I. Gerdin

The Balinese Sidikara: ancestors, kinship and rank

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 137 (1981), no: 1, Leiden, 17-34

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

INGELA GERDIN

THE BALINESE SIDIKARA: ANCESTORS, KINSHIP AND RANK

Introduction

Many variations are to be found in Balinese culture and social life, but these may be said to be variations on common themes, differently combined and emphasized. The maintenance of ritually recognized relations between the living and their ancestors is one such theme; it is central to Balinese kinship and constitutes the focal point of the *sidikara*, an institution of marked importance to the Balinese in Lombok.¹ The *sidikara* group is composed of kinsmen honouring common ancestors, or, more generally phrased, a common source of origin (*kawitan*), usually undefined, as genealogies are seldom kept. To the Balinese in Lombok, the *sidikara* relations are essential in defining a person's place in the social and ritual universe. "The *sidikara* is what makes us tied (*terikat*)", informants state emphatically. To be tied (*terikat*) is viewed as opposed to being independent and "modern". "*Terikat*" is used to describe the relation of a person to a group:

"...for a Balinese, personal identity is the sum total of all the *terikat* relationships, of affinities and bonds to kin, temple, voluntary association, hamlet, title group, and so on. It is the task of the experts, especially the Brahmanic priests (*pedanda*) to learn knowledge about these bonds, ties and relationships, not only for persons and villages, but also for the cosmos. This is the essence of religious knowledge, for it determines

INGELA GERDIN is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Gothenburg, where she is at present also teaching. Her specific interests include Indonesia, processes of social change and problems of inequality. Two of her publications are: 'Ruinous Feasting: Changed Position of the Big Feast among the Balinese in Lombok', *Ethnos* 1975, and 'Frågor kring kontroll av människor och jord på förkoloniala Lombok under 1800-talet; Ett försök till problemfixering' [Labour and Land in Pre-Colonial Lombok; A Tentative Approach], *Historisk Tidskrift* 3, 1977 (with a summary in English). She may be contacted at the Department of Social Anthropology, University of Gothenburg, Karl Johansgatan 27, S-414 59 Gothenburg, Sweden.

what is appropriate, what is right, what is in balance or out of proportion." (Lansing 1974: 4-5.)

Now, in Lombok most other institutions (such as the hamlet, voluntary associations, irrigation association) are of much less importance than in Bali, whereas the *sidikara* occupies a preponderant place and displays more pronounced rules, and I have seldom heard the word "*terikat*" being used in this sense for anything else but a person's relation to his *sidikara*.²

In terms of the distinction that the Balinese make between the private and public domain of social action (cf. Geertz and Geertz 1975: 159-160), the *sidikara* is confined to the private domain. But a *sidikara* may emerge as a public group, then called a *dadia*, by erecting a common ancestor temple on public ground, thereby manifesting the cohesiveness, strength and unity of the group. The *dadia* is in principle a *sidikara* group that has been turned into a corporate unit often operating as a kind of faction in public life. So, whereas every Balinese belongs to a *sidikara* group, he is not necessarily a member of a *dadia*. Whether or not a *dadia* is actually formed depends on factors external to the *sidikara*, factors such as wealth and political ambitions. To pay homage to the ancestors is a central concern for the *dadia* as well as for the *sidikara*, but the former group usually takes on other functions as well. In Bali, the *dadia* often acts as a faction in local politics. In Moslem-dominated Lombok, *dadia* groups are infrequently found, and when they are, they seldom function as factions in political matters, simply because the existence of a majority of Moslems means that public action can usually not be defined in terms of Hindu-Balinese culture.

In their book on kinship in Bali, Hildred and Clifford Geertz (1975) treat the *dadia* at length, but deal with kinship in the private domain somewhat more superficially. The present study is complementary to theirs, as it examines kinship relations in the private domain in more detail. Geertz' and Geertz' study suggests that classical anthropological descent theory cannot account adequately for kinship in Bali, while Boon's (1976) essay on Balinese marriage shows the limits of the applicability of alliance theory. In the present article, these limitations are taken for granted, and attention is directed to processes resulting in inclusion and exclusion with regard to a *sidikara* group and to possible maintenance, creation or denial of rank distinctions in this context. The aim is to account for the logic of basic notions and of relations defining the *sidikara*, without rendering this logic as a

mechanism automatically producing rigid structures when in fact a certain flexibility is allowed for. The *sidikara* will be presented in terms of rules and alternatives in the maintenance and creation of group membership and relations of rank. But the existence of alternatives in the system does not necessarily mean that a particular person has any real options in a particular situation, as all but one of the alternatives may well be ruled out by the prevailing circumstances.³

