “If a is mother of b , and b is mother of c , a cannot be mother of c ”. A non-transitive relation is one that is neither transitive nor intransitive. Examples of non-transitive relations are designated by, for instance, “has a different colour from” and “is discriminably different from”: Here it is clearly an empirical matter to determine whether the relation that holds between a and b and between b and c also holds between a and c . Both transitive and intransitive relations contrastedly implicate necessity, at least relative to the language, i.e. classical or orthodox logic, that it has been decided to apply (Duff-Cooper 1990b, chap. 4; Waismann 1968: 196).

A reflexive relation, next, is designated by the phrase “is the same age as”: A relation is reflexive “if any particulars which stand in that relation one to another also have that relation to themselves”. “An irreflexive relationship is one that no individual can have to itself”, e.g. “is father of”, “is married to”. A non-reflexive relation is one that is neither reflexive nor irreflexive. Words that designate this mode of reflexivity are, for instance, “loves” and “hates”. A totally reflexive relationship, which of course is also reflexive, is one that every individual has to itself: “Is identical with” designates a totally reflexive relationship (Duff-Cooper 1988: 221, 222).

The notion of reversal, to which we now turn, “does not denote a simple relation with a strict formal definition”: There are various modes, some of which are presented as formulas in “Reversals” (Needham 1983: 117, 115–6). Other types can be expected to emerge from analysis: One such is that represented by $[(a, n, x) \Rightarrow (x, n^{-1}, a)]$. “Here a and x constitute the first and last terms of a sequence of $n+2$ terms. The other sequence consists of x as the first term, a the last term, in a sequence which is the reverse of the other $(n+2)^{-1}$ ” (Duff-Cooper 1986c: 132). The reversal may be understood

as operating in both directions (hence “ \Leftrightarrow ” and not, e.g. “ \Rightarrow ”). Balinese reversal is more commonly enantiomorphic, of the form $[(a, b, c) \Leftrightarrow (c, b, a)]$. The *Jñānasidāntha*, also, discusses the reversal of the *rva-bhinéda*, here the formula *AH-AM* to *AM-AH* (Soebadio 1971: 76/77). Such a reversal of this formula, which is life-promoting, is associated with misfortune and death. It appears to be a reversal akin in form to Needham’s formula *i*: $(a, x) \Leftrightarrow (a, y)$ (1983: 115), as do the *ongkara madu muka* and the *ongkara pasah*.⁽⁷⁾ The point, anyway, of these examples (more could be given) is to demonstrate that within one form of life the term “reversal” (or “inversion”—the two are largely equivalent) does not denote a monothetic class of facts all the members of which have a common feature: It denotes, rather, a polythetic class, the members of which have sporadic resemblances one to another.

As for modes of periodicity, alternation is the most frequently encountered mode in Pagutan (see n. 1); periodicity of three is also fairly widely evinced. Periodicities of four, five, and nine are far less so. These five modes are not claimed to be the only modes employed by Balinese ideology—periodicity of 18 is discernible in the periods that a day, on one account, consists of, and the Balinese calendar evinces numerous periodic modes—but it is pointed out that the phrase “modes of periodicity”, when used below, refers to these five modes only. “Alternation”, and *mutatis mutandis* other modes of periodicity, incidentally, can be represented by the equation, $e_n = e_n + 2$: “It is to be understood that *n* can occupy any position in the sequence. Thus in the interrupted sequence $a, -, a, -, \dots$, the alternative *b* must occupy the vacant positions between the incidences of *a*; and likewise in $b, -, b, -, \dots$, *a* must occupy the vacant positions between the incidences of *b*—so that *n* may be represented by *a* or *b*” (Needham 1983: 127-8).

