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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines warga or 'origin groups' in contemporary Bali and considers the negotiations over hierarchy and equality in which they are socially engaged. The study focuses on Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and its formal organisation, the Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi (MGPSSR). This warga is the largest origin group and one of the most progressive in the struggle for equality.

The study was carried out throughout Bali, since there is no 'average village' which can represent 'Balinese society'; variation in socio-cultural practices in Bali is unbelievably wide ranging according to village or region. Moreover, the nature of the warga, which crosscuts administrative boundaries, compelled me to wander from one village to another, from one kabupaten to the next. I even followed members of this warga to Solo (Central Java), as this warga has discovered one of its presumed ancestors there and has constructed a petilasan (tomb-shrine), where annual celebrations are conducted.

To start with, I describe the 'multiple identities' of the Balinese, since all Balinese are inevitably members of more than one organisation, ie. desa adat (customary village) and banjar (customary hamlet), desa dinas (administrative village), subak (organisations for irrigation farmers), subak abian (organisations for upland farmers), pamaksan (temple congregations), seka (functional groups), and warga (kin-based origin networks). All of these organisations are egalitarian in nature, in the sense that all members are more or less equal, regardless of their other social roles, and no member holds special privileges. Once they enter the sphere of these organisations, they are 'one,' as 'brothers' (semeton).

The theory of four-castes provides an inappropriate concept to understand Balinese society because it oversimplifies the complexity of Balinese social relations and daily interactions. As an alternative, I suggest that the concept of origin group or warga is more useful, since the warga has more religious and sociological significance than caste. Nonetheless, I maintain the terms Triwangsaa and Jaba, the first being those who bear honorific initial names and
the latter those who do not. Despite the honorific initial name they bear, the Triwangsa people have no special privilege in present-day Bali.

The establishment of modern-style organisations for warga has been inspired by an ideology of equality that challenges the hierarchical ordering of these warga. The sense of being different from others with a distinct identity is clear in the emergence of warga organisations. They emphasise the concept of ‘difference,’ as opposed to ‘hierarchy.’ According to the concept of difference, no warga is higher or lower, and the various symbols used by different warga are merely differences. This search for difference is obvious in warga of the Jaba, notably Warga Pande, Bhujangga Waisnawa, and Pasek Saptta Rsi. The search for difference, in practice, means a search for enhanced status. However, the search for status here is not carried out by claiming honorific initial names (as is frequently reported), but by each warga’s attempt to enhance its status as a whole while ignoring the hierarchical order of the warga.

The search for difference also means a search for identity. To establish their difference and, at the same time, assert a prestigious self-identity, a warga invariably chooses a certain figure as its originator. The chosen originator must be popular, extraordinary in some way, and prestigious. In order to maintain its distinctiveness, this originator must not have been claimed by another warga.

The role of babad (a traditional chronicle) is important in the (re)construction of the warga. Babad, particularly the part called the bisama (ancestral instruction), has been very effective in establishing the attitude of warga in general, particularly toward the maintenance of origin temples (pura kawitan), the conduct of ritual ceremonies in such temples, and reinvention of a symbolic identity for the warga. Babad and bisama thus become a charter, the neglect of which is an offence against the ancestors, which will result in punishment.

Leadership patterns of most warga organisations, including the MGPSSR, have shifted from traditional leaders, who are leaders of dadya or dadya agung, to new-elite leaders, ie. those who hold power in the government bureaucracy, intellectuals, or businessmen, who are not necessarily influential in their own warga temples. This has produced a psychological divide between these leaders
and their grassroots supporters, i.e. members of *dadya* throughout Bali. Some problems faced by the MGPSSR in implementing its programs have been associated with this psychological divide.

The temple system of the *warga* is clearly an arena where the *warga* try to consolidate their strength. Temples are the building blocks of *warga* organisations. The success or failure of the MGPSSR is clearly determined by its ability in controlling its temple system.

The formal acknowledgment by *Parisada* (the Indonesian Hindu Council), that all twice-born priests (*sulinggih*) are equal in status, has been effectively used by some *warga* in Bali to channel their struggle for status. At present, the priesthood is a battle field between the ideology of *homo-hierarchicus* and *homo-aequalis*. In order to be able to use their priests to spread their ideology, the MGPSSR tries to produce priests of high quality. This is partly achieved through the rules of a ‘priesthood ladder,’ according to which an ordinary member from *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi* cannot directly perform a consecration ceremony (*dwijati*) without first becoming a *pemangku* and then a *jero-gede* (both are lower-level priests). Another means to ensure quality is through an oral examination (*diksa pariksa*) for the candidate, administered by a special team from the MGPSSR. Aside from the effort to achieve quality, several practices found in the consecration of a priest from *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi* are also meant to mark their identity by marking ‘differences.’

Other factors of great help for the MGPSSR in the struggle for equality are the introduction of the *Pancasila*, the Indonesian state ideology, which acknowledges that human beings are equal; the better access to Hindu teachings from *Vedic* sources, not merely Balinese sources; the movement to purify Balinese Hindu religion or ‘return to the Veda’; and the contemporary global concern with social justice and human rights. In legitimising its claim of equality, the MGPSSR has developed a discourse based on global issues, on the Indonesian nation-state ideology of equality, and on traditional sources.
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A NOTE ON SPELLING

I have decided to follow the simplest spellings in this thesis. The spelling of words common to Balinese (and Kawi) follows the ordinary Balinese spelling, and this is guided by the latest version (1992) of the *Kamus Bali-Indonesia*, published by the Department of Primary Education of Bali Province. When variations are found, one variant is chosen. However, for direct quotations, the spelling of the sources is retained, except the changes of tj to c, dj to j, nj to ny, and oe to u. Personal names are also retained. Hence, for example, while *Ketut* and *Rsi* are the most common spellings among Balinese, the spellings *Ktut* and *Reshi* are maintained in the case of Ktut Soebandi and Reshi Ananda Kusuma.

Plural forms are not indicated in Balinese, Indonesia, or Kawi. Terms such as *sulinggih* may therefore indicate one priest or several priests; and *warga* may indicate one or several origin groups.

Non-English words (Balinese, Indonesia, Kawi, or Latin) appear in this thesis in italics, such as *warga*, pedanda, anak agung, mpu, pura padharman, dadya, and pura kawitan. However, the following words appear throughout this thesis in plain text:


2. Geographical toponyms such as Gunung Agung, Danau Batur, and Gunung Semeru;

3. Specific place such as Pura Besakih, Pura Ulun Danu Batur, Pura Lempuyang, Pura Kawitan Pande, Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel, Padharman Bhujangga Waisnawa, Desa Adat Kutri, Banjar Lantangbejuh, and Desa Ubud; and

4. The names of gods such as Dewa Wisnu, Betara Hyang Tumuwuh, and Sang Hyang Pasupati.
Chapter One

RESEARCH ON BALI AND FIELDWORK AT HOME:
AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Of this rather select class of studied, and restudied and again restudied cultures, the Balinese is surely one of the most prominent. The list of names, nationalities, and disciplines this little island ... has hosted in the name of scholarship is quite extraordinary. So is the unbroken stretch of time, roughly the 1840s to the present, over which that scholarship has gone on. So, too, is the range of subjects to which it has been addressed (Geertz 1983: viii).

When I first told a friend that I was intending to carry out my research in Bali, his prompt reaction was cynical: “Bali has been flooded by researchers of various fields of social sciences, notably anthropologists. So, what more can you add?” This point was also expressed by several other friends, who were not ignorant of the literature pertaining to Bali. They were (and are) correct, for Bali has, as Geertz has pointed out, hosted hundreds of scholars, both expatriates and locals. It is not an exaggeration to argue that Bali has been a ‘live socio-cultural laboratory’ for it has attracted scholars from various fields and from all corners of the globe. The indologist R. Friederich, a German by origin, pioneered research in Bali in 1846, and even before him, a number of other Europeans had written about Bali, such as John Crawfurd (1820) from Britain and van den Broek (1835) from Holland. In the early 20th century came Gregor Krause (photographer), Miguel Covarrubias, Jane Belo, Margaret Mead, and Gregory Bateson (anthropologists); Colin McPhee (musician), Walter Spies (painter), Vicky Baum (novelist), and so forth.¹ After the independence era, came the troop of social scientists from the US, such as Clifford Geertz, Hildred Geertz, James Boon, Mary Zurbuchen, Philip McKean, Mark Poffenberger, 

¹For brief introductions of the works of these earlier Balinists, see for example Boon (1977) and Vickers (1989 and 1994), while the complete bibliography on Bali since 1920 to 1990 can be found in Stuart-Fox (1992).
Andy Toth, Stephen Lansing, and Margaret Wiener. From the Netherlands, there are names such as Henk Schulte-Nordolt, HIR Hinzler, and BL Bakker. From Britain came Mark Hobart, Ann Hobart, SO Robson, Anthony Forge, and Leo Howe; from Norway came Uni Wikan and Fredrik Barth; from Australia came Peter J. Worsley, David Stuart-Fox, Carol Warren, Linda Connor, Adrian Vickers, Arlette Ottino, Lynette Parker, Raechelle Rubinstein, and Rodolfo Giambeli; from France there were Gerard Francillon, Michel Picard, Jean Couteau, and Jean-Francois Guermonprez. The list can be expanded. While I was doing my fieldwork, there were also dozens of foreign researchers. To name a few, there were Thomas Reuter, Bret Hough and David Poignand of Australia, Graeme MacRae of New Zealand, Ayami Nakatani of Japan, Veronica Long of Canada, and Klaus Rielander of Germany, in addition to a number of returnees.

With this continuous flood of researchers, it would seem that all corners, all sides, and all aspects of Balinese life have been written about, and “no custom has been left unturned” (Geertz 1983: viii). All wrinkles of the Balinese have been traced, all of their hairs have been counted, all of their gestures have been discussed, all of their symbols have been interpreted, and even their winks have been analysed. Hence, what remains to be studied?

BALI AND WARGA

No lengthy introduction is, I believe, needed to locate where Bali is or its other general characteristics, since Bali has been one of the cultural worlds frequently cited by anthropologists. Physically Bali is a small island, represented merely by a dot on the globe. It is only around 5,632 km² in size, including its nearby isles such as Nusa Penida, Nusa Lembongan, Nusa Ceningan, and Nusa Menjangan. The island had 2,708,893 inhabitants in 1993.²

²It must be noted here that this figure represents only the ‘registered inhabitants.’ The non-registered inhabitants (penduduk liar, literally ‘wild population’) was estimated to number more than 10,000, particularly immigrants involved in construction work, hawkers, and individuals involved in other informal activities.
Most of them (92.8%) are Hindus, while Moslems constitute 5.8% of the population. The rest are Protestant (0.6%), Catholic (0.4%), and Buddhist (0.4%) (BPS Bali 1995).

Administratively Bali is one of the 27 Indonesian provinces. The province of Bali consists of eight kabupaten (regencies) and one kota madya (municipality) (Maps 1.1 and 1.2). Below the kabupaten and kota madya, there are 51 kecamatan (subdistricts), and below the kecamatan there are 631 villages (552 desa and 79 kelurahan). Aside from the government’s administrative structures, there are also a number of traditional organisations in Bali, which are still functional, ie. the desa adat (customary village) and its banjar (hamlet), the subak (irrigators’ organisation), subak abian (uplanders’ organisation), seka (functional group), pamaksan (temple congregation) and warga (origin group), which I will describe in more detail in Chapter Two. Suffice it to say here that these organisations are quite powerful in governing the attitude and behaviour of Balinese Hindus.

In spite of the high ratio of researchers to the size of Bali, I am of the opinion that a lot more needs to be researched. Hobart (1986: 151) aptly asserts this point by saying that “despite --or even because of-- the amount of research on Bali, it is becoming clear how little we know.” Among topics worth researching, I discovered that no one has thoroughly analysed the existence of the Bali-wide organisations based on origin, referred to as warga. Goris (1960 [1929]) seemed to have seen the importance of the warga, when he wrote an article on the existence and position of Warga Pande (‘blacksmith’) in Balinese society. The study of the Pande was later continued by Guermonprez (1987), who analysed the Pande based on the networks of its temple systems. However, he failed to comprehend the present day organisation of Warga Pande, particularly the struggle for equality of its priesthood, while this struggle has a major sociological consequence in contemporary Bali. Stuart-Fox (1987) also realised the importance of the notion of warga in understanding the dynamic of Balinese society but, apart from describing several clans found in the village of Besakih, he gave little attention to this subject. Geertz and Geertz’s (1975) work on Balinese kinship and their discovery of the dadya (family temple) as an
important institution is indeed one of the cornerstones of an understanding of *warga*. Nonetheless, no one has built upon this foundation by analysing the Bali-wide network of *dadya*, which constitutes the basis for *warga*. The local movement of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Tabanan area has been discussed by Boon (1973, 1977, 1979) but his discussions focused mainly on local *dadya* and are thus similar to those of the Geertzes.

The notion of *warga* has so far been overshadowed by the notion of caste in academic discourse. Caste, as distinct from *warga*, invariably has become the appetiser or dessert, if not the main course in any discussion of Balinese society and culture. Caste has been considered the main player in ‘the anthropological romance of Bali’ (Boon 1977). Caste is invariably discussed in every book pertaining to the socio-cultural aspects of Bali, from popular tourist-guide books to the most ‘scientific’ anthropological ones, while *warga* is rarely touched on by such books. On the other hand, my empirical observation provided me ample evidence that *warga* is a better concept for analysing contemporary Balinese society than caste. Furthermore, *warga* consciousness has been increasing over recent decades, and at present most *warga* tend to unite their members into a formal organisation, which is referred to as *warga* organisation. No study has been done on the internal structures of such organisations, nor on the role they play in the making of the dynamics of present day Balinese society.

---

3 As we shall see in the chapters to follow, caste is different from *warga*, though to some extent the two overlap. To simplify the matter, it is sufficient to state here that caste is a concept which divides society into four hierarchical groups, i.e., from the bottom to the apex, *Sudra*, *Wesia*, *Ksatria*, and *Brahmana*. Those included in a caste group do not necessarily have kinship ties and any kind of solidarity. *Warga*, or what is called an origin group in the literature of Austronesian speaking societies by James Fox (1988, 1990a, and 1996) on the other hand, is a form of social organisation based on kin-like relations, whether true or presumed kinship. Members of a *warga* trace their common ancestry to a figure, whether historical or mythical, as their origin point (originator), who is worshipped in their ancestral temple, called *kawitan* (‘the origin’). In contrast, there is no common ancestral temple for a caste group.
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To my knowledge, there is no report as yet available which analyses the movement of several warga to consecrate (through dwijati ceremony) and to use their own high priests. It is no exaggeration to argue that so far high priests in Balinese Hinduism have been associated solely with Warga Brahmana (see eg. Boon 1977; Geertz 1980a; Howe 1989). Although some non-Brahmanic priests, such as dukuh and rsi bhujangga, have been discussed in brief (Hooykaas 1964a, 1964b, 1976), they were not treated as ‘high priests,’ but merely as ‘commoner priests’ or ‘exorcist priests’; while high priests from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi have never been discussed at all. Thus there was a niche that I could fill, to contribute to the knowledge of Bali.

My friends challenged me farther with another no less cynical question. They argued that one of the very characteristics of anthropology is doing fieldwork in a terra incognita, in the more romantic, unexplored part of the world. This enables anthropologists to come up with novel and unchallenged truth --since the anthropologist is often the only one who knows the society being discussed. But this point did not bother me so much, because doing fieldwork in a complex society, in urban areas, or in one’s own society is not taboo in anthropology, since many anthropologists have done just this. I gained more encouragement for this position after I read Anthony Jackson’s (1987) introduction in his Anthropology at Home, where he states that “it was a great mistake to think that the distant ‘savage’ had more to give to anthropologists than one’s local ‘compatriot’....” Further, in the case of Bali in particular, Hildred Geertz (1991:3) has challenged the Balinese to do research in their own society, since “[r]esearch in Bali has been conducted primarily by non-Balinese and has been almost entirely devoted to ‘explaining’ or ‘understanding’ Bali, not to the Balinese who would most profit from it, but to foreign readers.”

I took up the challenge. Further, when I was in doubt, my supervisor, Professor James Fox convinced me. “I believe that no other researcher can do this [warga] research better than you can. You know the system, the people, and the sense of what are the meaningful and meaningless actions or symbols in your own society,” I remember he told me this once in his messy office --with no place to be seated, where he was buried by papers he had to work on.
FIELDWORK STRATEGY

The nature of my investigation, the study of warga, obliged me to wander from village to village, from temple to temple, from warga to warga. In other words, I could not choose a particular village, or even a region, in which to stay and make a detailed ethnographic description. This is in line with my standpoint that, as noted by Geertz (1959: 991), “there is no ‘average’ village [in Bali], a description of which may well stand for the whole.” The concept of desa kala patra (‘place, time, and circumstances’) clearly gives the Balinese a wide leverage in which to move; it allows the Balinese to be different from each other. As such, no one would deny that variation in socio-cultural practices in Bali is unbelievably wide ranging, not only between regions, but also between two adjacent villages. The problem of representation put forward by Geertz was also reinforced by Barth more than three decades later, when he suggested that because the variability among regions is so wide, a convincingly conclusive phenomenon in one village may be found to be untrue in others. Hence, “any single village will prove entirely inadequate as a specimen for understanding other communities” (Barth 1993: 29).

In an effort to understand the current situation of warga in Bali, I carried out my fieldwork in several villages, and did not live permanently in any one village. Initially I worked in Ubud, a village on the lower plain of Bali, famous as a tourist resort. I did not have any intention to use this village as ‘representative’ of Bali, but I hoped Ubud would enable me to learn something ‘new’ to satisfy my sense of curiosity, to train myself to observe everything in detail, or what is simply known as ‘explicit awareness’ in carrying out participant observations.4 As a Balinese doing fieldwork in Bali (‘fieldwork at home’), I realised that there were a number of problems that I had to cope with. Theoretically, when one is doing fieldwork at home, one tends to lose one’s curiosity because a lot of things, which are considered by an outside researcher as new, tend to be taken for granted; nothing is ‘special,’ hence there is nothing

4For a further discussion of the building of ‘explicit awareness’ in conducting participant observation, see Spradley (1980) and Bernard (1994).
to be curious about. There is also a tendency to become a ‘pure participant’ (instead of a ‘participant observer’) when doing fieldwork at home. Often one cannot control one’s emotional involvement in one’s own village. There is also the tendency on the part of a local researcher to describe the society as he would like the society to be seen as, rather than describing what is really out there. This is a question of objectivity and, as Bernard writes (1994:154), “objectivity gets its biggest test when you study your own culture.” Although the positivists’ notion of total objectivity is a myth, I am of the view that anthropologists should try their best to describe the society being studied as objectively as possible.

In relation to these considerations, there were at least three reasons for me to choose Ubud as an entry point for my fieldwork. Firstly, the region is inhabited by people of numerous warga which, according to traditional status hierarchy, occupy the ladder from the bottom to the apex. This enabled me to observe the daily interaction among villagers of different warga, and to investigate how warga works in the every day life of contemporary Bali. Secondly, the social-economic setting of this village differs greatly from that of my own village. The village where I was born and grew up is a small village in the hilly region of Tabanan regency, which was (and still is) only populated by people from two warga, i.e. Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (94% of the families) and Warga Gusti Keramas (6%). Daily interaction in this village shows very subtle differences between warga. By taking Ubud, a village quite far from my own and with different socio-economic characteristics as a point of entry, I sought to minimise my weaknesses as a local researcher. Thirdly, Ubud is a region which has had intensive contact with the outside world through tourism. The role of agriculture in the economy of this village has significantly decreased, having been displaced by modern sectors, notably trade and tourism. This, to a certain degree, characterises the present situation of most Balinese villages, which are in the process of ‘touristification’ (Picard 1990; cf. Hassal 1992).

5 For further discussion on problems encountered by anthropologists doing fieldwork at home, see Jackson (1987).
6 Although, as we shall see, I finally oppose the theory of the seemingly fixed-ordered hierarchy of society based on the so-called Balinese ‘caste system,’ I acknowledge this as a good entry point to understand the complexity and dynamics of Balinese society.
In Ubud I investigated how *warga* work in every day life and in the collective activities administered by traditional organisations. I further observed how people perceive and behave in inter-*warga* interactions, as well as in the fashionable movement to visit ancestral temples. I several times joined groups of families in search of their *kawitan* (origin point), or visited festivals in their ancestral temples (*pura kawitan*). After gaining some knowledge and sense of how *warga* work at the village level, I moved from village to *warga*. In other words, I started to pay special attention to *warga* organisations. To do this I visited *warga* secretariats, participated in their temple ceremonies, and attended their meetings. At temple festivals, several times it happened that I met families who were visiting their ancestral temple for the first time. I usually discussed in depth with them how and why they came to the temple, and how they had found out that the temple was indeed their ancestral temple. I usually made appointments for further discussion with them, for which purpose I visited their villages later. Aside from formal interviewing on specific matters or informal discussions with villagers, I collected my data mostly without asking, but by carefully listening to people talk, discuss, or even when they exchanged jokes with each other in a collective work (*gotong royong*) administered by *banjar* or *desa adat*, during temple festivals, or while having lunch or dinner in small food stalls. In fact most of my data I collected by the way of these informal methods.

I found that people's discussions during the temple festivals were significant in advancing my understanding. This was so because, I observed, they were sincere in expressing their ideas at the temples. For most Balinese, saying something untrue during a temple festival is a great sin, which would bring punishment at once. To discuss sacred matters or to convince someone on a particular point, it is common for Balinese to state explicitly that what they say is real. They usually say, "*matur di ajeng betara,*" which literally means "speaking in front of the gods." This indicates that they are telling the truth.

---

7 Although in principle Balinese trace their ancestry by name (as mentioned in *babad*), the notion of 'origin' (*kawitan*) in practice is more associated with place rather than person, i.e. the place where the *kawitan* temple (the temple of origin) or other ancestral temples are located. Origin temples are commonly believed to be the places where the ancestors lived or died. Hence, the more appropriate question with regard to origin is 'where is your *kawitan* temple' instead of 'who is your originator.'
since they are closely witnessed by the gods or ancestors, which also indicates that they are ready to be punished by the deities should they lie. On the other hand, however, there are disadvantages to having discussions in temples because Balinese are generally afraid to mention the name of the gods (or the deified ancestors) who have descended at the temple.

The reconstruction of a warga and its activities invariably requires reference to each warga’s babad (a genre of genealogical chronicle). In view of this I also studied babad extensively, particularly those from the Gedung Kirtya in Singaraja, the Pusat Dokumentasi Kebudayaan Bali (PDKB, Office of Documentation of Balinese Culture), published versions, and those, of no less importance, which come from the warga being studied. I collected not only written babad, but also oral stories with regard to genealogies and the sacred instruction (bisama) of warga. To gain a better understanding of the development of the warga being studied, I also gathered its written documents. As a Balinese, I easily gained the trust of warga leaders to do this. This was more so since there were always people from my university (University of Udayana) who hold leadership positions in each warga organisation I studied, through whom I had good access.

Although I studied several warga, I focused my in-depth study on the organisation of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the MGPSSR (Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi). There were various reasons for this choice. Among others, this organisation seemed to be well established, and its formal organisation has been in operation since the 1950s. In terms of membership size, it is indisputably the largest, and its members can be found in nearly every village in Bali. More importantly, this warga is at the forefront of the warga movement in Bali, particularly among the Jaba (‘commoners’)\(^8\) with a strong ideology of equality or, in stronger terms, an anti-caste ideology. Among all the warga in Bali, save Warga Brahmana, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is the most active in the consecration of its own high priests (sri mpu) and is very progressive in the struggle to gain

\(^8\) Jaba (‘commoner,’ literally ‘outsider’) is a loose term which refers to Balinese people who do not bear honorific names, while the rest, the Triwangsa, are those who have honorific names. See Chapter Three.
recognition of its sri mpu, and thus to have their sri mpu acknowledged as equal in status to their counterparts from Warga Brahmana. This arguably would give a better understanding of the nature of the warga movement and the dynamics of the society in present day Bali. In addition, as a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, I have the privilege of access to the internal affairs of the organisation, which are supposed to be secrets for others.

Along with the strength that comes from being a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, I also realised that there are weaknesses. Since I myself am a member of this warga, I had to remind myself continuously to be careful in managing my potential biases. Literature on research suggests that if the researcher is a member of the society being researched, there is a great danger that the perception of the researcher will be blurred since the possibility for bias is extremely great. Again, although in varying degrees everyone is inevitably biased, I would say that any researcher should try to minimise such bias. In my case, to minimise my bias in favour of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, I did not just select my informants exclusively from members of this warga. I also discussed matters with people of other warga, particularly among the Triwangsa, and participated in their temple festivals and other ritual ceremonies. I also discussed these matters with high priests from Warga Brahmana (pedanda). During my stay in Ubud for four months, the family I lived in was an Anak Agung of Warga Ksatria Dalem Sukawati, a warga of high status.

THESIS ORGANISATION

Following this introduction, in Chapter Two I describe the principal institutions that exist in present day Bali. These include the desa adat (customary village) and its banjar (hamlet), desa dinas (administrative village), subak (irrigators’ organisation), subak abian (uplanders’ organisation), pamaksan (temple congregation), and seka (functional group). I believe that a cursory introduction on this subject will greatly assist the reader in understanding the body of my thesis. Furthermore, I frequently refer to these
organisations, especially the desa adat, banjar and desa dinas, in subsequent chapters.

Before taking up the topic of warga, I consider in Chapter Three the academic --and Dutch bureaucratic-- debates about the Balinese 'caste system,' and argue that the concept of caste is inappropriate to understand Balinese society. As an alternative, I put forward the concept of warga.

Chapter Four presents the general features of warga organisations in Bali, for which I take several warga as examples. In describing these warga I also include their genealogical origins based on the babad. Babad are highly regarded by Balinese, and the ancestral instructions conveyed by these babad are considered sacred and hence must be followed, while the neglect of these instructions is believed to result in punishment by the ancestors. Babad in the Balinese context is a charter in Malinowskian terms.

In Chapters Five, Six, Seven, and Eight I focus my discussion on Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the largest warga in Bali in terms of membership, and also the leading warga in the struggle for equality. In discussing this warga, I start from the genesis of its formal organisation, the MGPSSR, and examine the motives of its leaders in organising warga members into a formal organisation. In addition to its seemingly intact organisation, I discuss also its factions and the factors related to the existence of these factions. I also argue that its temple system, the ancestral temples (kawitan and dadya), is at present the battlefield for influence. Through rehabilitation of ancestral temples, this warga has even spread its influence to Java. However, renovating ancestral temples does not necessarily result in a more cohesive organisation, but can also lead to dissension.

Besides temples, the priesthood is also the spearhead of this warga in the struggle for an ideology of equality and 'difference.' To support this argument, I describe (in Chapter Seven) the effort of the MGPSSR to strengthen its system of priests and to propose them for involvement in major ceremonies for the general public. I also discuss the process of consecrating priests (sri mpu) in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and warga members' perceptions of the differences found between consecrating a pedanda (priest from Warga Brahmana) and a sri mpu. As there are factions within the warga, I also examine conflicts within the
warga and within desa adat associated with the consecration and use of sri mpu. How the struggle to have the sri mpu sociologically recognised as equal in status to their pedanda counterparts and how people perceive the idea of equality among high priests are also discussed in Chapter Eight.

The final chapter, Chapter Nine, summarises the important findings of my study and its contribution to existing knowledge of Bali. It also proposes several themes that need further study.
Chapter Two

INTERLOCKING SOCIAL WEBS: AN OVERVIEW OF BALINESE SOCIAL ORGANISATIONS

linggih manut sesana,
sesana manut linggih.

one's seat must accord with one's actions
one's actions must accord with one's seat.

This is a popular Balinese saying. Loosely translated it means that we will be positioned by others based on our actions, and our actions must accord with our position. It is interpreted by people to mean that a person has to know his/her position in society, and then behave accordingly. This saying is extremely important in Balinese social life, because an actor in Balinese life unavoidably plays many roles in society, and these roles are not fixed on all occasions, but change according to context. A person high in the hierarchy of adat or the religious spheres could be very low, in fact his presence may not even be considered, in the hierarchy of other aspects of village life. This is due to the fact that Balinese society has numerous institutions and while some overlap with others, some are entirely different. This situation results in Balinese being caught in an intricate web of social interaction, and this, in turn, should determine their way of behaving, way of speaking, or actions in general.

Among the most important institutions are the desa adat (customary village), desa dinas (administrative village), subak (irrigation association), seka (functional groups), and warga (kinship-based group). The nature of these institutions to a large extent varies from region to region, or even from village to village within a region, following the well-known concept of desa-kala-patra (‘place, time, and circumstance’). These institutions have been discussed frequently by anthropologists working on Bali, but there are gaps, confusion, or
a lack of clarity in their work. Thus, writing about Tihingan, a village in Bali, Clifford Geertz (1967:212) asserts:

Actually, whether or not Tihingan is a village depends upon how you choose to define the term, for, as I have tried to show in more general terms elsewhere, the notion of a single, uniform social referent for this word (desa) cannot be defended when actual relationships and not merely ideal cultural conceptions are considered.

Decades later, in his Negara, Geertz suggests that

desa in Bali refers most accurately not to a single bounded entity, but to an extended field of variously organised, variously focused, and variously interrelated social groups --a pattern I have referred to elsewhere as “pluralistic collectivism” (1980a: 48).

Stephen Lansing (1983: 98) claims that “a Balinese desa is defined by a cluster of three temples (the ‘three great temples,’ ‘kahyangan tiga’).” But James Boon (1977:103), from his study in Tabanan, concludes that

... there are sociological complications in this religious architecture of local organisation. The congregation that supports a three-temple-cluster can contain people other than the residents of the geographical areas under its influence. Thus, it is misleading to view desa as a confederation of hamlets (banjar). One desa territory might contain residential units which are affiliated to another territory’s three-temple-cluster....

These quotations clearly illustrate the difficulty in understanding and defining ‘what a village is’ in Bali. More importantly, it is clear that these researchers --and some others-- are confused by the two types of villages in Bali, the so-called desa adat and desa dinas. When they refer to ‘a village,’ it is unclear to which kind of village they are referring. This same difficulty holds true for other Balinese social organisations, such as that of the irrigators’ organisations (subak), voluntary functional groups (seka), temple congregations (pamaksan), and kinship-like-based groups (warga, soroh). To add to the confusion, it is worth noting that for Carol Warren (1993:8), banjar, subak, and pamaksan are all a kind of seka. In her words, “among the most important seka in local life, the banjar, subak, and pamaksan are permanent groups in which
membership under defined circumstances is obligatory," a statement which needs further theoretical discussion.

The functioning of these institutions unavoidably places every Balinese in an intricate web. Although, as an actor, a Balinese is able to act outside these webs, the functioning of the web is also crucial in understanding people's actions. To provide an appropriate background, it is thus important, I believe, to give a general understanding of these institutions. This is necessary because I cannot escape from discussing these institutions throughout this thesis.

**DESA ADAT AND DESA DINAS**

‘Desa’ in Balinese refers to two distinct manifestations of a ‘village.’ The first, called desa adat or desa pakraman, refers to the customary-law society based on adat-istiadat (custom), and is characterised by the ownership of three main temples, collectively known as kahyangan tiga, or other temples with functions similar to those of kahyangan tiga.¹

The second village is the village in terms of the national administration system, which is mentioned in the national law, Undang-Undang No. 5/1979, and is by legal definition a ‘desa.’ In order to distinguish this type of desa from the desa adat, this desa is often called desa dinas or desa administrasi, which can be further classified into desa (dinas) and kelurahan. In daily conversation, however, people just refer to this village as ‘desa.’ In 1994 there were 1305 desa adat and 632 desa dinas in Bali.

---

¹The kahyangan tiga include (1) Pura Desa or Bale Agung, a temple dedicated to Dewa Brahma, God’s manifestation in His function as creator; (2) Pura Puseh, dedicated to Dewa Wisnu, God in His function as preserver; and (3) Pura Dalem for Siwa and His sakti, Durga, the destroyer. Ownership of kahyangan tiga alone, however, as Boon suggests, is not a sufficient criterion to define a desa adat. There are a number of other criteria that must be fulfilled, which I will discuss below.
Desa Adat and Banjar

Desa adat has been in existence in Bali for centuries, as mentioned in old inscriptions.\(^2\) The word adat was borrowed from Arab adah, ‘habit,’ (Purwita 1984) and has been combined with the word desa, to differentiate it from the other type of desa, ie. desa dinas, as we shall see.\(^3\)

The existence of the desa adat in Bali has been formally recognised by local government through the Perda (provincial regulation) No. 06/1986. The Perda, in article 1 (e) defines the desa adat as

\[
a\text{a community based on traditional law, in the province of Bali, that has a single unified tradition and Hindu ethics of social interaction which have been passed down for many generations, is bounded by kahyangan tiga or village temples,}
\]

---

\(^2\)In inscriptions, the desa adat was referred to as wanua (Goris 1974a). The word wanua (‘place,’ ‘friendship’) was later replaced by desa, a Sanskrit word for ‘land,’ ‘home country,’ ‘land of origin,’ or ‘a civilised community,’ referring to a community in a certain territory, where all members collectively perform social and religious affairs regulated by certain cultural values and norms. The term wanua (banua) is still used at present, particularly in desa adat Bali kuna, to denote a group of desa adat or subak that are responsible to maintain a particular temple. For detailed discussion on banua, see Thomas Reuter (1996).

\(^3\)There is a divided view with regard to the history of the desa adat establishment. While most Balinese rely on traditional sources, some scholars dispute the validity of the source. A traditional source, Markandeya Purana, states that wanua or desa pakraman was first established by Maharsi Markandeya in the first century AD. The kahyangan tiga, the main binding factor of a desa adat, was introduced during the reign of Raja Udayana-Sri Gunapriya Dharmapati, 10th to 11th century AD (Ardana 1989, Soebandi 1983). The traditional sources mention that in this period there were a number of sects within the Hinduism adhered to by Balinese people. (Goris [1974b] noted that there were at least nine sects, ie. Siwa-Siddhanta, Pasupata, Bhairawa, Waisnawa, Boddha or Sogata, Brahmana, Rsi, Sora or Surya, and Ganapatya.) The traditional source goes on to state that these sects were continuously in competition with each other, causing social and political instability in the country. Under the auspices of Mpu Katuran, the head of the kingdom’s advisory body (pakira-kiran i jero makabehan), a meeting was held in Bedahulu to discuss the possible ways to unify the practice of religious life in Bali. The meeting came out with the concept of tri murti: that there are three high gods, ie. (1) Brahma the creator; (2) Wisnu the conserver; and (3) Siwa the destroyer; and that the tri murti must be worshipped as primary gods in all communities. To implement this decision, shrines to worship these gods had to be erected in each village community (desa pakraman), to be known as Pura Desa, Puseh, and Dalem, or kahyangan tiga, collectively. The story relating the origin of the kahyangan tiga as found in the traditional source (the Markandeya Purana), has not yet been supported by archaeological findings, for which some scholars doubt the history (Guermonprez, pers.com. 1995). For Helen Creese (pers. com. 1996), the story “sounds like a very recent reinterpretation of the remote past, to match the concerns of recent (late 20th century) times.”
and owns certain territory and property, and with the right to manage its internal affairs. 4

This definition gives a rough description of desa adat, but without clarifying how we can define a desa adat. Based on my observation from village to village (Pitana 1994), a community or social organisation in Bali can be defined as a desa adat if it fulfils the four criteria below. First, it has to have clear physical boundaries (wewidangan desa). 5 Secondly, a desa adat must have definite members (krama desa), who may or may not be classified into several categories. A common way of categorising members is according to the ‘originality’ of their membership. In this case, desa adat members are generally classified into (1) krama nuwed (from tuwed, ‘the left part of a tree trunk after it is chopped’), ie. those members who have resided in the village since ‘the old time’; 6 and (2) krama neka or krama tamiu (from teka, ‘migrant,’ ‘coming in,’ and tamiu ‘visitor’), ie. those members who are newly incorporated into the desa adat membership. This difference in status may or may not have consequences for the members’ duties and obligations within the desa adat. The other method of classification is based on the nature of members’ rights and duties. If this is the case, krama desa adat are differentiated into krama pangarep or krama pangayah on one hand, and krama pangempi, krama roban or krama pangele on the other. Krama pangarep (from arep, ‘front,’ ngarep, ‘direct,’ ‘to confront everything’) or krama pangayah (from ayah, ‘obligatory labour contribution,’ and ngayah ‘to contribute labour’) are members who have to take full responsibility in the maintenance and ritual ceremonies of village temples and

4... kesatuan masyarakat hukum adat di Propinsi Daerah Tingkat I Bali, yang mempunyai satu kesatuan tradisi dan tata krama pergaulan hidup masyarakat umat Hindu secara turun-temurun dalam ikatan kahyangan tiga (kahyangan desa) yang mempunyai wilayah tertentu dan harta kekayaan sendiri serta berhak mengurus rumah tangganya sendiri.

5 The boundaries can be a natural landmark such as a creek or river (eg. Desa Adat Penyaringan, Kerobokan, and Temacun), a forest (eg. Desa Adat Angsri and Bangli), or man-made boundaries such as a wall, as we can see in the case of Tenganan Pagringsingan.

6 It must be noted here that it is very difficult to define this ‘old time,’ since the term is relative. It could be that their grandfathers were born in such a desa adat, or that their ancestors were among the first settlers in the village.
other village facilities. In all customary and religious activities, the *krama pangarep* take 'precedence' over *krama pangele*. 7

*Krama pangarep*, historically, are members whose ancestors were given parcels of village land, usually housing lots called *karang ayahan desa*. *Krama pangempi* (from *ngempi*, 'to get a free-ride' or 'to seek protection') or *krama roban* (from *rob*, 'united in one household' or 'greeny-leafed tree') or *krama pangele* (from *ngele*, 'deviant' or 'stranger') are those who do not receive or inherit *karang ayahan desa*. In this case, if one has more than one child who 'stays at home' (not marrying out), only one will become a *krama pangarep*, replacing his father, while the others will be *krama roban*. They may, and generally do, divide the obligatory duties among themselves, as well as the portion of lands. 8

Most, but not all, *desa adat* members reside in the territory of the *desa adat*. Members are closely tied to their *desa adat*, and it is very difficult, even unthinkable, to forsake one's *desa adat* membership, unless one is expelled. Even if one has lived in other areas (far from one's *desa adat* of origin) for years, one usually still retains membership in the *desa adat* of origin. In the domicile village, on the other hand, one is only a member of the *desa dinas* for administrative purposes. When this person intends to conduct large-scale ritual ceremonies, notably marriage and death ceremonies, he/she will return to his/her *desa adat*. 9

---

7 On the theory of precedence, see James Fox (1990a and 1990b). In contrast to the theory of hierarchy, which uses a single fixed opposition, the concept of precedence “recognises a plurality of oppositions” (1990b: 7), and this concept is used “as an analytic category to crosscut the dichotomy between hierarchy and equality” (1990b: 2).

8 Because the criteria of becoming *krama pangayah* and *krama pangele* are fixed, the number of *krama pangayah* tends to be fixed as well. For example, in Desa Adat Panglipuran, Bangli, the number of *krama pangayah* is fixed at 76; in Desa Adat Kerobokan, Tabanan, at 20. On the other hand, the number of *krama pangele* increases over time, in line with demographic changes, i.e. the number of married couples.

9 Recognising the high rate of permanent migration in Bali (especially through urbanisation), Parisada (the Hindu council) of Bali has in fact issued a decree, according to which anyone who resides in a *desa adat* other than his/her own for more than three months must become a member of the *banjar*. Those who wish to stay permanently must become members of the *desa adat* where they live. However, this decision is clearly ineffective in practice.
It is important to note that membership in the *desa adat* is not individual, but is based on the family unit or the household. This means that the number of *ayahan* (obligations) in the *desa adat* are defined by the number of married couples, not by the number of individuals. In some *desa adat*, the basis for membership is not merely marriage, but marriage with separate household management, indicated by the separation of kitchens (*palas paon*). It is not uncommon in Balinese practice, particularly in rural areas, to have joint families of two or three brothers/sisters and their spouses and parents.

In *desa adat* that have ancient origin (*desa Bali kuna*)\(^\text{10}\) such as Tenganan Pagringsingan, Sembiran, Julah, and Panglipuran, the requirements to become *desa adat* members are very strict, so that newcomers can never be fully included as members of the *desa adat*. On the other hand, some *desa adat* provocatively advocate that newcomers to their residential areas should become *desa adat* members. This has to do with the burden of maintaining *desa adat* facilities, temples, and ritual ceremonies. Newly accepted *desa adat* members have to pay a certain amount as an ‘admission fee,’ called *pamogpog*, and afterwards they have to contribute to all the activities of the *desa adat*, on an equal footing with the other members. In the first case, i.e. in a *desa Bali kun*, the *desa adat* usually has enough resources to fulfil the *desa adat* obligations, and members of *desa adat* are entitled to a portion of the *desa adat* land and land produce. Inclusion of new comers to *desa adat* membership would therefore decrease the size of individual shares.

---

\(^{10}\)The term *desa adat* Bali kun, as I use it here, is better known as *desa Baliaga* in anthropological literature (eg. Lansing 1974, 1983; Geertz 1959; Geertz and Geertz 1975), which literally means ‘mountain villages.’ I prefer to use the former term, because these *desa adat* are not necessarily situated in a mountain area. In fact, the most frequently cited examples, Tenganan Pagringsingan and Julah, are located in coastal areas. Further, it is widely reported that *Baliaga* people are very distinctive from the rest of Balinese. My field data suggest that a number of *warga* (*dadya* groups) in these villages are Pasek Sapt Sra, who trace their ancestry to Pasek temples (see also Danandjaja 1980). Some *dadya* are even Pulasari (eg. in Desa Adat Panglipuran), whose members trace their ancestry to Dalem Tarukan, the second son of Dalem Kresna Kepakisan, the founder of Majapahit-installed Dynasty of Kepakisan. Another interpretation is that the *Baliaga* are those whose ancestors came from the village of *Aga* (*wong Aga*) on the slope of Gunung Raung (East Java), the followers of Maharsi Markandeya (Soebandi 1994). However, there is no evidence to rely on this interpretation. For this reason, the term *Bali kun* is more appropriate, for all of these villages trace their history back to the pre-Majapahit era.
The third characteristic of a desa adat is the ownership of kahyangan tiga, or other temples which function as the kahyangan tiga do. Fourthly, desa adat has the autonomy to manage its internal affairs, such as defining its membership, electing officials, conducting ritual ceremonies, defining its own rules and regulations (awig-awig), and the like. It also has autonomy in the sense that it is not governed by another institution or government bureaucracy. As an autonomous entity, the desa adat has a governmental structure, consisting of desa adat officials (called dulun desa or prajuru desa adat), and oral or written rules and regulations (awig-awig).

There are several ways to install desa adat leaders. The most common way in present day Bali is via elections conducted in a special meeting (sangkepan desa). Another way, as in desa Bali kuna, is based on seniority, seniority being measured from the date of marriage. In this case, the most senior couples, after fulfilling certain criteria, automatically assume the desa adat leadership. A newly married man will be positioned at the bottom of the membership hierarchy, and his position will gradually increase with the arrival of other newly married couples and the ‘fall’ (ngelad) of people above him. The events that cause one’s membership in desa adat to fall are (a) if one of a couple dies or they divorce, so that the husband-wife unit is no longer complete; (b) the member’s youngest child has married; or (c) one of his grandchildren has

---

11 It is worth noting that in empirical terms, not all desa adat possess kahyangan tiga. Desa adat in coastal areas usually have Pura Segara, dedicated to the god of the sea, Dewa Baruna. Since the sea is water, and the god of water is Wisnu, this temple is also associated with Wisnu, and hence, functions as Pura Puseh. Desa adat in Beratan, Tabanan, has Pura Ulun Danu Beratan, dedicated to Wisnu and his sakti Sri or Dewi Danu. Accordingly, it does not need a special Pura Puseh to worship Wisnu. In most desa adat in Bali, Pura Desa and Pura Puseh are situated in one complex, so it is misleading to define kahyangan tiga as physically composed of ‘three temples.’ In several desa adat, such as Desa Adat Tangkas, Pura Desa, Puseh, and Dalem are all located within one complex.

---

12 In traditional Balinese organisations, leaders are invariably called prajuru, from ‘para-juru,’ which means ‘messengers.’ This signifies that leaders are not commanders or directors, but merely the ‘executors’ of members’ voices or of awig-awig. Desa adat leaders are often referred to as dulun desa, meaning ‘the upstream of the village,’ or para dulu (‘those upstream’). The term kelihan is also used, from the word kelih (‘mature,’ ‘grown up’; kelihan (‘older’) literally meaning ‘he who is considered elder’ or ‘maturer.’
married. By this rule, only a few people can reach the top of the structure, ie. the rank of kubayan.\textsuperscript{13} 

A desa adat may or may not be divided into several neighbourhood groups, called banjar. A big desa adat generally has a number of banjar. In this case, most desa adat activities are usually centred in the banjar, while the desa adat functions merely as a coordinator of the banjar, as well as handling external affairs.

\textit{Desa Dinas}

The term desa dinas, which refers to the institution managing the 'administrative affairs' of the village, was introduced when the Dutch colonial government started to use desa as the lowest level of administration, particularly for 'secular' matters.\textsuperscript{14} The existence of desa in present day Bali, as in other provinces of Indonesia, is based on the national law, \textit{Undang Undang} No. 5/1979, called \textit{Undang-Undang tentang Pemerintahan Desa} (Law of Village Government). Desa, in its broader sense includes desa dinas (in a narrow meaning) and kelurahan.\textsuperscript{15} The principal difference between kelurahan and desa is that a desa dinas has autonomy to manage its internal affairs, while a kelurahan does not.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} A detailed discussion on membership and leadership systems in desa adat Bali kuna can be read in Reuter (1996).

\textsuperscript{14} See further Warren (1993).

\textsuperscript{15} Desa, in its narrow meaning (Article 1a), is defined as: "a locality occupied by a number of inhabitants as a community, including the legal community which is the lowest governmental organisation directly under camat [district head] and is entitled to manage its internal affairs within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Indonesia." While kelurahan (Article 1b) is defined as: "a locality inhabited by a number of inhabitants, which is the lowest governmental organisation directly under the camat (district head), but has no autonomy to manage its own internal affairs" (italic added).

\textsuperscript{16} A number of other theoretical differences can be listed as follows. In terms of government structure, a desa government consists of kepala desa and LMD (Lembaga Musyawarrah Desa, Village Advisory Council), assisted by village apparatus. Below desa there are dusun/banjar. Unlike desa, a kelurahan has no LMD, and a kelurahan 'may' be subdivided into lingkungan, but the establishment of lingkungan is not compulsory. The head of a kelurahan, called lurah, and his staff are civil servants, while kepala desa and his staff are not. A desa, since it has internal autonomy, has its own source of income (pendapatan asli desa), as well as its own budget allocation, while a kelurahan does not, since its budget is included in
For the great majority of society, there is no difference between *desa dinas* and *kelurahan*: both are concerned with administrative matters of society, such as the issuance of ID cards (KTP, *Kartu Tanda Penduduk*); and both provide the office where one goes to process marriage, birth, and other certificates, before proceeding to higher authorities. Accordingly, in daily life villagers do not differentiate the terms *desa* and *kelurahan*, and these terms are used interchangeably. The only apparent difference for the villagers is in the way the village head is installed. A *lurah* is invariably appointed by the government (the *bupati*), and the people have no say in this matter. A *kepala desa*, on the other hand, is generally elected by, and from among the villagers, through a set of democratic procedures. In saying this, we have to note that this notion is not necessarily true all of the time. For several reasons, particularly for security and maintenance of government control, and more particularly to secure the vote for

the budget of a *kabupaten* or *kotamadya*. A *desa* is entitled to make village decisions (*keputusan desa*), while a *kelurahan* is not. Geographically, *kelurahan* are generally situated in urban areas or an urbanised society, while *desa* predominate in rural areas. However, this geographic definition is not necessarily true. There are a lot of *desa* in urban areas in the capital of the province, *kabupaten*, or *kotamadya*, known as 'desa kota' --in contrast to 'desa pedesaan'-- and inversely, there are *kelurahan* in rural areas. A *desa* generally has a population of 2,500 to 5,000 people or 500 to 1,000 families. If this number is surpassed, the *desa* is generally divided into two or even three. However, other factors are also taken into account. Geographically, a *desa* is expected to be capable of managing its area effectively, so that the *kepala desa* and his/her staff are capable of serving their villagers, or of 'controlling' their territory. This means that there are enough transportation facilities to connect hamlet to hamlet within the *desa*. Socio-cultural factors, such as religion and unique custom are also considered. A *desa* is expected to be relatively homogeneous in order to minimise socio-cultural conflict. By these criteria, a community of less than 2,500 inhabitants may be defined as a *desa*, as we can see in mountainous villages, such as those in Kintamani. In this region, due to a geographic factor --isolation-- most of the *desa* consist of only one hamlet, and generally have less than 2,500 inhabitants. In cities, most *desa* have more than 5,000 inhabitants because they are still 'manageable,' due to the good transportation and communication facilities. A community of less than 2,500 members in a geographically manageable area, with relatively good facilities, may also be an independent *desa* because there are very specific socio-cultural factors that make it incompatible with its neighbouring villages. Kampung Gelgel in Klungkung and Kecicang in Karangasem are examples of this --both are Islamic enclaves surrounded by Hindu villages.