Some background data

This paper deals with those Balinese in Lombok who originally came there from Karangasem in Bali. In the eighteenth century the original inhabitants of Lombok, the Sasak, were defeated by the Karangasem dynasty. Karangasem noblemen and their followers settled in the plains of West Lombok, an area that was sparsely populated at that time. Fertile *sawah* (irrigated rice field) complexes were created with the help of a Sasak labour force brought there from other, more densely populated, parts of Lombok. The Balinese dynasty ruled Lombok until 1894, when the Dutch conquered the island. Today there are some 50,000 Balinese in Lombok, and approximately 75 per cent of these Balinese are descended from the kingdom of Karangasem. Most of them make their living from agriculture. Land is privately owned and wage labour is common. A large part of the population, probably the majority, consists of landless labourers and petty traders.

Balinese culture, in Lombok as well as in Bali, is permeated by notions of rank (cf. Covarrubias 1965: 46-67; Geertz and Geertz 1975: 129-134), which in everyday life are expressed in etiquette and the use of more or less refined levels of language. In this paper, I will use the concept of "rank" in a broad sense to denote an institutionalized classification of social positions as relatively higher, equal and lower, a higher position requiring deference and ritual precedence.

There are at least two types of generally recognized ranking of the social positions of individuals and groups:

1. *Genealogical rank*. This type of ranking is based on seniority, and it is also expressed in the kinship terminology. Distinction is made between elder and younger siblings as well as between generations.

2. *Title rank*. Here I will take this type of ranking as a matter of course and not go into its basis and character. The two major categories in this ranking scheme are *triwangsa*, noble title-holders, and *jaba*, commoners (literally "outsiders"). In Bali, *triwangsa* make up less than ten per cent of the population, while in Lombok, due to the

pattern of settlement related to conquest, they constitute approximately twenty per cent of the Balinese population.⁴ *Triwangsa* titles are grouped, in turn, into three subordinate categories (*wangsa*): Brahmana, Ksatria and Wesia. In the literature on Bali, this type of ranking is often referred to as "caste", but until further research has been done, I think it would only be confusing to use that rather specific term. Be that as it may, there are ranked hereditary titles, the title of a person depending mainly on the title held by his/her father. The title of the mother can influence a person's title only if the mother is of considerably lower rank than the father, in which case the title of the child may be degraded one step. Formerly, certain prerogatives went with the title, mostly ritual prerogatives, but also, e.g., a mandate to "rule" over people with lower titles. Nowadays, only a few ritual prerogatives are still attached to these titles, and in daily life deference for title-holders is usually simply a matter of etiquette and not a token of real power or influence.

Group formation

Generally speaking, in Balinese kinship agnatic links are the primary links, while uterine links may have a secondary influence. Patrification is both the normative and the statistical rule. The Balinese themselves reflect upon the importance of agnatic versus uterine links. They say that agnatic kinsmen (*kepurusa*) are always close kinsmen, while kinsmen related by one or several uterine links are distant kinsmen. But they also think along lines like: "Although my daughter's children are not reckoned as close kinsmen, they are still of the same blood as I am, and in a way they may be said to be part of the same descent line, might they not?" Perhaps this problem is more accentuated in Lombok than in Bali, since the Balinese in Lombok are confronted with the more markedly bilateral kinship pattern of their orthodox Moslem neighbours and contrast it with their own, patrilineally oriented, kinship pattern. In any case, two general rules operative in Balinese kinship can be formulated:

- I. Agnatic links take precedence over uterine links.
- II. Uterine links can exert an influence in specific matters.

Inclusion/exclusion with respect to a certain *sidikara* group is governed by the rules set out below, rules that are applied as guide-lines for behaviour:

a. Patrification.

b. The exclusion of illegitimate children (i.e. children born to parents not formally wed), who will automatically become the starting-point for a new *sidikara* as soon as they have legitimate offspring, however.

c. The principle that "the woman follows the man". I.e., when a woman marries she becomes the subject of the ancestors of her husband, and she is incorporated into her husband's *sidikara* group.

