relations are also, of course, symbolized in various ways – for instance, by reference to fineness and coarseness, to related colours, or by ranking them – for as Lévi remarks (1933: 79), "il n'y a de noblesse que dans le symbole."

In these respects, I suggest, the Balinese language or the lexical sets that compose it, do not differ (expectedly) from any other aspect of Balinese life. It may therefore be that to isolate language as an object of study is to distort it.[16] In any case, it is no surprise that to discuss speech and language, as to analyse a chunk of dialogue, other apparently disparate aspects of Balinese have to be taken into account; and in the stress on such formal notions as symmetry, asymmetry, and point of reference in considering Balinese lexical sets as a whole, the scene is at once set for more detailed analysis and for comparison, while the limitations imposed by the spatial metaphor of ranking are transcended. This move to greater abstraction, further, has the advantage that it accords with what Balinese life should consist of, viewed under the aspect of metaphysics *(sarva-surya)*, namely a gradual progress away from the material toward the essential, the apotheosis of which is of course Ida Sang Hyang Vidhi, the goal of all who, knowledgeably, aspire to the paradisical state of freedom from rebirth and complete release from the material.

4. Concluding Remarks

The fourth core element – resilience in the face of outside influences – that J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong propounded the heuristic value of in 1935 is much less specific than the other three elements (P. E. de Josselin de Jong 1985: 199), but he was nonetheless (or perhaps thereby) able to show that the forms that this element took in the Hinduization and later Islamization of Java were different one from another. He also was led to suggest, plausibly, that the resilience referred to could be active or passive (1977: 180); in the latter case, we can interpret this as "resistance," though the participants in it may not have seen or see what they did in that way. For the present purpose, however, such a possibility does not weigh.

Forty years later, and without apparent reference to de Josselin de Jong's "structural core element," van der Kraan wrote (1975: 97) that it was striking "the extent to which the island [Lombok] played a passive and receptive, rather than a dynamic [active], role in its relations with other powers in the archipelago." True, these remarks are addressed at the early history of the island, but they might also be thought applicable to its later history as after the Balinese the Dutch first (from 1843 when the ruler of Mataram acknowledged by treaty the sovereignty of the Netherlands over the island to March 1942), then the Japanese (until October 1945), and then briefly the Australians, and then again the Dutch, and, finally, the Javanese and other Muslims like Sasak (from around July 1946) successively exercised jural authority over the island's population.

Of course, there was resistance ("active" resilience) to some of these outside influences: in 1894 a Dutch punitive expedition led by generals Vitter and van Ham was repulsed and van Ham was killed; and between October 1945 and July 1946, when the Dutch flag again flew over the island after the capitulation of the Japanese, and with their assistance, there were (I was told) cells of resistance on Lombok, armed by the Japanese, to the Dutch (cf., e.g., Dennis 1987). Less spectacularly, perhaps, when the Balinese came to realize that the arrival of Japanese troops in the village usually meant the theft of rice, eggs, and other foodstuffs and the abduction (and subsequent rape)[17] of young women, they took the precaution (I was told) of hiding both when a visitation from the Japanese seemed immanent. Yet some people now much older, such as I Nengah Semer, supported the arrival of and collaborated with the Japanese on Lombok; and others admitted that they knelt at the side of the road as Japanese soldiers passed (as they had to, otherwise they would have been beaten) and passively submitted to being chain-ganged in support of the Japanese war effort.

All of that raises numerous questions. What exactly is meant by "active" and "passive"? Not only can these words each convey different ideas in English, but it is far from obvious that these ideas would correspond with Balinese (or Sasak) notions of the active and the passive, which are connected with the relationship of a married man and woman *(kuren)*, enjoyer ("active," *purusa*) and enjoyed ("passive," *pradhana*) respectively. They might also be rendered into Balinese by hard-working *(rajin)* and lazy *(mayus)* or pig-like *(kiul)*,

16 Perhaps that language is the principal mode of cognition upon which much of an ethnographer's other data depend (cf. Baumann 1987: 24), and the reasons given by Sherzer (1987) justify its isolation for study.

17 On Balinese ideas connected with rape *(ngosa)*, see, e.g., Duff-Cooper (1985*e*: 416 f.).