The status of a *desa* can be raised (*ditingkatkan*) to a *kelurahan* if its population exceeds 2,500 and the condition of the village is relatively heterogeneous, dynamic, and its economic activities have been greatly influenced by an urban economy (*Permendagri* 2/1980). The government structure of a *kelurahan* is similar to that of a *desa*, except there is no LMD in a *kelurahan* --since a *kelurahan* has no autonomy in managing its internal affairs. A *kelurahan* is headed by *kepala kelurahan* (*lurah*), assisted by a secretary and *kepala urusan*. A *kelurahan* might be divided into several hamlets, called *lingkungan*, each headed by a *kepala lingkungan*. 
the government political party, *Golkar*, instead of the opposition parties (PDI or PPP) in the general election, it is not uncommon for the government to send its own people (generally a soldier or a policeman) to chair a *desa dinas*.

Unlike *desa adat*, there is little variation in governmental structure in *desa dinas* and *kelurahan*, since everything has been standardised nationally. *Desa* government consists of a *kepala desa* (village head) and LMD (Village Advisory Body), supported by *perangkat desa* (village apparatus), which consists of a *sekretaris desa* (village secretary), *kepala dusun* (hamlet heads), and *kepala urusan* (heads of affairs). In theory, the LMD functions to channel people’s aspirations for village planning; therefore it is commonly known as the ‘legislative body of the *desa*.’ This council is made up of all *kepala dusun* and prominent figures in the village, including leaders of social institutions in the village. In the case of Bali, they are *desa adat* and *subak* heads. The village head and village secretary are, ex-officio, the head and secretary of this body, respectively (*Permendagri* 1/81 and 2/81).

The establishment of a LKMD (Lembaga Ketahanan Masyarakat Desa, ‘Village Community Development Council’) is compulsory for both *desa* and *kelurahan*. The main function of this body is to assist the *kepala desa* or *lurah* in the village development planning, as well as the execution of the planning. However, LKMD is not a structural part of village government, but a separate village institution (*Kepres* 28/80; *Kepmendagri* 225/80). It differs from LMD in the sense that LMD is a legislative body, that can, theoretically at least, define the planning of the village development. On the other hand, LKMD merely assists the *kepala desa/lurah* to prepare the plan to be proposed to the village meetings, and to implement the plans after they have been ratified by the LMD. As with the LMD, the *kepala desa/lurah* and his secretary automatically assume the posts of head and secretary of LKMD, respectively.

In terms of territory and population, a *desa dinas* clearly does not necessarily coincide with a *desa adat*, due to the different bases for their establishment. My data suggest the following possibilities. The first is that, a *desa dinas* (or *kelurahan*) may have exactly the same geographic area boundaries as a *desa adat*. This case is mostly found in ‘isolated’ villages such
as Terunyan, Bunutin, Manikliu, Mengani, Serahi, Abangsongan, and Bonyoh. The second possibility is that, a desa dinas consists of more than one desa adat. Since the number of desa adat is much greater than desa dinas/kelurahan (1305 as compared to 632), this is the most common case, particularly in the lowland regions. For example, Desa Luwus and Desa Mekarsari each consists of six desa adat; Desa Kusamba consists of seven; Kelurahan Kuta consists of three; and Desa Canggu of four. The third possibility contrasts with the second in that a desa adat may be divided into several desa dinas. In other words, desa dinas territory is physically part of a desa adat, a situation which is generally found in densely populated areas. For example, Desa Adat Denpasar and Desa Adat Buleleng are both divided into dozens of desa dinas (and kelurahan). The last possibility, which seems very awkward, is that a desa dinas may cover a number of desa adat, together with part of another desa adat, the other part of which belongs to another desa dinas. In the case of Kelurahan Ubud, for example, the kelurahan consists of six-and-a-half desa adat. Ubud only has one banjar of Desa Adat Taman, while the other half of this desa adat belongs to Desa Dinas Peliatan.

It is noteworthy that, legally, the desa adat is not subordinate to the desa dinas; nor is the reverse true. Each is an independent organisation, theoretically concerned with different domains of village life. In daily life, however, the role of kepala desa dinas seems to dominate village life, and the adat domain, which is the responsibility of the bendesakelihan desa adat, is strongly influenced by the kepala desa. This is particularly true in the case where a desa consists of more than one desa adat. In this situation, the kepala desa commands a larger geographic area and more supporters. Moreover, due to formal requirements, a kepala desa must be at least a graduate of junior high school. In fact most kepala desa have graduated from high school (SLTA) and quite a number are university graduates. On the other hand, formal education is rarely a requirement of desa adat heads. Accordingly, in the majority of cases, kepala desa have a higher level of formal education than desa adat heads. This results in kepala desa and lurah being generally more active and possessing more worldly knowledge and experience than their bendesa adat counterparts. Kepala desa or lurah also have better access to higher officers in the government
structure, eg. *camat*, *bupati*, and other offices. The national rules also stipulate that the *kepala desa* or *lurah* is the sole authority (*penguasa tunggal*) in his/her village.\textsuperscript{17} He/she is the primary caretaker (*penanggung jawab utama*) of village development, and he/she should give guidance (*membina*) to all traditional institutions and customs within the village (UU 5/79; *Kepres* 28/1980). This provides opportunities for *kepala desa* and *lurah* to enter the domain of *bendesa adat*, with the result that the *bendesa adat* tend to be considered inferior. It is not uncommon, then, as I observed, that in a *desa adat* contest (*lomba desa adat*), which is designed to activate and strengthen the *desa adat*, the *kepala desa* plays a more important role than the *bendesa adat* himself.

**SUBAK, IRRIGATORS’ ORGANISATION**

In addition to *desa adat* and its *banjar*, the *subak* is yet another landmark institution of Bali, and is another strand in the web in which most Balinese live. Available literature suggests that the *subak* has been in existence in Bali for more than 10 centuries. Goris (1952), in his *Atlas Kebudayaan*, asserts that settled agriculture had been practised in Bali before 600 AD. The inscription of Sukawana (Sukawana A1, 882 AD) mentions the word *huma* (‘field’), a word which is still used at present. The word *kasuwakan*, presumably the origin of the word *subak*, is first found in the inscription of Banjar Sengguan-Klungkung (Goris 438.C.I.a), dated 1022 AD (Goris 1974a). As is the case with the *desa adat*, the *subak* has also attracted the attention of a number of scholars, both foreign and indigenous.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{17} Although most of the *kepala desa* and *lurah* are men, in theory there is equal opportunity between men and women to assume this post. In Bali there are only two women *kepala desa*, ie. the *kepala desa* of Mundeh (Tabanan) and Batur Tengah (Bangli).

\textsuperscript{18} Among others, L.A. Liefenck (1969) described the general ethnography of the *subak* system in Buleleng region in 1886-87; CJ Grader (1960) wrote about *subak* in the Jembrana regency, focusing on its labour mobilisation, water distribution and land taxes; Birkelbach (1973) discussed the agricultural practices in *subak*; Clifford Geertz (1959; 1972; 1980a; 1980b) also wrote about several aspects of *subak*; and Stephen Lansing (1983; 1987; 1991) analysed the temple system of the *subak* in relation to its water management. Local researchers have also studied *subak* from several points of view. To mention just a few, Geriadhi et al. (1993) focused on its legal aspects; Sutawan et al. (1984; 1986) and I myself (Pitana 1989)
Grader defines the subak as a ‘group of sawah’ which are “watered from the same conduit or the same branch of a conduit” (1960: 269). A similar definition is given by Geertz, who simply states that the subak “is all the rice terraces irrigated from a single dam (empelan) and major canal (telabah gede)” (1967: 230). These definitions clearly see the subak from a physical point of view, equating subak with a ‘collection of rice fields.’ As a matter of fact, the social aspects of the subak are of primary importance as the unique feature which distinguishes subak from other irrigation systems elsewhere. In terms of organisation, a subak is much more than merely ‘a group of farmers’ owning rice fields watered by a single irrigation source.

Similar to the desa adat, subak systems in Bali vary greatly, so one subak cannot be used as ‘representative’ of the nature of Bali wide subak. However, as a general rule subak are characterised by the following features. Firstly, as noted by other writers (such as Grader 1960; Geertz 1972 and 1980), the subak is a collection of rice fields diverting irrigation water from a common source. This common source might be a single weir, a division structure in a big canal, a spring, or a combination of these water sources. It is not uncommon for one weir to be used by several subak, especially in the lowland areas. Likewise, it is not uncommon for a subak to divert irrigation water from several sources. In any case, the physical boundaries of a subak clearly define which sawah is and which sawah is not, part of a particular subak. Secondly, a subak is internally an autonomous entity, meaning that it has the independence to manage its internal affairs, and to make contracts with other institutions. This internal autonomy is indicated by its independence to elect its own leadership (prajuru subak), to manage its own budget, as well as to define its own rules and regulations (awig-awig). Thirdly, a subak invariably manages a Bedugul temple of its own, a temple dedicated to Dewi Sri, the goddess of rice or of fertility. In addition to these characteristics, as an organisation, a subak has clear membership rules, which define who are members and who are not.

studied inter-subak coordination along a river course and the impact of government intervention.
Plates 2.1 and 2.2 Activities in subak (above) and banjar (below). All members have the same rights and duties, regardless of their warga of origin or honorific initial names.
If one weir is utilised by more than one subak, a supra-subak body is generally established, called a subak-gede (‘great-subak’). This functions mainly to coordinate ritual ceremonies and the maintenance of shared facilities. On the other hand, if the size of the rice land or membership of a subak is very large, the subak is generally subdivided into sub-subak, called tempek or banjaran.

A subak is organised by subak officials called prajuru, the same terminology as is used in desa adat. Again, the number and titles of the prajuru vary considerably, but usually consist of a kelihan subak (called also pekaseh), deputy pekaseh (petajuh), secretary (penyarikan), treasurer (juru raksas), and messengers (juru arah or kasinoman). In conducting certain activities, eg. ritual ceremonies in subak temples, groups of two or three members generally take turns to be ‘general assistants’ (saya). If the subak is divided into tempek, the same structure is also developed at the tempek level, chaired by kelihan tempek and a number of assistants, depending on the size of such tempek. Likewise, if there is subak-gede at supra-subak level, a similar structure can also be found.

Subak officials are democratically elected by, and from among subak members, for a certain period, generally three to five years. As with other traditional organisations in Bali, however, there are a number of subak whose leaders have been in place for decades without any election process.

Members of a subak, called krama subak, are the owners of the rice fields, which are irrigated by the subak irrigation water. In the case of share cropping, the ‘registered members’ are still the owners of the land, but the physical activities are usually performed by the tenants. Membership of a subak is generally based on water rights rather than the exact size of land. Water rights are generally measured in terms of tektek (‘a chop’ in the wooden division structure), which means one portion or one share. Sawah irrigated by one tektek of water is called one sikut (‘one measure’), or one bit-tenah (‘a sawah that uses one bundle of traditional rice seed’), or one kecoran (‘one water inlet’), which ranges widely in area from 0.30 to 1.00 hectare. The obligations of members are proportional to the water-rights they command. Those who have water rights of less than one tektek will be less than ‘full’ members. This means that those
having half a tektek of water rights are half-members, and have to contribute half the labour or materials that full members do (in practice, they only attend every other subak activity). Likewise, those who have two tektek of water have to contribute twice the amount of normal full members.

As an ‘irrigation society,’ subak membership is distinct from desa adat, banjar, or desa boundaries. Members of a subak may come from a number of desa adat or desa dinas, or even from different kabupaten. There are a number of cases where the irrigation canal of a weir irrigates sawah in more than one kabupaten, such as the weir of Cangi (Tabanan and Badung), Pama-Palean (Badung and Tabanan), Mambal (Badung and Tabanan), and Kedewatan (Gianyar and Badung). Conversely, farmers may be, and often are, members of more than one subak because their sawah are irrigated by water sources that are managed by different subak.

Like the desa adat, membership in the subak is generally also classified according to the involvement in subak activities. Those who actively perform subak duties in terms of labour contribution are called active members (krama pangayah); while those who, for various reasons, are exempted from being physically present are non-active members (called krama pangoot or krama pangampel). In lieu of their presence, krama pangampel have to pay a pangampel fee, a certain amount of rice every season. For practical reasons, however, the fee is generally converted into cash, based on the market price of rice. In some subak there are also exempted members (krama leluputan). They are members who are freed from the subak’s physical duties without the need to pay pangampel because they hold special jobs ‘to serve society.’ These include high priests (sulinggih), temple priests (pemangku), and desa adat leaders.

As in other organisations in Balinese society, the religious aspect of the subak is salient. Each subak has at least one Bedugul temple. Most subak also have, individually or in a group with other subak, a temple at its water source (near the weir or spring), called Pura Ulun Empelan, dedicated to Dewa Wisnu, the god of water or the god of life. In addition to its Bedugul, a big subak generally also has a Pura Ulunsuwi, also dedicated to Dewi Sri, but covering a larger area. A group of subak in a region usually also have a regional subak
temple, known as Masceti in Gianyar, Klungkung, Bangli, and Karangasem, or by an idiosyncratic term such as Pura Besikalung and Pura Beda in Tabanan. Subak perform several kinds of ritual ceremonies in each of these temples. The most common ones include odalan (the temple’s festival), ngusaba (a thanksgiving, after-harvesting ceremony), neduh (a ceremony to request general prosperity for subak life, eg. enough water, no conflicts, no pests and diseases, etc.), and occasionally nangluk merana (a ceremony to request protection from plant pests and diseases) if there are symptoms of a pest explosion. Ritual ceremonies at subak level are usually officiated at by pemangku (temple priest), and for this purpose a subak usually uses a desa adat’s pemangku. A subak rarely has its own pemangku, except for the big regional subak temples such as Masceti.

At the individual level, each farmer has a small shrine, called sanggah catu or sanggah pangalapan, in his uppermost sawah plot, close to the individual’s water inlet. Individual ritual ceremonies for the sawah are performed in this shrine. The common ceremonies follow the growth stages of the rice. These begin from mendak toya (acquisition of irrigation water), and proceed to newasen (starting time of transplanting), neduh (42 days after transplanting), biukukung (when the rice paddy is at its panicle-initiation stage), banten manyi (before harvesting), and mantenin (after the rice paddy is stored in the granary). Although most farmers currently sell their standing rice, manyi and mantenin ritual ceremonies are still practised. For these ceremonies the farmers mark approximately one square metre of the standing rice (called sri) close to the sanggah catu, and treat this as representative of the whole rice field.

**SUBAK ABIAN, UPLAND FARMERS’ ORGANISATION**

While the subak functions in the irrigated regions, a similar organisation also exists for dry land farmers, called subak abian (literally ‘subak for dry land farming’). Although evidence suggests that the organisation of upland farmers has been in operation for decades in several areas, being known by different names such as seka kopi, subak jepun, and subak kopi, this organisation was
revitalised in the late 1970s by the government, through Bali’s Provincial Office of Plantation. In an effort to accelerate development programs in dry land farming, the government tried to organise upland farmers, drawing on the success of irrigated agriculture based on the subak system. The organisation was then called subak abian, apparently named after subak, the already well-known farmers’ organisation for irrigated land. The term subak is familiar to farmers, and it bears a good reputation as an intact and well functioning organisation. It was expected that the subak abian would succeed in accelerating agricultural development in upland areas, just as the subak does for irrigated agriculture. The first subak abian were formally inaugurated by the Bupati of Tabanan on 29 July 1978 in Pupuan, Tabanan, after which the number of subak abian increased over time in all kabupaten. By 1993, 703 subak abian had been registered.

The subak abian, following the subak model, also constructs its subak temple, known as Pura Subak Abian, dedicated to Betara Tumuwuh (‘god of plants’). In several subak abian it is locally referred to as ‘Dewi [‘goddess’] so-and-so,’ depending on the primary commodity grown by subak abian members, eg. Dewi Sri Congkeh for coffee, and Dewi Kelapa for coconut plantations. As a matter of fact, individual members already had individual shrines dedicated to ‘the owner of the land,’ where farmers performed their ritual ceremony on tumpek uduh day (a 210-day cycle ceremony for plants). A few field complexes also had their temple before they were named subak-abian.

As an organisation, the subak abian also has its leader, called kelihan subak abian, who is assisted by a deputy (wakil), secretary (panyarikan), and treasurer (patengen). The subak abian also has its own rules (awig-awig) regulating several things, such as land boundaries, rights of way, and collective action in managing plant pests and diseases, and harvesting season. However, it seems that the subak abian does not function as well as the subak, partly due to the lack of cohesive sanctions. In the subak, irrigation water is clearly a very strong binding factor since members disobeying the awig-awig will not be given water. Subak temples are also more powerful in governing members’ behaviour than the temple of subak abian because rice plays an important role in people’s lives,
and rice has traditionally been a status symbol: the amount of rice owned reflects the image of one’s wealth.

**PAMAKSAN**

There are also groups in a certain village or several villages in a region that are responsible for a certain temple or a certain sacred object. This kind of group is known as *pamaksan* or *pangemong* or *pangempon*.¹⁹ The most common *pamaksan* groups are *pamaksan pura* (for temple) and *pamaksan barong* (for *barong*). The *pamaksan* are the ones who have the full responsibility in maintaining the temples or *barong* as well as performing the ritual ceremonies needed. Those outside the *pamaksan*, although they may regularly visit the temples or participate in their ritual ceremonies, are only voluntary participants, referred to as *panyungsung* or *panyiwi* in Balinese.

For *subak* temples, *subak* members are automatically members of the *pamaksan*. For village temples, there are several possibilities in defining the *pamaksan*. In some *desa adat*, the *pamaksan* of a particular temple might be only a section of the *desa adat* members (as found in Desa Adat Ubud). In other cases, only the *krama pangarep* are members of the *pamaksan* (as found in Desa Adat Krobokan). In other cases still, all village members are members of the *pamaksan* (eg. in Desa Adat Panglipuran). In large public temples (known as *dang kahyangan* or *sad kahyangan*), members of their *pamaksan* invariably come only from several villages, while the rest of Balinese are only *panyungsung*. The same holds true for *warga* temples particularly *padharman*, *kawitan*, and *dadya agung*. The *pamaksan* are only *warga* members from some villages, while *warga* members from the rest of the island are only *panyungsung*.

¹⁹ The word *pamaksan* came from *paksa* (‘force’ or ‘obligatory’), implying that their contributions and participation are obligatory. The words *pangemong* (from *emong*, ‘to take care’ or *among*, ‘responsibility’) and *pangempon* (from *empu*, ‘baby sitting’ or ‘possess’) both signify that they are the ones who possess, and have to take care of, the temple or the sacred object concerned.
Plate 2.3. A *barang* is usually the responsibility of a *pamaksan*, whose members may come from several villages, while villagers in which a *barang* originates are not automatically members of the *pamaksan*.

For some temples, which are not directly associated with *desa adat* or *subak*, membership of the temple's *pamaksan* are difficult to define. This is to say that there are no clear criteria which can be used to define the *pamaksan*. Priests of some temples told me that membership of their temples has been increasing over time.\(^{20}\) The most frequently cited reason for this was that those who visited the temple for a certain purpose sometimes made a vow that if their wishes were granted, they would be members of the *pamaksan* of that temple.

\(^{20}\) This phenomenon is particularly true in temples with a high reputation of sacredness and 'generosity' (*bares*) where the wishes of the faithful are frequently fulfilled.
Among the most common wishes, the temple priests told me, are to be cured from diseases or to have children. This is also true in the case of pamaksan for barong. In most cases that came to my knowledge, members of the desa adat in which the barong originates are not automatically members of the pamaksan barong. For example, out of 280 households who are members of Desa Adat Peneng, only 54 are members of the pamaksan barong in this village, while another 32 members of the pamaksan come from several neighbouring desa adat.

SEKA, FUNCTIONAL GROUPS

For activities which the desa adat, desa dinas or subak cannot perform, another kind of organisation, called seka (from sa-eka 'being one'), exist in Bali. A seka generally performs special tasks in the economic, social, or religious spheres of Balinese life within a banjar/desa adat, or crosscutting desa adat. These tasks usually involve efforts that need a great amount of labour for a short time, or special skills. A seka, in most cases, usually recruits its members on a voluntary basis, and is established to achieve certain objectives. However, there are also seka where membership is compulsory, ie. if the seka is a functional, or even a structural, part of another more established organisation (banjar/desa adat or subak). It is a common practice for a banjar or desa adat to set up seka for certain purposes. In the 1970s, Desa Adat/Banjar Kerobokan mobilised its members in a seka manyi (rice harvesting group) every season to raise funds for the renovation of its meeting hall (bale banjar). Subak Kedokan, in Tabanan regency, also established a seka manyi to raise funds for the renovation of its Bedugul temple. A pamaksan of certain temples, particularly warga temples, sometimes also makes it compulsory for its members to join a seka, with similar purposes to those in the banjar or subak. For fund raising purposes, a number of panti or dadya (warga temple) organise their members in the form of seka, such as seka manyi (rice harvesting), seka bleseng (transferring rice from ricefield to the home of the owners), or seka mamula (rice transplanting).
Banjar also have seka as functional task forces, whose membership is also compulsory, such as seka teruna, seka daha, and seka gong. All unmarried youths must be members of the seka teruna (for boys) and seka daha (for girls), collectively known as seka teruna-teruni, whose major task is to assist in the social religious activities of the banjar. In temple festivals, they are the ones responsible for the decoration of the temple, and they are also the ones responsible for carrying the sacred objects (pratima, jempana, banners, spears, and the like) during the procession, or for performing the sacred dances such as rejang, pendet, baris, and abuang. Being members of a seka gong (gamelan orchestra) is often also compulsory for banjar members, so that each family must assign one of its members to join the seka gong.

Seka generally exist temporarily, except for seka teruna-teruni, which are a permanent part of a banjar/desa adat. In the agricultural sector, where seka are most commonly found, they generally last for one season. It is exceptional for a seka of this kind to last for years. The relatively long lived seka (eg. seka gong, seka arja, seka joged, and seka jukung) may set out their rules and regulations (awig-awig), but they are mostly unwritten. The rules mainly contain the obligations, rights, and fines for rule breaking. The long lived seka usually elect their leader, called kelihan seka, who might be assisted by staff such as a secretary and a treasurer, depending on the number of its members and complexity of its activities.

Although the religious characters of seka are secondary, they do not lack religious concerns. As with other social groups, the religious aspect is also observable in the seka, particularly the long lasting seka. Seka arja, seka gong, and seka joged generally offer small ritual offerings preceding their performance.

Seka can be classified according to their main objectives. The first type is the economically-oriented seka, the main objective of which is to gain income for its members. In the agricultural sector this type of seka includes seka manyi and seka nigtig (rice harvesting seka), seka numbeg (hoeing, land preparing seka), seka nebuk (rice-hulling seka), and seka semal (squirrel-hunting seka). Art groups can also be included in the economically-oriented seka, particularly
those performing for tourists, such as seka legong in Peliatan and Ubud, or seka barong in Batubulan and Kesiman. Seka jukung (boat sailing seka) in Tanjung Benoa, who take tourists sailing for recreation, can also be classified into this type of seka. The second type of seka is social-religious-oriented. This type of seka is usually part of a banjar/desa adat, and plays an important role in ritual ceremonies in the desa adat. Among others, these seka include seka baris (baris dance), seka rejang (rejang dance), seka kidung (religious singing), seka gong and angklung (gamelan orchestra), seka teruna-teruni (banjar youth), and seka patus (mutual assistance in death). The third type is the recreationally-oriented seka, such as seka layangan (kite-flying seka), seka mancing (fishing seka), seka matuakan (tuak drinking seka), and seka tajen (cock fighting seka).

This classification relates to typical characteristics, and is by no means absolute, but more a matter of degree. In practice, although some seka clearly fall into one category, many are a mixture. Some are religious in nature, but also significantly try to obtain money from their performances; others are mainly recreational, but the price of the performance is a matter of great importance. Take seka joged, for example, a seka that performs joged, a romantic dance, and invites the spectators to join the dancing. This is mainly a recreational type of seka, but the members usually set a certain standard performing fee, below which they would refuse to perform. The religious character of the seka joged is also observable, since a ritual offering is also made preceding the performance of the joged.

**WARGA AND DADYA**

To these traditional institutions, desa adat/banjar, subak, subak-abian, pamaksan, and seka, as well as desa dinas, another kind of organisation must be added, ie. warga or soroh or treh (origin group). Warga is a strong institution in the daily life of Balinese people, especially in religious matters. All village members may be united as one in a banjar or desa adat; all land owners are also

---

21 I will discuss this organisation in more detail in the following chapters.
united as one in a subak; farmers may be united to form a seka for certain purposes; and villagers may be united in maintaining a certain temple or a barong in a pamaksan; but they will separate from each other and refer to their respective warga in individual ritual ceremonies, notably life-cycle ceremonies such as ngotonin (spiritual birthday), tooth filing, marriage, and ngaben (cremation). Even in a village-sponsored ngaben ceremony, groupings based on warga of origin are of primary importance.

If the desa adat and its banjar, as well as subak, are geographically defined entities, warga crosscuts them. A warga naturally has no geographic boundaries, and members of a desa adat are invariably members of different warga whose points of reference, their respective warga temple, are situated in different villages. Warga temples are apparently strong as points of reference in determining the religious behaviour of the warga concerned. At village level, people from the same warga may organise themselves in managing a warga temple, called dadya or panti, or sanggah gede at the lowest level. However, in most villages in Tabanan, Badung, and Jembrana, dadya or panti are rarely found because every housing lot builds its own sanggah, relatively independent of the master sanggah, although they still admit that the master sanggah is of higher status. The master sanggah, in this case, in practice belongs solely to the master-family. Thus, members of this warga tend to look for their dadya to other villages.

SUMMARY

This chapter describes traditional Balinese organisations. A Balinese cannot escape being a member of a desa adat and, at the same time, a member of a desa dinas. For practical purposes, one can be a member of more than one desa dinas. To ease administrative affairs, such as car registration and obtaining birth certificates or land certificates, most people become desa dinas members in their village of residence while still maintaining membership in their desa dinas of origin. In the case of desa adat, it is rare to be a member of more than one desa adat. Balinese usually maintain their membership in their desa adat of origin,
while in the *desa adat* of residence they may, and some do, become active participants without becoming registered members. If they have religious ceremonies, they tend to perform such ceremonies in their village of origin. Within the *desa* or *desa adat*, and sometimes in more than one *desa adat*, Balinese may be also members of *seka* of various kinds.

Aside from being members of *desa adat*, *desa dinas* and *seka*, a Balinese farmer who owns irrigated land must be a member of at least one *subak*; while those in the upland areas tend to be members of *subak abian*. *Subak* membership often cross cuts the boundaries of *desa* or *desa adat* because this organisation is canal-based. Membership of *subak abian*, to a lesser extent, may also spread beyond *desa/desa adat* boundaries, since it is not uncommon for farmers to own dry land in other villages.

Traditional Balinese organisations which have a certain physical territory, i.e. *banjar*, *desa adat*, *subak*, and *subak abian*, are governed by the concept of *Tri Hita Karana* ('three causes of happiness'), consisting of three components: (1) *parhyangan* (God Almighty), (2) *pawongan* (human beings or microcosms), and (3) *palemahan* (territory, the environs or macrocosms). This concept suggests that real happiness can only be achieved if these three components are in harmonious relationship to each other. In *banjar/desa adat*, *parhyangan* is signified by *desa adat* temples, *pawongan* by *desa adat* membership, and *palemahan* by the territory of the *desa adat*. In *subak*, these three components are associated with *subak* temples, *subak* membership, and *subak* rice land areas, respectively; while in *subak abian* they are *subak abian* temples, *subak abian* membership, and the plantation areas. Other organisations, such as *seka* and *wargal/dadya* do not have specific territory and hence the concept of *Tri Hita Karana* is not applicable.

While some writers assume that *seka*, *pamaksan*, and *banjar* are the same -- at least they use these notions interchangeably-- I find that there are a number of distinct differences among them, hence, it is preferable to distinguish these terms. Table 2.1 summarises some distinguishing characters of these traditional organisations, seen from membership, durability, and their religious characters.
Table 2.1 Differences between banjar/desa adat, pamaksan, and seka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Banjar/desa adat</th>
<th>Pamaksan</th>
<th>Seka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Unit</td>
<td>Membership of a banjar/desa adat is the family as a whole, and anyone in the family can perform the labour needed (ayahan) on behalf of the family.</td>
<td>Membership of a pamaksan is the family as a whole, and anyone in the family can perform the labour needed (ayahan) on behalf of the family.</td>
<td>Membership in a seka is based on the individual, and a member can rarely be replaced by another on his behalf. For example, it would be impossible for a member of seka gong to ask his brother, who does not know how to play gamelan, to replace him in a performance. Similarly, in no way would a seka joged member ask her sister to dance on her behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Criteria</td>
<td>Memberships in banjar/desa adat are exclusive and compulsory. There are a set of criteria for membership in banjar/desa adat. A non Hindu cannot be a member of the banjar/desa adat.</td>
<td>The basis of the membership is widely variable. Some have fixed criteria, while others do not. Since a pamaksan is associated with a sacred object, a non-Hindu would never be a member.</td>
<td>Membership is open, in the sense that anyone can join, as long as he has the capacity (skill) needed. Membership in a seka is mostly voluntary.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Inheritance</td>
<td>Membership in banjar/desa adat is inherited.</td>
<td>Membership in a pamaksan is inherited.</td>
<td>Membership in seka is rarely inherited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Duration</td>
<td>Banjar/desa adat are permanent organisations.</td>
<td>A pamaksan is a permanent organisation; in theory the pamaksan never ceases to exist.</td>
<td>A seka is generally unstable and temporary. Seka in agricultural activities generally last for only one season, and some for only a day.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Character</td>
<td>Religious and customary (<em>adat</em>) matters are the main concerns. <em>Banjar/desa adat</em> invariably have temple priest(s) (<em>pemangku</em>) of their own.</td>
<td><em>A pamaksan</em> invariably has a strong association with the ownership of religious objects. Its religious character can also be seen from the appointment of priest(s) (<em>pemangku</em>) by the <em>pamaksan</em> itself.</td>
<td>In <em>seka</em>, the religious character is either secondary or very minimal. Rarely does a <em>seka</em> have its own priest (<em>pemangku</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature of Properties</td>
<td><em>Banjar/desa adat</em> usually have religious properties, which are improper to be measured in monetary terms. They generally also have economic assets (land and buildings).</td>
<td>The main property is usually a sacred object (such as a <em>barong</em> or a temple) which is rarely measured in terms of money. Some <em>pamaksan</em> also have economic properties (land, gamelan orchestra, etc.).</td>
<td><em>A seka</em>’s property can be valued in monetary terms, such as agricultural tools, dancing costumes, or gamelan orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Boundaries</td>
<td><em>Banjar/desa adat</em> are geographically defined, in the sense that they have certain geographical boundaries.</td>
<td>Generally a <em>pamaksan</em>’s members come from a limited locality. In a few cases, they may come from distant villages.</td>
<td><em>A seka</em> has no specific area, and can operate everywhere as long as there is work to do relevant to the <em>seka</em>’s activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *) Exceptions can be found in these characterisations. There are also some permanent *seka*, ie. *Seka Teruna-Teruni*, which form part of a *banjar/desa adat*. In addition, membership in this *seka* is somewhat compulsory, in that any unmarried youth must be a member. In some cases, memberships in *desa adat*-sponsored *seka*, eg. *Seka Baris* and *Seka Gong*, may also be compulsory.  
Another difference can be added, that a *banjar*, a *desa adat*, or a *pamaksan* can transform itself into a *seka* for a special purpose. In this case, membership of the *seka* is also compulsory; all members of the *banjar*, *desa adat*, or *pamaksan* concerned must be members of the *seka*. |
All of these organisations are egalitarian in nature, except, to some extent, the warga organisation. This is to say that in principle there is no difference among members. All members of a desa, desa adat, subak, subak-abian and seka are more or less equal, and no members hold special privileges. Once they enter the sphere of desa adat, desa dinas, subak, or subak abian, they are ‘one,’ ‘brothers,’ as indicated by the term of address used: ‘semeton krama banjar,’ ‘semeton krama subak,’ which mean ‘my fellow banjar members’ or ‘my fellow subak members.’ Their egalitarian nature can also be seen from their leadership. Anyone can be elected leader, both in theory and in practice, regardless of his/her warga of origin, socio-economic status, and the like. This situation has been reported by Hobart (1975: 72) from his fieldwork in a village in Gianyar, that “all members are equal regardless of their other social roles” and “membership of banjar elite ... is not necessarily correlated with wealth or caste status.” In this case, the image of Balinese social structure with its ‘caste system’ does not apply. In terms of rights and duties in the daily life of the banjar, seka, or subak, there is no connection with caste. This situation is perfectly abstracted in the saying “linggih manut sesana, sesana manut linggih” as I quoted at the opening of this chapter. As an informant told me:

If we perform banjar activities, they are banjar affairs, symbolised by the sound of the banjar’s wooden bell (suaran kulkul banjar), and not individual affairs. Hence, all individual attributes must be left at home before going to the banjar as a krama banjar (Arka 1994).

A kelihan of a seka gong in Ubud made a similar point, that:

If we bring in kasta (caste), wangsa, warga, soroh, or whatever you call it, to seka, than the seka will soon be destroyed. In a seka like the one of mine, we are only concerned with the objectives of our seka. If any one of my seka members wants to show his superiority based on warga, that is all right, but definitely the seka is the wrong place. There are other channels to do so (Wayan Sadia 1994; the same point was also made by Wayan Roja 1994).
Chapter Three

CASTE AND WARGA IN CONTEMPORARY BALI

Vasishta was born of a prostitute,
Vyasa of a fisherwoman,
Parasara of a Chandala girl:
conduct counts and not birth.
(Radhakrishnan 1949 [1927]: 121).

Speaking about Bali, one of the images which often comes to mind is that of ‘caste’ (or *kasta* in Balinese and Indonesian). More often than not, caste is said to be part of Hindu teachings. As such, the image of ‘Balinese caste’ might be expected to be more or less the same as that found in India, characterised by separation, division of labour, and hierarchy based on a conception of purity-pollution. In this chapter I will examine how the ‘caste system’ works in contemporary Bali. Based on this examination I argue that caste, particularly the four-caste model, is inadequate for understanding the dynamics of Balinese society. As an alternative, I propose that origin group or *warga* is a better concept in understanding the current sociological life of the Balinese.

---

1 The word ‘caste’ is not a Hindu term. As Dumont (1980) points out, caste is a word of Portuguese and Spanish origin, ‘casta’ or *castus,* which means ‘properly something not mixed.’ This term was used by the Spaniards to refer to a race or tribe. From the middle of the fifteenth century, the term caste has been applied to Indian society. As in India, the Balinese word ‘*kasta*’ as a direct translation of the English word caste, is relatively new for Bali. In earlier Balinese writings, such as in the *Brahmana Purana, Babad Dalem, Babad Pasek,* and *Babad Ksatria Tamanbali,* the common terms used to denote ‘origin groups’ or ‘clans’ are *wangsa* (‘nation,’ ‘dynasty’) or *treh* (‘descendant’). For example, Wangsa Kemenuh, Wangsa Keniten, Wangsa Mas, and Wangsa Manuaba, etc., all refer to subgroups in Warga Brahmana Siwa; Wangsa Kepakisan, Wangsa Tegehkori, Wangsa Kenceng, all refer to *warga* in *Arya* groups; while Treh Pasek and Treh Pande refer to Warga Pasek and Warga Pande respectively. Another term also commonly used is *soroh* (‘class, group, or anything with similar characteristics’).
BALINESE CASTE SYSTEM IN ACADEMIC AND BUREAUCRATIC DISCOURSE

There have been a lot of debates on the Balinese caste system, mostly written by Westerners. Every social scientist writing about Bali invariably discusses the existence of caste. An earlier writer, R. Friederich, writing in 1849, reported that there were four castes in Bali, Brahmana, Ksatria, Wesia and Sudra, and that people from certain castes were identifiable from their initial name or title, ie. Ida for the Brahmana; Dewa for the Ksatria; Gusti for the Wesia; while the fourth caste, Sudra, bore no title of honour. Another early visitor to Bali, Katharine Edson Mershon, who stayed in Sanur in the 1930s, wrote:

... there were eight rulers, raja, called Anak Agung, each of whom formerly governed his section of the island. They are Ksatria, in the three-caste system, Triwangsa.... The other high caste group are the priests and teachers, the brahmanas, taken from the Brahmins of India.... A third caste of the Triwangsa is the Wesia, who are a somewhat military grouping as they enforce the edicts of the rulers or the bidding of the priests. This concludes the caste system, Triwangsa. However, outside this caste system live the greatest number of persons, the peasants, sudras. They are casteless....(1971: 17).

Later writers, like the anthropologists Geertz and Geertz (1975) and Geertz (1980a) note the complexity of caste in Bali, and that it is not the same as that known in India. They argue that caste in Bali is not simply a status group. In their view,

... to what extent the gentry and the commoner are true 'status groups' in the Weberian sense --that is, to what extent they have separate spheres of

---

2 In this thesis I prefer to use the term 'initial name' or 'honorific name' instead of 'title,' because in the Balinese context, people mostly associated the term 'title' with achieved titles such as Ir (insinyur, 'engineer'), Drs (doctorandus, 'university graduate of social sciences'), SH (sarjana hukum, 'graduate of the law faculty'), and SE (sarjana ekonomi, 'graduate of the faculty of economics'). Honorific names, on the other hand are commonly known as 'nama depan,' because they are always put in front of real names. Hence, the term 'initial name' in the Balinese context is arguably the best term to help avoid this ambiguity.
interaction and distinct subcultures-- is a much debated matter (Geertz and Geertz 1975: 6).

Commenting on the four-caste model, Geertz wrote:

... the reality of the situation was much more irregular than this simplistic summary suggests. In the first place, not all those with Triwangsa titles, even very high ones, actually played significant political roles at any particular time....

Yet even this picture is not quite complete. Although Sudra could not become lords, princes, or kings in the proper sense --could not, given their inborn disabilities, be truly exemplary figures-- they could, and in a number of cases did, play central roles in supravillage politics. At the other extreme, Brahmana, though eligible for the most prestigious status (aside from kingship) in all Balinese culture, that of Sivaite priest (pedanda), were, with a few carefully limited exceptions, systematically debarred from access to the concrete agencies of command (Geertz 1980a: 26-27).

A later anthropologist doing fieldwork in Bali also could not help writing about caste:

Compared to Indian conceptions of caste, by which they were of course deeply influenced, these Balinese conceptions echo rather archaic and partial forms. Their schema is that of varnas, not of jati subcastes; their paradigmatic functional relevance is to government, not to production; their imagery is one of worship, deference, and participation in various aspects of divinity, not primarily one of purity and pollution (Barth 1993: 227).

The most intensive and extensive discussion of the Balinese caste system to date is found in Korn's (1932) Het Adatrecht van Bali. Based on initial names, Korn classifies caste in Bali into four groups, exactly the same as that of the varna, ie. Brahmana, Ksatria, Wesia, and Sudra. Each caste is then sub grouped into three 'subcastes,' ie. utama (high), madya (middle), and nista (low), except for Brahmana. In a schematic way, this classification can be seen in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1. Schematic classification of caste in Bali, according to Korn (1932)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASTE AND SUBCASTE</th>
<th>INITIAL NAME MEN</th>
<th>INITIAL NAME WOMEN</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAHMANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemenuh</td>
<td>Ida, Ida Bagus</td>
<td>Ida Ayu (Dayu)</td>
<td>Descendants of Mpu Dwijendra (Dang Hyang Nirartha). Mpu Dwijendra was a Sivaite priest, who came to Bali ca. 1489, and became a palace priest in the Gelgel era under Dalem Waturenggong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manuaba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keniten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Antapan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bindu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KSATRYA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ksatria Utama</td>
<td>I Dewa Agung Istri</td>
<td>Anak Agung</td>
<td>The initial name ‘I Dewa Agung’ is only for sons of Klungkung kings by their primary wives; whereas sons from other wives of the same ‘caste’ are called Cokorda, I Dewa, or Anak Agung.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ksatria Madya (Pradewa)</td>
<td>I Dewa</td>
<td>I Dewa Ayu</td>
<td>Descendants of Klungkung kings, who did not inherit commanding power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ksatria Nista Pungakan</td>
<td>Ngakan</td>
<td>Desak</td>
<td>Heirs of Klungkung kings, from lower wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabagus</td>
<td>Bagus</td>
<td>Ayu</td>
<td>Heirs of Dalem Tegalbesung, Pegedangan, and Anggungan. They were brothers of Dalem Waturenggong (the ruler of Gelgel in 1460-1550), or sons of Dalem Ketut Ngulesir from a lower wife. (See further the genealogy or warga based on babad in Chapter Five.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasangiang</td>
<td>Sang</td>
<td>Sang Ayu</td>
<td>Heirs of Bendesa from Pandak village, who were given an honorific name by Dalem Ketut Ngulesir for their loyalty in hosting him before he gained the crown. (According to Babad Dalem, Dalem Ketut Ngulesir was an addicted gambler, and he was found in Pandak village by his supporters, who installed him as a new ruler, marking the emergence of Gelgel era.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these descriptions of the Balinese caste system, the notion of the four-caste model is strongly emphasised, as if the caste system in Bali consisted of Brahmana, Ksatria, Wesia, and Sudra in a hierarchical ladder with clear boundaries. This four-caste model was also adopted by the Dutch colonial government, who somewhat arbitrarily classified Balinese initial names into Brahmana, Ksatria, and Wesia, while those without an honorific initial name were defined as Sudra. Once the classification was made, the order was considered fixed, although Balinese themselves protested against this order (Schulte-Nordholt 1986, 1991).

My own research suggests that the ‘caste system’ in Bali is quite different from what has been described by most of Western scholars. Empirical data suggest that there are many ‘anomalies’ in classifying Balinese into four caste groups, some of which were noted by Korn himself. In the four-caste model, only Brahmana can be identified by both their honorific initial name, ie. Ida, Ida
Bagus, or Ida Ayu and their common ancestry, ie. Mpu Dwijendra and Mpu Astapaka. In other words, Balinese would unanimously agree that the bearers of these initial names are definitely from the Brahmana caste. Ksatria, Wesia, and Sudra are unclear. If Ksatria are defined as those who claim ancestry back to the Majapahit Balinese King, Sri Kresna Kepakisan, this definition soon becomes untenable. Among the descendants of Sri Kresna Kepakisan there are a number of groups considered Jaba, identified by the lack of an honorific initial name. These include Warga Pulasari, Warga Belayu, Warga Bebandem, Warga Dangin, and many more.

If, following Korn, the basis of the classification is the initial name, the classification is also arbitrary and does not fit reality. Honorific initial names do not necessarily suit the four caste model, meaning that certain initial names cannot be easily fitted to a certain caste group. Take the initial name Anak Agung for example. This honorific initial name is ambiguous, in the sense that there are several interpretations of this initial name. For some, Anak Agung is nothing but a title for Ksatria. For others, Anak Agung is reserved for kings, regardless of their warga of origin. Even if his family is a Gusti, once one becomes a crowned lord, a Gusti is entitled to use the title Anak Agung, as was the case of the kings of Buleleng, Karangasem, Jembrana, and Denpasar. However, most descendants of Majapahit Arya use the initial name Anak Agung, although they were not crowned lords. These include the descendants of Arya Kenceng in Badung and Tabanan, descendants of Arya Belog in Kaba-Kaba, and descendants of Arya Sentong in Carangsari.

As another example, the initial name I Gusti in Korn's classification occurs among the Wesia. However, most former ruling families in Bali (Karangasem, Badung, Tabanan, Mengwi, Buleleng, and Jembrana), as well as the kings themselves, used the initial name I Gusti.\(^3\) Being rulers, they are definitely not Wesia or, to be precise, they refuse to be called so. In addition, several babad, such as Babad Dalem, Babad Pasek, Babad Pinatih, and Babad Bendesa

\(^3\)Examples of the latter include I Gusti Panji Sakti, the king of Buleleng; I Gusti Ngurah Pementutan, the king of Badung; I Gusti Agung Putu, the king of Mengwi; and I Gusti Ngurah Jelantik, the king of Karangasem.
mention that there were only three Wesia from Majapahit who came to Bali under the names Tan Kobar, Tan Mundur, and Tan Kawur. From this point of view, the Arya groups do not belong to the Wesia, but Ksatria. Further, if Wesia are defined as the descendants of an Arya group from Majapahit, as was commonly assumed by the Dutch officials, including Korn, a number of them (e.g. Warga Arya Gajahpara, Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh, Warga Arya Pangalasan, and Warga Arya Kenceng Tegehkori) are now, and have long been, considered Sudra or Jaba, because they use no honorific initial name. In contrast, some other Arya descendants use the honorific initial name Anak Agung (for example in Kaba-Kaba, Tabanan, Jembrana, and Badung). Some of them even use the more prestigious honorific initial name, Cokorda, as found in Badung. The inappropriateness of ancestry to be used as a governing principle for classification of caste group is made more complicated by the fact that quite a number of warga considered Sudra trace their ancestry to priestly or princely figures. For example, Warga Pulasari claims as an ancestor, Dalem Tarukan, the second son of Dalem Ketut Kresna Kepakisan (the first Majapahit king in Bali), or the elder brother of Dalem Ketut Ngulesir, the famous king of Bali in the 15th century AD. This claim is recognised by the family of the former king of Klungkung, who worships at the same padharman (origin temple) in Besakih. Warga Pasek Kayu Selem traces its ancestry to Mpu Dryakah, a high priest; again, therefore, viewed from the perspective of ancestry, members of this warga are not Sudra. So too for other warga, such as Warga Pande, Pasek Sapta Rsi, Bhujangga Waisnawa, Karangbuncing, Tangkas Koriagung, Arya Kenceng Tegehkori, Arya Gajahpara, and Kubon Tubuh. All of these groups claim that their ancestors were people of nobility. Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Pasek Kayu Selem, Pande, and Bhujangga Waisnawa claim that their ancestors were Brahmana; Warga Karangbuncing, Arya Tangkas Koriagung, Kenceng Tegehkori, and Arya Gajahpara trace their ancestors to Ksatria.

If Korn is correct, there is a practical difficulty in daily life. It is very difficult, or nearly impossible, to identify in the field whether one is ‘I Gusti’ or merely ‘Gusti’ (without ‘I’). Furthermore, a name like Ni Luh, which is Gusti in Korn’s classification, is not a name for a Gusti. I found in Tabanan, Gianyar, and Badung, that most people from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and Bhujangga
Waisnawa use this name, eg. Ni Luh Putu Sitiari, Ni Luh Made Witari, Ni Luh Nyoman Suryawati, and Ni Luh Ketut Cita Rasmini, without claiming to be a Gusti.

Mention must also be made of the honorific names Cokorda, Anak Agung and I Dewa Agung. Based on the government regulation (staatblaad) No. 226/1927, the Dutch colonial government gave several titles for a ruler as zelfbestuurder (Kepala Pemerintahan Daerah Swapraja, autonomous governor). The titles were: I Dewa Agung for Klungkung; Anak Agung Agung for Karangasem; Cokorda for Badung and Tabanan, and Anak Agung for Bangli, Buleleng, Gianyar and Jembrana (Panetje 1986).

These situations clearly indicate that honorific initial names cannot be used to define one's caste group, and there is no single interpretation for these honorific initial names, except in the case of Ida Bagus, and Ida Ayu. This is closely associated with the fact that the four-caste model does not represent the complexity of Balinese society.

Another problem in theorising about caste lies in the priesthood. In the four-caste theory, only the three upper castes are entitled to perform the twice-born (dwijati) ceremony. In present day Bali, in contrast, any one is entitled to perform the dwijati ceremony, to become a sulinggih (high priest). At least two large warga, which should fall under the category of Sudra, have used their own high priests for generations, ie. Warga Pande and Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. Warga Bhujangga calls its high priest rsi bhujangga or sengguhu, while the high priest of Warga Pande is called sri mpu. Not only do they use their own priests, but they also refuse to be sprinkled by holy water from high priest of Warga Brahmana (pedanda). I also found this to be true for a smaller warga in Karangasem, Warga Arya Gajahpara. Members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, in some areas, have also started to use their own high priests.\(^4\) In Bali Kuna villages (often referred to as Baliaga villages), no twice-born high priest of this kind is ever used. Instead village priests, called jero-kubayan or jero-gede, are used.

\(^4\) See Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight for further details.
THE CONCEPT OF WARGA

Considering these facts, I argue that the four-fold caste model is a representation that inhibits an understanding of Balinese society. If we insist on using the term ‘caste’ in discussing the Balinese social system, we can only classify the Balinese into two, namely (1) the Triwangsa or Anak Menak, the collectivity of those who are commonly called Brahmana, Ksatria, and Wesia or, to be more precise, those who bear honorific initial names, in addition to their birth-order name; and (2) the Jaba (which literally means ‘outsider’) i.e. those who have no honorific initial name, or are commonly referred to as Anak Biasa (‘ordinary people’).

If we want to refer to a specific group and to be more productive in analysing Balinese society, I suggest that the concept of ‘origin group’ as introduced by Fox (1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1995, 1996), or what I call warga in the case of Bali, is more appropriate. Warga refers to a social group associated with one or more ancestral temples. Members of a warga trace their ancestry to a common ancestor, either real or mythical, as their ‘originator,’ by which they derive significant factors of solidarity and share common sacred symbols as self identity. The identity of a warga is enforced by origin myths, ancestors’ instructions (bisama) as stated in its babad, and prescribed codes of conduct.