Rule c. above (as well as rule d. below) is important where the marriage is not endogamous with respect to the *sidikara* group. In this context it should be pointed out that endogamy is ideally preferred and fairly often practised.

d. An outsider wife (exogamous marriage with respect to the *sidikara* group) should give up her own ancestors by ritually asking their permission to leave. This is by far the most usual procedure, but there are alternatives to this rule, resulting from the application of general rule II above. In exceptional cases the woman can be allowed to continue paying homage to her own ancestors. (This may be the case if, for example, her *sidikara* group is related by consanguineal or frequent affinal ties to her husband's *sidikara* group.) In even more exceptional cases, the children can also be allowed to pay homage to their mother's ancestors as well as to their father's, the result being a partial merging of two *sidikara* groups (kinship grafting).

e. If a person A fails to invite his *sidikara* mate B to a marriage or death ceremony, or if B is invited but fails to show up without a valid excuse, the *sidikara* relationship between these two, as well as between their respective descending lines, is broken (kinship pruning). Such a break usually reflects the existence of a serious conflict between A and B.

f. A person can be "thrown away" (*kutang*) from the group if he pays homage to ancestors of another *sidikara* group or eats of offerings that have been dedicated to ancestors other than his own.

The application of rules a.-f. above results in a division of Balinese society not into discrete groups, but into a number of overlapping groups. Such a group can hardly be appropriately classified by standard anthropological kinship labels like kindred, deme or lineage. Davenport (1959: 564-565), for example, makes a distinction between kin groups which are identical for siblings only (i.e. the personal kindred) and descent groups the personnel of which is the same for all members of

the group. By these standards the *sidikara* is not a descent group, since kinship pruning, for example, may give it a bias. Neither can the *sidikara* be labelled a kindred, since the group is in a vague way lineage-like, the relationships between its members being traced almost exclusively through agnatic links and its personnel being the same for (usually) most of its members. The concept "deme", defined by Murdock (1960: 62) as "an endogamous local group in the absence of unilineal descent", would also misrepresent the *sidikara* group. Although the *sidikara* is preferably endogamous and usually a local group, the concept of patrilineal descent is stressed in the indigenous theory of kinship. Still, the term "clan" would not be adequate, as it is commonly used for unilineal descent groups (cf. Fox 1967: 49-50), and a *sidikara* may not be a unilineal group because of the option of kinship grafting. Now, this list of anthropological standard terms could easily be extended, but the exercise would only show that unless a term is very inclusive and thus imprecise, it could not be used to classify the *sidikara* group appropriately. The problem in classifying types of groups, giving them standard labels, is that the actual composition of groups is but the outcome of processes of inclusion and exclusion of people, of maintenance or non-maintenance of relationships. It will be more rewarding, then, to consider the processes of group formation, a mode of procedure that has the further advantage of avoiding the reification of groups.

Let us take a look at kinship pruning (rule e. above):

Assume that B fails to attend a cremation held by C because there is a serious conflict of some kind between them. This has the effect that not only B and C but also their respective descending lines will no longer "share the same *sidikara*" (*masidikara*). In the first descending generation, the situation from the points of view of different individuals would be (only generational peers being considered):

Ego	Sidikara group
G, H	E F G H - - L M
I, K	E F - - I K L M
E, F, L, M	E F G H I K L M

All of these *sidikara* groupings are focused on the same, vaguely conceived, ancestral apical point. Figuratively speaking, the tree trunk is still growing from its root, even if some of the branches are cut off.

Kinship grafting (option in rule d. above) also produces overlapping groups:

usual situation

kinship grafting

If C and I, belonging to different *sidikara* groups, marry each other, the usual situation is that their children will belong exclusively to the *sidikara* group of their father C (exclusive patrilineal descent). But in the case of kinship grafting, their children, F and G, will be incorporated into both groups. (By the rule of patrilineal descent, this extends to their descending lines as well.) But this does not mean that D and E will be *sidikara* mates to L and M. From the point of view of D and E, the personnel of their *sidikara* group is not changed. From the point of view of L and M, F and G are so to speak grafted onto the stem of their *sidikara* group.

Sidikara group

Ego	Usual situation	Kinship grafting
D, E	D E F G – –	D E F G – –
F, G	D E F G – –	D E F G L M
L, M	– – – – L M	– – F G L M

Kinship pruning (rule e.), rare cases of kinship grafting (option in rule d.), and breaches of ritual obligations (rule f.) change the personnel of *sidikara* groupings. These are not common incidents, but in a long time perspective of several generations, complicated patterns can be produced. Moreover, with the exception of high-ranked nobility, people do not as a rule keep genealogies, so that breaks of *sidikara* bonds cannot be located, which gives the pattern of groupings an incomprehensible appearance at first sight.