IV

Transitivity

Symmetry may be combined both with transitive and with intransitive relations: Thus, for instance, Garden has it (1984: 45) that “for binary relation R on a set $A \dots R$ is an *equivalence relation* if R is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive”; while Hesse writes (1974: 67) that “similarity in the present account is a *primitive* symmetrical, intransitive relation between objects, holding in varying degrees in respect of particular properties”. Grounds other than an argument based upon the priority of symmetry must therefore be sought for establishing priority among the three modes of the present relationr

Such grounds are easily located. The relation that is described as transitive (e.g. $A=B, B=C, A=C$) is the basis of the other two modes; intransitive and non-transitive both mean “not transitive”. The prefix *in-* is cognate and synonymous with Greek *a-* and *an-* and with Common Germanic **in-* (as unhappy): this last and Greek *a-* and *an-* are prefixes of negation; so also is *non-* (Onions 1966: 467, 956, 1, 613). Transitive may thus be seen as prior to *in-* and non-transitive.

How can the logical priority of these two negations be established? Transitive and intransitive relations, it was noted, imply necessity. The relations that “intransitive” describes are therefore more similar to transitive relations, by the criterion of necessity, than to relations that are non-transitive. By the criterion of negativity, on the other side: intransitive relations are more similar to non-transitive relations than to transitive relations. By these criteria, the priority is: Transitive > intransitive > non-transitive.

As relations combined with symmetry and asymmetry, the modes

of transitivity take priority over the relations (analogy, homology) that concatenate the related terms into a system. So far, then, the following cline of priority has been established: Modes of division > perfect symmetry > symmetry > asymmetry > transitivity > intransitivity > non-transitivity > analogy > homology.

The combinations listed in Table 1 above can now be ordered again, in respect of the relative priority of perfect symmetry, symmetry, asymmetry, and the modes of transitivity, as in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Combinations Shown in Table 1 Reordered by Reference to the Cline of Priority Last Established

<i>Symmetry/Asymmetry</i>	<i>Reflexivity</i>	<i>Transitivity</i>
Perfectly symmetrical	Totally reflexive	Transitive
Symmetrical	Reflexive	Transitive
Symmetrical	Reflexive	(None)
Symmetrical	Non-reflexive	In- or non-transitive
Symmetrical	Non-reflexive	Non-transitive
Asymmetrical	Reflexive	Transitive
Asymmetrical	Irreflexive	Transitive
Asymmetrical	Non-reflexive	Transitive
Asymmetrical	Reflexive	Intransitive
Asymmetrical	Irreflexive	Intransitive

V

Reflexivity

The ordering of the three basic modes of reflexivity—reflexive, irreflexive, and non-reflexive; perfect reflexivity, we noted, is a special case of the first-mentioned of the three modes—is easily done. The grounds for saying that reflexive relations are prior to those that are irreflexive and non-reflexive are those adduced (sec. IV) to justify the priority of transitive relations over relations described as intransitive and non-transitive. A further ground can here be adduced: We have already adverted to Garden's

demonstration (1984: 45), for instance, that “for a binary relation R on a set $A \dots R$ is an *equivalence relation* if R is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive”. It has been shown elsewhere (Duff-Cooper 1990c: 35) that the constituents of Vidhi (V), which may be symbolised as $(a/a' = a \vee a' = V)$, constitute such a relation. Vidhi as Sunya is basic to everything else in the Baliness universe. It therefore follows that the special case of reflexive relations, the totally reflexive relation, and therefore this mode in general is prior to the other two modes of reflexivity.

As for the relative priority of the irreflexive and non-reflexive modes, *ir-* is a variation of *in-* before *r* (above; Onions 1966: 485), and is a prefix of negation. By the matters considered in section IV, therefore, irreflexive relations may be said to be prior to non-reflexive relations.

At this point, it was to be expected that the priority relative one to another of the two sets—the three modes of transitivity and of reflexivity—would have to be decided: As it stands, Table 2 above is ordered on the premiss that perfect symmetry and symmetry and asymmetry are prior to the modes of reflexivity, which is all right, *and* that these modes are prior to those of reflexivity. This second premiss would seem to stand in need of examination.

