and the Gria Taman (as opposed to knowledge of them) during residence there.

My proficiency in these languages is recorded below; but any competent social anthropologist will be able to gauge my linguistic competences, at least impressionistically, from among other matters – what follows in sections 2 and 3 – being more in the nature of an ethnographical survey than minute, intensive analysis along the lines of, for instance, Jacob's article (1986) on the deliberate use of foreign vocabulary by Khmer.

The present study has a number of aims, some of them descriptive, some, to use the cant term, more theoretical. The former include placing on record some Balinese ideas concerning the nature of language and speech. These are important in themselves, as a part of the ethnographic record, and especially so as the analysis of dialogue or discourse increases in favor (cf., e.g., Sherzer 1987: 297) in some quarters at least.[3] It may also be useful to others if the complex linguistic situation that an ethnographer can find him- or herself in somewhere like Lombok, which has been open to centuries of influence from east and west,[4] is recorded, as well as the writer's professional response to that situation: not only are the data, even though presented only in passing, pointers to in this case Balinese attitudes and ideas about the foreign, but they will preclude my inclusion among that band of social anthropologists who manage to convey by implication or by what is not put in print a crooked impression of linguistic confidence and ability, which is not only pointless, for such charlatans are always found out (see, e.g., Hobart 1986*a*: 145), but is also damaging to the scholarly standing of our subject.[5]

After recording these data, we move on to consider one of the four "structural core elements" that in 1935 J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong (1977: 174 f.) highlighted as being heuristically important in the comparative study of Indonesian forms of life that have a pronounced family resemblance one to another, viz., the special type of "reaction of indigenous culture to certain powerful cultural influences from without."[6]

These elements have never been intended to characterize these forms of life; as indeed they could not have been: as Barnes points out (1985: 94), J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong's comments about Indonesian societies' resilience to outside influences are reminiscent of similar observations about elsewhere such as India, and, one could add, Japan where Japanese scholars such as Suzuki Takao (e.g., 1987: 133) often emphasize the way in which foreign influences are Japanified as they become a part of Japanese life and thought (cf., e.g., Dale 1986: 49–53). But in any case Lombok has not generally played a part in such comparative analysis, though Bali and Java of course have if often without direct reference to these "structural core elements." That three elements are not discernible in or are not evinced by Balinese forms of life (see note 6) may account for this; but whatever the reasons, it is timely to remedy this deplorable state of affairs, and a start is made on this in section 4 below.

2. Ideas Concerning Language and Speech

"Speech" may be rendered into Balinese as *"sabda."* *Sabda*, *bayu*, and *idep* constitute what my instructor and friend Ida Ketut Sideman termed the three *(tri) paramana* or *kaya* (but cp. Hooykaas 1964: 26; Hobart 1986*a*: 148). These tags refer to the three "Powers" (Zurbuchen 1987: 129). *Bayu* which is crudely glossed "energy" (Hobart 1985: 125; cf., 1986*a*: 148) is predicated of all aspects of the material and generally visible *(sakala)* world that live *(urip)* in the sense that they are capable of either self- or other-directed action. (The emphasis here is upon action as mere "natural" movement without intention.) Such aspects include plants, trees, ploughing-oxen, houses, tractors, and

3 Critical questions are raised about the recording, reporting, and analysis of dialogue and discourse by, e.g., Marcus and Cushman 1982, Tyler 1982, Clifford 1983, and Bachnik 1987, though the latter maintains (p. 27) that the investigation of dialogue is "crucial."

4 For the little that is known about the history of Lombok, which at some time has been under the jural control of the Balinese (from Karangasem), of the southern Sulawesi kingdom of Gowa, of Makassar (via Sumbawa), the British, the Dutch, the Australians, and the Japanese, and, as villagers have it, now the Javanese, see, e.g., Vogelsang 1922, Goris 1936, de Graaf 1941, van der Kraaj 1975, and Duff-Cooper 1983: 8–16.

5 Agreeable exceptions include Bateson 1932, Evans-Pritchard 1940, Fortes 1945, and Maybury-Lewis 1967.

6 The other three structural core elements or bases for comparison, as P. E. de Josselin de Jong now prefers to call them (1984: 240), are: socio-cosmic dualism, double unilineal descent, and circulating connubium (sc. asymmetric prescriptive alliance). As far as Balinese forms of life are concerned, these elements are not appropriate heuristics: they do not evince simple socio-cosmic dualism, but various modes of classification by partition are discernible in them; double unilineal descent as defined by one authority and which is distinguished from "cognatic kinship" (P. E. de Josselin de Jong 1985: 203 f.) is inconsonant with Balinese notions about descent; while Balinese marriages are in no technical sense prescriptive (e.g., Needham 1984: 221).