Summing up the rules for inclusion and exclusion (rules a.-f. above), we find that the rules are of two kinds:

1. Primary rules of ascription (rules a.-d.), which, if taken alone, would result in the formation of agnatic descent groups with fixed limits (given no options in rule d.).

2. Secondary rules in terms of the fulfilment of ritual obligations (rules e.-f.). If these rules concerning the ritual enactment of relationships to ancestors (rule f.) and *sidikara* mates (rule e.) are broken, exclusion or a partial internal split is the probable result. By processes of this kind, the *sidikara* will acquire its sometimes ego-centered appearance.

So, as a first step, the inclusion/exclusion with regard to a certain *sidikara* group is defined almost automatically by kinship relationships (ascription), but certain options are given by the general rule II. As a second step, *sidikara* co-relationships must continually be confirmed by proper ritual action. It is this continuous ritual re-enactment of ties to ancestors and ties to *sidikara* mates that distinguishes the *sidikara* from close (agnatic) kin in general. The rules of ascription place the individual in a structured kinship setting, while the rules of ritual action stress the responsibility of the individual as an actor, giving him a certain liberty to "decide" on the continuity of his *sidikara* relationships, taking into account the conditions and demands of the wider social situation.

Ritual rights and obligations of the sidikara

A. *Sumbah*: to worship the ancestors

By cremation and subsequent death rites, the soul of the deceased is purified and becomes an ancestral deity. When all prescribed death rites have been performed, rebirth is possible. Rebirth is usually thought to take place only in direct descendants of the ancestor, though contradictory notions of the orthodox Hinduist type are also held (rebirth in the form of, e.g., animals being possible), since there are Hindu classical texts to be found in Bali and Lombok.

Ancestral deities soon lose their personal identity, but when specified ancestors are honoured (as in death rites), genealogical rank determines whom a person can *sumbah*: only those junior in kinship terms may *sumbah* their seniors. For example, a younger brother can *sumbah* a deceased elder brother, but not vice versa. A widow may *sumbah* her deceased husband, but a widower can not *sumbah* his deceased wife. If someone should *sumbah* ancestors outside his *sidikara*, he would most probably be expelled from his own *sidikara* group. There are exceptions, however. So descendants of an illegitimate child may *sumbah* their grandparents and their grandparents' ancestors, or a commoner may sometimes *sumbah* the deceased Brahmana priest whose client he has been.

The act of *sumbah* is an acknowledgement of inferiority, an act whereby a person subjects himself to the ancestral deities and acknowledges that they have power over him. Since the same terms or acts indicating subjugation are used for subjection to the ancestors and subjection to a lord in the former Balinese kingdoms,⁵ it is likely that these types of relationship are viewed as comparable.

B. *Pared-mamared*: eating offerings dedicated to the ancestors

There is a general notion that it is permissible to eat left-overs from another person's meal only if that person is of higher rank (in terms of kinship and title). Yet I have never heard of any Balinese in Lombok eating left-overs from the meal of a person outside his *sidikara* group, even if the outsider were of considerably higher title rank.

This applies strictly to left-overs, not to food as such. Anyone may take food from anyone else, as long as it is not food left on a person's plate after he has finished eating. Eating from the same plate is also freely allowed, and the ceremonial way of eating, *magebung* (*kasar*, or "low", language) or *makemulang* (*alus*, or refined, language), involves precisely persons eating from the same tray, the eaters being

seated in groups of eight. People who do not belong to the same *sidikara* can still *makemulang* together, though men and women are separated unless they are closely related by kinship and/or friendship. It is very important that all people eating from the same tray start and stop eating at the same time, and that food sticking to one's fingers is not put back on the tray but thrown on the ground instead, so that it may not be said that any of the participants have eaten the left-overs from anyone else's meal.

As for offerings, anyone can eat offerings dedicated to high gods, but only members of the *sidikara* group may eat offerings dedicated to their ancestors,⁶ i.e. left-overs from the meals of the ancestors. Offerings to high gods are terminologically distinguished from those of the ancestors.⁷ If someone eats the *paredan* (offerings for the ancestors) of another *sidikara*, he will most probably be expelled from his own *sidikara* group. There are, however, rare cases when two persons or groups who consider themselves to be closely connected (e.g. through frequent affinal bonds) and of the same rank may eat each other's *paredan* without risking expulsion from their own group. *Pared-mamared* would then be a relationship of reciprocal honouring, indicating approximate equality of rank of the two groups. The party taking the first step and eating the other group's *paredan* is said to *nyeburin*, literally "fall down", and the other party, when reciprocating, is said to *ngewales*, literally "level out" or "reciprocate".