When Table 2 is considered more closely, however, it is apparent that after all this decision does not here have to be made: Taking the modes of transitivity as prior nevertheless results in the modes of reflexivity combined with perfect symmetry and symmetry and those combined with asymmetry being listed orderlily, that is to say consonantly with their priority as established above—except for the last two modes listed. Taking the modes of reflexivity as prior to the mediated relationships, however, has the result that the modes of transitivity, from the first “asymmetrical” entry to the last, become jumbled up so that “transitive” and “intransitive”

alternate.

Before we decide how to proceed, it should be said that these irregularities should not dismay us. The object of our study, after all, is social life. It is to be expected that social facts will not accord in every particular with a formal construct. This expectation is well exemplified by the alliance system of Mamboru, for instance, which evinces irregularities (relative to the asymmetry of the system). Closer inspection of those irregularities suggests that they can be explained, but they are irregularities nonetheless (Needham 1987b: 176-83). This situation is akin to the relationship between the ideal geometry of mathematics and what Waismann (1968: 195) calls "visual geometry" (*natuerliche Geometrie*): a factor of inexactitude, or blur, attaches to the latter, but not of course to the former—as the alliances actually contracted between, ultimately, local descent groups in Mamboru evince irregularities relative to the formal construct of the Mamboru system of alliance through intermarriage.

Rather than being dismayed, indeed, we should perhaps be pleased that the slight irregularities of Table 2 appear there. Responding to Mary Douglas's contention (1980: 99) that Carlos Castaneda's first three books (1970, 1973, 1982) are "'consistently' knitted into an attitude toward life and death and human rationality whose very 'coherence' is alien to our own contemporary thought", Needham (whose main concern here is with parallels that appear to hold between work of Eugen Herrigel on *kyudō* and the first two titles in Castaneda's saga of Don Juan) writes: "Coherence is in itself no evidence for or against authenticity; a clever writer of bogus ethnography will easily make his inventions coherent, and a cleverer one perhaps will contrive to make them just as inconsistent as may be plausible" (1985: 205, 206; cf. 179). That is, one does not expect all aspects of social practice to be consistent; the relationship between what Rivière, for instance, calls (1969;

227) "ideal" and "practice" (the formal construct and the carrying into effect of the ideal may be more or less disparate—but that the two will be on all fours one with another is not to be looked to.

To resume consideration of the irregularities displayed in Table 2, now, the question is: Can they be resolved? My inclination, which is acted upon in Table 3 (sec. VIII) is simply to transpose the last two entries in Table 2. This amendment is more economical than assuming the priority of the modes of reflexivity, which would involve re-ordering all the "asymmetrical" entries; and the transposition results in an enantiomorph (reflexive, irreflexive, non-reflexive, irreflexive, reflexive) which at once retains the priority, in the first three "asymmetrical" entries, of the modes of reflexivity and displays a form characteristic of Balinese ideology (sec. III). Moreover, if the result of this operation is more beautiful than that would result from the alternative operation mentioned, as it seems to be to me, then there is a good chance that it is the right one to adopt (cf., e.g. Penrose 1974: 267).

VI

Reversal (Inversion)

The consideration of these operations' position in the cline of priority can be very brief. Whatever form these operations can be shown by analysis to take, and as seen above (sec. III) three forms are in evidence in Balinese ideology, they are all posited upon an order that is manipulated in one or other ways. This order may be variously constituted: These various constitution or, rather, some of them are what the cline so far arrived at partially delineates. Whatever its constitution, though, this order is that of the lives of the right-minded; the categories that this order frames are those employed either by the right-minded (people

who live in accord with the order) or by others such as practitioners of left-handed magic (“witches”, *léak*) or the small number of “well-educated low-castes” of “more urbanized parts of Bali” who express anti- “caste” sentiments (Howe 1989: 48; cf. Duff-Cooper 1990a, forthcoming-a) who, in one way or another, for the gods know what reasons, react against it (Duff-Cooper 1987). Either way, these operations are subsequent to that order, ultimately an aspect of Vidhi; reversal (inversion) which describes these operations is equally so.

VII

Modes of Periodicity

A few more words about the modes of division that the periodic modes express dynamically are required before the latter can be examined further.