---

5 This is, to some extent similar to what Geertz (1980a) terms “gentry” and “peasantry,” though, as we shall see, their positions in the society are not the same as Geertz describes. For Geertz (1980a: 26-7):

“The intricacy of the balance of power in traditional South Bali was matched by that of the institutions upon which it rested. The most elemental of these was the radical, ascriptive distinction between gentry and peasantry: between those whose titles gave them an intrinsic claim to supravillage authority and those, some ninety percent of the population, whose titles carried no such claim. The former, called collectively the Triwangsa (“three people”), consisted of the three upper “castes” (i.e. varnas): Brahmana, [K]satria, and [W]esia. The latter consisted of the fourth, or Sudra, “caste.” From the former, also referred to as wong jero, or (roughly) “insiders,” came the leaders of Bali. From the latter, wong Jaba, or “outsiders,” came the followers.”

6 Etymologically warga is a Sanskrit word (varga), which means “a separate division, class, set, multitude of similar things (animate or inanimate), group, company, family, party, side” (Williams 1956[1899]: 923), or “a separate division, class, group, company, family” (Zoetmulder 1982: 2207). J.S. Badudu and S.M. Zein (1994: 1620) translate this word as ‘members, family, clan, citizen.’ From the word warga, other words are derived, such as kulawarga or keluarga (family) and kewarga-negaraan (citizenship).
I observed that warga are socially and religiously more important than so-called caste groups. The sociological and religious importance of a warga can be seen in its strong unifying capacity, related to its ancestral temple(s), unified ritual symbols as part of group identities, and the existence of a degree of solidarity, all of which are absent in the case of caste.\(^7\)\(^8\)

Ancestral temples are crucial to the warga identity, as the practices of the religious life of Balinese Hinduism is dominated by ancestral worship. Misfortunes are often explained as punishment from neglected ancestors. Ancestral temples are a strong binding factor for a warga --while there is no such temple for a particular 'caste.'

Ritual symbols representing the identity of a Balinese are symbols of warga --and not caste. This is very obvious in the case of the cremation ceremony (ngaben). Each warga has its more-or-less exclusive symbols of identity, particularly the patterns of the sacred formulae-ornament drawn on the white cloth that covers the corpse (called kajang) and the form of the burning coffin (patulangan). The patterns of the formulae-ornament are specific for each warga. This also holds true for the coffin. Thus, for example, a member of Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh invariably uses the form of a black tiger (macan selem), Warga Ksatria Dalem uses a dragon-like coffin (naga kajang or naga banda), Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi uses the form of a bull (lembu) or a lion (singa), etc. On the other hand, there is no uniformity of coffin within a particular 'caste group': some Anak Agung in Karangasem use an elephant-fish form (gajahmina), while Anak Agung in other areas use a black bull (lembu cemeng).

---

\(^7\) I do not claim that I am the first researcher to realise the importance of the concept of warga in Balinese settings. Stuart-Fox (1987: 137) has also realised that "the role of warga is absolutely essential to understand Balinese social dynamics," although he did not have much to say further.

\(^8\) I should note here that by introducing the term warga, I do not deny the existence of the term caste (kasta) in Bali. The term kasta has been deeply planted in Balinese discourse, and was fixed there by the Dutch. In present day Bali, kasta is apparently a very lively topic in discussing the Balinese social system among Balinese themselves. What I argue here is that the concept of caste or kasta is inappropriate in analysing the real social-religious relationships of the Balinese.
Group solidarity, the attitude of being one group of equal status (sidikara), only occurs within a warga group. The sidikara, which is symbolised by the willingness to exchange homage for the dead (sumbah-kasumbah), the willingness to eat left-over food from the family temple of others (parid-kaparid), the willingness to carry the corpse of others’ (tegen-kategen), and the freedom to intermarry (juang-kajuang), only occur within a warga. The willingness to exchange wives (juang-kajuang), which means that A’s family can take a wife from B’s family and vice-versa without a feeling of being degraded or upgraded in status, occurs only within a warga. Stated in different words, there is a strong sense of ‘we-ness’ or solidarity within a warga, while there is no ‘caste solidarity’ in Bali. It is hard to imagine that a Gusti in Karangasem and a Gusti in Tabanan, or an Anak Agung in Buleleng and an Anak Agung in Klungkung, would have some kind of solidarity, if they are not from the same warga.

The importance of warga is also supported by the self-identification of the Balinese themselves. If one asks a Balinese, “nunasang antuk linggih?” (literally ‘what is your seat?’ --this was the first question to ask formerly in Balinese social interaction, thus inquiring about the person’s social status in order to behave accordingly), the answer will usually refer to the person’s warga: “I am a Gusti”; “I am a Kubon Tubuh”; “I am an Anak Agung from the village of so-and-so”; “I am an Ida Bagus from the village of so-and-so”; “I am a Cokorda from so-and-so”; “I am a Pasek”; “I am a Pande”; “I am a Bhujangga,” etc. Sometimes, one might hear also “I am a Brahmana” for Warga Brahmana, or “I

---

It must be noted here that the tegen-kategen rule is no longer valid in present day Bali. I was told that formerly in Bali, people from warga of high status would refuse to carry corpses of lower status people. However, in my fieldwork I found in Ubud, Gelgel, and in most villages throughout Bali, members of high status warga actively involved in carrying the corpse of banjar’s members, regardless of their warga. Nevertheless, people still tolerate Warga Brahmana --and Keluarga Puri in some villages-- who do not carry a corpse of a Jaba directly. Instead, they are expected to carry offerings or other materials needed during the funeral ceremony. I was also told that the Jaba group, who dominated the village, had exacted vengeance on some Triwangsa people (Anak Agung families) in Tegallalang who had refused to carry a Jaba corpse. When such a Triwangsa had a ngaben ceremony, the Jaba members of the banjar refused to carry the wadah (the cremation tower, on which the corpse is laid). Instead, all of them just carried offerings and other materials, exactly duplicating what the Triwangsa families had done before toward the Jaba.
am a *Jaba* from Warga Pande, Pulasari, Pasek Sapta Rsi, and Bhujangga Waisnawa. But I have never heard anybody refer to himself as a *Wesia*; and “I am a *Sudra*” is rarely heard, if ever.

There are a number of *warga* in Bali, and *warga* consciousness is currently increasing. This can be seen from several indicators, such as the eagerness of *warga* members to contribute in the renovation of *warga* temples; the increasing number of *warga* members visiting their *warga* temples; and the emergence of modern style *warga* organisations and the strengthened *warga* networks.

Table 3.2 Classification of *warga* into *Triwangsa* and *Jaba* (alphabetically ordered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warga within the <em>Triwangsa</em> and their initial names</th>
<th>Warga within the <em>Jaba</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warga Anggungan (Dewa, Ngakan, Sang)</td>
<td>Warga Arya Gajah Para</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Batulepang (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Arya Kenceng Tegehkori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Belog (<em>I Gusti, Anak Agung [AA]</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Kenceng (<em>I Gusti, AA</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Arya Kuta Waringin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Kepakisan (*I Gusti, <em>I Gusti Agung</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Balangan*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Kepakisan Dauh Baleagung (AA)</td>
<td>Warga Bebandem*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Pengalasan (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Belayu*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Sidemen (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Bendesa Mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Telabah (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Wang Bang Pinatih (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Gaduh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Bhujangga Sakti (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Karangbuncing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Brahmana Boda (<em>Ida, Ida Bagus, Ida Ayu</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Pande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Brahmana Siwa (<em>Ida Bagus, Ida Ayu</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Pasek Kayu Selem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Brangsinga (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Pasek Sapa Rsiego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Ksatria Dalem (<em>Cokorda, AA, Dewa Agung</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Pulasari*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Ksatria Dalem Sukawati (<em>Cokorda, AA, Dewa</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Sekar*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Pegatepan (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td>Warga Tangkas Kori Agung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Pegedangan (Dewa, Ngakan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Penyarikan (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Sukahet (<em>I Gusti</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Tirta Arum (AA, Dewa, Ngakan, Sang)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*)*: Collectively organise themselves in *Maha Gotra Sentanan Dalem Tarukan.*
BALINESE WARGA AT WORK

The relationships among warga in Balinese society differ from those indicated by the general theory of caste as found in India. Although the sense of hierarchical status among warga is observable, there are no privileges or special rights associated with warga or an initial name in Balinese daily life. It can be said that in the daily life of the banjar, desa adat, subak, and seka, warga plays no role. These traditional organisations are egalitarian, so that every member has more or less the same rights and duties. If there are classifications of village members, the classification is definitely not based on warga. The general criteria used for classification are the ownership of village housing lots (karang ayahan desa), land size, physical involvement in village activities, being born in the village or being a new-comer, etc. Leadership in any organisation is definitely not defined by honorific initial name. Being a leader has nothing to do with warga, because leadership is open to everyone. To my knowledge, there is no rule, neither in theory nor in practice, in any village in Bali stating that a

10In his classic Homo Hierarchicus, Dumont explains that the caste system is characterised by three main principles. The first is separation. According to this principle, each caste tries to separate itself from others, avoiding both direct (physical) and indirect contact (via food cooked by other caste groups), as well as intercaste marriage. The second principle is division of labor, which means that each caste group has a rigid and inherited professional task, and the caste members have only very limited room to move. The third, the most important principle, is that of hierarchy, according to which the castes are ordered in ranks of relative superiority. This hierarchy is based on the concept of ‘pure-impure’ or purity and pollution. From the work of others such as Srinivas (1962), Bateille (1981), Bhai (1987), Fuchs (1981), and Murdoch (1977), additional characteristics of Indian caste can be added. Among other things, different ritual activities must be performed by particular caste groups. There are castes specialising in drum playing, carrying the dead, officiating at death ceremonies, etc. More often than not, the residences of different castes in Indian villages are not mixed; each caste group will occupy a certain area of the village, e.g. the residential blocks of the Untouchables are invariably at some distance from the blocks of the Brahmin or Ksatria. It is widely known that some caste groups are denied access to public utilities such as wells and temples. At the extreme, the Untouchables are even denied the use of the village road within the area of higher-caste residence. Some caste groups (the Untouchables) must not even show themselves in public; they have to hide themselves from being seen by Brahmin.

Although there have been some changes in caste practices, the notion of caste with these characteristics still remains (cf. Oommen 1990; Kjaerholm 1991; Omvedt 1993; Milner 1994; Quigley 1994). Even in recent sociological dictionaries, published in the 1990s, caste is defined as a form of social stratification “… the membership of which [caste] is ascribed, and between which contact is restricted” (Jary and Jary 1991: 59).
leader must come from *warga* such-and-such. In short, *warga* (or initial name) is not a passport to claim superiority.

In terms of occupation, there is no relation between initial names and occupation. *Warga* in Bali has nothing to do with occupation, since anybody is free to choose their field of work, based on talent, capital, and other circumstances; except for the high priesthood which is mostly, but not exclusively, assumed by people from *Warga Brahmana*. Geertz and Geertz’s experience in Bali is worth mentioning on this point. When they were conducting their fieldwork in Bali in 1957, they lived in the home of a Brahmana family, where the father was a barber. In India, being a barber is considered a very low occupation. It is out of the question that a *Brahmin* could take this job. In Bali, people of ‘high caste’ working as labourers for people of *Jaba* status are common, and this is not a new phenomenon. In the precolonial Balinese kingdoms, it was not uncommon for high ranking positions to be held by those who were considered *Sudra*. Examples are given by Vickers (1989), who states that some kingdoms maintained *Jaba* families in various ministries. He further discovered that out of 26 district heads (*pambekel gede*) in Buleleng in the 1850s, 16 were *Jaba*; and out of 54 village heads (*pambekel*) in Gianyar in 1884, 27 were *Jaba*.

---

11 Using initial name as an indicator, statistical data show that out of 1305 *desa adat* throughout Bali in 1994, 1224 were headed by people of *Jaba* status.

12 As we have seen in the Indian case, the professions of caste groups are fixed and caste members have limited choice, though this is changing at present.

13 “During the period of fieldwork in Tabanan, from August to December 1957, we lived in the home of a Brahmana family, a barber with a college-educated son” (Geertz and Geertz 1975: 33).

14 In the 1960s, my own family, a member of *Warga Pasek Saptarasi*, which belongs to the *Jaba* category, had a number of servants (*jurugae*). One was Ida Bagus Murdha, the head of a poor Brahmana family with four children from Gianyar; and the other (until 1976) was a widow of a *Gusti* from Badung, with her only son. A number of other *Gusti* from Badung and Gianyar also seasonally came to my village to seek menial jobs, such as rice hulling, rice harvesting, or ploughing in the rice field of *Jaba* people.

15 Although, in reference to the Triwangsa-Jaba ratio, these figures suggest that the *Jaba* were under-represented, at the same time the figures also show that the *Jaba* were not always at the bottom of the status ladder, and they are not ‘the rest of the society.’
Plates 3.1 and 3.2. The importance of warga in contemporary Bali can be seen from warga temples. A lot of warga have renovated their temples (eg. Pura Kawitan Warga Kayu Selem, above). Other warga, who previously did not have kawitan temples, have also built new ones (eg. Dalem Tarukan, below).
Plates 3.3 and 3.4. The increasing importance of warga can also be indicated by the increasing number of signboards of warga temples along the roads all over Bali.
Language Use: Exchange of Respect

The only easily observable expression of status hierarchy in present day life is in the use of language, particularly if the conversation is conducted in the Balinese language. Traditionally, those from higher status speak in low Balinese (kasar) to those of lower status, while those of lower status had to speak in a refined manner, high Balinese (halus). This practice can still be found to some extent in rural areas, particularly among the elderly. Most people, however, tend to use the same level of language no matter to whom they are speaking. The Jaba invariably speak in refined language to the Triwangsa at first, and later the language used depends on the partners’ answer. If the Triwangsa people use the ordinary level (Bali madya, meaning not refined, but not necessarily coarse), the answer would be the same. However, there is a tendency at present to use Bahasa Indonesia instead of Balinese, particularly in urban settings.\(^\text{16}\)

The terms of address used in conversations are also an obvious indication of relative status. To an Ida Bagus, Cokorda, and Anak Agung, a Jaba or a Gusti generally uses the honorific term of address “tu,” (from ratu ‘sir’), regardless of their relative ages. Those who consider themselves ‘higher’ will speak to the addressee using genealogical kinship terms, depending on their relative ages or real genealogical relations.\(^\text{17}\) On the other hand, it is improper for a ‘lower-ranked’ person to address a ‘higher’ one using these genealogical terms. For those who have an honorific initial name, the proper terms of address are the contraction of their initial names and their marital status.\(^\text{18}\) In pre-independence

\(^{16}\) In contrast to Balinese language, which has grammatical levels for status marking, Bahasa Indonesia has practically no grammatical status marking. This is not to say that status marking in Bahasa Indonesia does not exist, but it is very subtle and limited only to the choice of pronoun.

\(^{17}\) These terms of address are “kak” (‘grandfather’), “dadong” or “embahi” (‘grandmother), “bapa” or “nanang” (‘father’), “meme” (‘mother’), “beli” (‘elder brother’), “embok” (‘elder sister’), or “uwa” (‘uncle’).

\(^{18}\) These terms are “ida aji” (for a married Ida Bagus with children), “dayu biang” (for an Ida Ayu with children), “gung kak” (for an Anak Agung who has grandchildren), “gus de,” “gus tut,” or “gus man” (for an unmarried Ida Bagus, where ‘de,’ ‘man,’ and ‘tut’ are contractions of ‘gede’ or ‘made,’ ‘nyoman,’ and ‘ketut’), and so forth.
Indonesia, and to a certain extent until now, those who feel that they are ‘higher’ could even use “cai” (‘you,’ at a very low level) to address lower ranking people. These terms of address are now changing, and currently most people of higher social status tend to address others politely. For example, an Anak Agung or an Ida Bagus would address people of Jaba as “Beli Made,” “Beli Putu,” “Bapa Pan Sari,” etc. This is because if the Anak Agung or Cokorda addressed a Jaba with an impolite term, the Jaba might return the address in the same manner (called nebah or katebah). Being addressed in the same manner (katebah) in public is generally a matter of shame. Cokorda Agung Suyasa, my informant from Warga Ksatria Dalem Sukawati in Ubud told me:

Who will we call ‘cai’ now? Everybody needs to be respected, and everybody will feel insulted if I speak in low Balinese. If we want to be respected, we have to respect others. I always talk politely with anyone, even to those who were traditionally my subjects. If I call them ‘cai,’ then what will happen if they say ‘cai’ as well to me? I cannot imagine if I were katebah like that.... It must be very irritating, while I cannot sue them in the court because our law admits that we are all equal.

A similar opinion was held by Anak Agung Oka Negara, my landlord in Ubud, also from Warga Ksatria Dalem Sukawati. In his opinion,

It is more difficult to be a Triwangsa, because we have to behave well. If we, Anak Agung, speak or behave improperly, people will easily say ‘what is an Anak Agung!’ (Anak Agung apa keto!). With the change of situation in social interaction, Triwangsa people must observe their speaking manner, because there is no sanction for the Jaba to copy our way of speaking, especially in terms of the level of the language used (nebah).

In most situations, the use of neutral words when addressing others, such as Indonesian “pak” for men and “bu” for women, is becoming more common, even though the conversation flows in Balinese.
Plate 3.5  In public temples and public ceremonies, the faithful are seated at random, regardless of their warga of origin, and are sprinkled with holy water by pemangku, who are mostly of Jaba status.

Plate 3.6  An Ida Bagus (Warga Brahmana Siwa) is being sprinkled with holy water by a Jaba pemangku during a ceremony in Besakih, 1996.
Purity, Pollution, and Contact

The governing principle of status associated with warga in Bali is not directly associated with purity and pollution, which is a basic principle in the Indian caste system. In Bali, purity is defined by ritual ceremonies such as pawintenan, panglukatan, or dwijati (padiksan)\(^\text{19}\) and, of course, actual conduct. Temple priests (pemangku) are mostly Jaba, and they are not considered ‘polluted.’ Being temple priests, they are the ones who can enter the most sacred parts of any shrine in the temple. No one else, not even members of Warga Brahmana, if they have not yet conducted pawintenan, can do so. Most Triwangsa people receive holy water (tirta) from pemangku. There are some, however, particularly from Warga Brahmana and Ksatria Dalem, who refuse to be sprinkled with holy water by a Jaba pemangku.

In April 1994, I participated in a temple festival in the Pura Dalem of Ubud. On the first day, there was a ritual to purify (mlaspas) the newly constructed temple gate, wall, and some statues in the temple. After a religious procession, the ceremony continued with a mass prayer (sembahyang bersama). The faithful all sat randomly in rows, no matter whether they were Anak Agung, Ida Bagus, Gusti, Pasek, Pande, or Dewa. The one exception was Keluarga Puri (the Cokorda group), who sat in reserved seats in the first rows. Before the praying, the chairman of Pura Dalem, I Wayan Ada, gave a short speech, describing the renovation of the temple, and thanking all contributors, particularly the Keluarga Puri, as well as the temple’s supporters. After him, the bendesa adat of Ubud, Cokorda Agung Suyasa also gave a speech, explaining the philosophy of the ceremony, and the position of the Pura Dalem. He also thanked all the contributors, and hoped that the good organisation and the high sense of mutual self-help would be maintained.

The praying was led by Ida Pedanda Putra Telaga from Banjarangkan (Klungkung). After the praying, the temple priests (pemangku) took holy water

\(^{19}\)All of these are purification rituals for human beings, but are different in their levels, complexity, and religious significance. The highest level of these rituals is the dwijati (twice-born ritual), i.e. the consecration ceremony to become a high priest.
from Ida Pedanda, to be sprinkled over the faithful. The Keluarga Puri, on the other hand, had prepared their own containers. A pemangku, I Made Sadia, who is from Warga Pasek Saptar Si, took a container from Keluarga Puri, and asked for holy water from Ida Pedanda. After filling it, he returned to the cokorda’s group’s row and handed the container to them. They then sprinkled themselves. The rest, whatever their honorific initial names were, were all sprinkled by the pemangku.

This procedure was repeated on the following day, when the supporters of the temple held another mass praying at night. The same practice was also applied when the Desa Adat Ubud conducted a melasti (a ritual for purifying sacred objects, including their barong, by the sea). At that time they also prayed together on the shore. On other occasions, such as in the praying together in relation to the temple festivals of Pura Desa (21 May 1994) and Pura Puseh (31 May 1994), the same procedures of sprinkling holy water were repeated.

Elsewhere, it is also not uncommon for a Jaba pemangku to sprinkle holy water for Triwangsa, as can easily be observed at the Penataran Agung (the central court) of Besakih temple. The pemangku in this so-called mother temple of Bali, who are mostly Jaba, randomly sprinkle holy water on the faithful. Only in very rare cases will the pemangku ask those seated in the first row whether they want to be sprinkled by the pemangku or prefer to do the sprinkling themselves. But this practice is not limited to Triwangsa. The pemangku usually also ask the faithful if the faithful are ‘important people,’ ie. high ranking government officials, such as bupati, camat, or Parisada officers.

These practices clearly show that there is no separation in terms of physical contact between people from different warga. If a sense of purity-impurity exists for some people, this is limited to the sprinkling of holy water. People of Triwangsa status do not object to their offerings being officiated by a Jaba pemangku; it is also common for a Jaba pemangku to lead the mass-praying in public temples.

Contact in terms of food is also very relaxed. In any ritual, in temples and in banjar alike, food is cooked by any banjar member, regardless of their warga. This food is used for offerings as well as being taken home by banjar members.
of all warga. High priests of Warga Brahmana (pedanda) also take food cooked and served by Jaba. Unlike the situation in India, inter-dining among people from different warga is common in Bali. This can be observed when they eat together in banjar, subak, or in temples. They sit together and take food from the same containers. The only prescribed rule is that they should not eat each other's leftovers (carikan).

**CHALLENGES TO THE STATUS DIFFERENCE**

Anthropological literature emphasised that Balinese lived in harmony (eg. Covarrubias 1937; De Zoete and Spies 1973; and Unud and Francillon 1975). As a matter of fact, conflicts have been part of Balinese life, including conflicts over status between the Jaba and the Triwangsa. Conflict between the Jaba and the Triwangsa is not a new phenomenon. Cases of conflicts, particularly in marriages, were reported by Friederich in 1849. However, open conflict with a clear battlefield between the Jaba and the Triwangsa can only be traced back to the 1920s, marked by the emergence of the exclusively Jaba organisation, called Surya Kanta.\(^{20}\) Surya Kanta blatantly challenged the status of the Triwangsa and called for equality. Challenges to the Triwangsa's status continue to the present, as seen in the conflicts of desa adat, which have led to the split of the desa adat based on warga.

**Surya Kanta Movement**

The emergence of the Surya Kanta movement was closely associated with the emergence of the new elite group of Jaba brought about by modern education. When the HIS (Hollands Inlandsche School, a Dutch school) was established in Singaraja in 1913, only pupils of Triwangsa status were admitted as students. The rich and progressive Jaba had to go to Probolinggo, Surabaya, Yogyakarta, or Batavia (Jakarta) to enter the same school. Graduating from

\(^{20}\) Surya Kanta has been discussed in a number of studies, such as Agung (1974, 1983); Bagus (1969, 1975, 1996); and Connor (1996).
HIS, most of them continued on to teacher training (*sekolah guru*). Graduates from these schools returned home to Bali and became the new elite in Balinese society. Some had double status (*Triwangsa* and educated), while others were educated *Jaba* who formed a new non-traditional elite. Education has given ways to these people, particularly the *Jaba*, to have access to broader knowledge, including world developments (outside Bali), and more importantly to written religious teachings other than Balinese lontar (palm-leaf manuscript). They started reading Hindu teachings based on Indian sources, or their translations and interpretation in English or Dutch. Associated with this development, this new elite brought progressive ideas and organised themselves in several new modern-style organisations (Agung 1974 and 1983).

The first Western-modelled organisation among Balinese youth was established in Singaraja in 1917 and called *Setiti Bali*. The main objective of this organisation was to help Balinese improve their economic and social well being, and to teach Balinese the philosophy of Hinduism. The activities of this organisation consisted of short courses, mainly on religion. However, this organisation did not last long. In 1921 another Western-style organisation, named *Soeita Gama Tirta*, was established. Although initiated by *Jaba*, mostly teachers and government officials, the organisation was chaired by a *Triwangsa*, I Gusti Bagus Jelantik, a member of *Raad van Kerta* (the Dutch court of justice). Other prominent figures in this organisation were I Gusti Tjakratenaya, I Ketut Putra, I Ketut Nesa, Ida Kade Sukera, I Nengah Metra, I Wayan Badra, I Nyoman Kadjeng, and I Ketut Djirna. The objective of this organisation was to disseminate Hindu teachings (Hinduism in Bali was known as *Agama Tirta* at that time) based on 'valid' sources, ie. *Veda, Bhagavadgitha, Sarasamuccaya*, and other written materials; and at the same time to alter the customs (*adat-istiadat*) which were considered no longer appropriate to a changing world. For example, there was a traditional rule, called *ajawera* ('do not reveal'), which meant that religious teachings could only be taught to *Triwangsa*; the rest were not allowed to learn, read, or touch holy books. For a discussion of the concept of *ajawera*, see Zurbuchen (1987), especially Chapter 2. They had to follow whatever they were instructed to do by the *pedanda*. *Soeita Gama Tirta* wanted to abolish

---

21 For a discussion of the concept of *ajawera*, see Zurbuchen (1987), especially Chapter 2.
this rule. However, not much of its program could be implemented since the organisation lasted for only one year.\(^{22}\)

In 1923 a new organisation emerged, named *Shanti*, which was in fact the continuation of *Soeita Gama Tirta*. To disseminate Hindu teachings, *Shanti* published a newsletter, named *Shanti Adnyana*, and established a girls’ school, called *Sekolah Perempuan Shanti*. The cooperation between *Triwangsa* and *Jaba* seemed to be quite smooth at the beginning. As time passed, however, conflict began to emerge. This stemmed from different perspectives regarding Balinese custom (*adat-istiadat*) in social interaction, particularly in communication. The *Triwangsa* generally used low-level Balinese (*kasar*) toward the *Jaba*, while the *Jaba* had to speak in a refined manner, using high-level Balinese (*halus*). Often in public the *Jaba* felt humiliated by the offensive manner of the *Triwangsa*. According to the *Jaba*, this was not appropriate in a changing world. The *Triwangsa*, on the other hand, maintained that such a custom ought to be conserved because it was a ‘law’ (*dresta*) in Balinese tradition. This conflict exploded after a hot debate at a general meeting of *Shanti* held in the house of Ida Gde Soewanda in Banjar. At the meeting, a *Jaba* member of the *Shanti*, I Ketut Nesa, said that “Balinese religion is bad.” He condemned the traditional practices of Balinese Hinduism, which discriminated against the faithful based on birth. Nesa’s comment invited hot debate. I Gusti Tjakratenaya described the situation as follows:

In a general meeting held in Banjar, at the house of Ida Gde Soewanda, the district head of Banjar, unexpectedly a member of *Shanti*, Ketut Nesa, a teacher in Bubunan village, boldly said that the BALINESE RELIGION IS BAD...

Because of Ketut Nesa’s statement, some Balinese, especially *Triwangsa* people who were still strongly ‘Balinese,’ became angry. They replied to Ketut Nesa’s accusation, resulting in the meeting becoming deadlocked. And it

\(^{22}\)According to the debate published in both *Bali Adnyana* and *Surya Kanta* newsletters, this organisation died because its head, I Gusti Jelantik, was very busy with his work as a judge, and also because the draft of its basic legislation had never been finished by I Ketut Nesa, who was assigned to do the task.
closed with unfinished discussions and left ill feelings....” (Bali Adnyana 5 [1929]: 2-3)23

After this meeting, the head of Shanti tried to organise other meetings, but always failed. In contrast, most Shanti members who were teachers (particularly the Jaba) left the organisation, followed by other Jaba members. This desertion significantly weakened the organisation. The nearly-defunct Shanti Adnyana newsletter was taken over by the Triwangsa group, and its name was changed to Bali Adnyana, under the editorship of I Gusti Putu Tjakratenaya.

On the other hand, the Jaba group formed a splinter organisation, officially founded on 1 November 1925, called Surya Kanta. This organisation was exclusively for Jaba. Its basic regulation stated, “those who are eligible to become members are Hindu Balinese of Jaba status, above 18 years of age, and of good character” (article 5). The objectives of Surya Kanta were to rehabilitate and develop the way of thinking of Balinese society, replacing what it saw as “the backward and traditional” with open mindedness, in accordance with modernisation and a changing world. It also aimed to minimise discrimination based on Jaba/Triwangsa status for Balinese and to improve and protect the fate of the Jaba; to simplify religious ceremonies, stressing more the philosophical aspects of the religion (tattwa); to modify custom which was contrary to the current situation; as well as to develop the Balinese economy.

To disseminate its ideas, the Surya Kanta published a monthly newsletter, also called Surya Kanta, the first issue being on 1 October 1925.24 The motto of the newsletter was “Penyebar kitab-kitab pusaka dan sesuluh kemajuan umum”

23 "Dengan tak tersangka-sangka, lantas pada suatu hari waktu diadakan vergadering di Banjar, yaitu di rumahnya Ida Gde Soewanda, punggawa District Banjar, lantas di antara anggota Shanti bernama Ketut Nesa kepala guru sekolah Bubunian dengan gagah berani berkata di muka vergadering mengatakan bahasa AGAMA BALI BURUK....

Karena tuduhan 1 Ketut Nesa semacam itu, adalah beberapa wong Bali, terutama Triwangsa yang masih berdara Bali, sama mendidih darahnya, terbukti lantas menyayat dan mempertahankan tuduhan 1 Ketut Nesa, sehingga vergadering menjadi kalut dan lantas dibubarkan dengan hasil yang sama kalutnya serta mengandung panas hati.”

24 In fact the publication was in press in July 1925. This can be seen from the newsletter’s heading, which reads ‘July 1925.’ This heading was crossed out by hand and changed to ‘October 1925.’ This also indicates that the group had been established and active months before its formal establishment (November 1925).
('The disseminator of holy books and the torch of general development'). This is in line with the objective of the Surya Kanta, to direct people's attention more to the philosophical aspects of the religion --based on holy books-- instead of merely to ritual aspects of the religion, and to accelerate modernisation in Bali. The eagerness to accelerate development (kemajuan) and to stress individual qualities rather than warga were clearly the main themes of the Surya Kanta movement. As stated by its president, I Nengah Metra, at a meeting on 29 December 1925, Surya Kanta was meant to seek development according to the present era, based on humanity and budi ['good character'], because it is the budi that can refine internal feelings and create eternal ties of brotherhood rooted in humanity... (Quoted from Surya Kanta No. 2).

Surya Kanta was also meant to provide a critical evaluation of Balinese tradition, to decide which parts must be maintained, and which must be discarded. In its third issue, in December 1925, the editor of Surya Kanta wrote that the publication of the Surya Kanta was meant to:

throw light on Bali and Lombok, not only in high places of beauty, but also in places that are low, deep, and indecent alike, without discriminating whether they are fragrant, rotten, glorious, or miserable, so that all can see themselves and others, as well as evaluate what must be abolished, modified, or strengthened, and which ones must be achieved.

In Surya Kanta's judgement, the Jaba population had been exploited by the Triwangsa, both physically and mentally. While the Jaba had been faithful, performed more work in banjar activities, and had spoken respectfully to the

---

25 "buat mencari kemajuan menurut zaman sekarang beralasan kemanusiaan serta berdasar dengan budi, sebab budi itulah yang dapat memperhalus perasaan bathin dan mengekalkan tali persaudaraan dengan alasan kemanusiaan..."

26 "menyinari alam Bali dan Lombok, bukannya pada tempat tinggi dan permai saja, maka pada tempat yang rendah, dalam dan mesum sekalipun disinari juga dengan tiada membedakan harum, busuk, mula, dan hina dina, agar sama-sama melihat diri sendiri dan kawan, serta yang mana harus dihapus, dirubah dan diteguhkan, demikianlah pula yang mana yang harus dituntut."
Triwangsa people, they received in return humiliation and irritation. 

Accordingly, the Surya Kanta campaigned for the Jaba to rid themselves of this oppression:

We hope that our nation, particularly the Jaba population, are ready to cast off all humiliation and other conduct that hinders development (Reflector, Surya Kanta No. 1, January 1926: 1).

The articles in Surya Kanta and Bali Adnyana were always opposed to each other; reflecting the conflict between the Jaba and the Triwangsa. The debate focused on the issues of Jaba-Triwangsa discrimination, which covered several topics, chief of which were the orientation of education, the maintenance of Balinese local tradition in social interaction, the simplification of religious ritual ceremonies, and marriage.

On Education

The Surya Kanta progressively campaigned for Balinese to pursue Western education in order to compete with other ‘nations,’ such as those of Java, Maluku, and Sumatra. Because of its Western orientation, the Surya Kanta at the same time criticised the Balinese pride in using traditional, ie. warga titles. In an article written by NS, which appeared in Surya Kanta No.2 (1926: 17-18), this position was made clear:

While other nations are competing to achieve titles, Mr, Dr, Ir, and all kinds of knowledge, quite a number of my countrymen in Bali strive to maintain their

---

27 "Apakah balasan sang Triwangsa kepada kebaktiannya sang Jaba? Hanyalah menindas dan menghina saja" (Surya Kanta No. 8 [1926]: 98).

28 "Kami mengharap, supaya bangsaku, terutama kaum Jaba mulai bersiap akan menghalaukan sekalian penghinaan dan tindakan yang dapat dikatakan sebagai rem kemajuan."

29 Most of the writers in Surya Kanta and Bali Adnyana used pseudonyms, which I follow here as is. It is unclear to me why they preferred to use pseudonyms.
inherited titles, which are now only valued in Bali; in years to come, such titles will decrease in value (influence) in comparison to titles based on knowledge.\textsuperscript{30}

In the view of \textit{Surya Kanta}, titles such as Dewa, Gusti, and the like were useless. What was important was \textit{budi} (good character). And for the future, Western titles such as Dr, Ir, Prof, and so forth would be much more valuable, and these were what the \textit{Jaba} should pursue. In a meeting on 21 March 1926 (\textit{Surya Kanta} No. 4[1926]: 60-63), the general secretary of the \textit{Surya Kanta} stated:

There is no point for us, the \textit{Jaba}, to seek (or expect) titles like Ida, Dewa, Gusti. Let us, the \textit{Jaba}, put priority on \textit{budi}, and let us do our best to pursue titles like Mr, Dr, Ir, and Professor, because it is the \textit{budi} and knowledge which can uplift [the status of] us, the \textit{Jaba} people.\textsuperscript{31}

Though Western education was the priority, Balinese tradition had also to be preserved, so that the Balinese people would not lose their identity. An article by Anali, published in \textit{Surya Kanta} No. 3 (March 1926: 71) entitled \textit{Kapankah Waktunya Kaum Jaba Bersatu} (‘When is the time for the \textit{Jaba} to unite’), metaphorically states:

the ship is to be headed to the West by its captain. However, we the passengers will not forget our Balinese origin, so that we prioritise also our heritage [\textit{pusaka}, ie. ‘Balinese teachings’] which has proved to be excellent.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{30}“Sedang bangsa lain berlomba-lomba mendapatkan gelar Mr., Dr., Ir., dan segala macam kepandaian, bangsaku di Bali banyak yang berikhtiar meneguhkan gelaran turunannya, yang kini berharga buat di tanah Bali sahaja, barangkali beberapa tahun lagi, tentu akan berkurang-kurang harganya (pengaruhnya) daripada gelaran yang berdasar kepandaian tersebut.”

\textsuperscript{31}“Kita kaum Jaba tidak perlu mencari (jangankan berharap) gelaran ida, Dewa, Gusti. Marilah kita kaum Jaba selalu mengutamakan budi, dan marilah berusaha sekuat-kuat kita, kejarlah gelaran Mr, Dr, Ir, dan Prof. karena budi dan kepandaian itulah yang dapat mengangkat kita kaum Jaba.”

\textsuperscript{32}“Perahu itu akan dituju ke Barat oleh nachodanya, meskipun demikian kita yang menumpang nachodanya tidak akan lupa dengan asal kita orang Bali, jadi kita akan mengutamakan juga segala pusaka kita yang memang utama.”
The Western oriented position of the *Surya Kanta* was challenged by the *Bali Adnyana* group. In contrast, *Bali Adnyana* viewed Western titles as useless in the Balinese context, and would even create a burden for society:

Where are we heading in development? O, to the West, to the West! Once reaching the West, would not we become devils? Of course! ... What kind of development has been proposed to us by the *Surya Kanta* through its trumpet? To search for Western knowledge as high as possible, to achieve titles Professor, Mister, Doctor, Engineer, and so forth. For whose pleasure is this kind of development? Is it true, and can we believe, that this is all for the sake of the people? Ha ha! I feel the contrary is the truth, because the people must serve their desires (*Bali Adnyana* : 2).  

### On Marriage

The *Surya Kanta* severely criticised the practice of marriage involving different warga in Bali as it was performed at that time. They considered such practice inhuman. The tradition of punishing a Jaba man who married a Triwangsa woman and the tradition of marriage by dagger with all its consequences, according to the *Surya Kanta*, were unfair traditions. In addition, the rules applied only to the Balinese, while if a Triwangsa woman married a non-Balinese man, such rules were void. The editor’s note in *Surya Kanta* No. 8 (August 1926: 92-93) under the title of *Kaum Jabakah yang Tiada Tahu Membalas Guna?* (*Is it the Jaba people who do not know how to be grateful?”) clearly protested against these practices:

---


34 There was a practice, that if a Triwangsa man married a Jaba woman, the groom would refuse to hold the marriage ceremony with the bride. To have a legal marriage in adat terms, during the marriage ceremony the groom would be represented by a dagger (keris) --and hence this practice was called kawin keris-- or by a pillar (adegan) of his house --hence this practice was called kawin adegan. For the rest of her life, the bride would have low status in the family: she would not be allowed to sit on the same level with her husband, in-laws, and children; when she died, her corpse would not be carried by her husband's relatives, etc.
[If] a Triwangsa woman is going to be married to a Jaba man, even if they love each other, the woman’s parents will feel offended, and file a case with the court. However, if their daughter is married to a Javanese, Chinese, Dutch or another nationality, no action is taken.

[If] the Jaba woman is married to a Triwangsa man, the groom will hesitate to use the same offerings at the marriage ceremony. If the marriage is childless, the husband and his relatives will refuse to carry her corpse when the woman passes away. If she has no relatives to do so, hired labourers will be used. 35

A supporter of the Surya Kanta, A. Kobar, also wrote in Surya Kanta No. 9/10 (Sept-Oct 1926: 131) about the same matter:

A lot of Sasak people married Balinese Triwangsa women, but the cases were just resolved informally... as in several regions of Southern Bali, numerous Chinese men married Triwangsa, but that does not matter... In other words, the rule is only for their own countrymen, ... while for other nations there is no regulation. 36

Bali Adnyana seemed to have no direct answer to this point. Nonetheless there were articles that indirectly discussed Balinese marriage customs, arguing that the marriage tradition had been practiced for generations, which meant, in their judgement, the tradition had been tested through time and proved to be good for Balinese society.

On Daily Interaction

The Surya Kanta strongly criticised the discrimination of the Balinese based on descent (keturunan). For the Surya Kanta, what was important was

35 “Seorang perempuan Triwangsa apabila hendak dikawin oleh seorang laki-laki Jaba, meskipun sama sukanya kedua anak muda itu, maka orang tua anak perempuan itu tiada senang hatinya, kemudian dimintakanlah hukuman kepada pengadilan. Tetapi apabila anaknya dikawin oleh orang Jawa, Cina, Belanda dan lain orang bangsa lain, taklah diperbuat apa-apa. Seorang perempuan Jaba yang dikawin oleh seorang laki-laki Triwangsa, ketika natab banten si laki tak suka bersama-sama. Dan apabila dalam perkawinan tiada mendapat anak (bekung), besok kalau perempuan itu mati, mayatnya tiada mau diusung oleh lakinya dengan sefamilinya, kalau tak ada familianya dari si perempuan itu memikul, terpaksa diupahkan saja.”

36 “Banyak ada orang sasak mengambil bangsawan Bali, tetapi akhirnya cuma diputuskan persaudaraanya saja... seperti di beberapa tempat di Zuid Bali, tiada kurang bangsa Tionghoa yang mengambil bangsawan-bangsawan Bali, tapi ya, tak apa-apa... Dengan perkataan lain, itu hukum untuk mengenai bangsanya sendiri... sedang terhadap pada orang lain tidak ada suatu ketentuan apa-apa”
individual character, budi (good character). In line with the theory of budi, the
Surya Kanta proposed that the interaction of people in society should be based
on this budi. In other words, respect, particularly in terms of the language levels
used, should disregard the initial names of warga. To support this idea, Surya
Kanta was fond of quoting Hindu holy books, particularly the Sanskrit versions
of Reg Veda, Sarasamuccaya, and Bhagavadgitha, or the Javanised versions of
Mahabharata and Ramayana. In these books, they found that respect should be
due to those who have good manners (berbudi luwur), regardless of their origins.
I Nengah Merta, in his article Pemandangan (‘Viewpoints’), published in Surya
Kanta No.1 (October 1925: 4-5) quoted the Sarasamuccaya, article 161, and
gave the translation as follows:

Yadyapi Brahmana tuwi, yan dussila, tan yogya katowanganan. Mon
sudratuwi, yan darmika, susila pujan katowangana jugaka, ling sang hyang
aji.

Even though Brahmin [by birth], if wicked, they do not deserve respect. Even
though Sudra [by birth], if good in character, they are the ones who deserve
respect, so says Sang Hyang Aji [the holy books].

This article was supported by various later articles. Among these, NM from
Lombok in his article in Surya Kanta No 9110 (Sept-Oct 1926: 128-129)
ettitled Mestika Bangsa (‘The pearl of the nation’) cited several passages (sloka)
from the Sanskrit holy books and finally reached a conclusion, ie. the concept of
‘manusa pada’ (‘equality among humans’). Based on this concept, he asserted
that the titles of Triwangsa such as Gusti, Dewa, Anak Agung, and Ida Bagus
were no more than just a name (‘hanya sekedar nama’). However, it seemed
that some Jaba maintained a moderate position. They did not call for instant
changes in the terms of the exchange of respect. Because of tradition, an article
said, the Jaba would continue to respect the Triwangsa as long as the Triwangsa
behaved well. The Triwangsa should follow the rules prescribed by the lontar
called Widi Papincatan. Otherwise, it would not be the fault of the Jaba if the
Jaba did not respect the Triwangsa as they had in the past. The Triwangsa in
this case would be punished for their own sins. To maintain respect and to
protect the Triwangsa’s initial names from being treated merely as a name, the
Jaba called upon the Triwangsa to give a good example to the Jaba. In an article published in Surya Kanta No. 6/7 (June/July 1926: 86) entitled Widi Papincatan Mendekat (‘The Widi Papincatan is approaching’), the writer stated:

Hence we appeal to all our Balinese Hindu countrymen, especially the Triwangsa people. Would you please follow the ethics based on your respective duties; since it is you, the Triwangsa, who should give an example to my Jaba brothers in order that your titles would not be considered merely a name.\(^{37}\)

The Jaba would reserve their respect for the ‘good Triwangsa,’ ie the Triwangsa who were honest, educated, and respected the Jaba in return. The editorial of Surya Kanta No. 3 (March 1926: 33), entitled Sikap Kita (‘Our position’), noted:

We the Jaba must respect the Triwangsa according to their respective levels. In return we ask them to respect us accordingly, not to insult our feelings as Jaba.... Toward the Triwangsa who are honest and fair to us, it goes without saying that we will put them high, we will not forget our homage and respect to them.\(^{38}\)

The theory of budi, proposed by the Jaba as the main determinant in social interaction in Bali was rejected by the Bali Adnyana. They considered that while budi should be taken into account in social interaction, there were other more important factors, chief of which was the traditional status (what they called kewangsaan), ie. Triwangsa versus Jaba. Bali Adnyana’s view was that language levels used as symbols of respect must be maintained as they had always been. A Jaba, however good he was, deserved only middle level language (madya) from the Triwangsa. A Triwangsa, in contrast, however bad

---

\(^{37}\) “Dari itu kami berseru kepada sekalian bangsaku Bali Hindu, terutama pada kaum Triwangsa, sukalah tuan menepati sesana tuan masing-masing yang telah menjadi kewajiban tuan; karena tuanlah yang patut memberikan conto kepada saudaraku Jaba, supaya gelaran tuan-tuan tidak dianggap nama saja”

\(^{38}\) “Kita kaum Jaba mesti menghormati sang Triwangsa menurut masing-masing tingkat dan derajatnya. Sebaliknya kita minta kepadanya, agar dia menghormati kita, seberapa patutnya kehormatan itu dijatuhkan kepada kita, yang kiranya tiada menyakitkan hati dan telinga kita Jaba.... Kepada Triwangsa yang jujur hati dan adil terhadap kepada kita, jangan dikata lagi, kita akan junjung tinggi, sembah dan sujud tidak kita lupakan.”
he was, must be addressed in high level language (utama) by the Sudra. As in other debates, the Triwangsa maintained that this was so because of the adat and teaching of Balinese Hinduism. Writing in Bali Adnyana No. 16 (1926: 1-2), I Gusti Tjakratenaya said:

BUDI: a Sudra with excellent budi deserves madya language from a Triwangsa, and utama from his fellow Sudra. KEWANGSAAN: a Triwangsa people, although stupid (lacking in budi), deserves utama language from a Sudra. DERAJAT: a Sudra holding high position or well behaved deserves madya language from a Triwangsa, and utama from Sudra. This has been practiced in Bali and Lombok by Balinese Hindus who know the custom.

The effort to change the tradition of Triwangsa-Jaba discrimination was considered dangerous by the Bali Adnyana. For them, articles in Surya Kanta were extremely irritating to the Triwangsa, and contained the seeds of dissent among the Balinese. If this was to continue, Balinese culture would be destroyed. Bali Adnyana strongly maintained that the Balinese should preserve their traditional customs or tata-lokacara. The voice of the Surya Kanta, advocating the ‘reconsideration’ of the custom, was considered revolutionary and insulting to the Triwangsa as well as the older generation. The editorial of Bali Adnyana No. 19 (1926: 4-5) stated:

Seeds that have been sown by the Surya Kanta always humiliate the nation and insult the Triwangsa as well as sadden older people, because their criticism is getting worse and is spoiling the culture of our Balinese Hinduism.... I am

---

39 There are principally three levels in Balinese language, ie. utama (high level), madya (middle level), and nista (low level). Each of these levels is also distinguished again based on the relative status of the pronoun. In the high level, for example, there are high level for high-status person (halus singgih), high level for ‘ordinary’ people (halus mider), and high level for lowly people or for animals (halus sor). The use of these levels is strictly governed by the relative status between the speaker and the addressee or the speaker and the third person mentioned. In deviance of this rule, however, low Balinese is commonly also used as a friendship language (bahasa pergaulan) without a feeling of being degraded or degrading among the parties involved.

40 "BUDI: Seorang Sudra yang utama budinya mendapat ia bahasa madya dari orang Triwangsa, dan utama dari Sudra. KEWANGSAAN: seorang Triwangsa walaupun bodoh sekalipun (kurang budi) mendapat is bahasa utama dari orang Sudra. DERAJAT: seorang Sudra yang berpangkat atau baik laksananya, mendapat ia bahasa madya dari orang Triwangsa, dan utama dari orang Sudra. Beginilah memang sudah berlaku di Bali dan Lombok bagi orang Bali Hindu yang tahu pada adat tata loka cara."
sure, should the *Surya Kanta* continue to spread these dangerous seeds, the order of Bali island will be under threat....

*Surya Kanta*’s promotion of equality among Balinese led the *Bali Adnyana* to accuse the *Surya Kanta* of being a communist movement. In an article entitled *Agama dan Adat Bali Terancam Bahaya Merah* (‘Balinese custom and religion is threatened by the red menace’), I Gusti Tjakratenaya told his readers that the *Surya Kanta* was the son of communism, who would destroy Balinese tradition and religion. A supporter of the *Bali Adnyana*, Bawak (*Bali Adnyana* No. 16 [1926: 5-6]), supported Tjakratenaya by saying that *Surya Kanta* was really communist and that its objective was exactly the same as that of the communists, ie. to achieve total equality, no hierarchy, except that based on *budi* ("*agar tercapai maksudnya bersifat sama rata sama rasa, ringkasnya tiada ada pertingkatan bangsa, hanya pertingkatan budi*.

The practice of *Triwangsa* people refusing to eat from dishes that had been used by *Jaba* people was also a topic of debate. In *Surya Kanta*’s view, such a practice clearly showed that the *Triwangsa* were inconsistent or hypocritical. A writer, I.K.Dj. from Lombok, in *Surya Kanta* No. 6/7 (June/July 1926: 92) in his article *Adat Berjamu* (‘Tradition of serving’) wrote:

*Triwangsa* refuse to use the *patamohan* [dishes that are used daily] of *Jaba* people because they think that they are different from us, meaning that they feel that they are from a higher race. In this case, it seems to me that [such a practice] is very clumsy, as if they never ever eat or buy food sold in small food stalls surrounding a market, eg. tea, coffee, etc. Oh, oh, beware! What dishes are used [by the sellers]? In no way would the sellers hurriedly buy new dishes once they see that their customers are *Triwangsa* people, and use such new dishes to serve them? Ah! very-very unthinkable!! Clearly, the dishes used daily are used again. Oh!! Beware again!! What [kind of] people have never used the dishes in such food stalls?