Title rank as well as genealogical rank is of importance for the restriction on eating left-overs. One proud, high-titled, informant stated that he could never eat left-overs from his mother's meals, since she was a commoner by birth. But, when she had died and was cremated, he could *sumbah* her as an ancestor. He reflected: "How lucky she was, being just a commoner and still to be honoured as an ancestor by elevated nobility". In terms of genealogical rank she was his superior, while in terms of title rank the situation was the reverse.

It is the relation to one's own group that makes it impossible to *sumbah* or *mamared* with outsiders. The outsiders themselves will not forbid one to share their *paredan* or worship their ancestors. However, by doing so, one would by no means automatically become a "full member" of the outsider's *sidikara* group. A person is incorporated into another *sidikara* group only when there is reciprocal honouring and when A's submission to B's ancestors is paralleled by B's submission to A's ancestors.

At Balinese life-cycle ceremonies, when food is served to the guests

it is generally pointed out that the food has not been previously used as offerings. To use force or deception, or even to simply ask an outsider to eat *paredan* is regarded more or less as a crime; it is always the outsider who must ask for it. On the other hand, if the outsider has close connections to the insider and is considered to be of equal rank, this involves a serious problem for the insider, too, since he feels he should reciprocate and eat the *paredan* served when the outsider is having a ceremony. This means that he must consult his *sidikara* mates or risk expulsion from his own group.

After more than one year of field work, during which I had lived all the time with the same Balinese commoner kin group and was regarded as one of them in many respects, I asked to be given *paredan*. One question put to me on that occasion was whether my people had the institution of *sidikara* too, since my eating *paredan* would then alienate me from my own kin (and, moreover, the Balinese commoner group would have to consider some way of reciprocating). They did not actually think that Swedes had the institution of *sidikara* even before asking me, but to eat *paredan* was considered to be such a serious step that they had to make really sure. I assured them over and over again that I had no *sidikara* of my own, and I was finally allowed to eat of the delicious roasted sucking-pig that the *paredan* consisted of at this time. Several people made sure once more that I knew what I was doing and also pointed out that I should not carelessly tell other Balinese about this, since this might give rise to false rumours that I had been tricked, which would not be good for the reputation of "my" commoner kin group. But as the present paper is an attempt to show that I have grasped the implications of acts such as the eating of *paredan*, and thus that I knew perfectly well what I was doing, I feel free to recount this example here.

C. *Pikul-mamikul*: to ceremonially carry a corpse

Pikul-mamikul is not an exclusive right or obligation for *sidikara* mates only, but may also be the task of the *banjar* (hamlet), a unit in the former administrative organization of the Balinese kingdoms. The *banjar* members are usually related by kinship ties, but non-kinsmen living in the hamlet area can be included. Moreover, *sidikara* groups quite often reciprocally carry each other's deceased members, provided they have the same title rank and that one of the *sidikara* groups does not consist of the illegitimate descendants of the other. A person carrying the corpse of an illegitimate kinsman or a deceased member of a

group of clearly lower title rank would be excluded from his own *sidikara*, to avoid the implications of the entire *sidikara* group being degraded on the scale of ranks. But *pikul-mamikul* is not an exclusive *sidikara* characteristic and does not define the limits of the group as neatly as the acts of *sumbah* and *pared-mamared*.

Sidikara and inheritance

Inheritance, though not necessarily a *sidikara* right, is often associated with the *sidikara*, for reasons of kinship and of ritual. The Balinese state that those who are entitled to inheritance are to be found among the members of the *sidikara* group of the deceased. Now, inclusion in a certain *sidikara* group is defined primarily by patrification, and inheritance is transmitted via recognized agnatic links, illegitimate children being excluded from inheritance. Thus the pool of potential heirs would coincide with the *sidikara* group (minus the woman, as women are not entitled to inherit).

Inheritances cannot be divided among the heirs before cremation of the deceased has taken place. Usually the deceased is first buried and later cremated, and in the meantime funds are raised and the necessary elaborate preparations made. Between death and cremation, the soul of the deceased is regarded as being potentially dangerous; by cremation and the subsequent death rites the soul is purified and transformed into an ancestral deity, after which rebirth is considered possible. The goods left by the deceased person should be used first of all to defray the costs of the cremation, and only after fulfilling the obligation to purify and elevate the soul of the deceased to the status of an ancestral deity may the heirs take their share. It is said that until a person is cremated, his descendants remain in his debt.