As mentioned earlier (sec. II), modes of division head the list of formal notions that order Balinese ideology: There could be none of the other principles of order, to say no more, without them (though see the qualification to this assertion registered in sec. III). In analysis, this priority is evinced by the serial consideration, for instance, of mediated relationships in unities divided into from two to eleven aspects (Duff-Cooper 1990c, sec. II-X). This analytical strategy, which in retrospect seems preferable to analysis based on, for instance, the modes of reflexivity (Duff-Cooper 1988b, secs. III-V), has a more general application. This is, the combined relations listed in Table 2, and perhaps others, and reversals are evinced in different degrees of completeness among unities divided into numerically different aspects. This also goes for the periodic modes, which (we have seen) implicate most significantly modes of division of a unity into two, three, four, five, and nine constituent aspects.

Still, like the combinations of relations listed in Table 2, and the other principles that so far constitute our cline of priority, these periodic modes are subsequent to the modes of partition. In one way, then, modes of periodicity can be adjudged to be of a priority equivalent to that of reversal.

However, in another way these modes may be considered prior to reversal. These latter operations, both in Balinese ideology and more widely, are most often but not always associated with misfortune and death, while periodic modes in Balinese ideology at any rate are generally but, again, not always life-promoting. Life is superior to death in that it is higher, more to the right, the northeast and/or east, and whiter than death, which is concomitantly inferior to (lower, more to the left, the southwest and/or west, and blacker and darker than) life.

If need be, then, modes of periodicity and reversal can be prioritised relative one to another by these criteria. Here, this need not be done. It is enough to say that both kinds of operations are subsequent to all the other aspects of the cline so far

Table 3. The Ordering Principles of Balinese Ideology in a Cline of Priority.

Modes of Partition	: Division of an entity into from two to eleven constituent aspects.
Relations in combination:	Perfectly symmetrical, totally reflexive, transitive; Symmetrical, reflexive, transitive; Symmetrical, reflexive, (none); Symmetrical, non-reflexive, in or non-transitive; Symmetrical, non-reflexive, non-transitive; Asymmetrical, reflexive, transitive; Asymmetrical, irreflexive, transitive; Asymmetrical, non-reflexive, transitive; Asymmetrical, irreflexive, intransitive; Asymmetrical, reflexive, intransitive.
Concatenating relations	: Analogy Homology
Operations	: Modes of periodicity <i>and/or</i> reversal (inversion).

established.

VIII

Summary of Findings

The principles that order Balinese ideology can now be collected together and are shown in a cline of priority in Table 3. In accord with the employment of the symbolic resource of elevation in Balinese ideology, what is higher in this table is prior to what is lower (but see sec. V above).

IX

Closing Remarks; Retrospect and Prospect

In line with what Rivière calls the duty of the social anthropologist, the present study, which could have been lengthily extended, continues the process of identifying and revealing the principles that order (Rivière's "underlying") indigenously defined aspects of Balinese ideology. In so doing, it is a further contribution to the structural history of the Balinese of western Lombok and to the process of insistent skepticism about the terms that frame analysis to which we are enjoined (above, sec. I; n. 4).

Those principles are collocated in Table 3. It is not claimed that these formal notions are an exhaustive list of the ordering principles of Balinese ideology, but they are a start, in at least two ways.

They are a step along the road, first, to a fuller appreciation of the possibilities of order latent in any complex form of life. Second, and more directly related to the impetus for the present piece, which is acknowledged elsewhere (Duff-Cooper 1990a), they provide a starting-point for a comparison of Balinese life not myopically limited to Bali.

What should be emphasised is that the principles listed in Table 3 are *not* to be seen as a paradigm in the ways that Radcliffe-Brown for instance adopts the systems of the Karia and the Aranda as “norms” of Australian social organisation to which each other system can be compared (1931: 15, 15 n. 5) and Howe (1989) adopts the “caste-like” hierarchical forms of social organisation of villages in the southern Balinese plains against which other forms of such organisation, reduced to just two, are set. Rather, the same notions will be brought to bear on other forms of Balinese life under one aspect after another, without any prejudicial advance circumscription of the aspects to be considered.