---

41 “bibit-bibit yang disebar oleh pengarang-pengarang Surya Kanta yang selalu menghina bangsa dan menyakitkan hati kaum Triwangsa serta menyedihkan perasaan kaum tua, karena caciannya, hingga merajalela dan merusakkan peradaban kita Bali Hindu ... Penulis berani pastikan, apabila terus-menerus lakunya Surya Kanta menyebab benih yang berbahaya itu, tentulah akan merusakkan keamanan Pulau Bali ....”

42 “Triwangsa tiada mau memakai barang petamohan kepunyaan kita kaum Jaba, oleh karena mereka merasa dirinya amat berbeda kepada kaum Jaba, artinya merasakan dirinya sendiri terlebih mula bangsanya. Dalam hal yang demikian itu, maka sangatlah heran kami
On Preservation of Balinese Culture and Rituals

The *Surya Kanta* was critical of Balinese culture and traditions. In its view, several practices were no longer acceptable and hence had to be altered or modified. For *Surya Kanta* supporters,

The World is continuously changing, and all its contents keep changing; rules and traditions that were good in the old time are not necessarily good at present, and not all people may like to use them. (N in *Pemimpin Rakyat*, ‘The leader of the people,’ *Surya Kanta* No. 2 [Feb. 1926: 26])

In contrast, *Bali Adnyana*, as usual, maintained that Balinese traditions had been tested for centuries, and had proved to be excellent. Moreover, Balinese traditions were part of the Balinese Hinduism. Consequently, altering Balinese tradition automatically meant altering Balinese Hinduism, and this would result in punishment by God.

The *Surya Kanta* severely criticised the extravagance of some ritual ceremonies, especially the *ngaben* (cremation ceremony). They proposed to simplify the ritual, and to return to the written sources on conducting ceremonies. According to them, the *ngaben* ceremony, which was usually performed on a very large scale, had caused poverty for the Balinese since people often had to sell their land to have enough money to pay the expense of the *ngaben*. At that time, there was also a practice of classifying the ‘grade’ of the *ngaben* based on the price of the holy water (*tirta*). The price of the *tirta* for *utama* (high-level) was 16,000 *kepeng* (Chinese coin); *madya* (middle-level) 8,000 *kepeng*, and *nista* 1,000 *kepeng*. This practice was strongly criticised by

*memikirkan di dalam hati, rasa-rasanya tak pernah sekali-kali kaum Triwangsa itu memakan atau membeli barang suatu makanan yang dijual dijual orang di dalam warung yang ada di tepi pasar, umpamanya: membeli the, kopi, dan lain-lainnya. O o, Awas! Barang apakah yang dipakainya itu? Masakan si penjual itu repot waktu ia melihat ada kaum Triwangsa berbelanja padanya lalu is tergesa-gesa mencabarikan ataupun membelikan barang-barang yang baharu (yang belum pernah dipakai ‘sukla’) akan diperbuatnya menyediakan mereka itu? Ah! Mustahil sekali!! Sudah nyata, niscaya barang yang dipakai sehari-harilah yang dipakainya. O! Awas lagi!! Bangsa atau kaum apakah yang belum pernah memakai barang yang di warung itu?"

43."Dunia ini selalu berpusing, dan segala isinya senantiasa berubah, yang baik baik buat purwa dresta dan tata lokacara di zaman dahulu, tidak semuanya baik buat zaman sekarang, dan belum tentu orang suka pakai dan melakukannya."
Surya Kanta. They questioned whether a priest would use different mantra (sacred formula) in the making of the holy water merely because of the different payments he had received. If so, this was really an unacceptable practice for them. For these reasons, Surya Kanta strongly urged the Balinese to read their holy books and give more attention to the philosophical aspects of the religion rather than the merely ritualistic aspects. In the case of ngaben, for example, Surya Kanta cynically questioned whether one’s sins could be wiped out by ngaben, which meant nothing but ‘money.’ To support this idea, Surya Kanta continually cited sloka from holy books which asserted that one’s sin can only be reduced by one’s own actions. In contrast, Bali Adnyana praised the extravagance of the ngaben, saying that such a practice was a symbol of the excellence of Balinese culture. As an indicator of respect towards parents or ancestors, ngaben had to be conducted in such a way to honour the parents and ancestors. In addition, ngaben was also an occasion where the poor banjar members were fed by the rich (Bali Adnyana No. 24[1926: 4-5])

In an effort to neutralise the endless conflict between Jaba and Triwangsa, (Surya Kanta vs. Bali Adnyana), a number of moderate Triwangsa together with moderate Jaba founded a new organisation on 2 May 1926, whose membership consisted of Balinese Hindus, regardless of their warga. The organisation was called Perkumpulan Tjatur Wangsa Derya Gama Hindu Bali, and was based in Klungkung. This organisation, however, failed to gain popularity. It was severely criticised by Surya Kanta for the internal contradiction in its objectives. Another organisation emerged in Denpasar on 14 July 1935, named Eka Laksana, which was later changed to Bali Dharma Laksana.

The conflict subsided during the independence movement, probably because everyone was concentrating on the independence war. After independence, the conflict emerged again, but in a different form. The conflict was brought to the legislative body of the province (DPRD). After years of struggle, the Jaba achieved a significant victory in 1951, when the government formally abolished

44 “Pedanda yang menjual tirta berbeda-beda wedanya hanya dengan lantaran perbedaan sesantun saja tidak masuk akal bagi penulis” (WK, Ngaben. SK No. 2 [Nov 1925: 8]).
the marriage prohibition among different warga (asu mundung and anglangkahi karang ulu) through Provincial Regulation (Peraturan Daerah) No. 11/1951.

The highest Hindu Council, Parisada Hindu Dharma Indonesia (or Parisada, for short), was established on 23 February 1959. The Parisada has brought considerable reforms to Hinduism in Bali. Hand in hand with the national laws, this board has been used by the Jaba in their struggle for equality, despite the fact that the board has been dominated by Triwangsa, particularly Warga Brahmana. In the general meeting (mahasabha) in 1968, the Jaba

45 The Parisada Hindu Dharma Indonesia, or Parisada (sometimes also shortened to PHDI), is the highest Hindu council in Indonesia. The establishment of this council was motivated by the fact that since the power of the rulers in Bali had been transferred to the bupati in 1957, no one was responsible for the management of Hindu affairs. Previously, based on Dutch regulations (zelfbestuur rechtgelen 1938), the ruler was the head of government, adat, and religion at kabupaten level, whereas the bupati was merely the head of local government. On the other hand, the government’s Department of Religion had not recognised the Hinduism as a formal religion, and hence this department did not concern itself with Hinduism. At that time, Hinduism was only ‘registered’ (terdaftar) in the Indonesian Department of Religion.

The council was established on 23 February 1959 in Denpasar, under the name Parisada Dharma Hindu Bali. Given that Hindus are not restricted to Bali, and the name of the religion was formally designated as Hindu religion or Hindu Dharma, instead of Hindu Bali, the name of the council was changed at its first mahasabha (general assembly) on 7-10 October 1964 in Denpasar to Parisada Hindu Dharma Indonesia. The organisational structure of the council ranges from the national (central) level down through provincial, kabupaten, kecamatan, to the village level.

A number of reforms have been carried out by the Parisada. Among those which are relevant to the present discussion are the following: (1) simplifying the ngaben ceremony, using a lontar called Yama Purwana Tattwa, as well as encouraging collective ngaben; (2) socialising the Trisandhya (the three prayer times) using the Gayatri mantra in schools and before mass praying, whereas chanting this mantra had not been allowed before; (3) allowing every Hindu access to the holy Scriptures (Bhagavadgitha, Sarasamuccaya, and Veda), which had previously been the monopoly of certain groups; (4) constructing the Jagatnatha public temple in Denpasar, which was aimed to accommodate migrants from outside Denpasar, as well as to neutralise the difference of warga among Balinese Hindus; (5) giving formal recognition that the priesthood (dwijati) is not the monopoly of certain warga, but the right of every Hindu, and asserting all high priests (sulinggih) are equal in status; (6) reinforcement of the provincial regulation No. 11/1951, i.e. the abolition of the rule of salah pati (bad death) and ngulah pati (death by suicide), whereas previously, those who were classified salah pati and ngulah pati were treated differently in that they were not entitled to be cremated and had to use lower status ceremonies. One more important decision was that Parisada agreed to the draft Marriage Regulation for Hindus (Undang-Undang Perkawinan Hindu) at its first mahasabha, on 7-10 October 1964. In this draft, it was stated that marriage should be based on mutual love, and status difference was not discussed as a criterion of marriage, which implied that there was no prohibition on inter-warga marriage. This draft failed to be ratified by the central government because at that time the government itself did not have a national marriage law. (More information on the Parisada can be found in Gosa 1986; Forge 1980; Lyon 1980; and Bakker 1993)
achieved another advance, by gaining formal recognition of their priests. The decision of mahasabha No. V/1968 explicitly states that any Hindu is entitled to conduct a twice-born (dwijati) ceremony and to become a high priest, and all high priests are equal, regardless of their warga of origin. By the same token, since 1968 the priesthood has formally ceased to be the sole prerogative of Warga Brahmana.

Return to the Veda Movement

Despite its short existence (less than three years), the role of the Surya Kanta in developing a ‘tradition’ for Balinese Hindus to read their religious teachings --not merely ‘orthopraxy’ as indicated by Geertz’s term-- was significant. It advocated that Balinese Hindus read Indian sources. As is clear from articles published in the Surya Kanta newsletter, members of the Surya Kanta also urged Balinese Hindus to read Balinese manuscripts. Based on this position, the Surya Kanta strongly rejected the ajawera concept --which states that religious teachings cannot be read by everybody, but only by those of Triwangsa status. With regard to the Indian sources, leaders of the Surya Kanta introduced the Sarasamuccaya, Bhagavadgitha, and other Indian sources, in addition to Balinese manuscripts. Nengah Metra and other leaders of the Surya Kanta often quoted Sarasamuccaya, Adiparwa (the first volume of the Mahabharata epic), Ramayana, and Mahatma Gandhi’s teachings in their articles to justify the ideology of equality, and to legitimise the idea that good character (budi) and actual behaviour --instead of birth-- should be the basis of respect. Another leader of the Surya Kanta, I Nyoman Kadjeng, translated the Sarasamuccaya into Indonesian. This was the first translation made available to the Balinese.

Citing Vedic holy books such as Rg Veda, Bhagavadgitha, Sarasamuccaya, and Manawa Dharmasastra, has been becoming popular among Balinese, especially among educated Balinese. This ‘tradition’, introduced by the Surya

46. However, I do not have reliable data on what language these sources were quoted from, whether Sanskrit, Dutch, or English.
Kanta movement in the 1920s, continues, even blooming at present. This ‘tradition’ recently has developed to become a ‘back to the Veda’ movement, subscribed to by those who are in favour of equality. Indeed, there are Vedic Hindu sources which implicitly and explicitly mention the equal status of people before God. And if there are differences in society, they are based on guna and karma (individual talent and achievement), and not on birth. The concept of tat twam asi (‘you are me’) from Chandogya Upanishad (VI.8.7) is one of the most popular quotations, which declares that all human beings are the same (equal). Another quotation is Rg Veda I.80.1, that “everyone must recognise everybody else’s independence and dignity” (Titib 1993).

The trend to ‘return to the Veda,’ so to speak, is clearly associated with education, the increasing ability to read Sanskrit or the English translations, and the more open access to the Scriptures and their interpretations. A middle class group, whose members were mostly from the Jaba, led by Putu Setia, actively conducted discussions on the Veda vis-à-vis the existence of social stratification among Balinese Hindus. Some results of the discussions were published in books such as Cendekiawan Hindu Bicara (‘Hindu Intellectuals Speak,’ 1991), Kasta dalam Hindu: kesalahpahaman berabad-abad (‘Caste in Hinduism: centuries of misinterpretation,’ 1993), and Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Hindu (Human Rights in Hinduism,’ 1994). All of these books condemn the hierarchical structure of Balinese society. The same group also published a monthly magazine called Aditya, but because of difficulty in gaining a publication permit, only a few issues were published in 1993. This magazine was later changed to a journal, called Raditya, published by a foundation (so it does not need a special publication permit), the first issue being October 1995.

47 It must be noted here that the Hindu’s Veda is a large corpus of accumulated knowledge, incomparable to Islam’s Koran or the Christian’s Bible (Titib 1993; Wiana 1995). Because of its nature, the Vedic teachings can be interpreted in extremely opposing positions, depending on which verses and what era of the Veda are taken. Sarasamuccaya, one of the most famous holy books known in Bali, for example, supports hierarchy, but some of its verses also state the equality of humans. Naturally, those from the Jaba only quote and (re)interpret the verses in favour of equality. Within the discourse of Pancasila, the citing of these kinds of verses gains more sympathy than those of hierarchy.

48 It is noteworthy that the writers of the articles in these books are not solely from Jaba, but also from Triwangsa.
To a great extent, the contents and mission of both the Aditya and Raditya are the same as those of the Surya Kanta newsletter published by the Surya Kanta group in the 1920s. It should be safe to state that the Aditya and the Raditya are 'reincarnations' of the Surya Kanta. All promulgate the spread of Veda and other Indian sources of Hindu teachings, supplemented by local sources (babad, purana, and the like). Aside from these publications, the same group has also organised a semi-formal course on Hinduism (kursus agama), free of charge. This is apparently an activity of those who support the movement to 'return to the Veda.' Although the driving force behind this movement is mostly Jaba, some of whom are leaders of warga organisation, they are not directly associated with their warga organisations. Nonetheless, to a large extent their mutual influence on each other has been apparent.

**Contemporary Conflict: The Break-Down of Desa Adat**

Despite rapid process in modernisation and intensive contacts with the global culture brought about by mass media, the tourist industry, internationalisation and the Indonesianisation of Balinese culture and society, conflicts associated with the traditional relative status of warga still arise in present day Bali. As evidence, I will present three recent cases that have occurred in Desa Adat Tegallalang (Bangli), Desa Adat Kutri (Gianyar), and Banjar Adat Lantangbejuh (Denpasar).

**Case 1: Desa Adat Tegallalang**

In dinas terms, Desa Adat Tegallalang is merely one lingkungan (sub-village) in Kelurahan Kawan, Kabupaten Bangli. Its membership consists of several warga, such as Prasangiang, Pragusti, Pasek Saptapati, Tangkas, Pande, and Brahmana Siwa. Out of the 90 families that constituted the desa adat in 1992, 24 were from Warga Brahmana Siwa. At the end of 1991, leaders of this desa adat participated in a short course in Denpasar, administered by the MPLA (Majelis Pembina Lembaga Adat or Council for the Development of Adat Institutions), to instruct desa adat leaders on 'innovations' for making desa adat
uniform throughout Bali. One of the main components of the course concerned awig-awig (rules of propriety), in that all desa adat in Bali are urged to have written awig-awig. To assist in the process, the MPLA, in collaboration with the bureau of Mental-Spiritual Affairs of the governor’s office, had issued guidelines for writing awig-awig. In some cases, the government provided further assistance to the desa adat in writing their awig-awig by sending adat experts.

Returning from the short course, the leaders of Desa Adat Tegallalang initiated the writing of its awig-awig, on which the desa adat members agreed unanimously. The desa adat formed a special committee to do the writing. The committee consisted of 13 desa adat members, headed by the bendesa adat, I Wayan Lilir. Out of these 13 members, 10 were from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, one was from Warga Pande, and two were from Warga Brahmana.

At the beginning, the activities of the committee went smoothly. The committee, as well as desa adat members in general, agreed to follow the guidelines prepared by the government with minimal modifications. A problem arose when they discussed section III of the awig-awig, ie. about ‘rules of membership’ (sukerta tata pakraman), particularly articles 4 and 8. Article 4 of the guidelines given by the government states that membership of a desa adat is open to Hindu families who inhabit the desa adat’s housing lots; and article 8 states that contributions (ayah-ayah) to desa adat activities, such as temple maintenance and desa adat rituals, are compulsory for all desa adat members. These rules were considered by the committee to be applicable to the Tegallalang situation, and hence such rules should be copied. As a result, article 4 of the draft of the awig-awig read:

49 One of the programs of the MPLA is to ‘develop’ desa adat in Bali so that the difference between desa adat is minimised. Implicitly this program means that desa adat in rural areas (including desa Bali kuna) must be restructured to follow the ‘modern-style’ desa adat found in urban areas.

50 “Sane kabawos krama desa inggih punika kulawarga sane maagama Hindu saha ngemong karang desa.”
(1) All who live in the jurisdiction of Desa Adat Tegallalang, who are Hindu by religion, and [fully] support the kahyangan tiga [three main village temples] are considered members of Desa Adat Tegallalang; (2) the rest are visitors.

By this definition, they meant that any family who lived permanently in Tegallalang must be members of the desa adat, and as members of the desa adat, they must be members of the kahyangan tiga congregation. Otherwise they would merely be considered ‘visitors.’ Membership of the desa adat is further classified into (1) full membership (krama ngarep), ie. those who have a desa adat housing lot and/or rice land; (2) half membership (krama bala angkep), ie. families who do not have a desa adat housing lot or rice field; and (3) ‘junior’ membership (krama tapukan), ie. those who should be full members but, because they are below the prescribed age, are freed from physical contributions. In line with the government guidelines, article 8 of the awig-awig draft also mentioned that all desa adat members must ngayah (contribute labour and materials) for the desa adat activities. The amount of the contribution (ayahan) was to be based on the classification of membership.

These articles were strongly opposed by the Warga Brahmana. The reason was because by tradition in Desa Adat Tegallalang, Warga Brahmana were exempted from ayahan. According to my informants, before 1992 Warga Brahmana enjoyed special privileges in this village; they did not contribute to the maintenance and festivals in the village temples. Hence, the new draft awig-awig would have changed this privilege, since there would no longer be any differentiation among village members in terms of Warga Brahmana versus other warga. This change was acknowledged by the committee and desa adat as a whole. One of the committee members told me that

Warga Brahmana were exempted from ayahan in desa adat, but they contributed in different ways, ie. officiating at the ritual ceremonies. This should have only applied to Warga Brahmana families who have sulinggih and whose houses are hence called gria, meaning the house of priests. Historically, there were only four families of Warga Brahmana in this position, ie. four karang ayahan desa, each of which had a sulinggih. At present, there are 24
families and all want to be exempted, while they are not sulinggih. We cannot tolerate such a practice any more. We would still give special status to the pedanda families, but definitely not to all Ida Bagus families. The most we can give them is informal acknowledgment, that they would be treated in a special way, in preference to anyone else. In praying, they would be assured of the first rows; in preparing the temple festival they would be given the light, respected, work; in death ceremonies, they would not be required to carry the corpse, but instead they would be asked to carry offerings or to sing religious songs; and the like. But in principal, they must recognise that we are equal, as banjar and desa adat members. And this is the practice everywhere in Bali, as I observed in Tabanan, Gianyar, Badung, and other regions. Even here, in Bangli itself, such a practice is very common (I Wayan Warsa 1994).

On the other side, my informants from Warga Brahmana maintained that the inclusion of Warga Brahmana in desa adat membership represented a destruction of Balinese tradition. Moreover, they had a number of warga temples to maintain, so that it would be difficult for them to contribute to the maintenance of the desa adat temples as well.

For generations, we the Brahmana have never been involved in banjar turun [active banjar members]. We merely participated in suka-duka, attending the death or other ritual ceremonies held by individual members of the banjar/desa adat. We have never been members of the pamaksan of the kahyangan tiga. If we contributed to kahyangan tiga maintenance, it was simply a donation (dana punya). This is because we have a lot of temples outside this village, such as those in Batulepang, Kediri, and Manuaba. And now, the desa adat have changed the rule and forced us to be full members, the same as others. Of course we refuse.... With the other temples, we cannot shoulder the burden of the kahyangan tiga any more (Ida Bagus Grudug 1994).

Responding to this statement, the non-Brahmana group maintained that all the temples mentioned by the Brahmana group are family or warga temples, and every Balinese invariably has his/her own warga temples. Hence, this should not be an excuse to be exempted from being a member of the pamaksan in desa adat temples.

Since the discussion of the contents of the awig-awig always ended in a deadlock, both parties standing firm on their own position, the members of the committee from Warga Brahmana left the committee. The desa adat leaders, together with the kepala lingkungan of Tegallalang reported this matter to the lurah, who then brought it to the camat. Both the lurah and the camat
(themselves from Warga Brahmana, but from other lingkungan) advised the Brahmana group to accept the awig-awig draft because the government guidelines for the awig-awig had been made based on the current situation, i.e. from Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, down to their lower level regulations. However, rather than accepting the new awig-awig, the Warga Brahmana decided to withdraw from desa adat membership and create a new banjar. This created further conflict, because separation of a desa adat brings a number of consequences, particularly concerning desa adat facilities (cemetry, desa adat meeting hall, and the like). Furthermore, a banjar in Bali is invariably a part of a desa adat (see Chapter Two). Thus with the emergence of this new banjar, the question was posed as to which desa adat it would be included in. For fear that the conflict would end in a physical clash, both parties were several times called and interviewed by police and military officers. However, they could not stop the Brahmana group from forming a new banjar, which was called Banjar Gria-Tegallalang. They also established a banjar meeting hall in the northern end of their housing complex.

Under the encouragement of dinas officers, as well as the MPLA and the Parisada, the remaining 11 committee members continued work on the awig-awig and finished the draft around October 1992. After several desa adat meetings, the desa adat finally, unanimously apart from Brahmana group, agreed to the awig-awig on 4 December 1992. Once agreed upon, as a normal procedure, the awig-awig was submitted to dinas official, to be signed. Although the dinas officers were well informed about the conflict between Warga Brahmana and other warga in Tegallalang, they gave their signatures, because what was written in the awig-awig was based on government guidelines. It is significant to note that the officers who signed the awig-awig were all from Warga Brahmana. They were the Lurah of Kelurahan Kawan, Ida Bagus Agung Wardana; the Camat of Bangli, Ida Nyoman Jelantik BA; and the Bupati of Bangli, Drs Ida Bagus Gde Agung Ladip, SH.

The problem came to a head when a member of Warga Brahmana, Ida Ayu Putu Ngurah, died in September 1994. The family of the dead woman reported to Bendesa Adat Tegallalang, but the bendesa refused her right to burial, saying
that Warga Brahmana were no longer members of Desa Adat Tegallalang, and that the cemetery, as a desa adat facility could only be used by desa adat members, ie. the supporters of kahyangan tiga. Other people could use it, but they had to pay a certain amount of money, called pananjung batu, and had to have the cemetery spiritually cleansed by a certain level of sacrificial ritual (called resi gana).

Warga Brahmana did not want to fulfil the requirements set out by Desa Adat Tegallalang. Instead, they asked permission of Banjar Gria-Kawan, a banjar located around 2 km from the northern border of Desa Adat Tegallalang, to use its cemetery. Banjar Gria-Kawan initially refused. However, after Ida Pedanda Istri Tegallalang came to discuss the matter, the leaders of Banjar Gria-Kawan agreed to lend its cemetery. According to its kelihan adat, I Wayan Mujung, when the cemetery was constructed in 1957, the officiating priest was a pedanda from Gria Tegallalang. In addition, some of Banjar Gria-Kawan members refer to Gria Tegallalang as their permanent priest’s house (siwa). These were the reasons why the banjar was willing to lend its cemetery to non-members, especially to the gria family from Tegallalang.

Since the death of Ida Ayu Putu Ngurah, who was childless, no one has occupied her housing lot. Because the housing lot is the desa adat’s property, the desa adat took it over and made it a fish pond. Warga Brahmana filed their protest with the lurah and camat, and the village situation became very tense. For fear of further physical clashes, the village was guarded by police and military men for weeks. Until December 1994, the last time I visited the village, the problem was still unresolved.

Case 2: Desa Adat Kutri

A similar case occurred in Desa Adat Kutri, Desa Singapadu Tengah, Kecamatan Sukawati, Kabupaten Gianyar.\(^5\) Conflict occurred between Warga Brahmana Siwa (‘kelompok gria’) and desa adat members from several warga,

---

\(^5\) Some data for this part were taken from local newspapers, Bali Post (1, 2, and 3 May 1996) and Nusa Tenggara (1, 2, and 3 May 1996).
most of whom were Gusi and Jaba. The seeds of the conflict, according to my informants, had existed since the 1970s, when the desa adat tried to involve members of Warga Brahmana, 32 families, in its daily life. This idea was rejected by Warga Brahmana, saying that for generations they had never been involved in the desa adat as the equal of others. This objection brought about ill feelings between the two groups, and the relationship between Warga Brahmana and the desa adat as a whole became tense.

In 1992 Desa Adat Kutri adopted a new awig-awig, which states that all members of desa adat are equal in rights and duties concerning desa adat affairs, meaning that there would no longer be any privileges for certain warga compared to others. In other words, all desa adat members, regardless of their warga of origin, must be active in the desa adat. Exception was only given to sulinggih. At a meeting in 1993, the desa adat decided to assign its members the role of kasinoman (messenger) on a rotational basis. The main task of the kasinoman is to deliver messages, information, and instructions from the bendesa adat (desa adat head) to desa adat members. This task was refused by Warga Brahmana, claiming that traditional rules exempted members of Warga Brahmana in this village from carrying out this lowly obligation. Both Warga Brahmana and the desa adat were determined in their respective positions, resulting in the expulsion of Warga Brahmana from membership of the desa adat. As expelled members, they were denied access to desa adat facilities, most notably the cemetery.

In 1994, a member of Warga Brahmana passed away. Warga Brahmana wanted to perform the ngaben ceremony in the desa adat cemetery, but this was strongly objected to by desa adat members. The ceremony could only be performed if Warga Brahmana was willing to pay an ‘admission fee’ (pananjung batu) of 5,000 kepeng (Chinese coin) or around Rp. 500,000. Warga Brahmana refused to pay this admission fee, since acceptance of this rule automatically implied that they accepted desa adat’s rule. This was considered a great humiliation for them. For fear of further conflict which might end in a physical clash, the government of Gianyar calmed the situation by paying the necessary admission fee to the desa adat.
On 17 March 1996, another member of Warga Brahmana, Ida Ayu Made Limbur, passed away. The ngaben ceremony for the dead was planned for 1 May 1996 in the cemetery of Desa Adat Kutri. As in the previous case, desa adat members objected to this and asked for another admission fee. Although government officials of Gianyar urged members of Warga Brahmana to pay the admission fee, the latter refused to do so. Instead, they planned to perform the ngaben ceremony on private land reserved as a cemetery for pedanda. This plan was also objected to by desa adat members because a non-sulinggih is not entitled to use private land for his/her ngaben ceremony, and they considered that it would pollute the purity of the desa adat.

The desa adat members who were informed of the planned ngaben ceremony on 1 May 1996, intentionally performed gotong royong ('working together') to clean the desa adat road on that date. This was apparently a means to mobilise the masses to gather along the village road in order to prevent the ngaben. After the pretended gotong royong, at around 2 PM, they gathered in the desa adat meeting hall, where the kepala desa, I Wayan Rinda, escorted by the bendesa adat, I Gusti Ketut Dalem, announced that the ngaben ceremony for Ida Ayu Made Limbur would be performed on private land owned by Ida Pedanda Padangratha, and that this decision had been agreed upon by the bupati of Gianyar, the army commander of Gianyar, and the police commander of Gianyar. Upon hearing this decision, the desa adat members suddenly walked out from the meeting hall to form a human barricade (pagar betis), blocking the road leading to the private land. They all brought with them equipment such as sickles, hoes, wooden clubs, and sharpened bamboo, and were ready to take violent action if Warga Brahmana was determined to perform the ngaben as planned. “We will fight to the death to enforce our agreed desa adat rules,”

52 The delay of the ngaben ceremony for quite a long time in this case was associated with the Ekabhuana ceremony in Besakih. The committee of the Ekabhuana ceremony and the Parisada had announced that for the sake of the purity and the success of the ceremony, funeral ceremonies should not be performed between 16 March to 26 May 1996.

53 Sulinggih, including a pedanda, are entitled (and are even encouraged) to perform their ngaben ceremony on private land, called tegal suci ('holy ground'). If they do not have a piece of land for this, the ngaben ceremony for sulinggih can also be performed in the yard of the housing complex. For those who are not sulinggih, only a cemetery can be used.
yelled some of them. Hundreds of army personnel and policemen sent to the scene could do nothing except prepare to prevent a physical clash. The top ranking officers of Gianyar, including the bupati of Gianyar, Tjok Budi Suryawan; the commander of Gianyar Army, Letkol Tjok Anom; and the commander of Gianyar Police, Letkol Lalu Suprapta, were well informed of this matter, and personally went to the scene. However, the presence of these authorities could not immediately solve the problem.

The members of Warga Brahmana were also very emotional and tried to carry the cremation tower with the corpse to the private land. However, government officers and policemen succeeded in preventing this action, which otherwise might have led to a fatal incident. Until ten o'clock in the evening, members of the desa adat still stood blocking the road.

Realising the gravity of the situation, the government officials forced Warga Brahmana to perform the ngaben ceremony in a neutral place, ie. outside the jurisdiction of Desa Adat Kutri, for which purpose they had negotiated with Desa Adat Medahan, Kecamatan Blahbatuh, Gianyar. This idea was initially objected to by members of Warga Brahmana, since it would be a shameful social loss in their view. Despite this initial objection, the government forced the members of Warga Brahmana to follow the plan, and the government assisted them by sending two trucks to transport the cremation tower, the corpse, offerings, and other necessities to the appointed cemetery. Thus the ngaben ceremony was performed at the cemetery of Desa Adat Medahan, some 20 km from Desa Adat Kutri, on the next day, 2 May 1996.

Case 3: Banjar Lantangbejuh

Another case involving a sense of superiority on one hand versus a sense of equality on the other occurred in Banjar Adat Lantangbejuh, Desa Adat Sesetan, Denpasar. In 1994 this banjar adat had 208 members consisting of several warga, including Pande, Bhujangga Waisnawa, Pasek Saptara Sris, and 22 Gusti families, locally better known as Anak Agung. Traditionally, this Gusti group was exempted from activities in the banjar adat. In lieu, this group was responsible for organising rituals in Pura Bukit Sari, a temple belonging to the
However, for decades this task had been turned over to banjar adat members, and the status of the Anak Agung in relation to this temple was not different from other members of the banjar adat.

In 1993, the banjar adat decided to assign its members to take turns in assuming the task of being kasinoman. Since the Anak Agung group no longer assumed a special status in the banjar adat's temple, they were expected to be active in desa adat affairs, including the task of being kasinoman. Most of the members of the Anak Agung group objected. Instead of undertaking the task, 17 out of these 22 families resigned their membership in Banjar Adat Lantangbejuh. They planned to join another banjar adat in Desa Adat Sesetan. Unfortunately, all banjar adat in Desa Adat Sesetan refused to accept members with special status. They would only accept new members if the new members accepted the awig-awig of the banjar, which states that every member of the banjar adat holds the same rights and duties in banjar affairs. Refused by other banjar adat and hesitant to return to Banjar Adat Lantangbejuh, these 17 Anak Agung families established a separate banjar, called Banjar Puri Agung. Desa Adat Sesetan agreed to the creation of this new banjar adat. However, as a consequence of being a banjar, this small banjar adat has to share the same duties as other banjar adat, particularly in the management of desa adat temples.

MARRIAGE: CONFLICT AND COMPROMISING STATUS

The nature of the relationship among warga in present day Bali is best illustrated by describing some cases of marriage. As in other cultures, marriage is considered to be the most important stage of life by Balinese. The importance of marriage in Bali does not merely concern the married couple; it extends to the relatives of the bride and groom. For the couple themselves, marriage is a stage which they have to pass through to take up full membership in a banjar and desa adat.

In pre-colonial Bali, there were strict prohibitions on hypogamous marriage, known as asupundung and anglangkahi karang hulu. Asupundung (literally ‘carrying a dog on the back’) is a prohibition on lower warga men marrying
women from Warga Brahmana or Ksatria Dalem. Breaking this rule, in pre-colonial Bali, was punishable by death. After the advent of the Dutch colonial government, the punishment was reduced to exile in Parigi (South Sulawesi). It was then eased further to ten years’ exile to anywhere ‘outside Bali’ (eg. Lombok). After 1937, the exile was again softened to ‘outside the jurisdiction of the respective kingdom,’ but mostly to Jembrana, the least populated part of Bali, and the period of exile was reduced to three years. 54

Anglangkahi karang hulu (literally ‘stepping over the head’) is a prohibition against marrying a woman from a warga classified as ‘higher,’ other than Warga Brahmana and Ksatria Dalem. 55 In pre-colonial Bali, the offenders were also punished by death. The Dutch colonial government again modified the rule, so that a payment in cash could be used as a substitution of the punishment. In the case of asupundung, both husband and wife were punished, while in the case of anglangkahi karang hulu, only the man was sentenced, though the woman was also sometimes punished (Panetje 1986).

The case of anglangkahi karang hulu is nicely described by Friederich, based on his research on Bali in the 1840s.

... in Bali, all marriages of high-caste women with men of lower birth (provided they are acknowledged) are punished with death. The guilty women are burnt alive -- a hole is made in the ground and filled with combustibles, into which the woman is cast; this punishment is called labuh gni (to fall or to be cast into the fire). The man is weighted with stones and drowned in the sea; this is called labuh batu. This penalty, especially the burning of the woman, is not

54 These traditional laws were formalised in a Pasuara (decision) of Balinese kings in 1910, and ratified by the governor (resident) of Bali-Lombok in his decree No. 352.Jl.C2, 11 April 1927). However, the Dutch government seemed to be accommodative in this case. A teacher from Warga Pande, I Nengah Metra, who was also a prominent figure in the Surya Kanta movement, married a woman from Warga Brahmana (Ida Ayu). The Dutch government did not punish him, and his case was not filed in court. Instead, he was moved to Lombok, which might be interpreted as an accommodative action taken by the Dutch government (Agung 1974).

55 The relative positions of higher, equal, or lower, is vague. Such a position would be acceptable to everybody if the distance was great, for example between Pasek Saptai Rsi (lower) and Anak Agung (higher). In other situations, such as between Dewa and Ngakan, between Pasek and Pande, between Tangkas and Arya Gajah Para, or between Anak Agung and I Gusti Agung, relative positions of the status were negotiable and debatable, and often cases of this kind were brought to court (see, eg. Korn 1932 and Panetje 1986).
always carried out so relentlessly. In several cases which came to my knowledge, both the man and the woman were drowned; in another case, where the guilty man had escaped vengeance by flight, the woman, at the command of her father (a *Gusti* in Kuta), was killed with the creese by a relation, her mother's brother, after having been adorned with flowers and fine clothes, and rendered fearless by opium and strong drink (1959: 101-102).

In present day Bali, there is no formal rule governing inter-warga marriage. Both the *asumundung* and *anglangkahi karang hulu* rules have been abolished since 1951, based on Bali Provincial Regulation No. 11/1951.56 People of *Triwangsa*, however, tend to marry their daughters in their own warga. It should also be noted that this preference also holds true among the *Jaba* because marrying a daughter to *Triwangsa* brings more difficulties (social-religious problems) than comfort. If hypergamy occurs, the parents of the girl have to speak in a high-level Balinese to their in-laws as well as their own married daughter. Even more importantly, they lose the right to their daughter's homage when they pass away. In some cases, these discomforts are relaxed, but in most cases, the old practices are still adhered to.

Cases of hypogamous marriage are not uncommon in Bali now. Although it is a disturbance to the family's harmony, there is no formal punishment for such marriage, except punishment by the family. The bride is generally expelled by her own family, especially for the first few years. In most cases that came to my knowledge, family relations would return to normal after the couple had delivered a baby. The society at large accepts the hypogamous marriage and tends to take an indifferent attitude, perceiving that all this is a family matter, not one of the general society. To demonstrate the current situation, cases of marriage involving different warga will be described below. To put these cases in context, I will first explain the general marriage tradition in Bali.

It is widely known that Balinese in general trace their ancestry through the male line. In marriage, the most common practice is for the bride to be integrated into the groom's family. To be spiritually safe, the bride has to ask

---

56 Interestingly, the abolition of these rules was implemented by a Bali government which was dominated by *Triwangsa*. The provincial regulation abolishing these rules was signed by the Governor of Bali, Anak Agung Bagus Suteja and the Speaker of DPRD, I Gusti Putu Merta. Both are people of *Triwangsa* status.
permission to leave (mapamit) her own ancestors. This is done by a mapamit ritual in her family temple, after which she is free from any obligation to her family temples since by adat rule, she has lawfully cut her ties to her own family. However, there is another type of marriage, the inverse of this marriage. In this case, instead of the bride entering the groom’s family, it is the groom who is integrated into the bride’s family. This type of marriage is called nyeburin (literally ‘downward jumping’). This practice is common in Tabanan, Badung, Bangli, and Gianyar regencies, but is very unusual in Buleleng and Jembrana regencies.

In old Bali, there were several ways for a man to take a wife. At least eight ways were known, ie. (1) mamadik (by proposal); (2) ngrorod or ngrangkat (romantic marriage, without permission from the bride’s parents); (3) jejangkepan (matched by parents of the two parties, whether or not the couple love each other); (4) ngodalin (returning a daughter to the former house of her mother); (5) ngunggahin (the bride comes to the groom’s house and asks to be married); (6) mlagandang (marriage by forced-capture); (7) nyangkring (to take a young girl and marry her when she has grown up); and (8) tetagon (matching the couple while they are still very young, each staying in their respective houses, and marrying them after they are grown up) (Artadi 1987; Kaler 1982). Out of these eight ways, only two are currently practiced, ie. mamadik and ngrorod. I will briefly discuss both below.

**Mamadik**

*Mamadik* literally means ‘to propose,’ while the result is called pepadikan. In this type of marriage, a relative of the groom proposes to the bride’s relative. This is generally done when there is a certainty that the proposal will be accepted by the bride’s party. *Mamadik* is a very complicated procedure, composed of numerous steps. The first step is called masedek (‘to report’). In this stage, a group of messengers, usually around 3-5 persons, from the groom’s party is sent to the bride’s house, and the groom himself is not allowed to be a member of this group. The main task of this group is to inform the bride’s party that in the next couple of days, a group of a certain number of people, the family
of so-and-so (the groom’s family) from the village of so-and-so, will come to propose the marriage. The representatives of the bride’s relative (the ‘owners’ of the bride) are expected to be ready to receive their guests. The messengers have to fix the date, in consultation with the bride’s party.\(^{57}\)

The next step is called *mapadik, mararasans* or *ngidih* (‘to request’). Here, on the agreed date, a group of the groom’s relatives comes to the bride’s house. The group might be quite small (less than 10), but in most cases it numbers dozens of people, and the groom must be present. In this step, the groom’s party has to bring with them a set of offerings, called *canang pangrawos* (‘talking offering’) and sets of *panginangan* (a betel chewing set, consisting of betel leaves, betel nut, betel-lime, and tobacco) placed on top of a closed bamboo basket (*sokasi*) filled with rice. In addition, the group may also bring gifts (*gagapan*), such as cake, fruits, and clothes for the bride and her family.

On this occasion, after an informal reception, the formal conversation invariably starts with questions from the representative of the hosts,\(^{58}\) with regard to who the guests are, and their purpose in coming, even though the hosts have been well informed about the purpose of the visit and the guests may even originate from the same village. In reply, the representative of the guests will give indirect answers. He will usually say that before the talk continues, he will ask the host to officiate at the *canang pangrawos* offering. The main function of the *canang pangrawos* is to ask guidance from God (*Sang Hyang Widhi Wasa*) and ancestors so that the discussion may be successful, and that the result of the discussion is spiritually binding (formalised). After this, the discussion is

\(^{57}\) The groom’s party usually proposes alternative dates to the bride’s family. Usually, the possible dates for the next steps are defined in consultation with experts who know the *dewasa ayu* (auspicious days) for certain activities.

\(^{58}\) The spokesperson of the hosts is never one of the parents of the bride. The relatives of the bride will choose the best orator among them to be the spokesperson. According to Balinese perception, this is the occasion where the pride of the family is at stake. Similarly, the spokesperson of the groom’s family is rarely one of the parents of the groom. Some informants told me that this is to prevent an emotional discussion which might disturb the flow of events. In a practical sense, this occasion is merely the formalisation of the decisions that have been agreed on by both parties (particularly the parents of the bride and the groom). By the same token, this is not really a discussion between the two parties, but a pre-planned conversation to be heard by others (distant relatives, co-villagers, and *banjar/desa adat* and *desa dinas* officials).
resumed, using high Balinese (*Bahasa Bali halus*). If the proposal is accepted, which is usually the case, the two parties then decide on the date when the bride will be taken to the groom’s house.

The last stage is *ngambil* or *nyuang* (‘to take’). Based on the date agreed upon, the relatives of the groom come again to the bride’s house to take the bride, and bring her to the groom’s house. On this occasion, the groom’s party has to bring offerings, chiefly *tipat* (rice, cooked in young coconut leaves, quadrangular in shape) and *bantal* (mixed-rice cake, also cooked in young coconut leaves, but rolled in lengthwise shapes). The two parties also bring along the respective leaders of their *banjar*, *desa adat* and *desa dinas*, to witness and legalise the marriage, both in terms of *adat* and national law. The two parties explicitly state, and this is witnessed by their *desa adat* and *desa dinas* leaders, the status of the *juang-kajuang* (who is the giver, and who is the taker), which automatically means who is the *purusa* (the family line to be followed) and the *predana* (the family line to be left). After the *purusa* and the *predana* status is agreed upon, the bride (the *predana*) prays in her family temple to ask permission from her ancestors to leave (*mapamit*), in order to enter a new family group. After the *mapamit*, the bride is brought to the groom’s house, invariably accompanied by a group of the bride’s relatives.

Upon arrival at the groom’s house, the couple is offered a small ritual ceremony, called *biakaon* or *biakala* (‘chasing the devil’ or ‘chasing the bad’), conducted in front of the groom’s family temple. As a matter of fact, this ceremony, the *biakaon*, is the essence of the marriage ceremony. This is to say that the *biakaon* is the symbol of the legal marriage in *adat* terms. Only after *biakaon* can the couple enter the family temple, and lawfully sleep together.

Depending on the readiness of the groom, a bigger marriage ceremony (*pasakapan* or *pawiwahan*) may soon follow, but it may also take place months, or even years later.

---

59 The *tipat* is the symbol of women (its shape is associated with the shape of women’s genitals), while the *bantal* is the symbol of men (associated with men’s genitals).
**Ngorod or Ngrangkat**

*Ngorod*, which is also known as *ngrangkat*, is by definition a romantic marriage, where permission from the parents (generally the bride’s parents) cannot be obtained, at least in the couple’s evaluation. In the *ngorod*, the groom takes the bride from an agreed meeting place such as market, village feast, or bathing place, and they run to seek a hiding place (*pangkeban*). It is also common for the bride to be taken by relatives or close friends of the groom on his behalf. The hiding place must be in a ‘neutral’ place, ie. not in any one of the groom’s close relatives’ houses.

Realising the disappearance of their daughter, the parents of the bride generally report to the *banjar adat* head (*kelihan banjar* or *kelihan adat*), who then knocks the *banjar*’s wooden bell (*kulkul*) with a specific beat (*kulkul bulus*), indicating that someone has been stolen. In olden days, the *banjar* as a whole then searched for the girl. As *ngorod* is a romantic marriage, the parents of the bride generally have an idea of who the offender is.

On arrival at their hiding place, the groom must soon send his representatives, generally 2-3 people, to the bride’s parents’ house, to confess that they are the ones who have stolen the girl. This stage is called *ngluku* or *mapajati* (‘a confession’ or ‘to make things clear’). In this *ngluku*, the messengers have to bring with them a lighted torch (usually made of dried coconut leaves, called *prakpak*), to signify that they come sincerely and transparently. The main task of this group is to apologise for their offending action —for stealing the bride— and to ask the parents’ agreement that their daughter be married by so-and-so. To do so, the *ngluku* group must bring *canang panglukuan* (‘a confession offering’), the core of which consists of rice and betel-chewing materials. There are several possibilities which can result. First, the bride’s parents may accept the matter, and agree to marry their daughter to the offender. If this is the case, one of the parents will take and chew the betel sent by the groom. The second possibility is that the proposal is rejected. If this is the case, the *ngluku* group usually return home, and discuss the matter with their relatives. Another group of messengers may also be sent again to confirm the bride’s parents’ decision. This step is called *mapepadang*. 
(‘to reconfirm,’ ‘to enlighten,’ or ‘to seek the real’). If still rejected, the groom’s party may marry the couple, although without the bride’s parents’ agreement. The only question asked by the pepadang group is whether the bride would be allowed to do mapamit ritual in her family temple, and in most cases, the answer is no. The bride is no longer even considered a daughter, and not allowed to return home. A third possibility is that the bride’s parents doubt whether their daughter really loves the groom. To clarify the matter, they usually postpone their answer, and together with the ngluku group they come to the couple’s hiding place. This is called netes (‘to ensure,’ ‘to confirm’). In the hiding place, the parents are allowed to communicate with their daughter through a wall, without seeing her. If their daughter says that she wants to marry, the parents can do nothing. If their daughter says otherwise, the parents have their right to take her home.

Provided that the bride’s parents agree or simply give up, the couple is allowed to return to the groom’s house. As in the case of mamadik marriage, once the couple arrives at the groom’s house, a biakala or biakaon ritual is conducted as a symbol of a legal marriage (in adat sense). A bigger marriage ceremony is usually conducted months, or even years later, depending on the readiness of the groom’s family.

Compared to mamadik, ngorod marriage is much simpler and less costly. Naturally, mamadik is considered more prestigious, particularly by the bride’s party, because the willingness of the groom’s party to follow the complicated rules of the mamadik is considered evidence that they are serious, that all of the groom’s relatives have agreed to the marriage, and that they respect the bride’s family.60 In the olden days, if the groom’s family felt that they were ‘higher’ in status, they would not respect the bride’s family by mamadik. They just took the bride, or even worse, they asked the bride’s family to ‘submit’ (ngaturang) their

---

60 There is an alternative interpretation on this matter. In old Bali, marriage by capture (ngorod) or even by force (mlagandang) was considered to be more valiant (lebih Ksatria). This was because the groom’s bravery in kidnapping a girl was an indicator of his seriousness, since he braved the wrath of the bride’s party for the sake of his love for the bride. This interpretation seems to be inspired by the story in the Mahabharata, where all the marriages of Arjuna, Gatotkaca, and Abimanyu (to Subadra, Pergiwa-Pergiwi, and Siti Sundari, respectively) are by capture.
daughter. In present day Bali, ngrorod is also commonly practiced for practical reasons, ie. to simplify the process and, more importantly, to reduce the cost and time involved. This is especially true if the marriage occurs between close relatives or between people of the same village. For ‘modern’ Balinese, especially unrelated families, mambadik marriage is preferred, but in most cases the procedures are simplified.

What I have described above are the procedures of a ‘normal marriage,’ in which the bride holds the position of predana ('female') and is taken by the groom, who assumes the position of purusa ('male'). There is also the reverse of this model, where the bride holds the position of purusa ('male'), and the groom as predana ('female'). In other words, the groom is integrated into the bride’s family. This type of marriage is called nyeburin ('downward-jumping,' from cebur, 'to jump'). In the nyeburin case, everything is reversed.

How these marriage principles are realised in practice, especially when the marriage occurs between people of different warga, will be discussed in the examples below.  

Case 1: Wayan Dana and Ida Ayu Tresnasih

I Wayan Dana of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Sekargula was a teacher in a primary school in Karangasem, where he met Ida Ayu Tresnasih, a woman from Warga Brahmana Siwa, who was also a teacher at the same school. Her parents and elder brothers continually advised her to leave Wayan Dana because he was a Jaba; for an Ida Ayu to marry a Jaba would shame the family. Since Tresnasih stood firm, her parents and brothers gave up. When the time came, in 1990, Wayan Dana and his parents sought permission from Tresnasih’s parents for Wayan Dana to marry Tresnasih. Tresnasih’s parents rejected this formal proposal, and angrily said that they would leave the matter up to their daughter. If Wayan Dana and Tresnasih decided to marry, they were free to do so, without any necessity to inform or ask permission from Tresnasih’s parents, because the proposal would never be accepted. Tresnasih’s parents even told them that

---

61 For the sake of confidentiality, all of the names used below are pseudonyms.
henceforth Tresnasih would no longer be considered a daughter, and she would not be allowed to step into the yard of their house. Dana’s parents had predicted this reaction in advance, and consequently were only mildly offended. Tresnasih was then taken from her office and brought to Sekargula, Dana’s village.

All the ritual ceremonies were conducted in Dana’s house, and Dana’s family did not send offerings to Tresnasih’s family temple at that time. They did ask permission from Tresnasih’s ancestors, but this was done at Dana’s family temple, according to what is known as nyawang (‘distant-praying’) in Balinese tradition. No one from Tresnasih’s side witnessed the marriage ceremony.

After the marriage, Tresnasih did not dare to visit her parents, for fear that she would not be properly accepted by her relatives. When she gave birth to a child, she sent a letter to her parents informing them of the matter, but no response came in return. Unexpectedly, six months later, her parents visited her, exactly on the first otonan (Balinese birth-day ritual) of her baby. Since then, relations between Tresnasih and her family have become normal. After the relation had been normal for several months, Tresnasih’s parents advised Dana and Tresnasih that Tresnasih had not asked permission to take leave from their family temple. In technical terms, they had not offered a pejati or mapamit offering in the family’s temple, the neglect of which could result in punishment (sickness, bad luck, poverty, etc.). Following this advice, Dana’s parents and relatives went to Tresnasih’s parents’ house with their pejati ceremony, and conducted the ritual as if Dana and Tresnasih were in the process of marriage.