The obligation to use the deceased's property for his cremation was formerly very strong. A person could disinherit his close kin by giving himself and all his property away to a person who was not his heir by the rules of kinship. This person could succeed him provided he sponsored the cremation. Lawsuits in this connection were not uncommon (see, e.g., *Adatrechtbundel* XLII 1943: 365-367), and these cases were argued in terms of who actually had the right to perform the cremation, although it seems that often what the parties were aiming at was the property.

So inheritance is intimately connected with ancestor worship by the requirement that it should be used first and foremost to finance the deceased's cremation. The primary concern of the *sidikara* is the con-

tinuous ritual confirmation of the relations to the ancestors, or, in other words, the persistence of descent and reincarnation. To transform a deceased relative into an ancestor is a prerequisite for reincarnation and for the continuity of descent. This ritually confirmed continuity of descent is paralleled by legally acknowledged continuity of ownership, i.e. inheritance. In the Balinese case, the common anthropological statement that descent is something more than the mere fact of biological relationship amounts to the fact that ritual acknowledgement and performance seem to have gained the upper hand in the notion of descent. This is illustrated by, among other things, the possibility to give oneself and one's property away to a non-heir, who acquires the right of inheritance by acquiring the right to perform the cremation.

Sidikara, marriage and rank

Marriage, cremation, and the subsequent death rites are occasions of central importance for the ritual enactment of the *sidikara* bonds. If a person is not invited, or fails to attend, or attends but does not bring the proper offerings or perform the act of *sumbah*, the *sidikara* relations are severed. So all marriage ceremonies must be witnessed by the *sidikara*. Furthermore, "...indigenous religious views of marriage claim that it must strengthen descent (*turunan*), in order to fulfil the duty (*dharma*) to the enshrined ancestors who are in line with the gods" (Boon 1976: 201). Descent is considered to be strengthened by endogamous marriage with respect to the *sidikara* group. Gods are said to marry their twin sisters, god-kings according to legend married their sisters, ordinary people should preferably marry their patrilineal parallel cousins, first-cousin marriage being highly valued though considered ritually dangerous, while second- and third-cousin marriages are considered more safe and frequently take place.⁸ Even a half-sister is deemed marriageable as long as the shared parent is the mother and not the father.

Cousin marriage is not only ideally preferred but also relatively frequently practised. Out of a sample of 86 commoner marriages, 32.6 per cent were endogamous with reference to the *sidikara* group, 5.8 per cent of the marriages being contracted with the father's brother's daughter and 19.8 per cent of the marriages falling within the range of those with third cousins related through male links only.⁹ Considering that a great many *sidikara* groups are fairly small (comprising less than ten households, or some fifty persons), involving difficulties in finding a suitable spouse within the group, this proportion of endogamous

marriages must be considered high. Hildred and Clifford Geertz (1975: 96-97) give comparable data for South Bali, where *dadia* (formalized corporate *sidikara* group) endogamy in three villages ranges between 24.4 per cent and 48.7 per cent of the marriages contracted.

Marriage has rank implications, being hypergamous in a broad sense. When a marriage is contracted within the *sidikara* group, the couple should preferably be generational peers. If the bridegroom belongs to the generation above that of the bride, this is regarded as a permissible breach of the rules, whereas the reverse situation is deemed to be a serious breach of rules, said to result in misfortunes for the couple. In marriages contracted between *sidikara* groups, the bride's group must be of the same or lower title rank. Formerly, if a noble girl married or had an affair with a commoner, they would both be sentenced to death. Nowadays, such a marriage is permitted under the national law, but will not be acknowledged as legally valid by the bride's group, while the girl will no longer be considered as a kinswoman by her natal group. In marriages between commoners belonging to different *sidikara* groups which cannot easily define their place in relation to each other on a scale of ranks, the bride's group is deemed to be of lower rank by the fact that the marriage is accepted by her *sidikara* if the equality of the groups is not explicitly stated through other acts. Equality between groups with frequent affinal relationships is represented as the groups being "like cousins" (cf. Boon 1976: 197-198), i.e., in terms of the endogamy model.