The findings of such considerations will then be sorted into a cline such as is exemplified in the Tables above, and most comprehensively in Table 3. The various clines will then themselves be sorted by reference to the criterion of simplicity or, conversely, complexity. The findings of earlier studies (some of which are listed in Duff-Cooper (1990c: 31)) allow the assumption to be made that the simpler the cline, the earlier (the more prior) the form of life from which it derives. Thus while it can be cogently argued that the forms of life of both the Balinese and the people of Mamboru are amenable to “total” analysis, the latter, based on the combination of duality, asymmetry, and intransitivity (Needham 1987b: 188–92) is simpler than Balinese ideology. (The same goes for the ideology of the Lio of eastern Flores (Howell 1989; Duff-Cooper, forthcoming-b).)

The principles listed in Table 3 are what can be called the cogitational features of Balinese ideology. This evinces imaginative factors also though, referred to above (sec. I) which can also be adduced in comparison. Here the question is: How far have other forms of in this case Balinese life taken advantage of the factors that are on offer to ideologies in their construction (as it were)?

Perhaps, to revert to our anonymous reviewer (sec. I), it will nevertheless be maintained that this and earlier studies do not address nor contribute significantly to "live issues". Howe's study (1989) and a response to it (Duff-Cooper 1990a) show that view to be at the least misdirected. I should say, indeed, that the present essay, and earlier studies without which it and the work to which it is a precursor could not have been nor could be undertaken, are crucial steps in the endeavour to bring analytical comprehension and comparison of forms of Balinese life, which have long languished much as they were at the time of Korn's comparative work in the 1920s (on which see, e.g. Korn 1933: v-vi and Schaareman 1986: *passim*), a little closer to the refined pitch that was achieved some time ago by, for instance, Fischer (1957; cf. Needham 1980a, 1984) for other parts of eastern Indonesia.⁽⁸⁾ But the reader cannot be bullied into acceptance of any of this: as Waismann says in another connection (1968: 18; cf. Duff-Cooper, forthcoming-c), when all is said and done it is the reader's, and the writer's, decision.

Notes

- (1) I did field research in Pagutan, western Lombok (the island next east from Bali), for about 21 months in 1979-81. Many thanks are due to my hosts there and to the bodies that funded and otherwise supported this work (the Social Science Research Council of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Emslie Horniman Anthropological Scholarship Fund, and the Philip Bagby Fund, University of Oxford, as well as the Indonesian Academy of Sciences (LIPI)). "Balinese" refers to the Balinese of western Lombok unless it is specified or otherwise clear. "Ideology" as I use the term refers to ideas and values in social action not to the deceptions perpetrated upon nor to the delusions of social classes, however defined.
- (2) Here is an appropriate place to enter a strong protest against the system in which work by someone whose identity is revealed to a reviewer is assessed by that reviewer under a veil of anonymity, at least in so far as the person whose work is assessed is concerned. One does not have to be professionally interested in such matters as economics, politics, and ideology (by which is here meant more or less "false consciousness")

to realise that such a situation is open to easy abuse especially when reviewer and reviewed are peers. It also offends against natural justice in that disparagements of another's work remain unanswered for to the person decried, who has no come-back, even on disputed matters of fact. After one has been subjected to such treatment one appreciates all the more the force of the contention that we "put our faith in exemplars rather than in institutions" (Needham 1970: xcvi).