Case 2: Anak Agung Raka Padma and Ni Made Padmirani

Anak Agung Raka Padma of Warga Ksatria Dalem from Puri Tohpati, Klungkung, fell in love with Ni Made Padmirani of Warga Arya Kenceng Tegehkori (classified as Jaba), from Penyaringan, Jembrana. Both of them held bachelor degrees in economics (‘sarjana ekonomi’); they met in their work

---

62 Nyawang is a common practice in Balinese religious life, and is done mostly for practical reasons. For example, in a major family ritual, the family is supposed to collect holy water from higher-level warga temples, which are often located far away. For this, the priests (pemangku) generally make the holy water in the family’s temple, but act as though the holy water comes from the associated temples.
place, a garment factory in Denpasar. When the time came, they wanted to marry, and this intention was informally agreed to by relatives of both parties. However, Padmirani’s brother-in-law, I Made Tirtayasa, who was a lecturer at Udayana University, told Raka that the marriage should be based on the Hindu concept of manusa pada or tat twam asi (literally ‘I am That’ and popularly translated to ‘human beings are equal’). To be explicit, the marriage had to be conducted in the mamadik way, and the couple should pray in front of the same set of marriage offerings (banten pasakapan). As a consequence of the manusa pada concept, Raka would not prohibit Padmirani from praying in her family temple after marriage. More importantly, she would be allowed to pay homage to her older relatives when they passed away. Raka, being an educated and modern Balinese, agreed to the condition, and this was conveyed to his father, a teacher in a primary school in Denpasar.

In 1991, Raka and his parents went to Penyaringan to make the acquaintance of Padmirani’s family, and to plan the future. According to mamadik procedures, this is the step known as masedek. Months later, as planned, a group of around 50 of Raka’s relatives and the banjar head came to Penyaringan to perform the mamadik. As the event had been agreed in advance, everything went smoothly. What they did was merely to formalise the mamadik in the presence of kelihan banjar from both sides, ie. Tohpati and Penyaringan. The discussion included the acceptance of the proposal and the planning of the pangambilan date. In addition, a Western-style engagement was also conducted, ie. the exchange of rings (tukar cincin).

63 In old Balinese tradition, if a Triwangsa married a woman of Jaba status, the groom would not be physically present at the marriage ceremony; he would be represented by a dagger (keris) or a pillar of the house (called kawin keris or kawin adegan, respectively). In less extreme cases, he was present at the marriage ceremony, but each of the couple used a different set of offerings.

64 However, there was a modification here, since the masedek is done by the parents of the groom, together with the groom himself, which should not be the case according to mapadik ‘rules.’ The masedek in this case is more a form of ‘introduction.’

65 Exchange of rings (tukar cincin) is quite new in Balinese practice, and occurs only among the ‘modern’ middle and high classes. However, this practice is not purely ‘Western.’ In the Ramayana epic, when Dewi Sita (the wife of Rama) was captured by Rahvana, Rama found his ring which was worn by Dewi Sita. This indicates that Rama had given the ring to Dewi Sita.
Fifteen days after the mamadik, as planned, a group of around 100 people from Tohpati went to Penyaringan to take the bride. As is usual, after an informal reception, the formal discussion started. On this occasion, the status of purusa-predana was reconfirmed, ie. that Raka was the purusa, and Padmirani was the predana. After the discussion, a marriage ceremony was conducted in the bride’s house, officiated by a woman high priest from Warga Brahmana, Ida Pedanda Istri Kemenuh. When the couple started to worship (mabakti), Raka’s father approached his son and gave signals that he was not allowed to pray. At the same time, Tirtayasa was also there, urging Raka to pray. Raka was very confused, and the situation became tense. In this situation Ida Pedanda Istri explained that the prayers were to God and dewa so that they might witness and bless the marriage, not to anything else. At last Raka followed Tirtayasa, and worshipped together with Padmirani, led by Ida Pedanda Istri. After the marriage ceremony, it was time for the bride to ask permission to leave (mapamit) her family temple, because her status was predana (‘female’) in this marriage. At this point, the ceremony was led by a pemangku (temple priest), and the spirits being worshipped were definitely Padmirani’s ancestors. When the time for prayer came, Raka’s father again asked Raka not to worship, while Tirtayasa told him the opposite. The situation again became tense. After a short pause, the pemangku compromised by saying that Raka should ask permission of Padmirani’s ancestors, but from his heart was enough, without the need to display any gesture of worship (nyakupang tangan). This compromise seemed to be acceptable to both parties.

With the marriage ceremony and mapamit completed, the group of the groom’s relatives went back home to Tohpati, together with the bride and groom. As usual, the bride’s family assigned a group of relatives to accompany (ngatehang) the bride.\footnote{Accompanying (ngatehang) the bride is a common practice, which signifies that the bride’s family are not throwing the bride away. It is also a symbol that the bride’s family is willing to know where the groom’s house is located. Theoretically, if something happens later, the family can then visit their daughter or pick her up if she is not well treated there.} Upon arrival in the groom’s house in Tohpati, a biakaon ceremony was conducted, as well as a welcoming ritual (banten...
panyambutan). As agreed upon, the couple used the same set of offerings.\textsuperscript{67} However, a problem arose after the ceremony when the family of the groom announced to the audience, composed of the groom's relatives, banjar members and banjar head, that Padmirani, a Jaba, had now increased her status because she had been married by an Anak Agung. To signify this rise in status, her name would be changed to Jero Sri Ayuningsih. Hearing this announcement, Tirtayasa, on behalf of the bride's family, suddenly stood up and said that he rejected the condition. Aloud he said:

We have agreed to have the marriage based on the concept of manusa pada. I accompanied my sister here to marry Anak Agung Raka, not to become a panjeroan. Panjeroan means a servant. Hence, I do not accept that my sister is called 'jero.' I and my relatives will not cease to call my sister by her very own name, 'Made,' as usual.

The groom's family was very upset at this. However, being good hosts they tried to calm the situation by asking Tirtayasa to sit down and talk privately. The spokesperson of the groom's family argued that changing the name of a Jaba after being married by a Triwangsa is a common tradition. It was a way of preserving Balinese tradition, particularly the existence of the catur wangsa. In reply, Tirtayasa challenged them to read holy books such as Sarasamuccaya, Bhagavadgitha, or other lontar. The elder brother of Anak Agung Raka, Anak Agung Arthana, a successful car dealer who was married to a Chinese woman, proposed a compromise solution. He suggested that the term 'jero' only be used within the puri's enclosure. Outside the puri, it would not be compulsory to call her 'jero.' However, if the villagers wished to call her by this name they could do so. This rule was not binding for her relatives. In other words, they were free to address her as they wished, regardless of the place and circumstances.

The marriage ceremony and reception were held a few days later. The bride's relatives were also invited to witness these and to ask God's blessing for the couple.

\textsuperscript{67} In fact, this has been practiced by the family of the groom for quite a long time. Two of Raka’s elder brothers also married Jaba women, while the other married a Chinese woman. In all of these marriages, the couples used the same offerings.
After the marriage, the relationship between people from both families has been very smooth. They invite and pay visits to each other, and eat at the same table. Padmirani’s relatives continue to address her as ‘Made’ as she was called before marriage. The child of Made Padmirani even eats from the same plate with the children of I Made Tirtayasa (carik-kacarik) with the full knowledge of Raka’s relatives. More importantly, when Ni Putu Ayu, Padmirani’s unmarried aunt, passed away in 1993, Padmirani paid homage (mabakti) before her corpse, witnessed by Raka and his parents. That is to say that they allowed Padmirani to worship her own ancestors, although as a predana she had been integrated into Raka’s family, from a warga of higher status.

Case 3: Ida Bagus Tirtha and Ni Luh Made Witari

Ida Bagus Tirtha, a member of Warga Brahmana Siwa from the village of Bitra, Gianyar, and a branch director of a private bank in Gianyar, married Ni Luh Made Witari, a daughter of a retired nurse of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from the village of Mekarsari, Tabanan, in 1993. The stages of the marriage were similar to the case of Raka-Padmirani. However, the difference of warga was more apparent here. During the mapamit ceremony, when Witari worshipped in front of her family’s temple, Tirtha (the groom) did not sit down. Instead, he and his relatives stood still, witnessing Witari and her relatives praying. Some banjar members and relatives who were at the scene grumbled that the groom and his relatives were arrogant, but no one asked them to sit down. This was because Witari’s father seemed to be happy with the situation. Nevertheless, some people, mostly Witari’s relatives, grumbled to me and criticised Witari’s father for humiliating himself (“tidak punya harga diri”).

After the mapamit ceremony at the family temple, another ritual, called ngulihang sembah (‘returning the homage’), was conducted in the adat house (bale gede). In this ritual, Witari’s parents sat before the offering, and Witari knelt on the floor in front of her parents. Led by a pemangku, who had been brought by the groom’s party from Bitra village, Witari paid homage (nyembah) to her parents. This homage (sembah) was supposed to be the last from her to her parents, since after marriage she would be integrated into her husband’s family. Being a member of a Brahmana family, she would no longer be allowed
to pay homage to a *Jaba*, including her own parents. All were moved by this ritual action. Witari, her parents, and her three sisters could not stop crying for several minutes. It was as if she was paying homage to dead parents. However, they seemed to accept the situation as if it was normal. At this stage, the groom’s family also announced that Witari should hence forward be addressed by her new name, *Jero* Made Cepaka. This was formally accepted by the bride’s family.

The relatives of the bride were invited to the marriage ceremony (*pasakapan* or *pawiwahan*) conducted in July 1993, and they sat on the same platform as the relatives of the groom. There was also only one set of marriage offerings, officiated by a *pedanda*, used by both the bride and the groom. Since the marriage, relations between the two sides have been good. I observed in 1994 that some of Witari’s relatives addressed her as “*jero*,” while some others still used “*Luh De*” as she was usually called before marriage. This does not matter for the husband and his relatives. I observed also that Witari’s son was allowed to eat together with his cousins (Witari’s elder sister’s sons) from one plate, and daily interaction among them showed no hierarchy in terms of *warga* difference.

**Case 4: I Ketut Bakta and Ida Ayu Rastiti**

A reverse case of what might be called *nyeburin menek* ('upward-jumping'), where a man from a *warga* considered ‘lower’ marries ‘higher’ women, is of more interest because of its rare occurrence.

Ida Bagus Rai, a member of Warga Brahmana Siwa from Desa Adat Wanasari, Tabanan, decided to keep his only daughter, Ida Ayu Putu Rastiti, at home to become the inheritor, or what is known as *sentana rajeg* ('woman inheritor'). In other words, Rastiti would be given the status of *purusa* ('male') and her husband would be integrated into her family. Unfortunately, Rastiti fell in love with I Ketut Bakta, a *Jaba* (Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi) from Desa Adat Tuwa, Tabanan. Thus, in this case a *Jaba* (lower status) would do *nyeburin* to a Brahmana family (higher status), which is very unusual. Most cases of *nyeburin* involve a bride and the groom from the same *warga* --preferably close relatives.
Rai reported to the organisation of Warga Catur Brahmana in his village and to the head of the dusun, with a carbon copy to the kepala desa (dinas) Wanasari, in the first week of June 1984, that he would like to marry Rastiti with a Jaba in a nyeburin arrangement, and the marriage would be held on 15 June 1984. As predicted, the organisation disagreed with Rai’s intention. In their perception, it was not in line with adat and religion. The letter of disagreement was sent to Ida Bagus Rai, with a carbon copy to the kepala dusun and kepala desa. Upon receiving the letter, the kepala dusun, who was himself from Warga Brahmana, did not dare to accept Rai’s report. Instead he advised that he would consult with the kepala desa (dinas). In response to the reports, the kepala desa (also from Warga Brahmana) summoned Ida Bagus Rai, the head of the Warga Brahmana organisation, and desa adat head. At the meeting, Rai insisted that the marriage should be allowed because Ida Ayu Rastiti would be in the status of purusa in the marriage, and hence would not lose her status of being a Brahmana; while her husband, I Ketut Bakta, would be integrated into the Brahmana family, for which he would be called ‘jero.’ On the other hand, the leader of Warga Brahmana insisted that such a practice would destroy adat and religion. The desa adat leader, who was himself also from Warga Brahmana, gave comments in favour of Warga Brahmana. The meeting failed to reach an agreement, and the case was postponed for months.

Ida Bagus Rai held firm, and planned to conduct the marriage on 22 November 1984, for which he called on the bendesa adat (desa adat head) and desa dinas head, reporting his intention and at the same time asking the adat head to witness the marriage. On 20 November, Rai received a letter from the kepala desa, saying that the kepala desa could not witness and legalise the marriage because the matter was very sensitive, and that he would first consult the camat and the Office of Religion of Tabanan. On the other hand, realising

---

68 Within Warga Brahmana Siwa, there are a number of sub-groups, known as Brahmana Kemenuh, Brahmana Manuaba, Brahmana Keniten, Brahmana Mas, Brahmana Antapan, and Brahmana Sangsi. Out of these subgroups, only the first four consider themselves more or less equal, and are in the sidikara network. These four sub-groups are known as Catur Brahmana ‘the four Brahmana sub-groups.’ The rest are considered inferior. In the village of Wanasari, there is a temple supported by these four Brahmana subgroups, and these temple supporters call themselves Warga Catur Brahmana.
that Rai was determined to go ahead with the marriage, Warga Brahmana of Wanasari issued a decision letter (No. 001/skp/1984), stating that Warga Brahmana would expel Ida Bagus Rai from the sidikara network. This decision not only covered the Brahmana from Wanasari village, but also all Brahmana who were members of the sidikara, as well as all their descendants.

In spite of these social and psychological pressures, Rai went ahead with the marriage, for which he brought witnesses from outside the village (because the desa adat and desa dinas leaders refused to witness the marriage). Upon the marriage, I Ketut Bakta was given a new name, Jero Wangi. After the marriage, the kepala desa refused to process the marriage certificate of Ida Ayu Rastiti and I Ketut Bakta. Since they were convinced that the marriage was legal, the couple filed a case with the court (Pengadilan Negeri) of Tabanan. After hearing several witnesses (including the kepala desa, bendesa adat, Warga Brahmana head, and a number of experts), the court reached the conclusion that the marriage had fulfilled the requirements of both adat and national laws. Hence, the court declared, in its decision No. 8/Pdt.P/1985/PN.Tbn., that the marriage was legal. Among other things, the court consulted the rules of anglangkahi karang hulu and asupundung, which had both been abolished by the Bali Regional Regulation No. 11/1951, and the Pancasila, the national state ideology, the 1945 Constitutions, the Law 1/1974 about Marriage, and other government regulations, all of which recognise that human beings are equal.

The couple have had five children (two boys and three girls), all of whom bore the initial name of Warga Brahmana (Ida Bagus and Ida Ayu). When I visited the village in 1994, I observed that the relationship of Rastiti-Bakta’s family with other people from Warga Brahmana as well as the society at large had become normal, and they were no longer prohibited from worshipping in the temple of Warga Brahmana in Wanasari, the Pura Resi.

Case 5: Gede Darsa and Si Luh Sulastri

Another nyeburin menek involving the marriage a man of a Jaba (lower status) to a woman of a Gusti (higher status) occurred in Pandakgede. I Gusti Made Dibia from Desa Adat Pandakgede made his only daughter, Gusti Ayu
Sulastri a *sentana rajeg*, as a result of which, upon marriage, her status would be *purusa*, and her husband would be integrated into her family. In 1976, Dr I Gede Darsa, a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and a lecturer at Udayana University, married Gusti Ayu Sulatri, in a *nyeburin* marriage. The extended family of I Gusti Made Dibia, as well as the *kelihan adat* and *kepala desa* welcomed the matter. With their children (a boy and a girl), the couple has been well integrated in the *Gusti* family.

This list of cases can be extended further. The Dana-Tresnasih case is not the only one found where a *Jaba* man married a *Triwangsa* woman in contemporary Bali.\(^6^9\) Cases of a ‘lower’ *Triwangsa* marrying a ‘higher’ one are also numerous,\(^7^0\) and cases of *Triwangsa* *nyeburin* to *Jaba* are also plentiful in Tabanan. The case of *nyeburin-menek* (‘upward-jumping’) can also still be added,\(^7^1\) although this type of marriage is much rarer than the other types.

These cases illustrate the state of social relationships among *warga* in present day Bali. The cases shed light on the fact that in daily interactions, the barrier associated with the differences in relative status of *warga* has diminished. The boundaries of *warga* are flexible and negotiable, which becomes clear only in rituals, while in daily life the boundaries are very subtle. As the cases of marriage show, tensions associated with relative status only occur during the marriage ceremonies or, in certain cases, one year or two after the marriage. As time passes, relationships between the two parties generally return to normal, without a marked status difference.

\(^6^9\) I came across a number of similar cases, such as I Gde Soka of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from the village of Pacung (Tabanan), who married Cokorda Istri Manik (Warga Ksatria Dalem) from Puri Payangan; I Wayan Jawi Tenaya (Warga Pasek Kayu Selema) from Denpasar married Anak-Agung Istri Sastri (Warga Arya Kenceng) from Puri Kawan; I Nyoman Wirata, a *Jaba* painter, married Ida Ayu Alit Surini (Warga Brahmana Siwa).

\(^7^0\) For example, I Gusti Agung Oka (Warga Arya Kresna Kepakisan) from Ubud, who married Anak Agung Sulatri (Warga Ksatria Dalem) from Tegallalang; and Anak Agung Gede Alit (Warga Ksatria) from Payangan, who married Cokorda Istri Artini (Warga Ksatria Dalem) from Puri Payangan.

\(^7^1\) Eg. the case of I Wayan Sedana (Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi) from Kekeran, Badung, who married I Gusti Ayu Putu Widastri (Warga Arya Kenceng) from Brengbeng, Tabanan, in a *nyeburin* arrangement.
Plate 3.7 Inter-warga marriage ceremony. While the bride and her relatives (Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi) performed mapamit ritual in her family temple, the groom and his relatives (Warga Brahmana Siwa) merely stood watching.

SUMMARY

I have indicated in this chapter that the four-caste theory oversimplifies the complexity of Balinese social relations and daily interactions and hence is inappropriate as a concept in understanding the complexity of Balinese society. Those who belong to the same ‘caste’ do not share a group identity in their religious life, nor do they maintain some kind of group solidarity. Honorific initial names are untenable for defining ‘caste group,’ since, “those with the same title, even though living in the one village, are no more than an aggregate of ‘similar’ kind of people” (Howe 1987:143). Moreover, we cannot clearly distinguish whether honorific initial names belong to Ksatria or Wesia, while ancestry has several drawbacks in defining Ksatria or Wesia ‘caste groups.’ In
addition, a number of *warga* considered *Sudra*, the lowest caste in the four-caste theory, trace their ancestry to nobility, hence, they are all not *Sudra* by origin. While caste theory states that a *Sudra* has no right to conduct the *dwijati* (twice born) ceremony, in Bali, everybody is now entitled to perform this ceremony and to become a high priest or *sulinggih*. Furthermore, most temple priests in Bali come from people considered *Sudra*. Because of these problems, I have argued in this chapter that the concept of caste is inappropriate in analysing contemporary Balinese society. A more useful concept in understanding Balinese dynamics is the origin group or *warga*, which has more religious and sociological significance than caste. *Warga* have clear identities, such as sacred symbols in ritual ceremonies, have *warga* temples, use *warga* temple priests (*pemangku*), maintain prescribed codes of conduct (*sesana*), and have a sense of we-ness (internal solidarity), which is manifest in the *sidikara*.

Status hierarchy is not uncontested. Status rivalry is not a new phenomenon in Balinese society. In the 1920s a group of *Jaba* (the *Surya Kanta*) openly challenged the discrimination between the *Jaba* and the *Triwangsa*. The emergence of this group was closely associated with modern education, which has given ways for the *Jaba* to read other sources of Hindu teachings, in addition to traditional Balinese sources. They introduced the practice of quoting selected *Vedic* verses to legitimise the claim of equality, and initiated the movement of a ‘return to the *Veda*’ among Balinese. The first translation of *Sanskrit* and Old Javanese *Sarasamuccaya* into Indonesian was done by a member of this group (I Nyoman Kadjeng). The most important concept which was reinvented by this group was the Vedic concept *tat tvam asi* or *manusa pada*, which indicates that human beings are equal. The other concept is that of *budi* (good character), which should be the basis of respect.

The complexity of social interaction has been described at length in this chapter, notably through an examination of cases of marriage. From these cases, it is clear that old traditions governing the nature of relationships among Balinese of different *warga* have been relaxed, and the practices followed are the result of a compromise which depends on the relative strength of the parties involved. This strength is not measured merely in terms of status based on
warga, but by other criteria, such as education, economic situation, and influence. In their negotiations, the Jaba generally make use of written religious teachings based on holy books, not merely tradition. The citing of Vedic verses to support the ideology of equality (tat twam asi or manusa pada), introduced by the Surya Kanta, is becoming increasingly popular among Balinese at present. The national ideology, the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as well as other government regulations are also often brought to the fore, because all of these, at least on paper, are in favour of equality among citizens. Legal measures through the court of justice have also been used to rule on this matter. The Parisada, as the highest Hindu council, is apparently a means to support the claim of equality.

While the status boundaries in the daily interaction among warga has been blurred, nonetheless the sense of precedence among Balinese, especially from those among the Triwangsa, is still quite strong. This is particularly true in ritual activities, although traditional rules concerning hierarchical symbols have changed considerably.

The traditional superiority of certain warga has also been several times challenged in the spheres of desa adat or banjar adat. The cases of splits in desa adat, as presented in this chapter, clearly illustrate that the privileged and superior position of warga in the daily life of Balinese society is in question, in line with the emerging strength of the discourse of equality. At the same time, the splits in the desa adat and banjar adat also indicate that the sense of being superior remains for some people of Triwangsa status.

I have also noted in this chapter that ‘warga consciousness’ is presently increasing in Bali, indicated by the emergence of dozens of warga organisations. The establishment of these warga organisations has been inspired by the ideology of equality as a challenge to the hierarchical ordering of warga. This should become clearer in the discussion of warga and warga organisation in the next chapter, where I will consider several warga, their babad, temple systems, and other sociological aspects of their current structure.
In Search of Difference (1): Warga, Kawitan, and Identity

Gunamanta Sang Dasaratha
wruh sira ring Weda, bhakti ring Dewa
tarma lupeng pitra puja,
masih ta sireng, swagotra kabeh (Ramayana I.3)

So respected was Sang Dasaratha [the king of Ayodya, in Ramayana epic)
[because] he was knowledgeable in the Veda, faithful to God
without ignoring to worship his ancestors
and he also maintained good relations with his relatives

There are numerous organisations in which the Balinese Hindus are immersed. Such organisations are established on the basis of territory, profession, interests, or common origins. Desa adat and banjar are based on residence in a given territory, although some desa adat/banjar members may live outside the territory of the desa adat/banjar. Subak and subak abian are also based on territory. In the case of subak, the territory is defined by the land served by the irrigation water belonging to one organisation, while in the case of subak abian the boundary of the territory generally coincides with the territory of the desa adat. People with the same interests also establish organisations called seka. Finally, those who believe themselves to be descendants of the same originators also establish organisations, commonly known as warga organisations. These organisations are the main theme of the present chapter.

Warga organisation starts at the village level, where a number of related families are united by the ownership of a family temple, such as sanggah gede, panti, or dadya, in honour to their ancestors. Warga have been in operation for

---

1 The terms sanggah gede, panti, and dadya have basically the same meaning, ie. a temple owned by families tracing their ancestry through the purusa (male) line. In theory, these temples are hierarchical. A number of sanggah-gede compose a panti, and a number of panti compose a dadya. A number of dadya can form a dadya agung (‘large dadya’), and finally a number of dadya agung can form a kawitan. No clear criteria can be used in defining
a long time, but the modern-style organisation encompassing all members of the
same warga is relatively new. At present, there are a number of warga
organisations of this modern type.

In this chapter I will describe a number of them in order to illustrate the
general features of warga in Bali. The discussions will include their current
organisational aspects and their presumed genealogical origins based on oral
histories babad (traditional chronicles). Based on data from several warga, I
argue in this chapter that babad, and especially the bisama (ancestral instructions
found in the babad) are used to reconstruct the warga identity. A babad strongly
influences the attitude of warga members, and at the same time the babad is used
to legitimise claims for the high status of the warga as a whole. Seeing the
activities performed by the warga organisation, it will be clear also that the sense
of ‘we-ness’ (internal solidarity) within the warga is strong.

WARGA PANDE

Warga Pande is a warga among the Jaba which seems to be unique
compared to other warga among the Jaba (Goris 1960; Guermonprez 1987).
Together with Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Warga
Pande is among the most active warga in the struggle for equality. Prominent
figures in this warga were leaders of the Surya Kanta movement in Singaraja in
the 1920s. As this warga possesses its own high priests (sulinggih), the warga is
also active in efforts to have its priests acknowledged as equal in status as those
of other warga, notably the pedanda of Warga Brahmana.

whether a family temple is a sanggah gede, panti, dadya, or dadya agung. The most common
criterion used is the number of family members worshipping in such a temple. However, this
criterion seems to be weak: some panti have more members than a dadya, some dadya have
more members than a dadya agung, etc. Hence, in this thesis, I will use these terms in the way
the owners themselves use them.

I have to acknowledge here that I am not in a position to judge the validity of the
contents of the babad, nor do I have data on when the babad were written, nor do I know the
political and historical context of each babad.
Organisational Aspects

Although it has long been a more or less unified group, Warga Pande established its formal organisation quite recently, naming it *Maha Semaya Warga Pande* or, for short, *Maha Semaya*. As stated in its basic rules and regulations, the *Maha Semaya* aims to guide its *warga* members to achieve material prosperity and spiritual well being. Based on this objective, its basic rules state that the *Maha Semaya* is expected to (1) cultivate and develop the life of the *warga* in religious fields, based on the holy books and (2) increase the devotion of its members to the advancement of society, the nation, and the state, in addition to their tasks in the spiritual field. All Pande, ie. the descendants (or those who claim to be the descendants) of Mpu Gandring and Mpu Saguna, are considered members of the organisation.

The organisational apparatus of the *Maha Semaya* consists of an organising committee at the province, *kabupaten*, and *kecamatan* levels. For the younger generation there is a special body named *Remaja Paramartha Maha Semaya Warga Pande*. The officials of the organisation are, by regulation, elected every five years at a general meeting (*pesamuhan agung*). However, since the organisation was founded in Denpasar in 1975, it has only been able to conduct one general meeting, on 29 September 1991, in Padharman Ratu Pande at the Besakih temple complex. At the provincial level, the officials consist of a president, secretary, and treasurer, each with their deputies, assisted by several heads of sections. There are also branches at *kabupaten* level, and sub-branches at *kecamatan* level. The central organisation is run by a modern elite of Warga Pande (businessmen, government officials, academia, or professionals), who are not necessarily influential in their own *dadya*.3

3 The first president was the late Nyoman Oka, a senior tourist guide who was once the *bupati* of Tabanan. The officials of the *Maha Semaya* for the period of 1991 to 1996 are as follows.

President: Nyoman Oka (died in 1993); vice president I: Prof Made Widnyana, SH (dean of the Faculty of Law, Udayana University, a former member of DPR, the Indonesian legislative assembly); vice president II: Pande Nyoman Yoga, BSc (a businessman); vice president III: I Nengah Merta (ex-Head of Bali Regional Office of Education and Culture); secretary: I Ketut Upedhana, SH (a businessman); vice secretary I: Drs Nyoman Wista
The establishment of the *Maha Semaya*, in the words of its leaders, was motivated not only by an increasing sense of brotherhood, but also by external pressure that has caused humiliation and insulting treatment to Warga Pande members. The awareness that the *warga* temples must be well-maintained was another motivation. Some leaders of the *Maha Semaya* told me that the establishment of the *Maha Semaya* is in line with the *bisama* (instruction or guidance) of their ancestors which, among other things, states that “all Pande must be one, since they are the descendants of a single seed” (Upadhana 1994). This clearly refers to the *bisama* found in *Babad Pande*, particularly in the section which describes how Lurah Kepandean received advice from Mpu Siwa Saguna:

\[\text{Aja adoha akadang-kadang, wenang kinumpulaken, apan mulania stiti, sawiji andadi akweh, sadoh-doh akadang, muliha andadi ming ro, aja angangken asanak aming tiga, ... Kunang yan ana pratisantananta angangken aming tiga, yadyapin sadoh-dohnya wong amurug angagu ngaranya, kena sodan ingsun, buating upadrawa, wastu, wastu, wastu, pariwastu, kena sodanira bathara sinuwun (Babad Pande Besi: 5b-6a).}\]

Do not stand apart from relatives, you must be united because you originated from one seed, you have become many, the most distant of your relatives must be recognised as a second cousin; never perceive third cousins, ... If my descendants perceive one another as third cousins, wherever they live, they will be struck by my curse, punished by the ancestors.

Furthermore, the *bisama* states that members of Warga Pande must never cut their *sidikara*\(^4\) or, in the *bisama* words, “Do not cut the exchange of homage among your descendants, as well as the taking and giving wives” (“*Aja pegat sembah ring pratisentanan kita sadaya mwah juang-kajuang*”).

---

\(^4\) About *sidikara*, see Chapter Three of this thesis, particularly the section *The Concept of Warga*. See also Gerdin (1981).
Members or Warga Pande are scattered throughout Bali, and some also reside outside the island. They often use the name of the warga, “Pande,” as initial names. So there are names like Pande Made Latra (a brigadier general, who served as the bupati of Badung in 1989-1992) and Pande Suteja Neka (a famous art collector and businessman from Ubud). There are also those who do not use the warga title, such as Prof. Made Widnyana (the dean of the Faculty of Law, Udayana University, who was a member of DPR), Made Kembar Krepun (a successful businessman and former bupati of Gianyar), and I Nengah Mertha (the former head of the Regional Office of Education and Culture). The use of the warga title, Pande, as initial name is becoming more popular among members of Warga Pande.

As a binding factor, Warga Pande maintains a number of dadya and panti. There are also three temples supported by all Pande throughout Bali, all of which have their festival simultaneously, on Saturday Kliwon Landep in the Balinese calendar (every 210 days). The three temples are:

1. Pura Padharman Ratu Pande in the Besakih complex. This temple is traditionally maintained by Warga Pande from Karangasem and Klungkung regencies. Aside from its function as a padharman (ancestral temple), this temple is also one of the four temples in a group called Catur Lawa, which hold crucial roles in major ceremonies in the main temple of Besakih.

2. Pura Kawitan Pande in Ulun Danu Beratan. This temple is traditionally the responsibility of Warga Pande in Mengwi (Badung), Celuk (Gianyar), and Beratan (Buleleng).

3. Pura Kawitan Pande in Ulun Danu Batur. This temple is mainly the responsibility of Warga Pande in Bangli and Gianyar.

According to Babad Pande, paying homage at Padharman Besakih and other ancestral temples is an obligatory task for Warga Pande. Warga Pande members are also obliged to learn the dharma kepandean (‘the duty of Pande’) as stated in the book Batur Kamulan. Neglecting these duties will result in unhappiness, sickness, and not enough food, as is asserted in a bisama:

*Kunang mwah yan hana santananya, treh ki Pande mula, norania ngabakti ring pajenengan pandene, ya kena brahmatia wastu iiga. Tan pariwastu,*
norana lasia mawak tan pegat kageringan, amangghih sekali-kali, sugih gawe kurang pangan, amentik-mentik punggel, apan ya dudu pratisentanan Pande. Wong mahulah mangkana, wong tan wruhing kejaten makadi wong ingon-ington ngaranja (Babad Pande Besi: 31a-31b).

If my descendants, the line of Pande, neglect the devotion to the heritage of the Pande, they will be punished. Always in difficulty, never rid of sickness, always in conflict, hard working but suffering from a shortage of food, whatever is planted will die, because of ignorance of being Pande descendants. Those who behave like that really do not know their self identity, like animals.

**Genealogical Origin**

Warga Pande traces its ancestry to Java, prior to the Singasari era. According to a version of *Babad Pande*, Dewa Brahma (the god of creation and of fire) meditated on Mount Silasayana in order to create human beings who were to be given the task of making tools and accessories. From this meditation Dewa Brahma produced a child, named Sang Brahma Wisesa. Sang Brahma Wisesa begot two sons, named Mpu Astapaka and Mpu Gni. Mpu Astapaka had two sons, Mpu Girinatha and Mpu Cilimanik. Mpu Cilimanik had two sons, named Mpu Patihjaya (or Mpu Saguna) and Mpu Gandring. Mpu Gandring begot Mpu Lumbang, and Mpu Lumbang begot two sons, Mpu Gandu and Mpu Galuh, both of whom lived in Daha. Mpu Gandu begot Mpu Jayaguna, and Mpu Jayaguna begot Arya Pande or Aji Pande, who then begot Ki Lurah Kepandean.

Since Ki Lurah Kepandean was skilful in making equipment, he was brought to Bali, and became a minister during the reign of Sri Semara Kepakisan. Ki Lurah Kepandean begot six sons, ie. (1) Pande Galuh, (2) Pande Bendesa Tua, (3) Pande Taman Bungbungan, (4) Pande Sasana Tamanbali, (5) Pande Bang Ngaran Banjar, and (6) Pande Anom. On the other hand, Mpu Saguna (Mpu Gandring’s elder brother) begot a son, named Ki Pande Tusan. These six Pande brothers and Ki Pande Tusan are the ancestors of those who are currently known as Warga Pande. Since there are seven direct originators, Warga Pande members also identify themselves as *Pande Sanak Sapta* (‘Pande, the Children of the Seven [Brothers]’) (see Figure 4.1). At present, in Bali they
are better known as Pande Kamasan, Pande Tusun, Pande Tamanbali, Pande Beratan, and so forth, named after the village where their recent ancestors lived.

There are other versions of the genealogy of Warga Pande, based on other written sources, such as Babad Pande Beratan, Prakerti Sesana, and Babad Pande Besi. Interviews with other informants from Budaga, Klungkung, produced yet other versions (Figure 4.2), which are far from similar to those mentioned in the written sources (babad and prasasti). Despite the differences, all versions mention that the ultimate creator of Warga Pande is Betara Brahma. This seems to be associated with the traditional occupation of Warga Pande, ie. mamande (smiths, making tools, accessories, and weapons), where the presence of fire is vital. In Hindu theology, the god of fire is Betara Brahma. Aside from Betara Brahma, all versions mention Mpu Gandring as the ancestor of Warga Pande, who is considered a real historical figure.

---

5 For a number of these versions, see Guermonprez (1987).

6 In the history of Indonesia (Kartodirdjo et al 1975 and other historical books), the name of Mpu Gandring is mentioned. It is said that Mpu Gandring was a blacksmith famous for his expertise in making keris. He was asked by Ken Arok to make a powerful keris, but Ken Arok was dissatisfied with the keris, and in his anger, he killed Mpu Gandring. The mentioning of an ancestor’s name in historical books is a great value for a warga, because it convinces warga members and non members as well that the warga’s babad is not merely a myth or legend, but a real ‘history.’
Figure 4.1 Genealogy of *Maha Semaya Warga Pande*, according to the *babad* held by its leaders.
Figure 4.2 Genealogy of Warga Pande, according to informants in Budaga, Klungkung
Babad Pande states that when Ida Brahmana Dwala wanted to conduct the dwijati ceremony in order to become a priest, he could not find any priests to be his nabe (teacher). To resolve the problem, he made effigies representing his grand parents, ie. Mpu Bhumi Sakti and Dyah Amertatma (the daughter of Dang Hyang Astapaka). The effigies were put in a shrine, before which he continuously meditated, until he was spiritually blessed and given a lontar, called Pustaka Bang (‘red book’). After the dwijati, he changed his name to Mpu Dwala. The procedure of this dwijati --through the personification of ancestors-- is to some extent still followed to the present day. For other warga (eg. Bhujangga Waisnawa, Pasek Sapta Rsi, or Brahmana Siwa), the nabe (teacher) directly conducts the action symbolising the transfer of knowledge and spiritual power. For Pande, the nabe merely acts as witness, while the candidate of sulinggih receives consecration from the prasasti of the warga temple. In other words, the prasasti of the warga acts as the personification of ancestors, who do the consecration.

The Use of Sri Mpu

Most members of Warga Pande do not use holy water (tirta) from pedanda (sulinggih of Warga Brahmana), but use holy water that is produced by their own sulinggih (sri mpu). In the babad, there is a story with regard to this point. When Mpu Tarub was at the peak of his meditation (yoga), he heard a bisama saying that Warga Pande is not allowed to use holy water from Warga Brahmana. This was to ensure that members of Warga Pande would not neglect their duty, dharma kepandean, which includes the making of holy water for their warga members. The bisama reads:

Yan sang brahmana weruh wesi, tan kayun sang brahmana masungklit,
 mengentas wangken sira Pande, surud ikang brahmana tekaning sang prabu
teka surud ikang pamuktian, katekan lides (Prasasti Pande Tonja: 9a).

If the Brahmana knows about iron, he would not dare to give holy water for the death of Pande, [if he does] his priesthood would fall, and the ruler of the kingdom would also fall, all burned.
Plate 4.1  A high priest from Warga Pande (*sri mpu*), officiating at a ceremony in Pura Ratu Pande, a Catur Lawa temple, which is also the Padharman of Warga Pande at the Besakih complex.

Plate 4.2  Members of Warga Pande in Pura Kawitan Pande in Beratan.
The same message can also be found from another written source, which says:

\[\text{Wenang sira Pande mangentas-entas sakadang sira Pande, lewih wong baneh wenang muah pangaskararayan, apan sira Pande wruh ring katekaning gena pinarah pitu pitui ring sastra sanga...aywa kita lali ring kamimitan ring gegaduhane iki, linglung banya..., aywa nunas tirta ring Brahmana, surud dadi Pande. Yan Brahmana nirtaning ikang Pande, genjong panagaran sang prabu, sapanira Betara Indra (Prasasti Pande Besi: 10)}\]

You Pande are entitled to \textit{ngentas} [to give holy water for the death ceremony] of all Pande members, as well as for other people, because you Pande know the sound of the praying bell \textit{pinarah pitu} [for the making of holy water] and the nine [sacred] characters [i.e. the process of making holy water] ... do not forget this hereditary duty, otherwise you will be in confusion..., do not seek holy water from a Brahmana, because this would cause you to cease being Pande. If a Brahmana sprinkles holy water on a Pande, the kingdom would tremble, so Betara Indra said.

There is also another version, an oral narrative about a \textit{pedanda} and a Pande, that explains why Warga Pande decline to use holy water from a \textit{pedanda}. The story goes that a \textit{pedanda} had stolen the golden regalia of a prince, and this was known by the Pande, since the \textit{pedanda} asked the Pande to reshape these regalia. The Pande reported this matter to the prince. When brought before the prince, however, the \textit{pedanda} denied the allegation and accused the Pande of trying to slander the \textit{pedanda}. For this, the Pande was detained and tied under a tree. The Pande was certain of his position and angrily vowed, "Now I know that a \textit{pedanda} is not a real holy man. From now on, I and my descendants will never take holy water from a \textit{pedanda}..." Based on this \textit{bisama} and oral history, members of Warga Pande have long refused holy water from \textit{pedanda}, and some informants even told me that they have not used the service of \textit{pedanda} for generations.\textsuperscript{7} Instead, to officiate at their \textit{warga} ritual

\textsuperscript{7}By chance I participated in a ritual in Payangan village (Gianyar), where a number of Pande families live. Before sprinkling holy water, the officiating \textit{pedanda} warned those of Warga Pande to get out from the flock of the faithful, by politely saying, "brothers Pande please move for a while because you may not accept a \textit{pedanda}'s holy water." I later learned that Warga Pande in this village had long been refusing holy water from \textit{pedanda}, and this had been known by \textit{desa adat} members as well as the \textit{pedanda} who frequently officiated there. When I inquired about this matter, the Pande families referred to their \textit{babad}. However, they told me that they had relaxed the practice and hold the view that all \textit{sulinggih} are the same.
ceremonies they use priests from members of their own *warga*, whether they are *pemangku* (temple priests) or *sri mpu* (*sulinggih*). Pande, in some villages, told me that they have never ever used *pedanda*.

The movement to use *sri mpu*, however, intensified in the 1920s, simultaneously with the conflict between the *Jaba* and the *Triwangsa* through the *Surya Kanta* and the *Bali Adnyana*. Arguments for and against the use of *sri mpu* appeared in both of these newsletters several times. At the beginning (in the 1920s), the use of *sri mpu* created intense conflict as reported in *Bali Adnyana* (No. 35, 1926). In 1925, it was reported that Warga Pande in the village of Mengwi (in the regency of Badung) consecrated a *sulinggih*, called *sri mpu*. They reported the consecration of the *sulinggih* to the district head (*punggawa*) and asked permission that Warga Pande would no longer have to use a *pedanda*. The district head could not decide and referred the case to the court (*Raad Kerta*) instead. However, before a decision was made by the court, a group of Pande families in Mengwi indicated that they would carry out a cremation ceremony (*ngaben*) on 10-11 November 1926 and planned to use their *sri mpu*. The villagers could not accept this practice and tried to obstruct the *ngaben* by blocking the village road connecting the Pande housing complex and the cemetery. Prominent figures in Warga Pande (ie. Nengah Metra, Poetra, and Ketut Nesa, who were also prominent figures of the *Surya Kanta*) backed the Pande movement and asked protection from the government (the district head of Mengwi). The district head was unable to resolve the conflict, and the case was brought to the *controleur* (governor) of Badung, who took a decision in favour of Warga Pande. In the end, the *ngaben* ceremony went smoothly under the guardianship of the *controleur*, the district head, and the police. 8

At present, the use of *sri mpu* among Warga Pande is common, although a number of Warga Pande still use the service of *pedanda*, for several reasons. Some feel hesitant to cut off the good relationship with an existing *siwa* (*pedanda*). Most of them, however, cite practical reasons. Informants from Budaga, Klungkung, argued as follows:

---

8 For an account of this event, see also Connor (1996).
We are eager to use our *sri mpu*, but we cannot afford to do so because there are no *sri mpu* close to our village. So, if we force ourselves to use *sri mpu*, we have to go to Tonja [Denpasar] to make an appointment, pick him up, and then return him again. This is very time consuming and costs more money. Moreover, we do not have a car of our own. In short, it is impractical. In addition, we have got very few *sri mpu*, while the demand for their service is quite high. Hence, we believe that they must be very busy all the time (Made Ana, also others in a group discussion with a number of Pande in Klungkung, 1994).

This problem has been well understood by the leaders of the *Maha Semaya*. In response, they encourage their elders who are ready, to take up the priesthood (to conduct *dwijati*). At present (1995) there are only ten *sri mpu* from Warga Pande, and one of them lives in Donggala, Sulawesi. They are (1) *Sri Pandita Buddha Raksitha* (Beratan, Singaraja), (2) Ida Sri Mpu Santapala (Peliatan, Gianyar), (3) Ida Sri Mpu Dharma Dasi (Tamanbali, Bangli), (4) Ida Sri Mpu Pande Aji (Tatasan, Denpasar), (5) Ida Sri Mpu Karuna Putra (Budeng, Jembrana), (6) Ida Sri Mpu Galuh (Kaliakah, Buleleng), (7) Ida Sri Mpu Juga (Mas, Gianyar), (8) Ida Sri Mpu Yoga (Kusamba, Klungkung), (9) Ida Sri Mpu Pande Mudita Bala (Donggala, Sulawesi), and (10) Ida Sri Mpu Upeksa Priya (Tusan, Klungkung).

---

9 Mention must be made here that Ida Sri Pandita Budha Raksita is a member of Warga Pande but a follower of Buddhism, rather than of Hinduism. He was consecrated in a Buddhist way in 1959 by a senior monk from Sri Lanka, Bhikku Aswin Sutwina Mahatera. In serving his Hindu followers (mostly from Warga Pande), he does not use 'special' regalia as other *sulinggih* do: no special clothes, no praying bell, no crown, and so forth. He merely uses his daily clothes (all white). The *mantra* (sacred formula) he utters are taken from Buddhism, known as *sutra*. Nor does he use *mudra* (sacred hand movements). He never instructs his followers to prepare special offerings, and whatever is prepared on the praying table is accepted. In addition to the prepared materials, he always burns candles when uttering the *sutra*. He also does not refuse to prepare holy water for his Hindu followers. For his Buddhist followers, he practices his priesthood in the same was as other monks.

Although everybody knows that he is a follower of Buddhism, not a Hindu, this is of no consequence for his Hindu followers. As I several times observed, the respect people pay to him is no different from other Hindu *sulinggih*. Moreover, he has been a *nabe* for several *sri mpu* of Warga Pande. Among others, he was the *nabe* of Ida Sri Mpu Dharma Dasi (Tamanbali, Bangli), Ida Sri Mpu Karuna Putra (Budeng, Jembrana), Ida Sri Mpu Upeksa Priya (Tusan, Klungkung), and Ida Sri Mpu Mudita Bala (Dudaga, Klungkung/Donggala). His role as a *nabe* in consecrating new *sulinggih* was once questioned by the *Parisada*, for fear that he would instruct his *putra* to follow his practice, ie. Buddhist practices applied to Hinduism. But their fears were allevied after he explained that he would only teach his *putra* about *tattwa* (philosophy) and *susila* (ethics), while for the *upacara* (ritualistic aspects) of the Hindu-Bali religion, the *putra* would be given full independence.
The making and the use of *sri mpu*, however, seems to still encounter some obstacles from other *warga*. The consecration of a *sri mpu* in 1993, the one who now lives in Donggala, is an interesting case. It illustrates both the eagerness of Warga Pande to use their own *sulinggih*, and the rejection by other *warga*.

I Wayan Kandra (born in 1930) is a Pande from Budaga (Klungkung), who transmigrated to Donggala, Sulawesi, in 1973. He had been keen on studying religion, and was appointed *pemangku* among the Balinese in Donggala. In May 1993 he came to Bali and discussed the possibility of undergoing a *dwijati* ceremony. According to him, Warga Pande in Donggala had urged him to do so. In I Wayan Kandra’s estimation, there were around 750 Pande families in South Sulawesi, and around 250 families in Donggala. He had secured the support of these 250 families, who all put their signature on a supporting letter (*surat dukungan*). In addition, the funds needed for the *dwijati* were cooperatively contributed by the Pande families in Donggala because they realised that they were the ones who were going to use the services of the newly consecrated *sri mpu*. At that time, every family contributed Rp. 10,000. I Wayan Kandra had also secured a permit from the *Parisada* of Donggala.

However, in the evaluation of the senior *sri mpu* in Bali, who would be his *nabe*, the knowledge and skills of I Wayan Kandra were inadequate. Hence, he was forced to learn intensively the needed skills and knowledge before the *nabe* (*Ida Sri Pandita* Budha Raksitha and *Ida Sri Mpu Santapala*) agreed to conduct the *dwijati*. A committee was established to administer the project. When the committee asked the *Parisada* of Kabupaten Klungkung to examine the candidate (*diksa pariksa*) in order to issue a permit, the head of the *Parisada*,

---

10 It seems to me that these numbers are exaggerated, compared to the total transmigrant families from Bali to Sulawesi. It would be more realistic if the figures represented the total number of Balinese families in the regions, or at least those of *Jaba* status. There is no convincing data with regard to those who signed the supporting letter, whether they were all Pande or included also non-Pande.

11 *Parisada*, as I stated before, is the highest Hindu council in Indonesia. This council was established in order to take over religious affairs, which were previously in the hand of kings (*zelfbestuurden*) before independence. These affairs include the *dwijati*. In pre-independence times, even until 1960, the permit for a *dwijati* was issued by the kings. Since 1968, permission for a *dwijati* has been in the hands of the *Parisada* and is given via the *Parisada* at kabupaten level.
Cokorda Surya Darma, refused, saying that I Wayan Kandra was not a citizen of Klungkung (he had long been a citizen of Donggala). When the committee consulted the central committee of the Parisada in Denpasar, they were asked again to approach the Parisada of Kabupaten Klungkung. However, the Parisada of Kabupaten Klungkung maintained that it had no right to give the permit. After a long and frustrating process of going back and forth, the central Parisada finally decided to handle the matter. Hence, the diksa pariksa was held in Denpasar by the central Parisada, who issued a letter saying that I Wayan Kandra was permitted to undergo dwijati. The dwijati was held in Pura Nataran Pande, a dadya temple of Warga Pande in Budaga, on 3 July 1993. The dwijati was witnessed by the central Parisada and the Parisada of Klungkung, camat, kepala desa, Maha Semaya, and a representative from Bupati Klungkung.

In the perception of Warga Pande members, the process of the dwijati was deliberately obstructed by those from other warga, especially the Triwangsa.

They [the Triwangsa] are uneasy about the rise of the Jaba, including Warga Pande. Accordingly, they will do their best to stop the emergence of new sulinggih from Pande, Pasek, or Bhujangga Waisnawa (I Made Badra 1994).