Reciprocal exchange of women between groups is not supposed to take place — the Balinese phrase this rule as "you should not take wives from a group that has taken wives from your group, because it is like two persons pulling at a bamboo knife (*makadengan engad*) — both of them will be hurt". Non-reciprocity rules out the father's sister's daughter as a potential marriage partner. The father's younger brother's daughter is held to be the most appropriate spouse, bride and bridegroom in that case being members of the same *sidikara*, generational peers, and the bridegroom of higher genealogical rank than the bride. As regards the mother's sister's daughter category, nothing definite can be said, the appropriateness of such a union depending on where the mother's sister has married. To marry a mother's brother's daughter means to take a wife from a group which has already given at least one wife to one's own group (namely one's own mother). This latter type of marriage is regarded as the most appropriate form of *sidikara*-exogamous union.

The Balinese model for marriage, then, is determined by the combination of preferred *sidikara* endogamy and the principle of asymmetric exchange.¹⁰ Preferred endogamy taken together with the notion of rebirth occurring within the descent line provide an ideal model of the *sidikara* as a kind of closed unit, its personnel circulating between the ancestral world and the world of the living. New-born babies are reincarnations of divine ancestors and therefore god-like. In *sidikara*-endogamous marriages, bride and bridegroom are reincarnations drawn from the same ancestral pool, and the male and female aspects of the divine ancestral source are re-united. By death rites, deceased persons are eventually transformed into ancestors again.

When marriages are ritually accepted by both the parties involved, asymmetric exchange may establish relations of rank between the groups or underline pre-existing rank relations between groups (cf. Lévi-Strauss 1967: 306). Exogamous marriage implies that the group of the bridegroom ranks higher than the group of the bride, unless one argues for a "cousin-like" quality of the relation. An example of this kind of "argument" is provided by the reciprocal honouring of each other's ancestors by sharing *paredan* with an outsider wife's natal group, thereby contradicting the rank implications inherent in asymmetrical affinal relationships by reciprocal subjugation to both sets of ancestors (kinship grafting). To say that groups are "cousin-like" or to share *paredan* are ways of transforming an asymmetric exogamous marriage into an example of extended endogamy.

Ranking is sometimes the result of the branching off of a new *sidikara* group from the original one. Such is the case with the illegitimate child and his offspring: in one sense, they are still reckoned as being descended from the original ancestral source and are still subjected to it. At the same time, however, their rank is lowered, and their "legitimate" kinsmen, even if genealogically their kin juniors, will not be able to *sumbah* them or eat their *paredan* (the "illegitimate" group can still do so, at least among commoners). Title groupings are often viewed in a similar way: lower title groupings are viewed as having "fallen down" from higher ones, either by breaches of (ritual) law or by descent from a high-titled father and a low-titled mother.

Generally, the higher the title rank, the more distinct and the more strictly adhered to are the rules of ranking. For example, high-rank parents will not eat left-overs from their children's meals, whereas many a commoner parent will gladly do so, considering this act to be a negligible breach of the rules.

The prevalence of ranking does not imply that status rivalry is necessarily rife in Balinese social life. Rank is a classification that can be used in case of status competition between persons and groups. Formerly, rank might be used as a criterion for the allocation of positions of political power, as was the case in the traditional Balinese state. The power structure has changed profoundly since the days of the Balinese kings, and the importance of title rank and the ranking of *sidikara* groups has dwindled (see Gerdin 1975). In contemporary Lombok, rank relations as described above can be used to only a limited extent as an argument or criterion in, for example, political matters, usually only in a purely Hindu-Balinese context (e.g. in such matters as the qualifications of a particular person for a function as head of some religious institution). In this respect, Lombok differs from Bali, where Balinese make up the majority of the population and the traditional power structure and relations of rank may still influence the local political life to a considerable extent (cf. Geertz 1963).

Concluding remarks

Ancestor worship and important life cycle ceremonies, vital matters for the well-being of the individual and the proper order of society in the Balinese world view, are the central concerns of the *sidikara*. But the performance of these ritual duties necessarily maintains and sometimes even creates rank distinctions, intendedly or unintendedly. To *sumbah*, to eat *paredan*, to carry a corpse to the grave, to marry — all these acts have rank implications for the persons involved. But as rank can be expressed in different idioms by different acts, rank distinctions implied by one act can be either reinforced or contradicted by another act (reinforcement being the more usual of the two, however). In this respect there is a certain ambiguity, allowing for pragmatic accommodations of the ranking scheme when the situation so demands (here factors such as actual power position or wealth may play a role).