- (3) The suggestion that speculation and conjecture can be a powerful incitement to the analytical imagination (Duff-Cooper 1986: 200-1) still represents my views on this matter.
- (4) At the place cited, Needham has it that "it is this side of the undertaking that most calls for methodical doubt, an insistent skepticism about the categories in which we frame our analyses".
- (5) Allowing that "equality" and "hierarchy" are equivalent respectively to "symmetry" and "asymmetry" for the sake of the argument, which exactly they are not (Duff-Cooper, forthcoming-b).
- (6) Although it is not strictly necessary to do so, it may be helpful and prudent to define "perfect symmetry" and "asymmetry" as employed in the present study and elsewhere: Two entities *a* and *b* are related perfectly symmetrically when any objective statement that applies to one also applies to the other and/or when *a* and *b* are interchangeable one for another in any context whatsoever. (This situation obtains only when *a* and *b* are devoid of content.) Symmetrical relations obtain between *a* and *b* when an objective statement about one goes for the other too and in contexts where *a* and *b* are interchangeable. In this latter case it is likely that *a* and *b* will also be related asymmetrically in other, different contexts when sometimes *a*, sometimes *b* may be pre-eminent. For pairs of terms in Balinese ideology related symmetrically and in one or both of the possible ways just mentioned asymmetrically see, e.g. Duff-Cooper (forthcoming-a).
- (7) These forms of the *ongkara* (*OM*), illustrated in, e.g. Warna (1978, *s.v. onkara*) respectively show well how reversal may operate horizontally or vertically, like non-reversed order.
- (8) The relevance of this allusion is that it has been asserted recently (Howe 1989: 48) that Bali is "culturally a part" of eastern Indonesia. More exact is Zurbuchen's view (1987: 8) that "both Bali's cultural history and its present-day linguistic [and other] cultural forms make us turn west toward Java (and even beyond Indonesia, to India) as well as east toward Lombok"—and beyond that island (Duff-Cooper 1990b, chap. 2: "'Metaphors for Living' and Balinese Life").

Bibliography

- Beattie, John, 1964. *Other Cultures; Aims, Methods and Achievements in Social Anthropology*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Beck, Brenda E. F., 1973. The Right-Left Division in South Indian Society, in: Rodney Needham (ed.), *Right & Left; Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Castaneda, Carlos, 1970. *The Teachings of Don Juan; A Yaqui Way of Knowledge*, Harmondsworth: Penguin (1st ed., Berkeley, 1968).
- 1973 *A Separate Reality: Further Conversations with Don Juan*, Harmondsworth: Penguin (1st ed., New York, 1971).
- 1982 *The Eagle's Gift*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Charras, M., n.d. *De la forêt maléfique à l'herbe divine*, Paris: E. H. E. S. S.
- Douglas, Mary, 1980. *Implicit Meanings; Essays in Anthropology*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Duff-Cooper, Andrew, 1985. Duality in Aspects of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Cosmos* 1: 15-36.
- 1986a Balinese Kingship in Pagutan. *Cosmos* 2: 164-81.
- 1986b Alternation and Other Modes of Periodicity from a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Southeast Asian Studies* 24/2: 181-96.
- 1986c Aspects of the Symbolic Classification of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Sociologus* 36: 121-37.
- 1986d Andrew Lang: Aspects of his Work in Relation to Current Social Anthropology. *Folklore* 97/2: 186-205.
- 1987 Living with the Structure of a Balinese Form of Life in Western Lombok. *Philosophy* 84: 193-226.
- 1988a The Formation of Balinese Ideology in Western Lombok. *Philosophy* 86: 151-98.
- 1988b Reflexive Relationships in Aspects of the Ideology of the Balinese on Lombok. *Philosophy* 87: 219-55.
- 1990a On Hierarchy, Equality, and Variations in Balinese Social Organisation. *Seitoku University Research Bulletin*.
- 1990b *Shapes and Images*, Denpasar: University of Udayana.
- 1990c The Formation of Balinese Ideology in Western Lombok: Inspection, Change of Aspect, Assessment. *Sociologus*.
- Forthcoming-a Analogical Classification in Balinese Ideology in Western Lombok. *Man and Culture in Oceania*.
- Forthcoming-b Balinese Exchange: Replication and Reaffirmation of the One. *Man*.
- Forthcoming-c For and Against "Degrees of Asymmetry". *Symmetry: Culture and Science*.
- Fischer, H. W., 1957. Some Notes on Kinship Systems and Relationship