WARGA KUBON TUBUH

Warga Kubon Tubuh is also a warga among the Jaba, but it traces its ancestry to a high nobility. In terms of membership, this warga is relatively small in comparison to Warga Pande, Bhujangga Waisnawa, or Pasek Saptap Rsi. Its leaders estimated that in 1994 the total number of warga members was around 4,000 families. Aside from Bali, some members also live in Lombok, Sumbawa, and Banyuwangi. Out of this total estimated number of members, 3,329 families have secured membership cards issued by the central committee of the warga organisation.
Genealogical Origin

Warga Kubon Tubuh traces its originator to a Majapahit Arya, Sira Arya Kutawaringin, known also as Sira Arya Kubon Tubuh (Figure 4.3). However, following its babad, their ancestry is traced further back to the first king of Medang Kemulan in East Java. The babad, known as the Babad Arya Kuta Waringin, states that in the Isaka year of 530 (608 AD) King Manu started to rule Medang Kemulan. Because of his noble character, he was considered the incarnation of Wisnu. He begot a son, named Sri Jaya Langit. Sri Jaya Langit also begot a son, Sri Werti Kendayun. Sri Werti Kendayun’s only son was Sri Kameswara Paradewasikan, who begot Dharmawangsa Teguh.

Darmawangsa Teguh was the famous king during whose reign several volumes of the Sanskrit Mahabharata were adapted and translated into Javanese. His daughter, Sri Gunaprya Darmapatni, was married to the Balinese king, Udayana Warmadewa. Gunaprya Darmapatni’s eldest son, Sri Erlangga, was later adopted by Darmawangsa’s son (Sri Kameswara). After the fall of Medang Kemulan, Erlangga succeeded in establishing a new kingdom, Daha. Erlangga’s kingdom was then divided into two, and each half was inherited by one of his two sons, Jayabaya and Jayasaba. Jayabaya begot three sons, ie. Sri Aji Dandang Gendis, Sri Siwa Wandira, and Sri Jayakusuma. Dandang Gendis, as the eldest son, inherited the crown.

---

12 Some of the names mentioned in this warga genealogy can be historically documented, such as Erlangga, Sri Jayabaya, Sri Jayasaba, Dandang Gendis, Kyai Klapodyana, Kyai Parembu (see, eg. Kartodirdjo et al. 1975; Rai Mirsha et al. 1986).

13 Most babad mention events in the Isaka year. In their transliterations and translations, however, each warga tends to include the Western calendar in dating such events. Parallel with the use of historical figures in the babad, the use of the Western calendar in dating events is meant to convince readers that the babad is really a ‘history’ and is not merely a myth.
Figure 4.3 Genealogy of Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh according to \textit{Babad Arya Kuta Waringin} (PDKB 453; cf. PSSA 1989).
Sri Aji Dandang Gendis, who ruled Kediri in the 13th century neglected his duties to both Siva and Buddha priests. Feeling that they were ignored, these priests fled to seek protection from Ken Arok of Tumapel. On the advice of the priests, Ken Arok attacked Daha in 1144 Isaka (1222 AD). Sri Aji Dandang Gendis, his brother Sri Siwa Wandira, and his son Sri Jayakatong died during the attack, while Sri Jaya Waringin (the son of Sri Siwa Wandira) and Sri Jayakata (the grandson of Sri Aji Dandang Gendis) were apprehended. However, Arya Gajah Para, who apprehended Sri Jayakata adopted him as a son, while Sri Jaya Waringin married Gandigari, the daughter of his capturer, Kebo Ijo.

Sri Jaya Waringin begot a son, named Arya Kuta Wandira, who begot Arya Kuta Waringin or Arya Kubon Tubuh. Arya Kuta Waringin, together with Arya Damar and Arya Sentong, was brought to Bali by Gajah Mada in an expedition to attack Bali from the northern coast. After the defeat of Bali, Arya Kuta Waringin remained behind in Bali, together with some other Arya. The Majapahit Arya were assigned to oversee various localities throughout Bali, i.e. Arya Kenceng in Tabanan, Arya Belog in Kaba-Kaba, Arya Dalancang in Kapal, Arya Sentong in Carangsiari, Arya Kanuruhan in Tangkas, Kryan Arya Jerodeh in Temukti, Arya Pincekan in Bondalem, Arya Bleteng in Pacung, Kryan Punta in Mambal, and Kryan Tumenggung in Patemon. Arya Kuta Waringin himself was assigned to Gelgel; he assumed the position of deputy patih agung (deputy prime minister) and commander in chief under Sri Kresna Kepakisan. It is the descendants of Arya Kuta Waringin who are now known as Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh.

In Bali, Arya Kuta Waringin (Arya Kubon Tubuh) begot four children. The first was Kyai Klapodyana, known also as Kyai Agung Bendesa Gelgel. The second son was Kyai Parembu, who was assigned by Dalem Gelgel to pursue Dalem Tarukan, the rebellious elder brother of Dalem Semara Kepakisan. However, he failed to accomplish this task, for which he was embarrassed to return to Gelgel, and instead he chose to live in Waringin. The third son was Kyai Candi, and the last was a daughter, named I Gusti Ayu Waringin.

Arya Kuta Waringin and his descendants played important roles during the Samprangan and Gelgel eras. His eldest son, Kyai Klapodyana, assumed a
ministry (*patih*) under Sri Semara Kepakisan of Gelgel. It was Kyai Klapodyana who took Dalem Ketut Ngulesir from a cock fighting arena in the village of Pandak and installed him as king in Gelgel under the name Sri Semara Kepakisan (1383 AD), marking the emergence of the Gelgel era. It is important also to note that Kuta Waringin’s daughter, I Gusti Ayu Kuta Waringin, was married by Dalem Kresna Kepakisan (the father of Sri Semara Kepakisan). This marriage produced a son, named Dewa Tegalbesung.

Because of the merit acquired by Kyai Klapodyana, Dalem Gelgel gave him several rights. The *babad* says that if the community has to pay a contribution (*urunan*), the descendants of Kyai Klapodyana (Warga Kubon Tubuh) are exempted from doing so, wherever they live. They are also exempted from any kind of taxes or labour contribution, and immune from the death sentence or slavery. In case of misconduct towards the king, the death sentence must be changed to exile; and if the offence warrants exile, it must be excused by the king. For their death ceremony, they are allowed to use prestigious symbols such as a seven-tiered cremation tower with nine colours of cotton accessories, *barong*-shaped corners (*karang boma*), and an eagle accessory on the back (*garuda mungkur*). The form of the burning-coffin can have the shape of tiger (*macan*), lion (*singamara*), boar (*bawi serenggi*), or lion-fish (*gajamina*). They are also allowed to become priests of the same rank as those of Warga Brahmana.

**Organisational Aspects**

Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh founded an organisation named *Prati Sentana Sira Arya Kubon Tubuh* (*PSSA Kubon Tubuh*) on 22 May 1983. By definition, “members of this organisation are those who recognise Arya Kubon Tubuh as their ancestor, and participate in supporting Pura Dalem Tugu in Gelgel, Klungkung.” The main objective of this organisation is “to develop a sentiment of brotherhood among descendants of Arya Kubon Tubuh, and to maintain and conduct ceremonies in temples associated with Arya Kubon Tubuh.” Its basic regulation also states that the PSSA is a “brotherhood organisation, which functions as a means of communication among members in order to enhance
participation in and devotion to the development of Warga Kubon Tubuh, as well as the motherland, the nation, the Republic of Indonesia” (article 2). In line with the nature of the organisation as a *warga* organisation, the PSSA is directed to develop and guide the *warga* in physical and material development, and to increase interaction among the members of Warga Kubon Tubuh, based on the principle of brotherhood. It also aims to develop ethics and to maintain unity, in the framework of increasing the participation of all *warga* members in the development of the nation and the state of the Republic of Indonesia, which is based on Pancasila and the 1945 constitution (article 4).

Prominent figures of this organisation are Drs Wayan Warna (the former Head of the Provincial Office of Basic Education), Drs Made Pageh Suardhana (chief of a bureau at the governor’s office of Bali), I Ketut Mertha SH (once the vice rector of Udayana University) and Ir Wayan Diartika (a lecturer at Udayana University). The organisational structure comprises president, secretary, and treasurer, each of whom has several assistants; a number of divisions, kabupaten branches; and representatives in Lombok, Sumbawa, Banyuwangi, and Nusa Penida.\(^4\)

As a binding factor, the PSSA Kubon Tubuh manages two temples at the central level, ie. (1) Pura Merajan Kawitan Sira Arya Kubon Tubuh in Gelgel, Klungkung, which is the *kawitan* temple of this *warga*; and (2) Pura Dalem Tugu, also in Gelgel. Pura Dalem Tugu is believed to be a temple constructed to commemorate the place where Kyai Klapodyana, an ancestor of this *warga*, led a meeting which decided to install Dalem Ketut Ngulesir as the new king. Festivals at these two temples are held on the same day, ie. on Tuesday *Kliwon Medangsia* in the Balinese calendar (every 210 days). Each of these temples has its organisational unit (*pangemong*) for the daily maintenance and conduct of

\(^4\) The present organising committee (1993-1998) of PSSA is as follows. President: Drs I Wayan Warna; vice president I: Drs Made Pageh Suardhana; vice president II: I Ketut Mertha, SH; vice president III: Drs Komang Soka; secretary I: Ir I Wayan Diartika; secretary II: Ketut Alit Suarna, BA; treasurer I: I Wayan Diartha; treasurer II: Drs I Nengah Taman; General Assistants: Ir I Nyoman Nusadha, MAgrSc, Ir Wayan Subagiana, I Nengah Cenik Astawa BA, Drs I Made Radiawan, and Drs I Ketut Rimpi.
any ceremony. Besides these two temples the PSSA has identified 191 dadya of Warga Kubon Tubuh throughout Bali.

Not all of those who believe themselves to be the descendants of Arya Kubon Tubuh are members of the PSSA Kubon Tubuh. There are at least two groups who acknowledge themselves as descendants of Arya Kubon Tubuh but who refuse to be members of this organisation. The first are the descendants of Kyai Parembu, the second son of Arya Kubon Tubuh. Kyai Parembu was assigned to capture Dalem Tarukan, but he and his 40 followers failed to do so. Because of the embarrassment, Kyai Parembu decided not to return to Gelgel; instead he stayed in Waringin where he died later. There, a special temple was built in his honour, known as Pura Waringin. His descendants, who call themselves Warga Kuta Waringin, are the current pamaksan of this temple, which is considered a kawitan temple. Since they already have their own pura kawitan, members of Warga Kuta Waringin refuse to join Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh, who support Pura Dalem Tugu and Merajan Kawitan Kubon Tubuh. Nevertheless, members of Warga Kuta Waringin admit that they are ‘brothers’ to Warga Kubon Tubuh, and some members of these warga exchange visits and pay homage to each other’s temple. In the view of the leaders of the PSSA Kubon Tubuh, Pura Waringin is merely a dadya, not a kawitan, because there must be only one kawitan, ie. Pura Merajan Kawitan in Gelgel, a temple in honour to Arya Kubon Tubuh.

The second group is a group of Gusti who call themselves Gusti Kubon Tubuh, from the village of Manduang. Members of this group, comprising around 50 families, admit that they are descendants of Arya Kubon Tubuh. They even claim that they are the ‘legitimate descendants’ who have kept the honorific name Gusti up to now. They have established a warga temple in their village, which they call a kawitan temple. Since they have their own kawitan, they refuse to join the PSSA Kubon Tubuh to support Pura Dalem Tugu and Pura Merajan Kawitan. However, I observed that some families of this group visited these temples during the festival.

The organising committee of the PSSA continually tries to achieve the objectives set up by the organisation. In order to disseminate the ‘history’ of the
warga and to encourage the sense of brotherhood, the PSSA has published its babad, ie. Babad Arya Kuta Waringin (Kubon Tubuh). To spread news, programs, and religious teachings, or other warga ideology, it publishes a journal, called Chanti Swara. This journal was issued twice a year, on the day of the temple festival at Pura Merajan Kawitan. However, because of shortage in funding, the publication of the journal was stopped after its fifth volume.

The variations in the conduct of ritual ceremonies among members have also been somewhat standardised to emphasise the identity of Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh. This includes the procedures for seeking holy water, guidelines for the offerings to be used in warga ceremonies, as well as the procedures for the making and the patterns of the kajang (sacred formulae for ngaben ceremonies).

Between 1988 and 1993, the organising committee also accomplished several renovations to its kawitan temple. This rebuilding project formally began on Sunday, 15 October 1989 and was symbolised by the laying of the first corner-stone by Ida Dalem Pemayun of Puri Klungkung. The renovation has been completed and the inaugural ceremony (mlaspas) was conducted on Friday, 23 March 1990. Several renovations have also been performed to Pura Dalem Tugu, including the extension of the temple yard, which was purified on 2 March 1993. For all of these projects, funding was mobilised from members. It seems that the members contributed with great enthusiasm, both by compulsory contributions (urunan wajib) and voluntary contributions (dana punya), channelled through kabupaten to the provincial level. During the period of 31 December 1988 to 26 June 1993, as much as Rp. 32,390,200 was mobilised from members, not to mention labour and material contributions. This is a huge amount of money by Balinese standards. The contributions in kind were also substantial. For the rebuilding of Merajan Kawitan temple in 1989/1990, dadya, kabupaten, and individual members contributed by each helping to finance one building to be rebuilt. The shrine called Limas Agung (valued at Rp. 325,000), for instance, was paid for by Dadya Kubon Tubuh of Sengkidu (Karangasem), while the cost for its carving was paid by Drs I Nengah Medra and Wayan Gede Wardana. The Manca Agung shrine (valued at Rp. 550,000) was contributed to
by Kabupaten Klungkung, while the cost of carving for the building was contributed by I Ketut Parta.

At present, members of Warga Kubon Tubuh are spread throughout Bali. Outside Bali, members of this _warga_ are also found in Banyuwangi, Lombok and Sumbawa, where the organisation has also established commissariats. Interestingly, some members use the honorific initial name _I Gusti_ or _I Gusti Ngurah_ (initial names of people of _Triwangsa_), while most others do not. Nevertheless, I observed that they do acknowledge being equal brothers to each other, and there is no difference in behaviour during temple festivals.

The establishment of the formal organisation has obviously reduced the burden of the _pangemong_ responsible for the maintenance and conduct of ceremonies in Pura Dalem Tugu and Pura Kawitan Kubon Tubuh. The leaders of these temples told me that before the PSSA was active, funding for conducting ceremonies was always a great problem, not to mention funding for renovation of the temples. Since the PSSA has been active, the yearly ceremony has been flooded by _warga_ members from regions throughout Bali and other islands as well. In the leaders’ view, this is associated with several factors, which include the increase in consciousness of being Warga Kubon Tubuh after reading the published _babad_, the increase in self-identity after coming to know the genealogy, and the awareness of the exact dates of the ceremony, because the ceremony is announced by the PSSA in the mass media (radio, TV, and newspaper). Together with the increase in the economic prosperity of members, this has resulted in an enormous income earned during the temple festival.

An example of the level of income received can be seen from the temple festival of Pura Dalem Tugu in April 1994. The expenses incurred, excluding labour and local materials, were Rp. 2,549,175; while the income during the temple festival (from donation and _sesari_ ‘money put on top of the individual offering’) reached Rp. 5,175,545. This resulted in a surplus of Rp. 2,626,370,

---

15 In present day Bali, it is common to announce a temple festival in a newspaper and in a radio broadcast, particularly for major ceremonies in public and _warga_ temples.
which the committee could use for daily maintenance of the temple or other purposes. A similar surplus resulted from the festival of Pura Kawitan Kubon Tubuh in April 1994. The expenses were Rp. 814,450, while the income was Rp. 3,196,487.

Although their babad states that members of Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh are entitled to become high priests, there is no high priest from this warga at present. There is also no intention among the warga leaders to consecrate one. Members of this warga use the service of pedanda siwa (high priests from Warga Brahmana Siwa).

WARGA BHUJANGGA WAISNAWA

Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa is another warga among the Jaba. This warga has been active in the struggle for equality, in particular the equality of their sulinggih, called rsi bhujangga, with their counterparts from Warga Brahmana. The main motive for the establishment of the formal organisation of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa was apparently this ideology of equality.

Genealogical Origin

This warga traces its ancestry to several points (Figure 4.4). The first is to Maharsi Markandeya, who is believed to be the founder of Pura Besakih and the first Hindu teacher who came to Bali. Mpu Pradnyana and Bhuana Tattwa manuscripts state that Sri Kresna Kepakisan brought a sulinggih of Warga Bhujangga from Majapahit, under the name of Rsi Waisnawa Mustika. Rsi Waisnawa Mustika is the second ancestor to whom the warga traces its origin. The third point is to Rsi Madura, who came to Bali during the Gelgel era. In oral histories, members of this warga also claim several historic figures who were followers of the sect of Waisnawa, such as Sri Jayapangus and Mpu
Kuturan, as their ancestors. Hence, one may argue that Bhujangga Waisnawa is not a warga by genealogical ties, but a ‘warga by sect,’ ie. those who worship Wisnu as the dominant god. Bhujangga Waisnawa is the only warga in Bali which explicitly proclaims itself to be a Waisnawa sect amid the strongly Siva-oriented Balinese Hindu.

According to the Rsi Markandeya Purana (‘The history of Maharsi Markandeya’), Maharsi Markandeya was of Indian origin, and came to Java to spread Hindu teachings. He was the son of Sang Niatha, himself the son of Sang Hyang Meru (the god of the Himalaya). When Maharsi Markandeya was meditating on Mount Dieng (East Java), he received instructions to spread Hindu teachings farther east, for which he moved to Mount Raung. There, he received the same instructions, ie. to spread the teachings farther east to an island called Balikulina. Following these instructions, he went to Bali, followed by villagers from around the slope of Mount Raung, known as Aga people (wong Aga). He started by commanding his 800 followers to clear forest and construct a settlement in Bali. However, this effort failed, and most of his followers died.

He returned to Mount Raung to ask for more guidance. Upon receiving guidance, he returned to Bali with 400 new followers, also of the Aga people. In Bali, before continuing to clear the forest, he conducted a major ceremony on the slope of Gunung Agung. The main component of the ceremony was the burial of the pancadatu (‘five fundamentals’ or ‘five colours’), which consisted of gold,

---

16 These figures are known in the history of Bali. According to Kartodirdjo et al. (1975) and Rai Mirsha (1986), Sri Jayapangus was the king of Bali in 1181-1200 AD, while Mpu Kuturan was a high ranking officer during the reign of Udayana and Gunaprya Darmapatni.

17 There are also Waisnawa sects in Bali at present, ie. Hare Krishna and Sai Baba. Members of Hare Krishna were aggressive in inducing people to follow the sect and its practices --notably vegetarianism. Its followers grew rapidly in number in the 1980s. In 1990 the government outlawed its public mission under the pretext that its activities had disturbed the harmony and the order of society. However, individual beliefs and practices were not banned. Sai Baba has grown slowly but steadily since the late 1980s, and now (1997) has thousands of followers. This sect was also questioned by the Indonesian Department of Religion in 1994, but the Parisada gave protection. Followers of both the Sai Baba and Hare Krishna sects are mostly educated and middle class citizens. A great number of Parisada officers are also followers of Sai Baba..

18 There are a lot of versions of Rsi Markandeya Purana, but the main story is the same. For a more detailed account (in Balinese), see Ginarsa (1979) and Soebandi (1991).
silver, copper, iron, and red diamond. The place where the ceremony was conducted was called Basuki Han (‘the state of well being’), which is now known as Besakih temple. After the pancadatu ceremony, the expedition was successful. Maharsi Markandeya wandered around Bali spreading Hindu teachings, particularly the concept of tripaksa, which involved the worship of three gods, Brahma, Wisnu and Siwa. Today, a number of villages and temples are associated with his sojourn. These include Pura Gunung Lebah and Pucak Payogan in Ubud, Pura Murwa in Payangan, Pura Gunung Raung in Taro (Tegallalang), Pura Besakih, Desa Adat Taro, Desa Adat Puakan, and Desa Adat Ubud. His followers also spread in Bali, mostly in mountainous villages, which became known as ‘Bali-Aga’ villages (because they came from Aga village in Gunung Raung).

The story goes that Maharsi Markandeya begot several children, and gave rise to several subgroups of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa in Bali.

After Bali was defeated by Majapahit, Gajah Mada installed Sri Kresna Kepakisan as the adipati of Bali. When Sri Kresna Kepakisan was sent to Bali, he was accompanied by several priests, one of whom was Rsi Bhujangga Waisnawa Mustika, a descendant of Maharsi Markandeya. Rsi Bhujangga Waisnawa Mustika served as purohita (‘court priest’) in Samprangan, and then conducted asceticism in Besakih complex, where he died without leaving any physical remains (moksa). He is the one who is worshipped in Pura Padharman Brahmana Bhujangga Waisnawa in Besakih complex and is considered the originator of most of the subgroups of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa.

Later, during the reign of Sri Semara Kepakisan, the first ruler of Gelgel, another priest of Bhujangga Waisnawa arrived in Bali, ie. Ida Rsi Madura, also a descendant of Maharsi Markandeya in Java. Rsi Madura is the originator of several subgroups of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa.

---

19 The story goes that when Maharsi Markandeya left Java for Bali, he left his children in Java.

20 Moksa (self-liberation) is the state of the highest happiness, where the soul perfectly reunites with its source, the God, and hence the soul will not reincarnate again. This is one of the five fundamental beliefs (Panca Sradha) of Hinduism. Moksa, in legends and the babad, is signified by death without physical remains.
Figure 4.4 The genealogy of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa according to their formal version (after lontar Batur Kelawasan Petak and Soebandi n.d.).
Organisational Aspects

Warga Bhujangga organised itself in the 1930s, when it was called *Pengurus Moncol Keluarga Bhujangga Waisnawa Bali*. It was established by Guru Ketut Gede Kemoning, Guru Ketut Petingan, and Ida Bhujangga Rsi Anom from Nyitdah (Tabanan). The organising committee of this warga organisation underwent several reshuffles. In 1982 the organisation conducted its general meeting in Pura Batan Getas, Denpasar for the first time, and elected I Made Anom SH as president, with a more complete organisational structure. Leaders of this newly restructured organisation mostly come from an urban elite -- academics, businessmen, and government officials.

The organisational structure of *Keluarga Besar Bhujangga Waisnawa* consists of advisers (all *rsi bhujangga* and some intellectuals), a president, vice presidents, a secretary, vice secretaries, treasurers, and general assistants, supported by a number of divisions.\(^{21}\)

According to Guru Langen, an elder in *Keluarga Besar Bhujangga Waisnawa Bali*, the emergence of the organisation of this warga was stimulated by the *manak salah* case in the 1930s.\(^{22}\) In his version, there was an incident where a Bhujangga couple from the village of Penarungan (Badung regency) gave birth to twins of opposite sex. Not long after that, another Bhujangga

---

21 The organising committee elected for the period 1987-1992 (which was still in place in 1995) is the following. President: Made Anom, SH; vice president I: Nyoman Sember BA; vice president II: Dr Nyoman Sugita; vice president III: Ir Made Pudja; vice president IV: Drs Ketut Sukarata; vice president V: Putu Kartaya; secretary: Made Suata BA; vice secretary I: Made Matram; vice secretary II: Made Puger; treasurer: Kompyang Gede Sudira; vice treasurer I: Made Putu Yadnya; vice treasurer II: Made Bhuktiyasa.

22 *Manak salah* (literally 'giving birth wrongly'), according to old Balinese law, refers to the occurrence where people of *Jaba* status deliver twins of opposite sexes, particularly if the baby boy is born first, followed by the baby girl. This occurrence was believed to be a sign of unforgivable pollution for the village, and hence deities would send disaster. If this incident occurred among *Triwangsa*, it was not considered *salah* ('wrong'), but in contrast, was believed to be a sign that the prosperity of society would soon come. According to the old Balinese *adat* rule, the *manak salah* case was punished by *adat*. This rule was formally abolished by the government of Bali through provincial regulation No. 10/1950. However, in some villages the sense of *'manak salah'* is still felt. Because of this, a special ritual is performed, although the babies and their parents are no longer exiled to the cemetery.
couple in Kaba-Kaba (Tabanan regency) also had twins. The Balinese tradition that applied at that time was that the delivery of opposite-sex twins by a *Jaba* was considered a dreadful sin, and the incident was believed to be a signal of disaster. To pacify the deities and prevent disaster, the house where the twins were born had to be burned, and the twins and their parents had to be exiled for 42 days to the village’s cemetery. Provided they survived the 42 days in exile, they were allowed to return to the village, preceded by a set of major purification ceremonies for both the family and the village.23

Since Bhujangga are generally classified as *Jaba*, the Bhujangga families who delivered twins had to be treated the same as other *Jaba* couples. Prominent figures in Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa objected to this for several reasons. Firstly, some educated Bhujangga Waisnawa were of the opinion that such a tradition was inhuman, and was clearly not a part of Hinduism. Influenced by the *Surya Kanta* movement (some Bhujangga were members of the *Surya Kanta*) they were of the opinion that old traditions, which were no longer in line with the changing world, must be changed or modified. In relation to the *manak salah*, the main argument was that, “as long as humans give birth to humans, there is nothing wrong.” Secondly, they rejected being equated with other *Jaba* or *Sudra*, because Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa had long used their own *sulinggih*, ie. *rsi bhujangga*, and had never used *pedanda*. The existence of the *rsi bhujangga* had been widely acknowledged since in any major ceremony, particularly *butha yadnya* (sacrifice for lower-level beings), a *rsi bhujangga* is involved in the group of three *sulinggih* (*trisadaka*, ‘three priests’), ie. *siwa*, *boda*, and *bhujangga*. Thirdly, *rsi bhujangga* is the one who has the ability to purify the world. As a matter of fact, any major purification ceremony (*tawur*, *labuh gentuh*, etc.) invariably uses a *rsi bhujangga*. The logic, then, was that since a *rsi bhujangga* is capable of purifying the world, he would be capable of purifying the sin brought about by the birth of twins. This ability to purify any pollution is written in their *babad*:

23 For a detailed description of customs pertaining to twins (*manak salah*) in a Balinese village, see Jane Belo (1970).
Yan hana letuhing rat, letuhing kedaton, bale agung mwah sawah, wenang sang guru bhujangga amretista, apan sira sang bhujangga kasungan geni saracinara, purwa bhumi twa, gelar siwaga waisnawalingga geni sara, aregep dening sanjatanira, sakwehing letuhing rat kasuda denira kabe.. Sira sang bhujangga waisnawa tan keneng cuntaka, apan sira mraga suku mwah cecek, wenang nyiwa boda (Quoted from Bhujangga Dharma: 35).

If there is a [spiritual] pollution in the world, palace, large house, and rice field, it must be purified by sang guru bhujangga, because sang bhujangga owns the fire of saracinara ['to burn the polluting agents'], knowledge of purwa bhumi, the ability to activate the fire owned by Wisnu, complete with His weapons, so that all pollution can be destroyed... Sang bhujangga cannot be infected by pollution, because they are suku and cecek, they are entitled to perform the tasks of siwa and boda.

Armed with these arguments, leaders of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa insisted that the cases of manak salah among Warga Bhujangga should not be treated as such, that the families should not be exiled to the cemetery, and that their houses should not be burned. A purification ceremony led by a rsi bhujangga should be enough. The arguments of Warga Bhujangga were rejected by the desa adat members where the cases occurred. In Penarungan, the case nearly ended in a physical clash between members of Warga Bhujangga and the non-Bhujangga members of the desa adat. In Kaba-Kaba, the leaders of Warga Bhujangga destroyed the offerings that had been prepared at the cross-road, which also led to a physical clash. In both cases, the Dutch government intervened. In the case of Kaba-Kaba, both parties were fined 15 ringgit. The desa adat was fined because it forced its warga to perform an expensive ceremony, while Warga Bhujangga was fined because they rebelled against the desa adat and destroyed the offerings. The fine for Warga Bhujangga was paid voluntarily by Guru Rupa, a wealthy Warga Bhujangga from Kapal (Badung).

To activate the warga organisation and to disseminate the ideology of the warga, Warga Bhujangga also founded a youth organisation, called Eka Bhuana Sutha. It was founded on 6 December 1987 when Warga Bhujangga conducted its general meeting (mahasabha) in Denpasar. For the period of 1987-1992

---

24 Suku and cecek are vowels for ‘u’ (symbolising leg) and ‘e’ (symbolising head) in the Balinese alphabet. This implies that rsi bhujangga are entitled to officiate at all levels of rituals.
(though the situation remained unchanged until 1994), *Eka Bhuana Sutha* was headed by Made Rai Suartana (a successful businessman), with Made Raka Santeri (a journalist working for *Kompas* daily) as the secretary. This organisation also recruits intellectuals, and at present has become the think-tank of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, as well as the driving force in the movement. *Eka Bhuana Sutha* has been active in conducting discussions on religious philosophy and in performing pilgrimages (*tirta yatra*) from temple to temple, particularly temples associated with Warga Bhujangga. As a matter of fact, all external affairs of the *warga* are handled by this youth organisation. In the struggle to involve *sulinggih* from all *warga* in the *Tribhuana* ceremony in Besakih in 1993, for example, it was *Eka Bhuana Sutha* that took the most active role, in collaboration with Warga Pasek Saptan Rsi (*Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Saptan Rsi*) and Warga Pande (*Maha Semaya Warga Pande*). For the general public in Bali, leaders of *Eka Bhuana Sutha* are better known as leaders of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, overshadowing the leaders of *Keluarga Besar Bhujangga Waisnawa* themselves.

There are a number of temples associated with Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, but only two are considered to be the responsibility of all *warga* members throughout Bali, ie. (1) Padharman Brahmana Bhujangga Waisnawa in the Besakih complex; and (2) Pura Kawitan Bhujangga in Jatiluwih, Tabanan. The daily maintenance of the Pura Padharman in Besakih is managed by Warga Bhujangga in Takmung, Klungkung; while the *pura kawitan* in Jatiluwih is managed by Warga Bhujangga in Tabanan.

Since the organisation was reactivated in 1987, it has accomplished a number of projects. The most recent is the restoration of Pura Kawitan Bhujangga in Jatiluwih (Tabanan), while the restoration of Padharman Brahmana Bhujangga Waisnawa in Besakih was under way when I conducted my fieldwork (in 1994 and 1996) with a predicted cost of around 60 million *rupiah*. Restoration of the *pura kawitan* in Jatiluwih in 1988/1989 cost 45 million *rupiah*, which included the construction of a stairway connecting the temple and another smaller temple which is the source of holy water for the main temple.
Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa does not use sulinggih from other warga. It has its own sulinggih, called rsi bhujangga or sengguhu. Currently this warga has nine sulinggih throughout Bali. The use of rsi bhujangga in public ceremonies has been in practice for a long time, particularly to accompany pedanda boda and pedanda siwa to make up the set of trisadhaka in major ceremonies. However, by tradition the platform of the rsi bhujangga was usually made lower than his counterparts, signifying that he was of lower status. This attracted protests from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. The first open protest was voiced at a meeting with the Governor of Bali, the late Prof Dr Ida Bagus Mantra, after a major ceremony (Pancawalikrama) in Besakih in 1988. Another successful protest was made in 1991, before a major ceremony in Pura Kehen, Bangli. Since then, in most cases, the seat of the rsi bhujangga is made equal in height to his pedanda boda and pedanda siwa counterparts.25

Bhujangga Sakti, A Rival Bhujangga

The Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa has gained wide acknowledgment among Balinese in general. If we talk about Warga Bhujangga, most Balinese will refer to the Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, that is the Warga Bhujangga that has and uses its own sulinggih, or the one that supports the Pura Kawitan Bhujangga in Jatiluh and Pura Padharman Brahma Bhujangga Waisnawa at the Besakih complex.

25 However, in the Ekabhuana ceremony at Besakih in March 1996, the platform for the priest from Warga Bhujangga was made separate from his pedanda counterparts. At the summit of the sacrifice ceremony (Tawur Ekabhuana), there were four sulinggih officiating at the main ritual. Three were pedanda (two pedanda siwa and one pedanda boda) seated on the same platform; while the sulinggih of Warga Bhujangga used a separate platform. This platform was made 5 cm (one asta) lower, so that at a glance the two platform looked level, but the meaning still indicated inequality. More importantly, the sulinggih from Warga Bhujangga invited for this ritual was not a rsi bhujangga, but merely a jero-gede. This attracted protest from Eka Bhuana Sutha (see further Chapter Eight).
Plate 4.3  The Pura Kawitan of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa in the village of Jatiluih, Tabanan, with an eleven-tiered meru.

Plate 4.4  A high priest from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, officiating at a public ceremony in Besakih.
However, there is also another warga in Bali whose members claim that they are the ‘legitimate Bhujangga.’ This warga, consisting of around 80 Gusti families, also manage a padharman at the Besakih complex, called Padharman Sri Mpu Bhujangga Sakti. Members of this warga call themselves Warga Bhujangga Sakti. According to leaders of this warga, the other Warga Bhujangga is not a ‘Warga Bhujangga,’ but merely a ‘Warga Sengguhu.’ They further cite a legend about the origin of the Sengguhu. The story goes that I Guto was a slave of Mpu Dwijaksara. Since he had heard the mantra (sacred formulae) so many times, I Guto memorised all the mantra needed to officiate at certain ritual ceremonies. One day, a villager wished to invite Mpu Dwijaksara to officiate at his ritual. At that time, Mpu Dwijaksara was not at home, and the villager was hosted by I Guto, who pretended to be Mpu Dwijaksara. I Guto then went to the place of the ritual and officiated at the ritual. Half way through chanting the mantra, Mpu Dwijaksara arrived at the scene. On seeing his lord, I Guto stopped chanting and asked forgiveness from Mpu Dwijaksara. Mpu Dwijaksara did not become angry, instead he gave permission to I Guto to officiate at rituals, particularly purification ceremonies for lower-level beings. I Guto was later called ‘sengguh’ (a Balinese word which means ‘mis-identified’) since the villagers had mistakenly identified him as Mpu Dwijaksara. The word ‘sengguh’ then became ‘senggu’ or ‘sengguhu.’

Leaders of Warga Bhujangga Sakti claim that Mpu Dwijaksara is their ancestor, while I Guto is the ancestor of Warga Senggu (ie. Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa). I Gusti Oka, the leader of this warga told me:

Warga Sengguhu had twice made the same mistake. The first was when their ancestor, I Guto, identified himself as Mpu Dwijaksara, my ancestor. The second is now, when they call themselves Warga Bhujangga, while the genuine Bhujangga is mine. I can prove that my warga is the real Bhujangga. In my kawitan, in the village of Sengguan, Klungkung, we still keep equipment of my

---

26 Interestingly, in written sources (the Raja Purana Pura Besakih and Surpha 1979), as well as on the Besakih plan which is now set on a signboard in front of the Besakih temple, this padharman is called Padharman Kuban Tubuh. Members of Warga Kuban Tubuh, on the other hand, have, for generations, not managed this padharman. In Warga Bhujangga Sakti’s view, this was merely an error in inventory. It is noteworthy also that some padharman at the Besakih complex have changed their name, but I can not discuss this phenomenon here.
priestly ancestor, including a prayer bell, holy water container, and other regalia.

Although Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa acknowledges that the influence of its sulunggh, the rsi bhujangga, has been eclipsed by pedanda, its leaders argue that the story of the Sengguhu was written and spread by their rivals to suppress the rsi bhujangga, who were once the dominant priests in Bali. The true story associated with the decreasing influence of the rsi bhujangga, according to Bhujangga Waisnawa is the following.

One of Rsi Mustika’s grandsons, Ida Bhujangga Guru, was appointed court priest by Dalem Waturenggong. As a purohita, his tasks included teaching the children of the king. While teaching, Ida Bhujangga Guru fell in love with I Dewa Ayu Laksmi, a daughter of Dalem Waturenggong, and they ended up marrying each other. Dalem Waturenggong was very angry and gave instructions to kill the couple. Fortunately, the couple managed to escape and fled to a place on the slopes of Gunung Batukau, known as Gunungsari. Since then, members of Bhujangga Waisnawa are no longer used as court priests, and their priestly status is considered lower than priests from Warga Brahmana Siwa and Brahmana Boda.

There is also another version with regard to the degradation of Bhujangga prestige. According to this version, Ida Bhujangga Alit Adiarsa was one of the court priests during the reign of Dalem Segening in Gelgel. In his effort to accommodate rebellions and factions, Dalem Segening used the politics of marriage, and hence had many wives and children. When he wished to take another woman, Ida Bhujangga Alit Adiarsa advised him not to do so. This created ill feeling on the part of Dalem Segening and resulted in him ignoring Ida Bhujangga Alit. Realising the situation, Ida Bhujangga Alit left the palace to practice asceticism in Setra Gandamayu. Dalem Segening, meanwhile, advised his children not to use a Bhujangga any more as a court priest.

---

27 According to some historical sources, Dalem Waturenggong is reported to have ruled Gelgel from around 1460-1552 AD (see Mirsha et al 1986).
The members of Warga Arya Pengalasan are relatively few in number, concentrated in several villages in Kabupaten Gianyar. In 1994, its leaders estimated that the warga had a membership of around 500 families, most of whom use the honorific initial name I Gusti. As its name indicates, this warga traces its ancestry to Arya Pengalasan, a Majapahit Arya sent to Bali during the Gajah Mada expedition.

**Genealogical Origin**

This warga has no written babad of its own. But the name Arya Pengalasan is mentioned in several babad, such as Babad Dalem, Babad Dalem Tarukan, Babad Pulasari, and Babad Pasek. Basing their accounts on several sources, its leaders told me that Arya Pengalasan was a member of the Gajah Mada troop guarding King Jayanegara during the rebellion of Ra Kuti.²⁸ Gajah Mada and his troop escorted Jayanegara to hide in a remote village named Bebander. For the sake of security, Gajah Mada made a rule that no one was permitted to leave the village. However, Arya Pengalasan insisted on leaving the village to return to Majapahit because his wife was about to deliver her baby. Failing to secure a permit from Gajah Mada, Arya Pengalasan slipped away quietly, but was found on the way by Gajah Mada, who then killed the poor soldier. Gajah Mada suspected that Arya Pengalasan would betray the king by reporting the hiding place to the rebels who at the time controlled Majapahit.

After Gajah Mada succeeded in putting down the rebellion and returned the king to Majapahit, he found out that Arya Pengalasan's wife had indeed just delivered a baby boy. This meant that Arya Pengalasan was not lying when he gave his reason for returning to Majapahit. Hence, out of a feeling of guilt, Gajah Mada adopted Arya Pengalasan's son as his foster son, whom he also named Arya Pengalasan. Gajah Mada then recruited the boy as his adjutant when he went to Bali on his expedition. After Bali was defeated, Arya

²⁸ In Javanese history, this event occurred in 1305 AD (Kartodirdjo et al. 1975).
Pengalasan was left in Bali and assigned to the old capital of Bali, Bedahulu, for which he was given a *keris* by Gajah Mada, called Kyai Bahan Kau. He died there and is worshipped by his descendants in a temple called Merajan Agung Arya Pengalasan.

Organisational Aspects

The formal organisation of this *warga* was established on 3 July 1985 and is called *Persemetonan Keturunan Arya Pengalasan* or PKAP. The objective of this establishment is to secure the maintenance of, and ritual ceremonies in Pura Merajan Agung/Kawitan Arya Pengalasan, located in Bedahulu village. The organisation also, as stated in its basic regulations, endeavours to increase the material and spiritual well being of its members, and the sense of oneness (brotherhood) among the descendants of Arya Pengalasan, through *sidikara* activities. In turn, the organisation prohibits its members to conduct *sidikara* with other *warga*. The organisational structure of the *warga* consists of a chairman called *panglingsir*, vice chairman, secretary, and treasurer, which are supported by a coordinator in each *kabupaten*.²⁹

Members of Warga Arya Pengalasan are classified into three categories. The first is called *warga jeroan* ('inner members'), ie. the direct inheritors of Arya Pengalasan property, such as housing and land. In practice, these members are the primary supporters (*pangemong*) of Merajan Agung Arya Pengalasan. At present this category consists of seven housing lots or 24 extended families in Bedahulu. The second is called *warga biasa* ('ordinary members'), ie. those other than *warga jeroan*. These members mainly live in three villages in the region, namely Bedahulu, Tengkulak, and Wanayu. The third category of the membership is *warga peninjau* ('visiting members'), ie. the descendants of Arya Pengalasan who have lost or do not use, for whatever reasons, their honorific

---

²⁹The present (1991-1996) leaders of the *warga* are as follows. Adviser: Prof Dr I Gusti Putu Panteri, a professor and formerly dean of the Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University; chairman: Drs I Gusti Ngurah Putera; vice chairman I: I Gusti Made Ngrah, BA; vice chairman II: I Gusti Putu Cenik, BA; secretary: I Gusti Putu Mertha; treasurer: I Gusti Nyoman Adnyana.
name *I Gusti*. This category comprises around 25% of the members. The chairman of the *warga* can only be chosen from *warga jeroan*, while staff can be taken from all *warga* subcategories.

*Warga Peninjau* seems to be a special group. While all members recognise that they are brothers to each other, the *warga peninjau* are not members of the *sidikara* circle, because they are *Jaba*, as signified by the lack of the honorific name ‘*I Gusti*.’ They are considered lower in status than their *Gusti* brothers. The loss of the honorific name *I Gusti*, they explained, was due to certain misconduct in the past, for which their status was degraded by the king. Nonetheless, they are permitted to ask for holy water from the *kawitan (merajan agung)* temple, and they contribute the same as the other members, ie. Rp. 7,500 and 2.5 kg of rice to every temple festival (twice a year, on Wednesday *Umanis Kulantir*). There is no difference in their treatment, as I observed during the temple festival. They sat together randomly during the prayers, and put their offerings at will on the available platforms.

*Warga Arya Pengalasan* has received new members in recent years. Several *Gusti* families in Ubud traditionally went to a temple in Keramas, since they belonged to another *Gusti* group, known as *Gusti Keramas*. In 1993 they claimed that they had just read their *prasasti*, and found out that they were in fact Arya Pengalasan. Accordingly, they asked permission to leave the temple in Keramas and became new members in Merajan Agung Arya Pengalasan temple in Bedahulu. The new *warga* members are required to pay an admission fee of 50 kg rice and a voluntary contribution in cash, after which their status will be *warga biasa* (if they have the honorific initial name *Gusti*) or *warga peninjau* (if they do not).

**BABAD AND BISAMA AS THE CHARTER OF WARGA**

These descriptions of several *warga* organisations clearly show that *babad* play a key role in the making of the *warga*. *Babad* have been the object of detailed studies by philologists, historians, and anthropologists alike. However, there are contrasting views on how to treat a *babad*. For Worsley (1972), a
babad is a-historical because it contains more myth, legend and parable than history. For Bali in particular, Vickers (1989: 69) argues that babad “tend to be unreliable as sources of Balinese history.” On the other hand, some argue that babad as a local history can be used as a historical source, particularly with regard to the genealogy of royal lines (Hinzler 1976, 1986; Creese 1991). James Fox (1971; 1979) demonstrates, in the case of Roti island, that not only written babad contain historical information, but also oral narratives. Others (eg. Mirsha et al. 1986; Rai Putra 1993), with a moderate view, argue that babad constitute ‘historical literature,’ meaning that they are literary works using historical events as background, and historical figures as actors. As historical literature, babad combine imagination, art, as well as historical data.

A babad invariably recounts the origin of a warga, which generally starts from a god (ie. Sang Hyang Pasupati, Batara Brahma, or Sang Hyang Acintya) or other supernatural beings and descends to the historical figures. In the body of the babad, one can recognise several themes, among the most common of which are the legitimization of claims (status, which is associated with rights), the admiration of certain figures, the display of the important roles played by the warga’s ancestral figures in history, and the sacredness of certain objects. The theme of legitimization can be clearly seen in the Babad Pande, Babad Bhujangga, and Babad Pasek, which legitimise the rights of these warga to have their own high priests (sulinggih). The Babad Bhujangga states that only Bhujangga can purify the world from pollution (“if it is not done by the sang guru bhujangga, the purification ritual would not be fruitful”). Babad Pasek also asserts that to be a sulinggih is not merely a right for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, but it is even a duty (“you must remember your duty to be a priest”). Babad Pande Besi states that Pande are not allowed to take holy water from Warga Brahmana (“do not ask for holy water from Brahmana”). Instead, Warga Pande have to use their own sulinggih (“you Pande are entitled to give holy water [for death rituals] to all Pande brothers”).

---
30 James Fox (1971; 1979) reports that figures named in the oral historic genealogy of Termanu’s rulers can be identified as historical figures with only a few exceptions. From Dutch documents, he even discovers that the period of these figures can be dated, the earliest back to 1681.
The legitimation of the right to use prestigious symbols in conducting ceremonies, particularly in *ngaben*, can also be derived from *babad*. *Babad Ksatria Tamanbali*, for example, gives the right to the members of Warga Ksatria Tamanbali to use the most prestigious symbol for the *ngaben* ceremony, i.e. the dragon (*nagabanda*), the same as the one used by Warga Ksatria Dalem. The *bisama* states:

*Kunang ri kapejahanta wekas, sedenging atiwa-tiwa, wenang pwa sira ingangge sapratingkahira Dalem, telas upakaraning ksatryan, tekeng *anagabanda* wenang, mangkana kramanira....*

For your death, in the *ngaben* ceremony, you are entitled to have everything in the same way as Dalem, all *Ksatria’s* offerings, including *nagabanda* [the dragon-like coffin], so is the truth....

Similar points are also made in the *Babad Arya Kuta Waringin* (for Warga Kuta Waringin and Warga Kubon Tubuh). Warga Pasek also claims that its members are entitled to use a seven-tiered cremation tower because Dalem Gelgel had given his permission to do so, as written in the *Babad Pasek*. Similar claims can also be found in the *Babad Pande*, *Babad Warga Bhujangga*, *Babad Arya Kanuruhan*, and so forth.

Every *babad* tends to show the importance of the ancestral figures of the respective *warga* in the history of Bali. The *Babad Pasek* claims that after the defeat of Bedahulu by Majapahit, one of the Pasek ancestors, Kyai Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel, became the caretaker of Bali. Other ancestors, Kyai Pemacekan, Ki Patih Ulung, and Kyai Arya Kepasekan were the ones who went to Majapahit to call upon Gajah Mada, asking that Majapahit should assign an *adipati* for Bali. Further, when Kresna Kepakisan was frustrated by continuous rebellions by Balinese people, the *babad* states that it was Kyai Arya Kepasekan and Kyai Pemacekan who went to the rebelling villages to pacify them. As a respected figure among *wang Bali* (‘the Balinese’), they were successful in this mission. Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa also claims that their ancestors were once important and part of the palace circle, where some of them assumed the position of court priest. More importantly, the first founder of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa was Maharsi Markandeya, a famous saint who is traditionally
believed to have been the first Hindu teacher who came to Bali, as well as the founder of Besakih temple.

The most important part of the babad, which strongly influences the foundations of the warga, are the instructions of the ancestors, called bisama (‘instruction,’ ‘ancestors’ message,’ or ‘holy guidance’). Most Balinese, if not all, believe in these bisama and their associated punishments. This is apparent from a number of my informants, who told me that:

God is very generous and never punishes people; it is the ancestors who punish, if we do not follow their bisama. If we have problems which cannot be solved using jalan sekala ['rational ways'], and then we go to jalan niskala ['spiritual ways'] such as the use of trance mediums, we will never be told that we are being punished by God (salahang Widhi). What we often hear is 'salahang kawitan' ('punished by the kawitan/ancestors') (Made Sadra 1994; the same point was also disclosed by Dewa Putu Swasta and Anak Agung Kompyang, 1994).

The bisama in general instruct the descendants of the respective warga to pay homage in kawitan temples and instruct that the descendants of an origin point to be united. With regard to the obligation to pay homage in a certain temple, bisama Brahmana Kemenuh states:

Aywa sira kabeh lipya subhakti makawitan, makadinya makahyanganing Dalem Kumenuh, sira ta kabeh helingakena juwa, wirasaning wyastreki, ri tingkahira sang amoring sunyatta; kunang sira Yogi Patni Sinungsung luminnga sira ring Dalem Kumenuh, pasambyanganira meru tumpang tlu,... Kuneng sawangsa brahmana watek Kumenuh, nguni weh yan lali makawitan ring sang luminnga kadi ngarep, ring hyang Yogi Sinungsung, wastwa pwa kita ndatan amanggih rahayu, saparanta nmu wighna juga ya, setya wiharan dukha pinanggih.... (Babad Brahmana Kemenuh: 58b-59a).

Do not forget to worship the ancestors, and to be supporters of Pura Dalem Kemenuh, also to remember all the advice of ancestors, and the history of events experienced by She who has achieved the nothingness, ie. Yogi Patni Sinungsung, the one worshipped in Pura Dalem Kemenuh, in the three-tiered shrine.... All Brahmana from Kemenuh subgroup, if you neglect the ancestor, especially Yogi Sinungsung as mentioned, you will never ever find happiness, you will always confront disaster, and always be in a state of sickness and sadness....
A *bisama* from *Babad Ksatria Tamanbali* asserts that Warga Ksatria Tamanbali (Tirtha Arum) must never forget to worship in a temple named Tirtha Arum:

*Aja lipya anyiwi Tirtha Arum, katekeng pratisentana kayang kawekas, apan siranaku witning Tirtha Arum, saking pakaryan Betara Subali, yata sira manggeh maka tatwa Satrya Tamanbali...* (Babad Ksatria Tamanbali, Kr. Va.1027/7:16b).

Do not forget to worship at the temple Tirtha Arum, for all your descendants, since your seed was from Tirtha Arum, as the creation of Betara Subali, who is the origin of Ksatria Tamanbali...