Moreover, *sidikara* relationships are to a certain degree "optional". By the primary rules of ascription, an individual is assigned a position in the *sidikara* pattern, but the secondary rules of confirmatory ritual action allow for severance of relationships (kinship pruning). On the other hand, *sidikara* relationships can be created under certain circumstances: the representation of outsiders as "cousin-like" can be carried further by the actual sharing of *paredan* and reciprocity in paying homage to ancestors, resulting in the partial merging of two *sidikara*

groups (kinship grafting). These are not common procedures, but the possibilities exist and can be utilized situationally in a ranked but ambiguous social universe.

The *sidikara* institution played a prominent role in the political life of the former Balinese kingdoms. Today, stripped of these functions, and confined to the rituals of the kinship sphere, the *sidikara* still looms large in the minds of the Balinese in Lombok. Of course, to take care of marriage, death and relations to the ancestors is a vital concern for every Balinese, but the peculiar flexibility of the *sidikara* institution may also have facilitated its persistence in the otherwise quite atomized Balinese society of contemporary Lombok.

NOTES

- ¹ As far as I know, the specific term *sidikara* is used only in Lombok and in Karangasem (East Bali). In the rest of Bali the relationships described also exist, though.
- ² Lansing's argument that the *terikat* ties define a person's place in Balinese society may perhaps be taken further. Possibly, to be *terikat* by a *sidikara* defines a person as a Balinese in the eyes of other Balinese in Lombok. To be classified as a Balinese, you must be born a Balinese (or, for a woman, marry a Balinese), and the *sidikara* ties place individual as a ritually acknowledged subject or descendant of Balinese ancestors.
- ³ Even if the different implications of alternative ways of acting are pointed out, I am not arguing for an analysis in terms of how individuals choose different strategies in order to maximize prestige or to obtain higher rank.
- ⁴ The percentage for Lombok is estimated on the basis of a survey of villages with major Balinese settlements. For Bali see, e.g., Geertz (1959: 996).
- ⁵ Examples of such terms are *marekan* (attendance) and *ngelungsur* (to eat leftovers from the meals of persons of considerably higher rank or offerings dedicated to the ancestors/gods).
- ⁶ It is also of importance who blesses the offerings and who places them at the altars. Regardless of whom the offerings are dedicated to, they cannot be eaten by a *triwangsa* ("noble") title-holder if they have been blessed or placed at the altars by a person of lower title rank. There is one exception to this: if the person of lower rank is the temple priest of a public temple where the ceremony is held, anyone may partake in eating the offerings.
- ⁷ *Banten* versus *sajen*.
- ⁸ A fuller description of Balinese marriage is given by Boon (1976).
- ⁹ The distribution of these 86 commoner marriages is as follows:

	Number	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Father's brother's daughter	5	5.8	5.8
Patrilineal parallel second and third cousin	12	14.0	19.8
Within the same <i>sidikara</i> group	11	12.8	32.6
Other kin, including affinals	12	14.0	46.6
Balinese non-kinsmen	35	40.6	87.2
Sasak	11	12.8	100.0

- ¹⁰ Marriages are occasionally contracted in opposition to these rules, but such marriages are classified as "wrong" marriages by the Balinese.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adatrechtbundel XLII

- 1943 Adatrechtbundels bezorgd door de commissie voor het adatrecht en uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. Bundel XLII, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Boon, J. A.
1976 'The Balinese Marriage Predicament: Individual, Strategical, Cultural', *American Ethnologist* 3: 191-214.
- Covarrubias, M.
1965 *Island of Bali*, New York: Knopf.
- Davenport, W.
1959 'Nonunilinear Descent and Descent Groups', *American Anthropologist* 61: 557-572.
- Fox, R.
1967 *Kinship and Marriage; An Anthropological Perspective*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Geertz, C.
1959 'Form and Variation in Balinese Village Structure', *American Anthropologist* 61: 991-1012.
1963 *Peddlers and Princes; Social Change and Economic Modernization in Two Indonesian Towns*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Geertz, H. and C. Geertz
1975 *Kinship in Bali*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Gerdin, I.
1975 'Ruinous Feasting: Changed Position of the Big Feast among the Balinese in Lombok', *Ethnos*, pp. 185-193.
- Lansing, J. S.
1974 *Evil in the Morning of the World: Phenomenological Approaches to a Balinese Community*, Ann Arbor: Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan.
- Lévi-Strauss, C.
1967 *Les Structures Élémentaires de la Parenté*, Paris: Mouton.
- Murdock, G. P.
1960 *Social Structure*, New York: Macmillan.