- Terms of Sumba, Manggarai and South Timor. *Internationales Archiv fuer Ethnographie* 48: 1-31.
- Garden, Rachel W., 1984. *Modern Logic and Quantum Mechanics*, Bristol: A. Hilger.
- Guermonez, J.-F., 1987. *Les Pandé de Bali*, Paris: E. F. E.-O.
- Hesse, Mary, 1974. *The Structure of Scientific Inferenec*, London: Macmillan.
- Hocart, A. M., 1970. *Kings and Councillors; An Essay in the Comparative Anatomy of Human Society*, ed. and intro. Rodney Needham, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1st ed., Cairo, 1936).
- Howe, L. E. A., 1989. Hierarchy and Equality: Variations in Balinese Social Organization. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 45/1: 47-71.
- Howell, Signe, 1989. Of Persons and Things: Exchange and Valuables among the Lio of Eastern Indonesia. *Man* (N.S.) 24: 419-38.
- Kant, Immanuel, 1964, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. N. Kemp Smith, London: Macmillan.
- Korn, V. E., 1933. *De Dorpsrepubliek Taganan Pagringsingan*, Santpoort: Mees.
- Kroeber, A. L., 1909. Classificatory Systems of Relationship. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 39: 77-84.
- Lowie, R. H., 1917. *Culture & Ethnology*, New York: Boni and Liveright.
- Needham, Rodney, 1969. Gurage Social Classification: Formal Notes on an Unusual System. *Africo* 39: 153-66.
- 1970 Editor's Introduction, Hocart 1970.
- 1974 *Remarks and Inventions; Skeptical Essays about Kinship*, London: Tavistock.
- 1979 *Symbolic Classification*, Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- 1980a Diversity, Structure, and Aspect in Manggarai Social Classification, in: R. Schefold and others (eds.), *Man, Meaning, and History*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- 1980b Principles and Variations in the Structure of Sumbanese Society, in: James J. Fox (ed.), *The Flow of Life*, Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- 1981 *Circumstantial Deliveries*, Berkeley and London: University of California Press.
- 1983 *Against the Tranquility of Axioms*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- 1984 The Transformation of Prescriptive Systems in Eastern Indonesia, in: P. E. de Josselin de Jong (ed.), *Unity in Diversity Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study*, Dordrecht and Cinnaminson, N. J.: Foris.
- 1985 *Exemplars*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- 1987a *Counterpoints*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of

Remarks on Some Systematic Aspects of Forms of Life

- California Press.
- 1987b *Mamboru History and Structure in a Domain of Northwestern Sumba*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Onions, C. T., 1966. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Penrose, Roger, 1974. The Rôle of Aesthetics in Pure and Applied Mathematics. *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications* July/August: 266-71.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R., 1922. *The Andaman Islanders*, Cambridge: At the University Press.
- 1931 *The Social Organization of Australian Tribes*, Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Rivière, Peter, 1969. *Marriage Among the Trio; A Principle of Social Organisation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schaareman, D., 1986. *Tatulingga; Tradition and Community*, Basel: Ethnologisches Seminar der Universität und Museum fuer Voelkerkunde.
- Shubiknov, A. V., N. V. Belov, and others, 1964. *Colored Symmetry*, trans. J. Itzkoff and J. Gollob, W. T. Holser (ed.), London and New York: Pergamon.
- Soebadio, H., 1971. *Jñānasiddhānta*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Waismann, F., 1968. *How I See Philosophy*, R. Harré (ed.), London: Macmillan.
- Warna, I Wayan, 1978. *Kamus Bali-Indonesia*, Denpasar: Dinas Penpajaran Tingkat I Bali.
- Weyl, H., 1952, *Symmetry*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L., 1977. *Vermischte Bemerkungen*, G. H. von Wright (e.d.), with H. Nyman, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Yoshida, Teigo and Andrew Duff-Cooper, 1989. A Comparison of Aspects of Two Polytheistic Forms of Life: Okinawa and Balinese Lombok. *Cosmos* 5: 212-42.
- Zurbuchen, Mary S., 1987. *The Language of Balinese Shadow Theater*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.