Similar messages are explicitly mentioned in the *bisama* of other *warga*, such as Warga Pande, Ksatria Dalem, and Tangkas Kori Agung.

A *bisama*, in the view of most Balinese, is not merely a message, but a sacred law, the breaking of which will result in punishment, and the obedience to which will bring rewards. The sacredness of the *bisama* is generally mentioned explicitly in the *bisama* itself. A *bisama* of Warga Ksatria Tamanbali, for example, dictates that descendants should behave according to the *bisama*: “so you must always remember, do not forget, since it is very dangerous, for it will be affected by my curse” (“mangkana elingakena juga, tutur ajalali, apan ila-ila dahat, kena sodan ingsun”). The *bisama* further states,

*Kunang yan sira lipya ring kawitan, anyiwi ring Tirtha Arum, tan wus kena sodanira dening Sang Hyang Kawitan, tan bisa umanggehaken kawisayan,... setata anemuaken kaduhkitan, mwang kagringan, .... sugih gawe kirang pangan. .... Kunang yan sampun sira manggeh ring kawitan, anyiwi pawaijilan, ametu saking Tirtha Arum, tan bisa lipya anyiwi, sadod-doh genahnya, teher kadi manggeh, yan mangkana, tan wus sira amangghih sadya manta, jana nuraga, suka sugih, dirghayusa, legya amangghih dreman, werdi santana....

If you neglect the ancestor and neglect to worship at Pura Tirtha Arum, you will be affected by the curse of *Sang Hyang Kawitan* (‘the deified originators’), will never achieve any knowledge... you will always be in a state of sadness, sickness, .... work hard but never have enough food .... If you are faithful to *kawitan* (the origin), never forget to worship in Pura Tirtha Arum as the temple of origin, never forget, even though far away but still worship; if so, you will always be in happiness, beloved by society, happy and rich, have a long life, have good children....
The strength of the *bisama* in directing people to worship in a certain temple is clear. As I encountered in a number of temple festivals, as well as in daily discussions, the faithful usually refer to *bisama* or *babad* to explain their presence at a temple festival even though it is far from their residence. The fear of being punished by ancestors for an offence (*salahang kawitan*) is very clear from most of my discussions with the faithful. The most common argument put forward is that:

Since we cannot communicate directly with our ancestors, we do not really know how they feel. Instead of risking punishment, it is much better to follow their *bisama*. We believe that the writer of the *babad* and *bisama* would not dare to manipulate the ancestors' words (Mangku Dwija 1994).

Anthropologists such as Boon (1977) and Geertz (1980a) argue that *babad* are used by Balinese people as a means of legitimation, ie. to enhance their status. This is true in some cases. However, more importantly, I found that *babad* are not merely 'a means,' but are indeed a sort of charter that people believe deeply. More people follow their own *babad* and *bisama* because of the belief in the contents of the *babad* rather than to claim status, although the later motive is also observable.

To make the point clearer, the situation of several *warga*, eg. Warga Kubon Tubuh, Arya Gajahpara, and Sentanan Dalem Tarukan, may be instructive. In the case of Warga Kubon Tubuh, no one I ever met, whether they were members of Warga Kubon Tubuh or not, denied the genealogy which asserts that members of Warga Kubon Tubuh are the descendants of Arya Kubon Tubuh (Arya Kuta Waringin); and no one denied that Kubon Tubuh’s ancestors played important roles in the history of Bali. An official historical account, *Sejarah Bali*, written by a group of historians from Udayana University (Mirsha et al. 1986), states that Arya Kubon Tubuh assumed a high position during the Samprangan and Gelandel eras. Nevertheless, most members of Warga Kubon Tubuh use no honorific name. To my knowledge, there is no tendency for them to change their name to *I Gusti* or *Anak Agung* in order to enhance their status. So, too, in the case of Arya Gajahpara’s descendants (Warga Arya Gajahpara); they do not use any honorific name, and there is no indication that they would claim an
honorific name such as I Gusti. The case of several warga who are now organised into Para Gotra Sentanan Dalem Tarukan also reveals the same situation. These warga are widely recognised as the descendants of Dalem Tarukan, the elder brother of Dalem Gelgel. In 1995/1996 they constructed a new temple in the middle of a ricefield in Tarukan village (Gianyar), in a place believed to be the former palace of Dalem Tarukan. However, members of these warga use no honorific name, and there is no indication that they intend to claim one.

The change of some people’s name from Jaba to Triwangsa (that is, the use of an honorific name) has, and still does, occur, but this is mostly because they have found their ancestral line. Finding a new ancestry, which means inter-warga movement, is not necessarily ‘upward’ (if we have to use the framework of hierarchy), ie. from Jaba to Gusti, from Pande to Dewa, or from Dewa to Cokorda. ‘Parallel’ or ‘horizontal’ movement is also common. As I several times encountered, several dadya or dadya agung received new members because the newly incorporated members had just realised that they were members of such-and-such a dadya, or such-and-such a warga. When I attended a temple festival of Pura Kawitan Tangkas Kori Agung in 1994, there were groups of people who were visiting the temple for the first time because they had just found out that they were members of Warga Tangkas. According to an elder of Warga Tangkas, Ibu Made Likub, every year around five to ten extended families visit the temple for the first time for the same purpose, ie. to ask forgiveness from the ancestor (guru piduka) because they have just realised themselves to be Warga Tangkas. They might previously have been members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, Warga Pasek Kayuselem, and so forth. The move to be members of Warga Tangkas Kori Agung is not an

31 Members of a group told me that they had successive misfortunes (family disputes and sickness), which led them to consult mediums. The mediums told them that they had to pay a visit to, and ask forgiveness from, their kawitan temple. The mediums also gave a clue that their kawitan temple was situated “in the centre of Balinese realm, and this temple was destroyed when Gunung Agung erupted.” After consulting with several experts about this clue they concluded that the temple was Pura Kawitan Tangkas Kori Agung in Tangkas (Gelgel). Before, they had never visited an ancestral temple beyond their sanggah gede. They had no dadya and did not know what their warga was.
increase in status. It is merely a newly found ancestral temple. I have also noted that several Gusi in Ubud recently claimed to be members of Warga Arya Pengalasan and that they had long mistakenly incorporated themselves in Gusi Keramas. This is a move from a Gusi to another Gusi, and definitely does not enhance status. One might even argue that this is a 'downward' movement, because Gusi Keramas (or Gusi Maruti) is associated with I Gusti Agung Maruti, once the king of Gelgel.\textsuperscript{32} He is apparently more prestigious than Arya Pengalasan, hardly a well-known figure.

The belief in the power of the babad and/or bisama among Balinese can also be seen from their adherence to several prohibitions. Bisama Pande, for example, prohibits Warga Pande from eating a kind of fresh-water fish called iwak pinggul or jeleg (Ophiocephalus sp.), flying-ant (dedalu, letaron),\textsuperscript{33} and bread-fruit (timbul, Artocarpus communis FORS). To the present day, most members of Warga Pande do not take such food because they are afraid of the bisama.\textsuperscript{34}

Members of Warga Tirta Arum do not eat deer (kidang) meat because their bisama says so. An Anak Agung from Warga Tirta Arum explained to me that he does not take deer meat because his parents said so. Retelling his father's story, he told me that when Dukuh Siladri, an ancestor of Warga Tirta Arum, went to the forest to start practicing asceticism, his wife died and his newly-born child was breast-fed by a deer. Since then, he promised that he and his

\textsuperscript{32} According to Balinese historical sources, I Gusti Agung Maruti toppled the Gelgel king in a successful coup, and became king himself from 1686-1704.

\textsuperscript{33} Balinese in general eat several edible insects as well as their larvae and cocoons. Such insects include grasshopper (balang), cricket (jangkrik), dragon-fly (capung), bees (nyawan, tabuan), beetle-larvae (sebatah and ancruk), and some others, including flying ants (dedalu).

\textsuperscript{34} In the babad, it is said that a Pande was once detained and tied to a bread-fruit tree by the king. At night, the tree was eaten by white-ants until it fell over. This gave the Pande a way to escape, and he hid in a small cave on a river bank. Troops of the king ran after him, but just as they were about to enter the cave, they saw a lot of jeleg fish swimming in front of the cave. One of the troop members told his friends that it would be impossible for the Pande to hide in the cave because if he did, there would be no fish there. The presence of the fish indicated that the water was undisturbed. So the troops departed and the Pande was saved. The Pande felt deep gratitude to the bread-fruit (for letting itself be destroyed by the white ants), to the white ants (for cutting down the tree), and to the jeleg fish (for preventing the troops entering the cave). As a result, he instructed his descendants not to eat them.
descendants would never eat deer meat. Similarly, Warga Pulasari do not eat quail (*puyuh*) and deer (*kidang*) because of a *bisama*.

I know a lot of people from these *warga* who take beef, which should not be taken by Hindus, according to Hindu holy books. While they eat beef, however, they do not dare to take food prohibited by their *bisama*. This clearly shows how strong the *bisama* is in shaping the attitude of the *warga* concerned, and this has nothing to do with status. This is more associated with the belief in magical danger and protection from ancestors. This does not mean that *babad* are not important for legitimation. The use of *babad* to legitimise the claims for status of the *warga* as a whole is also evident in the emergence of the *warga* organisation. For the *warga* as a whole, the *babad* is a means of shaping identity and a means of seeking difference. That is why the same *babad* is often interpreted differently.  

**INTER-WARGA GENEALOGICAL CONNECTIONS**

It is worth noting that traditional sources (e.g. *Babad Pasek*, *Babad Dalem*, *Babad Arya Kuta Waringin*, and *Babad Pasek Kayu Selem*) link most *warga* in Bali to 'genealogical relations' at different points, as shown in Figures 4.5 and 4.6. Most *babad* agree in the existence of the seven godly ancestors (the *Sapta Dewata*), and these gods are widely believed by the Balinese to reside and guard Bali at different point of the compass. They are Betara Hyang Gnijaya on Gunung Lempuyang (east); Betara Hyang Putranjaya on Gunung Agung (northeast); Betari Hyang Dewi Danu on Gunung Batur (north); Betara Hyang Tugu on Gunung Andakasa (south); Betari Hyang Manik Galang on Pusering Jagat ('the navel of the world,' middle); Betara Hyang Manik Gumawang on Gunung Mangu (northwest); and Betara Hyang Tumuwuh on Gunung Batukaru (west). There are temples in each of these places, and all of these temples at

35 The different interpretations of a *babad* and the need for a distinct self-identity often lead to the splitting of a *warga*, as for example in the case of the split of Warga Pasek and Tangkas Kori Agung (see further Chapter Five).
present, in the *Parisada's* classification, constitute the nine-direction temples, together with Pura Goa Lawah (southeast) and Pura Uluwatu (southwest). 36

Most babad also agree with regard to the existence of the *Panca Pandita* and their respective descendants, that is, Mpu Gnijaya is the originator of Warga Pasek Sapa Rsi; Mpu Semeru of Warga Pasek Kayu Selem; and Mpu Bharadah of Warga Brahmana Boda, Warga Brahmana Siwa, *Para Gotra Sentanan Dalem Tarukan*, Warga Ksatriia Dalem, and a number of warga generally known as the *Para Arya*. However, each of these warga chooses a particular figure as its origin point.

To some extent, a general pattern used as a strategy in choosing the starting point or 'the originator' (*kawitan* or *lelangit*) of a warga can be identified. Firstly, the chosen originator must be popular, demonstrate a particular specialty or power, or be extraordinary in some way. So, Warga Arya Kubon Tubuh chose Arya Kutawaringin, the deputy prime minister in the Samprangan era, as its originator; Warga Pande chose Mpu Gandring from the era of Ken Arok in Java; and Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa chose Maharsi Markandeya. Secondly, closely associated with the first, the originator must be prestigious (of royal or priestly status). Hence, Warga Brahmana Siwa starts its genealogy from Mpu Nirartha, a famous Majapahit priest who came to Bali in the 15th century; Warga Brahmana Boda chooses Mpu Astapaka, another Majapahit priest who came to Bali (before Mpu Nirartha); and Warga Tangkas Koriagung uses Pangeran Tangkas, the son of Dalem Gelgel by his [ex]-concubine, which means the warga contains princely blood.

---

36 However, the primary gods in these temples have been combined with the Vedic gods of Indian sources. Hence, for example, it is said that Betara Hyang Tumuwuh (on Gunung Batukaru, west) is the local name of Mahadewa (Mahadev), the Vedic god of the western direction (Oka Supartha 1995).
Figure 4.5 Genealogical relationship among some warga in Bali (I).
Figure 4.6  Genealogical relationship among some warga in Bali (II).
Another important criterion is that the originator chosen must not be claimed by other warga in order to maintain the exclusiveness or the ‘difference’ of the warga. This is the reason why Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi uses the Sapta Rsi (‘the seven priests’) as its origin point, instead of the Panca Rsi (‘the five priests’). If the Panca Rsi were used, a number of other warga would be included. As is clear from the Babad Pasek, a member of the Panca Rsi (or Panca Pandita), ie. Mpu Bharadah, is a distant ancestor of Warga Ksatria Dalem, Warga Brahma Siwa and Boda, and some Arya (see also Babad Pasek in Chapter Five). The same strategy is employed by Ksatria Dalem, which uses Dalem Ketut Semara Kepakisan as its originator, and not Dalem Kresna Kepakisan, the first Majapahit adipati in Bali. The intention to be exclusive is very clear in this case. If Sri Kresna Kepakisan were used, his descendants, including Warga Pulasari, Warga Bebandem, Belayu, and so forth, who are generally known as Jaba, would have to be included as members of the warga. The use of Mpu Nirartha, rather than Mpu Bharadah by Warga Brahmana Siwa is also a strategy to distinguish Warga Brahmana Siwa from other warga, such as Ksatria Dalem, Brahmana Boda, several warga of Arya, as well as several warga among the Jaba. In its effort to be exclusive, and not to be identified with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Warga Bendesa Mas uses Patih Ulung (or Bendesa Manik Mas) as its originator.

Seen from several babad, theoretically most of the warga in Bali can trace their originator to a common figure, and hence some warga might be considered as one. For example, if Mpu Bharadah or Mpu Tantular is taken as an originator, a number of warga would merge. These include Warga Brahmana Siwa, Brahmana Boda, Ksatria Dalem, Pulasari, Belayu, Balangan, Bebandem, Sekar, Arya Wang Bang Pinatih, Arya Sidemen, and Ksatria Madya. If the Panca Pandita were used as its originator, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Bendesa, and Pasek Kayu Selem would also be included in this large warga.

From all babad that I know, however, I cannot relate Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa to any other warga. With regard to Warga Pande, only one source (Soebandi 1985) mentions that this warga is part of the genealogy drawn from the Sapta Dewata. It states that Betara Hyang Gnijaya begot Mpu Withadharma,
Mpu Withadharma begot Mpu Wiradharma (who begot Mpu Lampita and Mpu Lampita begot the Panca Pandita) and Mpu Rajakertha, Mpu Rajakertha begot Mpu Brahma Wisesa, Mpu Brahma Wisesa begot Mpu Gandring and Mpu Saguna. These two mpu are the originators of Warga Pande.

SUMMARY

I have described in this chapter a number of warga in Bali, and have considered their babad, ancestral temples (kawitan), and current organisational structures. There are various motivations for organising the warga into a modern-style organisation. The main theme commonly cited in this context is to strengthen the sense of brotherhood and to secure the maintenance of the kawitan temple or other temples associated with the warga concerned, or to organise warga members in worshipping ancestors. Some warga also explicitly include the Indonesian nation-state jargon in their constitution, that the objective of organising warga into a formal organisation is to support national development based on Pancasila and 1945 constitution.

In line with the worship of the ancestors, there is a famous sloka taken from the Javanese version of the Ramayana, as quoted at the opening of this chapter. This sloka, which upholds the importance of ancestral worship along with worshipping God, is frequently cited by nearly all warga. It appears several times in various warga written documents, such as Dutta Warga of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Canti Swara of Warga Kubon Tubuh, and in the rules of propriety of Warga Pande, Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, and Warga Arya Pengalasan.

In terms of leadership, there is a common pattern found in warga organisations. All warga choose members of the 'modern elite' as their leaders,

---

37 Worshipping ancestors is closely associated with the belief in the existence of a permanent soul (atman), one of the five basic tenets of Balinese Hinduism (Panca Sradha). The other four tenets are (1) the belief in God (Brahman), (2) the belief in the inherent result of actions (karma phala), (3) the belief in reincarnation (Samsara), and (4) the belief in eternal happiness in the life after death (moksa).
ie. those who are influential in the modern world, such as government bureaucrats, academics, and businessmen.

The sense of being different from others with a distinct identity is clear in the emergence of *warga* organisation in Bali. Quite a number of my informants emphasised the concept of 'difference' (*len kulit*, 'different skin') in opposition to hierarchy. According to the concept of difference, no *warga* is higher or lower, and different symbols used by different *warga* are merely a 'difference.' This opinion is particularly evident among *warga* categorised as *Jaba*. Unavoidably, the search for difference automatically means the search for status equalisation, to be equal to other *warga*.

The struggle in search of difference is apparent in the efforts of Warga Pande and Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa (and also Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi) to have their high priests acknowledged as of equal status to the high priests from Warga Brahmana Siwa and Warga Brahmana Boda. By the same token, the emergence of *warga* organisation is also motivated by the intention to enhance status. Thus the *warga* organisation is also used as a means to uplift the standing of the *warga* in comparison to other *warga* in Bali. However, the search for status here is not individual status. While the status search reported by Geertz and Geertz (1975), Boon (1977), and Geertz (1980a) focus on changing initial names of individuals families, I have indicated in this chapter that, instead of enhancing individual status by claiming an honorific name, *warga* tend to enhance the status of the *warga* as a whole. By the same token, the status search by a *warga* does not involve a *Jaba* changing his name to a *Triwangsa* one. Instead, a *warga* conventionally categorised as *Jaba* and considered to be at the bottom of the status hierarchy claims that the *warga* is in fact of high status, or at least equal to others. To relate the reports of the previous anthropologists and what I myself found at present day Bali, it is apparent that there are changes in strategy for claiming status. In short, the strategy has changed from 'individual' (or a group of closely related families) to 'collective' (ie. through *warga* as a whole). The latter strategy is associated with the fact that the boundaries of *warga* are becoming clearer at present compared to the situation in the 1950s or
1960s. The clearer boundaries make it difficult for warga members to move individually in claiming status.

To strengthen the claim for collective status, warga among the Jaba tend to enlarge their membership, hence to gain wider support. The method used in this case is ‘inclusion.’ This means that if the warga identity of a family is unclear, a Jaba warga is generally willing to include this family in its warga membership. By contrast, Triwangsa warga invariably rely on ‘exclusion’ to maintain their status superiority. They reject those whose identity is not clearly linked to their warga. Hence, for example, although Warga Ksatria Dalem recognises (and advocates) some other warga to be supporters of its padharman in Besakih, it does not mean that Warga Ksatria Dalem acknowledges the latter warga as ‘members’. They are all treated as subject. In a less extreme case, Warga Arya Pengalasan recognises its Jaba members, but the Jaba members are classified merely as warga peninjau (‘visiting members’).

The search for difference for a warga also means a search for identity, aside from the rejection of hierarchy. With regard to this point, it is very interesting to note the effort of Warga Pande to ‘reinvent’ its identity, with the emphasis on the colour red, which is associated with fire, the vital medium in the performance of their traditional occupation of smithing, as well as being the colour reserved for Betara Brahma, the ultimate creator according to their babad. This has led to a movement to use the colour red among Warga Pande, particularly when they visit their ancestral temples, since the late 1980s. This use includes red head bands (udeng) and red outer clothes (saput for male or selendang for female), as well as the use of red flowers on their heads. Banners, shrines, and other sacred objects are also dominated by red colours.
Plates 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7. Warga Pande has claimed the colour red as part of its identity.
Pierre Bourdieu (1984) theorises that 'difference' is an important aspect of contemporary life. In the Balinese context, for the sake of difference and at the same time to promote a prestigious self-identity, a warga invariably chooses a certain figure, sometimes arbitrarily, as its originator. A number of criteria used by a warga in choosing an originator can be identified, such as: (1) the importance of the chosen originator as a popular or extraordinary personage; (2) the exclusiveness of the originator, who must not be claimed by other warga -- to maintain the 'difference' of the warga; and (3) the prestige of the originator (his royal or priestly status). Supposedly if these criteria were absent, some warga could be theoretically merged into a single large warga by choosing a more distant ancestor.

The discussion in this chapter also highlights the clear role of the babad in the shaping of the warga. Babad, particularly the bisama, have been effective in guiding the attitude and actual behaviour of warga members in general, particularly in the maintenance of the origin temple (pura kawitan). I have also shown that the bisama are stronger than Hindu-Vedic teachings in governing the attitude and behaviour of Balinese, as clearly seen in the case of food taboos. Babad, and particularly bisama, in this regard, are not merely a means of legitimating status; it has become a kind of charter in Malinowskian terms, the neglect of which is an offence against the ancestors, which will result in punishments.
Chapter Five

IN SEARCH OF DIFFERENCE (2):
MAHA GOTRA PASEK SANAK SAPTA RSI

kita Pasek sedaya, sagenah elingakena piteketku,
aywa kita pegat akadang,
... asanak misan ming ro

All you Pasek, wherever you are, always remember my instruction,
ever ever cut your familial ties,
... [if] you are all second cousins (Bisama Warga Pasek).

Having described the general features of a number of warga in the previous chapter, it is timely now to focus on one warga in more detail to better understand the nature of warga in Bali. For this purpose, I have chosen Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. This warga is arguably the largest warga in Bali in terms of membership, and one of the most active in the struggle for equality. Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is one of the front-runners in the movement to use non-Brahmana priests in ritual ceremonies, not only among members, but also for the general public. The emergence of this warga organisation was also among the first, predated only by Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. I devote four chapters to the discussion of this warga, considering the wide ranging aspects of its activities. In this chapter I describe the genesis of its modern-style organisation in the 1950s and its present situation. I also include various motives that inspired the emergence of this warga’s organisation (the MGPSSR). To have a better understanding of this warga, I also put forward shortened versions of its babad and bisama, and argue that these babad and bisama are a kind of charter that shapes the warga. In order to strengthen the warga, there have been considerable efforts by the organisation to popularise the babad and bisama.
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PASEK ORGANISATION

Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is the largest warga in Bali in terms of membership. Its leaders claim that its members include around 75 percent of all Hindu-Balinese,\(^1\) or nearly two million Balinese, scattered throughout Bali and in other islands such as Lombok, Sulawesi, and Sumatra. In Bali, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi can be found in every village (desa adat) because historically, according to its leaders' account, ancestors of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi were assigned as village leaders (bendesa) and other officers at village level after Bali was defeated by Majapahit, or even well before the Majapahit era. The name ‘pasek’ itself, they explain, came from this position because the word ‘pasek’ or ‘pasak’ means ‘a small wooden pin used to connect wooden structures, to make these structures stand firm.’ The word ‘pasek’ is associated with the word pacek, Pakis, or paku (‘nail’, the function of which is the same as pasak). One leader even associated Pašek in Bali with other related terms outside the island:

If in Java there is Paku Bhuvono, Paku Alam and, Paku Negara, and in Minangkabau we have pasak negari, so in Bali we have Warga Pasek. All denote a special function, at least historically, of a certain group in a certain society, particularly in maintaining the order of society (Soebandi 1994).

Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi regards Mpu Gnijaya as its ultimate common originator, and Pura Lempuyang Madya as its origin temple (pura kawitan). Pura Lempuyang Madya is believed to be the place of the hermitage of Mpu Gnijaya, as well as his place of moksa (death without leaving any physical remains). Furthermore, following the Babad Pasek, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi explicitly state that the Catur Parhyangan (‘the four temples’) are their main temples, ie. (1) Pura Lempuyang Madya, dedicated to Mpu Gnijaya, their

---

\(^1\) Eiseman (1989) asserts that around 60% of Balinese people belong to Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. These estimates seem to be exaggerated, and seem to include all Balinese whose warga are obscure. I observed that the method employed in defining membership (ie. to say that a person is a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi) was often through negative identification. This is to say that if one is a Jaba and not a member of Warga Pande, Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, Warga Pasek Kayu Sele, etc., then he must be a Pasek Sapta Rsi. Furthermore, as I will discuss later, leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi claim that some smaller warga are branches of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.
originator; (2) Padharman Ratu Pasek in the Besakih complex, dedicated to Mpu Semeru; (3) Pura Dasar Bhuana Gelgel, dedicated to Mpu Gana; and (4) Pura Silayukti, dedicated to Mpu Kuturan. These four mpu were brothers, who came to Bali during the reign of Airlangga in East Java, or Udayana-Gunaprya Dharmapatni in Bali. Together with their youngest brother, Mpu Bharadah, who was left in East Java, they are known as Panca Rsi ('the five saints') or Panca Tirta ('the five [sources of] holy water'). As mentioned in several babad, Mpu Gnijaya had seven sons, all of whom were known as the Sapta Rsi ('the seven saints') after they conducted a consecration ceremony. They were Mpu Ketek, Mpu Kananda, Mpu Withadharma, Mpu Wiradnyana, Mpu Ragarunting, Mpu Prateka, and Mpu Dangka.

Although Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi claims Mpu Gnijaya as its ultimate common ancestor, it defines Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as the descendant of the Sapta Rsi. That is why the name of the warga is Pasek Sapta Rsi or Pasek Sanak Pitu, literally meaning ‘the Pasek [the descendants] of Sapta Rsi’ or ‘the Pasek of the Seven Brothers.’ The naming of Sapta Rsi was also intended to distinguish this warga from other groups of Pasek, such as Pasek Bali Mula and Pasek Kayu Selem.

There was also a ‘political reason’ why the Sapta Rsi are used as the origin point of the warga genealogy, instead of the Panca Rsi. If the Panca Rsi are used, all descendants of the Panca Rsi must be included, and these would include the descendants of Mpu Bharadah, i.e. Warga Brahmana Siwa, Warga

---

2 According to historical accounts (Mirsha 1986; Kartodirdjo 1975; Goris 1967), Udayana Warmadewa and his wife, Gunaprya Dharmapatni, ruled Bali from 989 to 1001 AD.

3 Pasek Kayu Selem are the descendants of Mpu Semeru through his wooden son, Mpu Kamareka or Mpu Gnijaya Mahireng. According to a leader of Warga Pasek Kayu Selem, I Made Gina, there are four main branches of Warga Pasek Kayu Selem, i.e. Kayu Selem, Kayu Manis, Celagi, and Kayuan. These four branches have been united in a modern-style organisation named Maha Gotra Catur Sanak ('The Great Family of Four Brothers'), and claim Pura Tampurhyang in Batur crater as their kawitan. (But a different view was held by other leaders of Warga Pasek Kayu Selem, notably Putu Budiasta and Wayan Wardha, who claimed that their kawitan temple is in Pura Jati, on the bank of Batur lake.) Those Pasek outside of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and Pasek Kayu Selem are called Pasek Bali Mula. Pasek Bali Mula are believed to be the descendants of ‘the Balinese people’ before the intensive contact between Bali and East Java, i.e. before the reign of Udayana-Gunaprya Dharmapatni. However, in practice it is very difficult to differentiate between Bali Asli, Bali Mula, Bali Kuna, and Bali Aga, and these terms are used interchangeably.
Brahmana Boda, a number of Warga Arya, Warga Ksatria Dalem, and some others. "Since they perceive that they are higher than us, and reject sidikara (equal position), why should we consider them brothers?," said a prominent figure of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

The name, Sapta Rsi or Sanak Pitu, seems to indicate that there should be seven branches of Pasek. This may so in theory, but this cannot be found in daily practice. Although they trace their ancestry to one mpu of the Sapta Rsi, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi invariably identify themselves with smaller subgroups of Pasek Sapta Rsi, associated with the name of their villages or the villages where their not-so-distant ancestors lived, such as Pasek Gelgel, Pasek Denpasar, Pasek Padang Subadra, Pasek Kelabang Moding, Pasek Bendesa Mas, Pasek Bendesa Sibang, Pasek Batugaing, Pasek Ababi, Pasek Gaduh, Pasek Tangkas, Pasek Sumerta, Pasek Nongan, and Pasek Penida. There are hundreds of such Pasek branches. Aside from groups associated with their villages, there are groups associated with the special functions of Pasek ancestors in the past. According to leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, these groups of Pasek use the functional title that their ancestors assumed in history, particularly after the Gelgel era. They explain that Pasek Bendesa was assigned to maintain and implement adat laws; hence they were leaders of villages. Pasek Kubayan were assigned to perform ritual ceremonies or to be leaders in religious matters; Pasek Ngukuhin were responsible for the maintenance of stability and order of society; Pasek Dangka were assigned to defence; Pasek Gaduh to construction; and Pasek Salahin to intelligence and the court of justice.

The Emergence of the Warga Organisation

The awareness of being Pasek and the sense of brotherhood among Pasek, emerged sporadically after Indonesian independence, when the search for kawitan among Balinese became fashionable. This led to the creation of networks among pamaksan of temples associated with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, which further became the embryo for the need to organise the warga as a modern-style organisation. The history of this Western-style organisation, now called Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi (or MGPSSR for short), can be traced
back to the early 1950s. On Thursday, 17 April 1952, after a series of preparatory meetings, leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from a number of *dadya agung* and *dadya* throughout Bali conducted a meeting at the Sempoerma movie theatre in Klungkung. This resulted in the establishment of an organisation called *Ikatan Warga Pasek* (‘Association of Warga Pasek’), chaired by I Made Sirya, a leader of Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Desa Aan, Klungkung, and the appointment of a coordinator in each *kabupaten*, to organise Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi at *kabupaten* level. These first leaders came directly from the grass roots of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi throughout Bali, ie. those who were themselves leaders in various *dadya* or *dadya agung* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (Table 5.1). As such, these leaders did not necessarily live in the capital city of the *kabupaten* or province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kabupaten</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Dadya of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buleleng</td>
<td>I Made Toya</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Sawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jembrana</td>
<td>Pan Loderi</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Pekutatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabanan</td>
<td>I Gde Made Ckek</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Tuakilang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badung</td>
<td>I Made Rames</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Sempidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianyar</td>
<td>I Made Otar</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Gianyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangli</td>
<td>I Nyoman Raja</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Sidembunut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klungkung</td>
<td>I Ketut Serengen</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Tegak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karangasem</td>
<td>I Nyoman Rai</td>
<td>Dadya Pasek Selat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After its formal establishment, however, no real activity could be performed, mainly due to a lack of supporting facilities, a lack of enthusiasm among members, and opposition from other *warga*, especially from Warga Brahmana. According to some founders of *Ikatan Warga Pasek*, during that time members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi were continuously indoctrinated by Warga Brahmana, especially their traditional priest families (commonly referred to as *siwa*). It was said that the *babad*-based claim that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi were Brahmana was untrue and that the movement to use Pasek’s *sulinggih* (*sri mpu*), instead of Brahmana priests (*pedanda*) was a newly composed story.
Among the leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves, there was ill-feeling and suspicion of each other, associated with their diverse political alliances. They could not even organise a meeting because the place of the meeting was a crucial matter. A prominent figure in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi described the situation as follows:

... if the meeting was planned to be held in a PNI [Indonesian Nationalist Party] house, those from PKI [Indonesian Communist Party] and PSI [Indonesian Socialist Party] would strongly object, and vice-versa. Political sentiments were much stronger than kewargaan sentiments, partly because of the political motives, while in kewargaan, no worldly reward can be expected. It would even be a threat, a negative reward, because most people were suspicious of the Pasek movement (Soebandi 1994).

Above all, the very basic questions of the definition of 'who is a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi,' or who should or must be members of Ikatan Warga Pasek were still a matter of debate.

On Sunday, 22 January 1956, nearly four years after its establishment, the first meeting to evaluate the nature of the organisation was conducted in Gelgel. This meeting was called because of the fact that members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi who wanted to worship in Pura Dasar Bhuana Gelgel were being charged an admission fee by the caretakers of the temple (the pangempon), who were themselves Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. The fee applied to the faithful was considered destructive of the unity of the warga, and had become a subject of cynical jokes. To investigate and resolve the matter, Ikatan Warga Pasek of Bali established a team. On Thursday, 19 April 1956, the team conducted a meeting with the leaders of the pangempon of Pura Dasar Bhuana, and they all agreed to abolish the admission fee and in lieu, a voluntary donation (dana punya) was introduced to raise funds for the temple maintenance. It was forecast that these voluntary donations would surpass the amount collected through the forced admission fee, in view of the fact that the awareness of the warga had been

---

4 Members of this team consisted of leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from various kabupaten, ie. I Wayan Likes (Badung), I Made Rames (Badung), I Wayan Rana (Badung), I Nyoman Tirta (Buleleng), I Ketut Gede Mandala (Buleleng), I Nengah Kerti (Tabanan), and I Ktut Soebandi (Bangli).
increasing. To strengthen the decision, the committee went to see Ida Dewa Agung Klungkung, the primary inheritor of the Gelgel royal dynasty, to report the agreement because he was (and still is) considered the primary caretaker of the temple and has great power to define the policy of the temple. Dewa Agung Klungkung agreed to the decision reached by the warga and since then there is no longer an admission fee for those who want to pray in Pura Dasar Bhuana.

This was the only achievement to that date, and the organisation then became inactive for more than a decade. However, intellectuals of the warga showed their eagerness to revitalise the organisation. A famous Balinese writer, I Nyoman D jelada initiated a meeting in his house in Gianyar. The meeting, which was held on Sunday, 4 August 1968, was also attended by Warga Pasek Sapa Rsi from Lombok. The main agenda of the meeting was to discuss the failure of the organisation and to set an agenda for the future. In view of its past failure and the future needs of the warga, the meeting decided to restructure the organisation, as well as to reshuffle its leadership. It was agreed that aside from a central committee (Pengurus Pusat), an advisory body (Badan Penasehat) must also be established to advise the central committee. Upon agreement, the meeting elected a new leadership for its central committee (Pengurus Pusat) to replace the inactive leaders, and appointed a coordinator for each kabupaten, since the previous coordinators were inactive, and some had died. The new chairman of the organisation elected was I Made Rai (from a Pasek dadya in Klungkung), and the new coordinators appointed for kabupaten were also all leaders of dadya or dadya agung (Table 5.2).

Following the Gianyar meeting, a bigger meeting was held on 8 September 1968 in Padharman Ratu Pasek, in the Besakih complex. The Besakih meeting agreed to change the name of the organisation to Ikatan Warga Pasek Sanak Pitu ('Association of Warga Pasek of the Seven Brothers'), and to reorganise the structure of the organisation, as well as to elect new officials. The leadership of the organisation was divided into two. The first part was Pengurus Pusat (central committee), based in Klungkung, chaired by I Made Rai. All of the officers in this committee were leaders in their respective dadya or dadya agung,
and they all lived in their respective villages in Klungkung.\textsuperscript{5} The second part of the organisation was called \textit{Pengurus Harian Majelis Luhur} (the daily executive council). This was based in Denpasar and was chaired by I Wayan Rana, assisted by secretaries and a number of members. This executive committee also had its advisory body and was supported by a group of 26 intellectuals from all \textit{kabupaten} in Bali.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Kabupaten} & \textbf{Coordinator} & \textbf{Dadya of origin} \\
\hline
Buleleng & I Ketut Loka & Dadya Pasek Baleagung \\
Jembrana & I Ketut Sender & Dadya Pasek Pergung \\
Tabanan & I Gde Nyoman Rai & Dadya Pasek Tuakilang \\
Badung & I Made Mawa & Dadya Pasek Sumerta \\
Gianyar & I Made Otar & Dadya Pasek Gianyar \\
Bangli & I Ktut Soebandi & Dadya Agung Pasek Abangsongan \\
Klungkung & I Ktut Serenggen & Dadya Pasek Tegak \\
Karangasem & I Nyoman Rai & Dadya Pasek Selat \\
Lombok & I Made Kara & Dadya Pasek Sindu \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Coordinators of \textit{kabupaten} of \textit{Ikatan Warga Pasek}, based on the meeting on 4 August 1968.}
\end{table}

The daily management of the organisation was the responsibility of the \textit{Majelis Luhur}, while the \textit{Pengurus Pusat} mainly functioned as an advisory body, and this was practically non-functional. Thus, it can be said then that from this meeting onward, part of the leadership shifted from 'traditional

\textsuperscript{5} The committee consisted of chairman I Made Rai (Dadya Pasek Tangkup); Vice Chairman I Made Sirya (Dadya Pasek Gelgel Aan); Secretary I Made Pasek; Vice Secretary I Made Santun; Treasurer I Wayan Mudera; Vice treasurer I Made Pasek; General assistants I Ketut Tantera, I Ketut Lepik (Dadya Pasek Gelgel Pegatepan), I Wayan Parka, and Pan Munderi. Acting as advisers of the committee were I Wayan Mandera, I Nyoman Pasek Mudalara, and I Ketut Serenggen (Dadya Pasek Tegak).

\textsuperscript{6} Staff of \textit{Majelis Luhur}, based on the 1968 Besakih meeting were as follows. Advisory body: Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka, Ida Sri Mpu Dwi Sari, Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma, I Nyoman Jelada, Drs I Wayan Dhana, and I Nyoman Tastra BA. Chairman I Wayan Rana; Vice chairman I Nyoman Pasek Mudalara; Secretary I Ktut Soebandi; and Vice Secretary I Made Mawa. The chairman, I Wayan Rana was a district head of Kecamatan Kuta, Kabupaten Badung. After conducting \textit{dwijati}, he became known as Ida Sri Mpu Manik Adi Wirarunting.
leaders,' ie. leaders of ancestral temples, to 'modern leaders,' ie. those who were more influential in the modern world, such as government officials, military men and intellectuals, none of whom necessarily had direct influence on warga temples at any level. The traditional leaders still governed the central committee, but this committee was practically impotent because the real activities were largely performed by the Pengurus Harian, dominated by the 'modern leaders.' Another development that can be noted from this meeting was the explicit mention of the 'sanak pitu' ('seven brothers'). In other words, the organisation had clearly defined Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as being the descendants of the seven mpu, ie. Mpu Ketek, Mpu Kananda, Mpu Witadharma, Mpu Wiradnyana, Mpu Ragarunting, Mpu Prateka, and Mpu Dangka.

Another meeting was conducted on Sunday, 16 February 1969 in Denpasar and was attended by all kabupaten coordinators. The meeting decided, among other things, (a) to conduct a general meeting (mahasabha) of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in September 1969; (b) to legalise its provisional basic regulations (anggaran dasar) until the new ones were decided on by the coming mahasabha; and (c) the central committee, based in Klungkung under the chairmanship of I Made Rai, was abolished, and all tasks of this office were transferred to the Pengurus Harian Majelis Luhur. In turn, the name of the Pengurus Harian Majelis Luhur was provisionally changed to the Pengurus Pusat of Warga Pasek Sanak Pitu, until the new organisational structure and leadership could be decided on at the coming mahasabha. The provisional Pengurus Pusat was chaired by I Wayan Rana, with I Ktut Soebandi as the secretary.7

The decision of this meeting clearly indicated that the 'traditional leaders' had totally lost their control over the organisation, since the power had been transferred to Pengurus Pusat (then Pengurus Harian), which was manned by 'modern leaders.' As a matter of fact, this shift was one of the weaknesses of

7The full membership of the provisional Pengurus Pusat consisted of chairman I Wayan Rana; chairman II I Nyoman Pasek Mudalara; chairman III Drs Wayan Mertha Suteja BA; secretary I Ktut Soebandi; and secretary II I Made Mawa. These were supported by six divisions, ie. (1) rituals and religious affairs, (2) finance, (3) physical construction, (4) extension, (5) social affairs, and (6) statistics.
the organisation, because the leaders did not necessarily come from the masses and were not necessarily attached in the warga temples.

The First Mahasabha as Historical Pillar

Following the February meeting, preparations were carried out by the central committee, including a mass campaign to reach all dadya and dadya agung in Bali. Government offices were approached for permits and support, and wealthy warga members were approached for funding support. A special committee for conducting the mahasabha was established, chaired by Drs I Wayan Brata Subawa (decision No. 5/1969, 27 March 1969). As planned, on 19-21 September 1969 the first general meeting (Mahasabha I) was conducted in Denpasar, attended by around 850 members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from all over Bali and from Lombok as well. The theme of the mahasabha was “the participation of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in the Indonesian five-year development plan” (dharma bhakti Warga Pasek dalam pembangunan lima tahun). A number of high ranking government officials, including Bali’s Udayana Army Commander (Pangdam XVI/Udayana), gave speeches at the opening session.

Various decisions were taken during this first mahasabha. Firstly, it was agreed that the provisional basic constitution become permanent, and that the name of the organisation should be formally changed to Ikatan Warga Pasek Sanak Pitu. The organisation was also to be called Maha Gotra Sanak Sapta Rsi, which was the preferred name for the long term. However, since Pasek Sanak Pitu was more widely known at the time, it was decided that this name would be retained for some time. Secondly, it was decided that the structure of the organisation would consist of Pengurus Pusat (central executive committee) and Majelis Luhur (advisory committee) and that these offices would be staffed by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi representing various kabupaten and dadya in Bali. For practical reasons, however, the Pengurus Pusat had to be manned by those who lived in Denpasar. I Wayan Rana (a senior government official) was elected chairman of the Pengurus Pusat; I Ktut Soebandi (a high ranking officer in the police) was elected secretary, and I Gde Nuraja (a successful businessman in Denpasar) was elected treasurer. The mahasabha
decision also stated that the elected leaders were given the mandate to complete
the staffing of the organisation. 8

The first general meeting established a direct relationship between the
warga organisation and the government bureaucracy, whereby government
officials could be attracted or become involved in the warga affairs, whereas
previously this warga organisation was merely a network based on ancestral
temples. The first general meeting can be seen also as the first mass-action of
Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and became the starting point of its rise to confidence.
At the beginning, the organising committee was very pessimistic about the
response of warga members and feared hindrance from government or from
other warga who did not want the Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to be well organised.
As Ida Sri Mpu Wira Ragaruwing (then I Wayan Rana), the chairman of the
central committee of Warga Pasek at that time, and chairman of the organising
committee for the mahasabha recalls:

There were so many obstacles...! First, it was very difficult to get permission
from the police because the police were suspicious of us, that we would
organise the masses for political purposes. To get a permit for such a meeting,
we had to call on several offices a dozen times, explaining what Ikatan Warga
Pasek was. Second, rumours were spread by those who did not want us to
unite, that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was trying to divide the Balinese people by
breaking Balinese tradition and culture. In addition, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi
was considered Sudra, and hence why should they, the members, be proud of
being Sudra? Those who did not agree with our movement went even further
and said that if there were sulinggih from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, they were

---

8 Based on this mandate, the full organisational set up was decided later (Decision No.
I/PP/1969, 2 November 1969), as follows: Chairman I Wayan Rana; vice chairman I Letkol
Drs I Wayan Mertha Suteja, BA; vice chairman II I Nyoman Pasek Mudalara; vice chairman
III Drs I Wayan Arka; vice chairman IV I Made Soebaga; secretary Letkol I Ktut Soebandi;
vice secretary I I Made Mawa; vice secretary II I Nyoman Ranten; vice secretary III I Wayan
Windera; treasurer I I Gde Nuradja; treasurer II I Ketut Adi Sudana; and treasurer III I Made
Wistawan. This daily executive was supported by seven divisions, ie. (1) organisation, (2)
information/extension, (3) education, art and culture, (4) custom, brotherhood and religion, (5)
economy and social, (6) physical construction, and (7) logistics.

The Majelis Luhur, as the advisory body of the organisation, was staffed as follows
Nyoman Djelada, I Ketut Pasek, I Nyoman Rai, I Wayan Gede, Drs I Wayan Dhana, and the
chairman of the pangemong of Pura Dasar Bhuana in Gelegel; chairman I Ketut Kebek Sukarsa
BBA; vice chairman I Made Sugitha; secretary I I Ketut Siwia; Secretary II I Gde Tista; and
37 general assistants, including Ida Sri Mpu Dwi Sari and Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma.
‘Pedanda Sudra,’ and being Sudra, it was improper to use them at any ceremony. Besides that, our warga members were indoctrinated to believe that following the Warga Pasek organisation meant following all its ideology, chief among which was the use of sri mpu. Using sri mpu instead of a pedanda meant betraying the siwa. And this was considered an unthinkable sin at that time.

Among our members, the great majority of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, there was hesitancy to follow an organisation because of the traumatic PKI massacre in 1965/66. Members became very cold (dingin), and kept to the principle of minimum risk. This was yet another difficulty we had to deal with. I was unsure myself that I would be able to organise the mahasabha. I nearly gave up. But then Beli [brother] Ketut Soebandi had the excellent idea that we needed to go to our pura kawitan, Lempuyang Madya. We had to ask permission from our deified ancestors (Betara Kawitan), and let Them guide us on what to do.

So we went and stayed overnight there, followed by a visit to other temples of Catur Parhyangan. It was unbelievable,..., that returning from the temple all of us, the committee members, had one hundred percent self-confidence. Soon afterward we got a permit from the police as well as the green light from the governor, just a few days before the planned date. We distributed 500 invitations in the hope that some 80 percent would come, or around 400 participants. At the mahasabha, unbelievably, the 750-seat theatre was completely filled, and quite a lot of participants had to sit on the floor. And indeed it was very moving, since most participants shared a bunch of rice (sebungkus nasi) with others, because we prepared for only 500, while the number of participants came to no less than 850. It was really the starting point of the self-confidence for me and all warga leaders.

Similarly, the secretary of the organising committee, I Ktut Soebandi, who was an active policeman at that time, told me of his experience in preparing the mahasabha:

Before issuing a permit for the mahasabha, I was called in by my commander, Police Brigadier General Soebeno Ismaun, who asked me to explain what the Pasek organisation was. On 6 September 1969, my commander conducted a
meeting, which was attended by Parisada men, representatives from the governor’s office, and other high ranking government officials. At that meeting, my commander repeated his questions in order to have the answers heard by the participants at the meeting. There were four questions, or more precisely, accusations (tuduhan). First, Ikatan Warga Pasek was said to be a new political party. Second, Ikatan Warga Pasek was accused of being a movement to reconstruct Balinese Hinduism. Third, they said that Ikatan Warga Pasek wanted to be a rival to Parisada. Fourth, Ikatan Warga Pasek was said to destroy Balinese society through the abolishment of caste.

Repeating my answers to my commander when I was called days before, I explained that Ikatan Warga Pasek was not a political party at all. However, if it was considered a social group similar to a political party, it would be a victory of ABRI [Indonesian armed forces], since most of its leaders were active ABRI members, ie. Mertha Suteja, Sarja Udaya, I myself, Nyoman Suwetja, I Made Mawa, and so on, to mention just a few. Secondly, I strongly rejected the notion that Ikatan Warga Pasek would reconstruct Balinese Hinduism. I showed them the [provisional] constitution of Ikatan Warga Pasek, which mentioned that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was determined to continue the ancestral teachings. And the cornerstone of Hinduism in Bali were to a great extent laid down by one of the Pasek’s ancestors, Mpu Kuturan. It would be hypocritical if we said that we wanted to continue the ancestral teachings, while we were reconstructing Balinese Hinduism. In contrast, we aimed to strengthen one aspect of Hindu belief, ie. ancestor worship. Thirdly, how could they spread gossip that Ikatan Warga Pasek was meant to be a rival of Parisada? I myself was a member of Paruman Walaka [council of non-priest intellectuals of Parisada]. It would be unthinkable to make a chicken house and then put a wolf in it. To the fourth question, about caste, I explained that the question was put wrongly. The more accurate question would be whether caste is a Hindu teaching or not? I challenged them to read the Hindu holy books, and strongly suggested that Hinduism knows no caste. So too, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, as part of Balinese Hinduism, does not acknowledge caste. Furthermore, I said that Pancasila clearly acknowledges that humans are equal. The Balinese caste system was established by the Gelgel regime and strengthened by the Dutch colonial government, both of whom gave titles to those who accumulated merit, and in turn removed the titles of those who were not considered loyal. I even strongly stated that those who were proud of their caste titles were implicitly proud of the Dutch colonial government that had given them their titles. Should we appreciate this position, while we had sacrificed thousands of people to oust the Dutch from our country?

Upon hearing my explanation, no one commented, since they did not have any grounds to give any objection. Afterward, we got the permits needed from the police and government offices.

These answers were apparently political. The use of the national ideology, the Pancasila, to support the argument was quite sound because at that time (after the 1965/66 political turmoil) the discourse “to implement sincerely and consistently the Pancasila and the 1945 constitution” (melaksanakan Pancasila
dan UUD 1945 secara murni dan konsekuen) was gaining its popularity. No one would dare to refuse Pancasila openly, because the dominant discourse was that those who rejected Pancasila were associated with the PKI. In line with this, the Pancasila was used to legitimise the ideology of equality against the ideology of hierarchy embedded in the notion of ‘caste system.’ From these answers, it was apparent also that leaders of Warga Pasek manipulated Mpu Kuturan as one of Pasek’s ancestors, while on other occasions Mpu Kuturan was said to be the younger brother of their originator (Mpu Gnijaya). Nonetheless, the explanation of Ktut Soebandi before the meeting seemed to be accepted, at least on the surface, as indicated by the issue of the meeting permits and the presence of government officials at the opening ceremony of the mahasabha.

This first mahasabha was followed by the first lokasabha (general meetings at kabupaten level) in Buleleng (26 October 1969), Bangli (3 January 1970), Karangasem (21 February 1970), Tabanan (20 December 1970), and Badung (24 September 1972).

The first mahasabha was also very important in the history of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi because the already existing high priests (sulinggih) from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, who were known as merely jero-gede or dukuh, were formally ‘upgraded’ there to sri mpu. Two jero-gede and one dukuh were upgraded in this way, ie. Jero-gede Reka (from Basangbe, Tabanan), Jero-gede Dwisari (from Gerih, Badung), and Dukuh Sakti Tektek (from Peguyangan, Badung), respectively became Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka, Ida Sri Mpu Dwisari, and Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma. The changing of these names was approved by their teacher (nabe), Ida pedanda Gede Kutri. 11

Three years after the first mahasabha, the second mahasabha was held in Pancasari (Buleleng), from 7 to 9 October 1972. The mahasabha agreed to change the name of the organisation to Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi (‘the Great Family of Pasek Descendants of the Seven Saints’), shortened to MGPSSR, which is used until now. Aside from a number of supplementary

11 In the Balinese priesthood system, the nabe holds the sole authority to name his newly-born sulinggih (putra, ‘son’).
positions, the president and the secretary of the organisation have remained the same. At the third *mahasabha*, in Besakih on 23 January 1981, Dr I Wayan Mertha Suteja BA (an army major, who at that time was the director of the Academy of Art [ASTI] of Denpasar) was elected president, along with Ketut Soebandi as secretary general. At the fourth *mahasabha*, also in Besakih on 29 July 1989, Prof Ir I Ketut Rika (a professor at Udayana University) and Nyoman Ambara Dhyasa (a businessman) were elected president and secretary general, respectively. The fifth *mahasabha*, held in Denpasar on 24 July 1994, elected a new central committee, but Prof Ketut Rika and Nyoman Ambara Dhyasa were re-elected chairman and secretary for a second term.

A VARIETY OF MOTIVES

The idea of organising Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi into a formal organisation, MGPSSR, was motivated by various reasons held by different figures. For I Wayan Rana, who was a *punggawa* (district head) of Kuta in the 1960s, the organising of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was meant to restructure society, to place more emphasis on achieved instead of ascribed status. By organising the *warga* into a solid organisation, he told me, "we can increase the sense of humanity and equality with others. When we can see ourselves as equal to others, then we will

---

12 The full membership of the daily central executive committee for the period 1989-1994 was the following: Chairman: Prof Ir I Ketut Rika; vice chairman I: Letkol Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi; vice chairman II: Made Astana, SH; vice chairman III: Letkol. Drs. Made Ginantra; vice chairman IV: I Ketut Adi Sudana; vice chairman V: I Gde Nuradja; vice chairman VI: Mayor Wayan Seridana; vice chairman VII: Drs Pasek Sukaeling; secretary: I Nyoman Ambara Dhyasa; vice secretary I: Made Pasek Subamia, SH; vice secretary II: Drs Ketut Sri Setiabudi; treasurer I: Ketut Dendi; and treasurer II: Wayan Ledang. The executive was supported by ten sections, ie. (1) spiritual and ritual, (2) general assistance, (3) organisation, (4) art, culture, and extension, (5) youth, (6) economy and social, (7) development, (8) resource mobilisation, (9) publication and documentation, and (10) evaluation.

13 The full membership of the central committee for the period 1994-1999 are as follows: Chairman Prof Ir I Ketut Rika; vice chairman I Letkol Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi; vice chairman II Drs I Wayan Arka; vice chairman III I Wayan Koti Cantika, SH; vice chairman IV Made Artha, BAE; vice chairman VI Gde Nuradja; vice chairman VI Major (Pol) Drs I Wayan Nuada; vice chairman VII I Nyoman Djirna; secretary I Nyoman Ambara Dhyasa; vice secretary I I Made Pasek Diantha, SH, MS; vice secretary II I Wayan Mudasari; treasurer I Nyoman Widhisila; treasurer II I Ketut Dendi; treasurer II Putu Koyan Antara
have the self confidence to achieve what others can.” In short, the MGPSSR was (and is) a means to increase the social standing of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, because “if we do this individually, others will look down on us, while if they know that we are strong or well organised, they would not dare to do so.” For I Wayan Rana, “it is not others who are to be blamed for our low standing. We have to strengthen ourselves first.” This idea came to his mind from his experience of being a district head in Kuta. Although he was the highest authority in the region, he was still considered low, and was expected to address his people in a very respectful manner. “Why should I bow myself to an Ida Bagus or an Anak Agung, and why should they speak coarsely to me, when they are my own staff?”

In practice, this motive meant reconstructing the Balinese social stratification. But since Warga Pasek denied that caste was part of Hinduism, its members insisted that caste was a corrupted form of varna and, as such, had to be purified and returned to its original form. According to the leaders of MGPSSR, at that time rumours spread that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi would destroy the Balinese Hinduism (agama Hindu Bali) by destroying the caste system. Wayan Brata Subawa, the chairman of the first mahasabha reiterated that there was no intention at all among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to destroy the Balinese Hinduism, but “to put things in order, to maintain them, and to put them in the correct position, that Brahmana are those who perform the functions of Brahmana (kebrahmanan), and Ksatria are those who perform the functions of Ksatria, in order successfully to implement development” (Dutta Warga 1971 [2]: 35).

Another founder of the MGPSSR, I Gde Nuradja, a veteran of Bali during the revolutionary war (1945-49), gave me very practical reasons for the formal establishment of the warga organisation.

---

14 In this position, caste is frequently contrasted with varna (warna). It is said that caste is not a Hindu teaching, while varna is. Varna consists of divisions of society based on one’s occupation and personal quality (guna and karma), while caste is based on birth. While caste is inherited status, varna is achieved.
I was jealous of my friends from Warga Brahmana, Pande, or Bhujangga. Wherever we went during the revolution, we were treated differently, at least in the warmness of the welcome. Once we stayed overnight in a village, and the villagers asked, as usual at that time, "nunasang antuk linggih?"15 ("what is your seat"). Some of my friends answered that they were Pande, and suddenly they cheered “oh, we are semeton ‘brother’ Pande,” and soon I observed that those from Warga Pande received warmer treatment than the others. On another occasion, we went to another village, and here our friends from Warga Bhujangga were the most welcomed, because the villagers were ‘semeton Bhujangga Waisnawa.’ I, as a Pasek, never received such a privileged welcome, though I knew there were a lot of Pasek. But we did not have such a feeling of being ‘semeton’ ['brother']. I was thinking, why do only Pande, Bhujangga Waisnawa, and Brahmana have brothers, and not Pasek? Since then, I have felt it is very important for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to encourage the feeling of brotherhood among our warga members. And this is a must, because the bisama of Betara Kawitan (ancestors) says so: among Pasek, we are close relatives, no farther than being second cousins.

Another motive for establishing the MGPSSR was religious, particularly in uniting the warga members to take care of temples associated with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, as well as in helping semeton ‘brothers’ Pasek in finding their kawitan. This seemed to be the most salient motivation among the founders. In the 1960s, temples associated with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi were desperately ‘neglected’ in terms of their physical appearance. Moreover, very few people of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi knew their kawitan, while the Babad Pasek clearly states that all Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi must pay homage to the four ancestral temples called Catur Parhyangan, ie. Lempuyang Madya in Abang, Karangasem, Padharman Ratu Pasek in Besakih, Silayukti in Padangbai, and Dasar Bhuana in Gelgel. Take the Padharman Ratu Pasek in Besakih for example. According to Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi, the padharman of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was physically the poorest compared to other padharman, although in terms of number of members, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is the largest warga. He was moved by this condition, and tried to discuss the matter with some elders. The answer was to organise the warga, and

---

15 In traditional Bali, before continuing a conversation with a stranger, the first question asked was “nunasang antuk linggih?,” to inquire about the social status of the addressee, in terms of their warga, and then behave and use the level of language accordingly. In present day Bali, such a question is rarely asked, except among older people. The most common question asked now is “saking napi ragane?” ('where are you from?') and “ring dija makarya?” ('where do you work?'). This is because most Balinese tend to speak in a refined manner (halus) to each other for their first meetings, regardless of their warga.
Wake them up to the fact that their very own temples are in need of their support. It was not the fault of our warga members, because most of them did not know since they were mostly illiterate. Hence it was our duty to let them know. This must be done, or we all would be punished by Betara Kawitan for neglecting these temples, as mentioned in the babad and prasasti (Soebandi 1994).

Political motives could also be found among Pasek leaders. However, this was not the original motive for the establishment of the MGPSSR, but developed in the course of time. In the 1970s, before the national general election in 1977, its leaders claimed that ‘Pasek is Golkar,’ and used the organisation to mobilise the masses to vote during the general election. Further, during the governorial election in 1978, some leaders of the MGPSSR suggested that since Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi comprised roughly 75% of Bali’s population, the governor of Bali should be from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. This manoeuvre, however, failed to get enough support from leaders of the MGPSSR or Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as a whole. Most leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi maintained that politics (politik praktis) should not enter warga organisation because it would inevitably split the warga. Any member of the warga must be free to channel their political support (aspirasi politik) to his or her own choice, and the MGPSSR must be kept purely as a means to implement the bisama. This position in fact had been stressed from the outset. In the organisation’s newsletter, Dutta Warga No. 2 (1971: 18), this message was clearly spelt out in a Balinese stanza, Pupuh Ginada, composed by I Made Nama:

16 The term ‘political motives’ (motif politik) in this context is used in its narrow sense, i.e. the politics of governmental influence or state power. In this case, political motive implies gaining political position in governmental offices or to be members of the house of representative. In a general sense, the movement is evidently political since one of its basic tenets is to restructure the ‘caste system,’ i.e. discrimination based on warga or, in its leaders’ words, “to return the Balinese Hindu to the concept of varna instead of caste, because ‘caste’ is a corrupted form of varna.”

17 This seemed to follow the manoeuvre carried out by the Parisada when it proclaimed that the Parisada supported the Orde Baru (the New Order). In its decision letter dated 18 July 1968, No. Kpts 13/SBK/VII/1968, the Parisada stated that the Parisada is a member of Sekber Golkar (Joint Secretariat of Golongan Karya). In 1977, the Parisada proposed to the President of Indonesia that representatives of the Parisada should be appointed as members of parliament (DPR/MPR).
When organising Kepasekan [anything associated with Pasek affairs]/ **do not use political motives**/ do not betray/ do not be lazy/ your motive must be one, ie. [to support] Lempuyang temple/ this motive is very sacred/ cannot be deflected (emphasis added).

The first *mahasabha* also decided that leaders of the MGPSSR should not be political leaders, and that political affairs must never be part of the life of the MGPSSR.

**ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE**

The MGPSSR has a number of levels, following the administrative structure of the government. It starts from a central level and proceeds down through province, *kabupaten, kecamatan*, to village level. The central committee of the MGPSSR, called *Pengurus Pusat* or MGPSSR Pusat, is based in Denpasar. Since the activities of the MGPSSR Pusat are mostly in Bali, the MGPSSR Pusat automatically assumes itself to be MGPSSR of Bali province. The MGPSSR Pusat consists of an executive body, an advisory body, and an assembly of priests. The daily executive body is made up of a chairman and seven vice chairmen, a secretary general and two vice secretaries, and a treasurer and two vice treasurers. There are 16 divisions in the organisational body, and each vice chairman coordinates a number of these divisions (Figure 5.1).
Figure 5.1. Organisational Structure of the MGPSSR Pusat.
The advisory body, called *Pakira-kiran I Jero Makabehan*,
was established to give advice to the executive committee. This body is further differentiated into two. The first consists of a ‘regular advisory group’ (*penasehat*), which is staffed by influential figures and intellectuals from various disciplines. The second part of the advisory body is an ‘assembly of non-priest advisers’ (*paruman walaka*). This assembly is an extension of the regular advisory team. Members included in this assembly, aside from the regular advisers, are (1) a representative from each of the *pangempon* of the *Catur Parhyangan*; (2) a representative of each *dadya agung* within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi; (3) individuals, particularly those who were active in the MGPSSR in the previous leadership; (4) the daily officers of the MGPSSR Pusat (ie. the chairmen, secretaries, and treasurers); and (5) all chairmen of the MGPSSR Kabupaten.

The priest assembly, called *Paruman Panca Rsi*, is an advisory body particularly in relation to spiritual and religious matters. All *sri mpu* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are members of this assembly. At present, this assembly is chaired by a senior *sri mpu*, Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, while the secretary is a junior one, Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Rekananda. The *Pengurus Pusat* is obliged to implement decisions taken by both *Paruman Walaka* and *Paruman Panca Rsi*.

---

18 This term, *Pakira-kiran I Jero Makabehan*, is an old Balinese term, found in several inscriptions (*prasasti*), which means ‘the advisory body of a kingdom.’ It is believed that ancestors of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi were prominent figures in this body during the Old Balinese era (before the advent of Majapahit). This term has been adopted by the MGPSSR since 1994, replacing the older term, *Majelis Luhur*.

19 For the period 1994-1999, members of this advisory body are Drs I Wayan Dhana (the former *Bupati* of Badung), Brigjen I Ketut Sundria (the former *Bupati* of Tabanan, chairman of *Golkar* and the speaker of Bali Province), I Made Astana SH (formerly a head of a bureau at governor’s office, and now a member of Bali’s House of Representatives), I Wayan Kari (a businessman), Prof Dr Ir I Gde Suyatna (a vice rector at Udayana University), Prof I Gde Bungaya (a former dean of the Faculty of Economics, Udayana University), Dr Made Titib (a leader in *Parisada* of Indonesia and a member of Bali’s House of Representatives), and Ir I Nyoman Gelebet Ariawan (a lecturer at the Faculty of Engineering, Udayana University).
Plate 5.1 A general meeting (*mahasabha*) of the *Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi*, attended by around 800 participants representing various levels of its formal organisation and *warga* temples. Seated in the first row are some *sri mpu*.

Plate 5.2 The elected leaders of the MGPSSR (for the period 1994-1999). They are all 'modern-type leaders' (bureaucrats, academics, and businessmen), who are not necessarily influential in their own *dadya* or *dadya agung*. 
The executive body at kabupaten level is called Pengurus Kabupaten or MGPSSR Kabupaten. This is chaired by a chairman and three vice chairmen, a secretary and a vice secretary, and a treasurer and a vice treasurer, supported by a number of sections. There are also advisers at kabupaten level, ie. sri mpu and prominent figures of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from the respective kabupaten.

The basic regulations of the MGPSSR mention that in each kecamatan there is an organiser called coordinator, while at village level there is a sub-coordinator. However, they are better known as MGPSSR Kecamatan and MGPSSR Desa respectively.

Since 1989 the MGPSSR has also established a youth organisation, called Maha Yowana Sapta Putra (‘The Great Youth of the Seven Sons’). This youth organisation is intended to support the implementation of the programs of the MGPSSR, as well as being a means of educating the younger generation to be proud of being members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, with all their rights and duties as stated by the bisama. In 1994, a women’s division was also established, called Satya Darmapati. Both Maha Yowana Sapta Putra and Satya Darmapati are found at all levels of MGPSSR organisational structure.

OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAMS

Despite several changes of name, the objectives of the MGPSSR are still the same. As its basic constitution (anggaran dasar) states, the objectives of this warga organisation are the following.

1. To encourage warga members to learn and implement Hindu teachings, as based on the holy books (sastra agama). This is also meant to modify traditions that are not based on, or not in line with the written Hindu teachings.

2. To encourage warga members to raise the status of various aspects of their life, ie. social, economic, and cultural, leading to kertha warga (harmony within the family), kertha desa (harmony within the village or with society), kertha negara (harmony with the government or loyalty to the country), and kertha agama (implementation of religious teachings harmoniously).
3. To guide and develop warga members to be faithful Hindus, as a preventive measure to protect them from conversion to other religions, and to obey the bisama of the ancestors (Ida Betara Kawitan).

4. To establish a solid institution of sulinggih and walaka (non-sulinggih experts) to give advice on matters of art, culture, and religion for society, especially for members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

5. To help, morally and materially, warga members in maintaining and conducting ritual ceremonies in temples associated with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

6. To give assistance to warga members in continuing their formal education, such as arranging foster parents and giving scholarships.

The constitution also explicitly states that the organisation is purely an organisasi kewargaan and non-affiliative, ie. independent from any other social-political institution. According to its leaders, this is to prevent political conflict entering the brotherhood of the warga.

In warga, we have to abolish attributes such as social-economic status, political alliances, levels of education, and the like. Once we dare to say that we are Pasek, then we are all semeton ['brothers'], as repeatedly stated by the bisama. As such, our organisasi kewargaan must be purely oriented to social-religious objectives, to strengthen Hindu values among members, as well as Hindu society as a whole. Since differences in political aspirations are a fertile area for conflict, our warga organisation must be freed from political motives. Here in the warga we ngayah [contribute labour for free], both to God and Betara Kawitan (I Ketut Rika 1994).

The use of sri mpu is not explicitly mentioned in the objectives. Nonetheless, this objective is implied in objective number 3, ie. “to obey the bisama of the ancestors,” which, among other things, dictates that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi should use holy water from their own sulinggih. Indeed, in daily discussions the struggle to raise the image of the sri mpu and to encourage the use of sri mpu by both warga members and the public is very prevalent.

To achieve these objectives, a number of programs have been, and are being implemented by the MGPSSR. In the field of religious matters, the MGPSSR has intensified the publication of practical books on Hinduism, as well as books on Kepasekan, which can be used as guidance for members of Warga Pasek
Sapta Rsi. Books about *Catur Parhyangan* are also a priority, to spread the history and functions of such temples among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. The MGPSSR Pusat has published a number of books and booklets, such as *Bisama Warga Pasek, Berbakti kepada Leluhur adalah Paramo Dharma* (‘Devotion to Ancestors is a Primary Duty’), *Babad Pasek, Tuntunan Muspa* (‘Guidelines in Prayer’), and *Sejarah Pembangunan Pura di Bali* (‘The History of Temple Development in Bali’), to name only a few. The MGPSSR Pusat also published a newsletter, called *Dutta Warga*. The newsletter published news about the activities of the MGPSSR and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in general, religious teachings, *bisama* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, excerpts from *Babad Pasek*, folk tales, and also general knowledge. However, this newsletter could not continue to be published for managerial reasons, and its last issue was the June 1976 edition. In the *mahasabha* of 1994, the willingness to again publish the *Dutta Warga* was very evident among participants.

Aside from books, regular short courses and lectures on Hinduism and *Kepasekan* for members have also been held frequently in order to enhance faith and devotion (*sraddha* and *bhakti*) to God (*Ida Sang Hyang Widhi*) and the ancestors. The extension team of the MGPSSR Pusat receives, on average, two invitations a month from *pamaksan* of temples within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, asking for lectures. The lectures on *Kepasekan* are usually delivered during the festival in the temple concerned. In line with this program, regular education is also planned to increase the knowledge and skill of offering makers (*sarati* or *bawati*), tooth filers (*sangging*), temple priests (*pemangku*), and *jero-gede* (candidates for *sri mpu*). In 1991, a one-week short course was conducted on the priesthood (*kepemangkuan*). This short course was formally opened by the governor’s assistant for social and religious affairs, Drs Ida Kade Surya, on behalf of the governor, and witnessed by the chairman of the *Parisada* of Bali Province (Drs I Gede Sura). The certificate of attendance for this short course was also signed by the chairman of the *Parisada*. Interestingly, out of 40 participants of this course, three were from outside Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (two from Warga Arya, and the other from Warga Ksatria Dalem).
These programs are all associated with the effort of the MGPSSR to disseminate Hindu teachings based on written sources, or what they call sastra agama ('religious literature'). This has prompted a shift in the practice of Balinese Hinduism from mainly oral traditions (adat, particularly the mula keto, ‘so it was told’) to philosophical texts. Traditions were to be reinterpreted in accord with written teachings. In this position, written teachings were supposed to overrule the adat.\textsuperscript{20} This position is strengthened by the awareness that most adat (particularly the mula keto) favour the Triwangsa over the Jaba. Sastra agama, particularly Vedic teachings, then, are advocated as the primary source of all religious and adat practices, and all religious and adat practices are supposed to find their references in the sastra agama.

In the leadership for the period 1994-1999, one of the important programs is to renovate the Padharman Pasek in Besakih, which was expected to be finished before the Ekabhuana ceremony in March 1996. In relation to this plan, there was a proposal to extend the temple yard by buying the private land behind the temple. The total budget planned for this major physical development was Rp. 362,250,000. In this extended temple yard, it was planned to establish a dharmasala or education camp, where the MGPSSR could conduct training for candidates for pemangku, jero-gede, as well as a place to practice yoga, meditation, and other religious activities. By December 1995, several renovations and the construction of new buildings had been accomplished, at a cost of Rp. 23,492,000. The plan to expand the temple yard had not been carried out because negotiations between the owner of the land and the MGPSSR had not reached an agreement. This agreement was, however, reached in March 1996. The land owner agreed to sell his 0.135 ha of land for a total price of 20.25 million rupiah, and the payment for this, which was fully funded by members’ voluntary donations, was made in March 1996.

\textsuperscript{20} This position has gained its ground recently, when the Parisada stated that there are four sources (catur dresta, ‘four laws’) that can be consulted in managing disagreements over adat and religious practices. They are local traditions (loka dresta), generally accepted mores (sima dresta), the village’s rules and regulations (desa dresta), and written sources (sastra dresta). Of these four sources, the sastra dresta or sastra agama is the highest in the hierarchy.
Yoga and meditation exercises are also planned to be performed in all of the sri mpu’s gria. At present (since 1991), only two mpu host yoga and meditation practice, ie. Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga (Gria Agung Kelaci) and Ida Sri Mpu Satwika (Gria Pasek Pergung). The yoga is called Yoga Asanas Dharma Sandi. Students of this yoga are mostly members of the Maha Yowana Sapta Putra. They come from several kabupaten in Bali (Tabanan, Badung, Gianyar, Buleleng, and Jembrana), and practice yoga every Sunday afternoon.

One of the priority programs is to promote progressively the use of sri mpu among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and urge the Parisada to involve sri mpu in major ritual ceremonies for the general public. In some cases, this struggle has been fruitful, while in others it has failed. The MGPSSR also has plans for programs to educate their youth in Sanskrit, Veda, and Hindu philosophy, as well as the bisama of their ancestors, but this project, especially the Sanskrit course, has not been implemented due to the lack of instructors.

In order to support its program implementation, the MGPSSR has established a foundation named Yayasan Adhi Sapta Kerthi. This foundation, as the socio-economic wing of the organisation, has been one of the main source in financing activities of the MGPSSR. It supports the MGPSSR in funding, issuing calendars, publishing books pertaining to Pasek Sapta Rsi, and administrative work.

**BABAD AND BISAMA AS REFERENCE FOR GUIDING ACTIONS**

To understand actions taken by a certain warga, an understanding of its babad or other form of traditional texts is crucial because actions are generally legitimised by reference to these sources. The babad is, in most cases, believed to be a true history by members of the warga concerned, or at least as a ‘covert message’ that the members of the warga must decipher and consider.21 This is

21This is indicated by, among other things, the terms used by the Balinese in referring to babad, ie. sejarah (history) or riwayat keluhuran (the historical narrative of the ancestors), and not merely tutur or satua (story or advice).
also true of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. I will present here various shortened versions of *Babad Pasek*, and then discuss also some *bisama* found in the *babad*.

**Babad Pasek**

There are a number of written sources, all called *babad*, that recount the genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. There are also shortened versions of the *babad*, focusing on the genealogy, called *bencangah* or *parikandan*. The most famous *babad* version among members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is the one based on a *babad* in the Gedung Kirtya collection (No. Va.936/6). This *babad* is in general accord with the *Babad Pasek* owned by I Ketut Sengod from Desa Pidpid, Karangasem (Collection of PDKB No. 734). There are also Scriptures concerning Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in the collection of the Gedung Kirtya, ie. collections no. Va.955/6 (and PDKB No. 240) entitled *Babad Pasek Gelgel*; no. Va.254/4 (PDKB No. 212) called *Parikandan Pasek Gelgel*; and No. Va.1817/13 (PDKB No. 103) called *Bencangah Bendesa*. These sources provide various versions of the genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

**Version 1: Babad Pasek (Kr. Va.936/6) and Babad Pasek Pura Lempuyang (PDKB No. 734)**

According to these sources of the *Babad Pasek*, the islands of Bali and Lombok were very unstable, so that they easily trembled. Bali was particularly unstable because there were only four mountains functioning as stabilisers, ie. Gunung Lempuyang, Gunung Andakasa, Gunung Batukau, and Gunung Beratan. Betara Hyang Pasupati was moved by the sad condition of Bali and tried to stabilise Bali and Lombok. To do so, He cut off the peak of Mount Semeru in

---

22 PDKB stands for *Pusat Dokumentasi Kebudayaan Bali* (Centre for Documentation of Balinese Culture), a government office based in Denpasar. This office is responsible for collecting and documenting aspects of arts and culture of Bali, including old Scriptures. Since 1990 *Gedung Kirtya* of Singaraja has become a subsection of this office. Most of the collections of *Gedung Kirtya*, particularly lontar that have been transliterated into the Roman alphabet, have been duplicated and are kept in the Denpasar main office. PDKB has reorganised the numbering of the transliterated lontar in a list called *Alih Aksara Lontar* ('transliteration of lontar'). I use these transliterated lontar as my sources, and their numbers are referred to here.
Java (Mount Semeru itself is a piece cut from the Himalayas in India) and put this section in Bali and Lombok. In moving the cut section of Mount Semeru to Bali and Lombok, Hyang Pasupati was helped by three dragon-like gods (naga), i.e. Betara Hyang Naga Basuki, Betara Hyang Naga Anantaboga, and Betara Hyang Naga Taksaka. This was done on Thursday-Kliwon Merakih, on the new moon of the tenth month (Sasih Kadasa) Isaka 11 (89 AD). On the way, parts of the cut section fell here and there, and became mountains in the middle of Bali, such as Gunung Pangelengan, Gunung Silanjana, Gunung Pulaki, Gunung Pucak Sangkur, and Gunung Pohen, while the biggest fall became Gunung Batur (Gunung Lebah). The section cut from Gunung Semeru was then divided into two, one was put in Bali, to become Gunung Agung, and the other was put in Lombok, to become Gunung Rinjani.

In Isaka 31 (109 AD), Betara Hyang Pasupati sent His three children to Bali to guard this island. They were Betara Hyang Putranjaya, Betari Dewi Danuh, and Betara Hyang Gnijaya. The arrival of these three first deities was signalled by the eruption of Gunung Agung for the first time. Betara Hyang Putranjaya stayed in Gunung Agung, Betari Dewi Danuh in Gunung/Danu Batur, and Betara Hyang Gnijaya in Gunung Lempuyang. These three first deities are known as the Hyang Tripurusa. Later, Betara Hyang Pasupati sent four more of his

---

23 In the Balinese calendrical system, there are two methods to identify dates or days. The first is called pawukon, and the second is called Isaka Warsa (tahun Isaka). In the pawukon system, the system is cyclical, and only the name of the day is mentioned, while the number of the year is unstated. In this system, one year is 420 days, divided into two six-month units (of 210 days). Each six-month is divided into 30 weeks, called wuku, i.e: Sinta, Landep, Ukir, Kurantil, Tolu, Gumreg, Wariga, Warigadian, Julungwangi, Sunggung, Dungulan, Kuningan, Langkur, Medangsia, Pujut, Pahang, Krulut, Merakih, Tambir, Medangkungan, Matal, Uye, Menail, Prangbakat, Bala, Ugu, Wayang, Klawu, Dukut, and Watugunung. Aside from these Wuku, there are also Wewaran (days), which are organised into weeks which range from a one-day week (ekawara) up to a ten-day week (dasawara). Among the wewaran, the most important are triwara (three-day week), pancawara (five-day week), and saptawara (seven-day week). Triwara consists of Pasah, Beteng, Kajeng; Pancawara consists of Umanis, Pahing, Pon, Wage, Kliwon; and Saptawara consists of Redite (Sunday), Soma (Monday), Anggara (Tuesday), Buda (Wednesday), Wraspati (Thursday), Sukra (Friday), and Saniscara (Saturday). The second system, the Isaka Warsa, is practically the same as the Western-Gregorian lunar system, where one year is 364.25 days. However, Isaka year started 78 years after the Gregorian year. One year is also divided into 12 months, called Sasih, namely Sasih Kasa, Karo, Katiga, Kapat, Kalima, Kanem, Kapitu, Kawulu, Kasanga, Kadasa, Jyesta, and Sadha. The length of one month varies from 28 days to 40 days. These two calendrical systems are used side by side in present day Bali. However, most Balinese holy days and temple festivals follow the Pawukon system, and only a few follow the Isaka Warsa system.
children, ie. Betara Hyang Tumuwuh, to stay in Gunung Batukau; Betara Hyang Manik Galang in Pejeng; Betara Hyang Manik Gumawang in Gunung Beratan; and Betara Hyang Tugu in Gunung Andakasa.

From His yoga, Betara Hyang Gnijaya begot five sons, who returned to Daha (Java) to help King Erlangga. These five saints were known as Panca Pandita (‘five saints’) or Panca Tirta (‘five [sources of] holy water’). They were Mpu Gnijaya or Brahmana Pandita, Mpu Semeru (or Mpu Mahameru), Mpu Gana, Mpu Kuturan (or Mpu Rajakertha), and Mpu Bharadah. Four of these five brother mpu were sent to Bali by Erlangga, to help the spread of Hinduism and to maintain the order of society during the reign of Udayana-Gunaprya Darmapatni (Airlangga’s parents).

Mpu Gnijaya, a follower of Brahmanism (hence he is also known as Brahmana Pandita), arrived in Bali on Thursday-Kliwon Dungulan, the first day of the tenth month (Sasih Kadasa), Isaka 971 (1049 AD), and lived on the middle slope of Bukit Bisbis or Lempuyang. His day of arrival is celebrated as the day of the temple festival at Pura Lempuyang Madya, a temple dedicated to him. Mpu Gnijaya married Dewi Manik Geni, the daughter of Betara Putranjaya (the deity of Gunung Agung), and this marriage produced seven sons. Upon marriage, these sons were all consecrated to become priests (mpu or rsi), known as the Sapta Rsi (‘seven saints’).

Mpu Semeru or Mpu Mahameru, a priest of Siva, arrived in Bali on Friday-Kliwon, Pujet, on the full moon of the eighth month (Sasih Kawulu), Isaka 921 (999 AD). This arrival day is now the day of the temple festival in Padharman Pasek in the Besakih complex, where he was believed to conduct his asceticism after his arrival in Bali. Mpu Semeru practiced brahmacari (permanent celibacy), hence he had no children. However, from his yoga he was able to produce a son made of a black root, who was named, after his marriage, Mpu Dryakah or Mpu Kamareka. He is the originator of Warga Pasek Kayu Selem (‘kayu selem’ literally means ‘black wood’).

The third brother, Mpu Gana, arrived in Bali on Monday-Kliwon Kuningan, Isaka 922 (1000 AD). He lived in Gelgel, in the place where Pura Dasar Bhuana was later erected. His arrival day is now the day of the festival of this temple.
Mpu Gana was a follower of Hindu’s Ganapati sect and, like Mpu Semeru, he was also a *brahma-carin*, meaning that he took no wife. Hence, he had no children.

Mpu Kuturan or Mpu Rajakertha arrived in Bali on Wednesday-*Kliwon Pahang*, 923 Isaka (1001 AD). Upon retiring from serving as *senapati* (commander in chief) for Udayana-Gunaprya Darmapatni of Bedahulu, he lived in Silayukti, Padangbai, where a temple (Pura Silayukti) is now located, and the day of his arrival is used as the day of this temple’s festival. Mpu Kuturan had a wife and a daughter, but they were left in Girah (East Java), so his wife was better known as Rangdanin Girah (‘the widow from Girah’) who practiced black magic. Their daughter was named Dyah Ratnamenggali. During his term as a *senapati* in Bedahulu, Mpu Kuturan was also the head of the palace council (*pakira-kiran i jero makabehan*). In this position, he administered a tripartite meeting in Bedahulu, attended by leaders of various sects (*Gana, Brahma, Siva, Wisnu, Sogata, Surya, Buddha*, etc.), which resulted in the adoption of the *Trimurthi* concept, ie. the worship of the principal gods (Brahma, Wisnu, and Siwa) on an equal basis. Following this decision, each village (*desa pakraman* or *desa adat*) was encouraged to establish three temples (*kahyangan tiga*), each dedicated to one of these gods.

The youngest brother of the *Panca Pandita*, Mpu Bharadah, was kept in Java by Erlangga to serve as his court priest, and lived in Lemahtulis. However, he also visited Bali to propose to the King of Bedahulu that one of Airlangga’s sons should be given the right to rule Bali. This proposal was rejected by Mpu Kuturan, which angered Mpu Bharadah, and he went back to Java without asking permission from his elder brother, Mpu Kuturan. He could not reach Java because the sea was rough. This was caused by Mpu Bharadah’s arrogance, leaving without permission from his elder brother. Hence, he was forced back to Bali and landed in Padangbai. In this place he meditated, asking forgiveness from his elder brothers, after which he returned back to Java safely. The place where he landed is now the place of a temple called Pura Tanjungsari.

Mpu Gnijaya and his wife Mpu Manik Geni begot seven sons. They are Mpu Ketek, Mpu Kananda, Mpu Wiradnyana, Mpu Withadharma, Mpu
Ragarunting, Mpu Prateka, and Mpu Dangka. These seven *mpu* are known as the *Sapta Rsi* (‘the seven saints’), who are believed to be the originators of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (Figure 5.2).

Mpu Ketek begot Mpu Pemacekan, Arya Kepasekan, and Kyai Agung Pemacekan, who are the ancestors of subgroups within Pasek, ie. Pasek Tohjiwa, Pasek Tangguntiti, Pasek Padang Subadra, Pasek Wanagiri, and many more. Mpu Kananda begot Mpu Sang Kul Dewa, Wira Sang Kul Putih, and Mangku Sang Kul Putih, who are the ancestors of Pasek Sorga. Mpu Wiradnyana begot Mpu Wiranatha, Mpu Pranawa, Arya Tatar, and Ki Gusti Pasek Lurah Tatar, who are the originators of Pasek Penataran, Pasek Tatar, Pasek Telengan, and Pasek Pidpid. Mpu Withadharma begot Mpu Withadharma (the same name as his father), Mpu Pastika, Mpu Pananda, Mpu Lampita, Mpu Jiwaksara (Patih Ulung), Kyai Gusti Bendesa Mas, Ki Gusti Rare Angon, and Kyai Agung Pasek Gelgel, who are the ancestors of Pasek Dukuh Bunga, Pasek Dukuh Subandi, Pasek Gelgel, Pasek Bendesa, Pasek Tangkas Kori Agung, and so forth. Mpu Ragarunting begot Mpu Wirarunting, De Pasek Salahin, De Pasek Lurah Kubayan, and De Pasek Lurah Tutwan, the ancestors of Pasek Salahin, Pasek Kubayan, and Pasek Tutwan. Mpu Prateka begot Mpu Pratekajaya, Sang Prateka, De Pasek Lurah Kubakal, Ki Dukuh Gamongan, and Ki Dukuh Blatung, the ancestors of Pasek Prateka, and Pasek Nongan. The youngest, Mpu Dangka, begot Mpu Wiradangka, Sang Wiradangka, De Pasek Lurah Kedangkan, De Pasek Lurah Ngukuwin, and De Pasek Gaduh, the ancestors of Pasek Penida, Pasek Dangka, Pasek Ngukuwin, Pasek Gaduh, and Pasek Taro.
Figure 5.2 Genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, according to Babad Pasek (Gedung Kirtya No. Va.936/6 and PDKB No. 734).

Note: B.H. stands for Betara Hyang
After the defeat of Bali by Majapahit, the throne of Bali was vacant for several years. During this period, leaders from Pasek, Kyai Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel and Patih Ulung acted as caretakers of Bali. Realising that he was not entitled to rule Bali any more—because Bali had fallen to Majapahit—Kyai Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel sent his messengers to Majapahit, asking for an adipathi (king). The messengers consisted of Patih Ulung, Arya Pemacekan, and Arya Kepasekan. The new ruler (adipati), Sri Kresna Kepakisan was sent to Bali several years later.\footnote{According to other historical sources, the defeat of Bali by Majapahit occurred in 1343 AD, while the new ruler, Sri Kresna Kepakisan, was sent to Bali in 1352 AD (Kartodirdjo et al. 1975; Rai Mirsha et al. 1986).}

During the reign of Sri Kresna Kepakisan, a number of villages including Sukawana, Peludu, Taro, Bayad, Kedisan, Bunutan, and Serai, rebelled. Sri Kresna Kepakisan nearly gave up and intended to return to Java. To announce this intention to Gajah Mada, three Pasek ancestors, i.e. Patih Ulung, Arya Pemacekan, and Arya Kepasekan were sent again to Majapahit. Gajah Mada did not agree. Instead he advised Sri Kresna Kepakisan that to maintain order in Bali, several measures must be taken. Firstly, in confronting rebellion, an adipati should not use armed force, but an approach which would increase the sense of brotherhood (pasemetonan). Secondly, in relation to his first advice, Gajah Mada advised that the continuity of ritual ceremonies in the major temples of Bali, notably Besakih, must be maintained. And thirdly, the defeated Balinese, notably Pasek, who were still respected by the masses must not be neglected. In addition, Gajah Mada also gave Sri Kresna Kepakisan another piece of regalia, a keris named Si Lobar.

Based on this advice, a number of Pasek were assigned to govern villages throughout Bali. The babad mentions that Arya Pemacekan and Arya Kepasekan several times visited the rebelling villages. The leaders of these villages said that they would stop rebelling if their Pasek brothers were satisfied with the situation ("hulun tan hana panjang yan sampun pangandikan raka maka rwa...").
Version 2: *Babad Pasek Gelgel* (Kr. Va. 955/6) and *Parikandan Pasek Gelgel* (Kr. Va.254/4).

These two sources describe the genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in the same ways. These sources give a different genealogy to that in *Babad Pasek* (version 1). Neither the *Panca Tirta* nor the *Sapta Rsi* are mentioned, although both of these *babad* start from Betara Brahma, the creator. The *Babad Pasek Gelgel* and the *Parikandan Pasek Gelgel* state that Betara Brahma, from His *yoga*, begot Ki Mpu Withadharma, and Ki Mpu Withadharma begot Ki Mpu Wiradharma. Mpu Wiradharma begot three sons, ie. Mpu Lampita, Mpu Adnyana, and Mpu Pastika. Mpu Lampita begot two sons, Mpu Kuturan and Mpu Bharadah. Since Mpu Kuturan did not beget any son, he adopted his first cousin, Mpu Pananda, the son of Mpu Adnyana, as a son. Mpu Pananda begot Mpu Jiwaksara, Mpu Jiwaksara begot Mpu Ketek, Mpu Ketek begot Sang Arya Tatar, Sang Arya Tatar begot Ki Patih Ulung, and Ki Patih Ulung begot Ki Semar. Ki Semar, from his marriage with Ni Wredani, begot Ki Langon. Ki Langon, from his two wives begot six sons, ie. Pasek Gelgel, Pasek Denpasar, Pasek Tohjiwa, Pasek Nongan, Pasek Prateka, and Pangeran Tangkas (Figure 5.3 and 5.4). These are the originators of the present groups of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. The only difference in these two sources in terms of genealogical account is that, as seen from the figures, *Parikandan Pasek Gelgel* clearly mentions that Ki Langon begot three sons (Pasek Gelgel, Pasek Denpasar, and Pangeran Tangkas) from his first wife and the other three sons (Pasek Tohjiwa, Pasek Nongan, and Pasek Prateka) from his second wife, while *Babad Pasek Gelgel* does not make any mention of this.
Figure 5.3 Genealogy of Warga Pasek, according to Babad Pasek Gelgel (Gedong Kirtya No. Va.955/6, and PDKB No. 240).
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Figure 5.4 Genealogy of Warga Pasek, according to Parikandan Pasek Gelgel (Gedong Kirtya No. Va.254/4, and PDKB No. 212).
Version 3: *Bencangah Bendesa* (Kr. Va.1817/13)

In this version, the genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is described in a similar way to that of *Babad Pasek Gelgel* and *Parikandan Pasek Gelgel*. The only difference is that Mpu Pananda was not the adopted son of Mpu Kuturan, but the two merely lived together in Silayukti. This *bencangah* also clearly states that I Langen begot three sons from his first wife (Pasek Gelgel, Pasek Denpasar, and Pangeran Tangkas) and the other three from his second wife (Pasek Tohjiwa, Pasek Nongan, and Pasek Prateka) (Figure 5.5).

Version 4: *Kawitan Pasek Gelgel* (PDKB No. 111)

In this version, the genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is presented slightly differently again. In the first part, it is mentioned that from His *yoga* in Mekah (Mecca), Betara Brahma begot five sons, ie. Mpu Gnjaya, Mpu Withadharma, Mpu Kepakisan, Mpu Bang Sidhimantra, and Mpu Kulputih. From this point onward, the genealogy is similar to those found in the *Babad Pasek Gelgel*, the *Parikandan Pasek Gelgel*, and the *Bencangah Bendesa*. This source mentions that Mpu Withadharma begot Mpu Wiradharma, and Mpu Wiradharma begot two sons, ie. Mpu Lampita and Mpu Adnyana. Mpu Lampita begot two sons (Mpu Kuturan and Mpu Bharadah), and Mpu Adnyana also begot two sons (Mpu Pastika and Mpu Pananda). Mpu Pananda became the adopted son of Mpu Kuturan. Mpu Pananda begot Mpu Jiwaksara, Mpu Jiwaksara begot Mpu Ketek, Mpu Ketek begot Arya Tatar, Arya Tatar begot Patih Ulung, and Patih Ulung begot Ki Semar. Ki Semar, from his wife, Ni Wredani, begot Ki Langon (I Dangon), who then begot five sons, ie. Pasek Gelgel, Pasek Denpasar, Pangeran Tangkas, Pasek Nongan, and Pasek Prateka (Figure 5.6).
Figure 5.5 Genealogy of Warga Pasek, according to Bancangah Bendesa (Gedong Kirtya No. Va.1817/13, and PDKB No. 103).
Figure 5.6 Genealogy of Warga Pasek, according to *Kawitan Pasek Gelgel* (PDKB No. 111).
Version 5: Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi

In 1993, Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi, a leader in the MGPSSR Pusat published four volumes of the Babad Pasek in the Indonesian language. The author claimed that the babad was composed on the basis of several written sources (babad, prasasti, pamancangah, etc.). In this version, the Panca Pandita are not the sons of Betara Hyang Gnijaya, but His great-great-grandsons. In this version, Betara Hyang Gnijaya begot Mpu Withadharma; Mpu Withadharma begot Mpu Bajrasatwa (Mpu Wiradharma) and Mpu Rajakerta; Mpu Bajrasatwa begot Mpu Lampita; and Mpu Lampita begot the Panca Pandita, ie. Mpu Gnijaya, Mpu Semeru, Mpu Gana, Mpu Kuturan, and Mpu Bharadah (Figure 5.7).

From this point onward, the course of the genealogy is the same as that mentioned in the Babad Pasek. (Kr. Va.936/6) and Babad Pasek Pura Lempuyang (PDKB 734). Mpu Gnijaya begot the Sapta Rsi, who are the originators of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

Of all of these versions, the Babad Pasek (Kr. Va.936/6), which accords with Babad Pasek Pura Lempuyang (PDKB No. 734), is the most well-known. Conversations with several prominent figures in the MGPSSR as well as ‘ordinary’ Pasek showed that they seem to believe that the Panca Pandita are the sons of Betara Hyang Gnijaya. This is very clear, since in mentioning Betara Hyang Gnijaya, the term used is ‘abra sinuhun’ (literally ‘the old person that one carries above one’s head’), meaning ‘grandparent,’ ie. the grandparent of the Sapta Rsi. The Bisama Warga Pasek, compiled by I Made Subaga and published in successive issues of the Dutta Warga, and also compiled by Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi (1989), explicitly states that Sang Hyang Pacupati addressed the Panca Pandita as “putungku makabehan” (‘my all grandchildren’); while Mpu Gnijaya addressed the Sapta Rsi as “anakku kabe” (‘all my children’).
Figure 5.7 Genealogy of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, according to Babad Pasek (Ktut Soebandi 1993).

Note: B.H. stands for Betara Hyang
A *kidung* (Balinese verse) composed by Wayan Narji, entitled *Lelintih Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi* (‘the Genealogy of Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi’) also mentions that the *Panca Rsi* were the sons of Hyang Gnijaya. The *kidung*, which was published in *Dutta Warga* (1975 [21]: 17), reads:

```
Wenten weka Hyang Gnijaya pandita Panca Rsi/ Mpu Gnijaya matuha/ mwang Mpu Semeru Mpu Gana pwa nitiman/ Mpu Kuturan mwang Mpu Bharadah kapwa bhiksuka/
```

Hyang Gnijaya begot priests called *Panca Rsi*/ Mpu Gnijaya was the eldest/ then Mpu Semeru and Mpu Gana/ Mpu Kuturan and Mpu Bharadah, all of them were priests/

Other versions seemed not to be popular among members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. I never encountered in any conversation the opinion that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi included names like Mpu Bajrasatwa and Mpu Lampita. Leaders and ordinary members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi generally start from Hyang Gnijaya, and then directly to Mpu Gnijaya, without mentioning names like Sang Arya Tatar, Ki Semar, and Ki Langon, names which can be found in several versions of *Babad Pasek*.

The fame of the *Babad Pasek* Kr. Va.936/6 among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is associated with the fact that this *babad* was the first *Babad Pasek* translated into Bahasa Indonesia (by the late I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa), and this translation was published in issues of *Majalah Damai*, starting in June 1955. Later, this translation was published in mimeograph by *Pustaka Balimas*, Denpasar. This *babad* is also the longest and the most detailed in comparison to other versions.

*Bisama Betara Kawitan*

In the body of the *babad*, there are a number of messages (*bisama*) from the ancestors to be adhered to by all descendants. This is the most important part of the *babad* in governing the MGPSSR and members’ attitudes and conduct. It is worth noting that although the genealogies of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are presented differently by different sources, most of the messages (*bisama*) are the same. Nearly all messages found in other sources are also found in *Babad Pasek*
(Kr. Va.936/6 and PDKB No. 734). Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi called these *bisama* ‘*Bisama Betara Kawitan*’ or ‘sacred instructions of His Holiness, our Origin.’

The *bisama* are found in various parts of the *babad*, and the backgrounds of the *bisama* are varied. As there are a lot of figures mentioned in the *babad*, and the span of the time covered by a *babad* is invariably long, the *bisama* are also associated with particular ancestral figures and era. Hence, in the case of the *bisama* for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, some *bisama* are associated with Sang Hyang Pasupati, and others are associated with Mpu Gnijaya, Mpu Ketek, Mpu Kepasekan, Ki Pasek, and so forth. The themes of the *bisama* include the brotherhood, ancestral temples, rights and duties of the *warga* in society, rewards and punishments associated with the disobeyance and ignorance of the *bisama*, and some other instructions. Some important themes in the *bisama* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are presented below.

1. **All Pasek are one big extended family**

   There are *bisama* which dictate that all members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi should be close to each other, as if they were one big family, the farthest relationship being second cousin. This implies that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi must be united, and its members should share with each other. Members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are also taught to be loyal to their fellow Pasek, though they may be poor, humble, or uneducated. As a ‘family,’ they are in the same *sidikara*, and hence there is no ‘higher’ or ‘lower’ Pasek. The obligation to see each other as brothers can be seen from the *Bisama* of Mpu Ketek to his children, which states:

   ...*pira samawa genahnya, yadin muda mwang nista, aywa lepas asanakan, kawenang pangucape maring apasanakan, twi mangdoh genahnya, pinih doh angangken misan ping ro. Mwang tan wenang kita handapa...*(Bisama: 24).

   ...whatever the distance is, even though stupid and poor, never ever cut your familial ties, you must perceive yourselves to be brothers to each other, even though very far away in distance, at most you must consider yourselves as second cousins [to each other]. And you are all equal, no one is lower...
On the other hand, the *bisama* says, a Pasek should not accept an unknown person as a warga member without deep investigation, even if they are rich, handsome, etc.

>Mwah yang hana wong angangken apasanakan ri kita... aja kita kadropon, twinya prajnyan, bagus, suka, sugih, prayaksaka rumubun..., yadin muda mwang nistha, aywa lepas asanakan, ..., pinih doh angangken ming ro (Bisama: 23-24).

And if there are people who claim to be your relatives ... do not accept at once, although they are intelligent, handsome, happy, rich, do investigate first... [In contrast] even though they are stupid and poor do not cease to be brothers, ..., perceive them at most as second cousins.

2. Duty to maintain and worship in certain temples

The duty of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to maintain, conduct ritual ceremonies, and worship in the *kawitan* temple is a prevalent theme of the *bisama*. *Bisama* Hyang Gnijaya, which was transferred by Mpu Ketek and Mpu Withadharma to their respective descendants states:

*Kamung Pasek mwang Bendesa, aywa lupa ring kahyangan makadi ring Lempuyang, ring Besakih, ring Gelgel Dasar Bhuana, mwang ring Silayuki. Yan kita lupa ring kahyanganta, wasu kita tan anat ring apasanakan, tan wus amangguh rundah, tan mari apacengilan ring apasanakan, sugih gawe kurang pangan, mangkana piteketku ring prati santana... (Bisama: 41).*

You, Pasek and Bendesa, do not forget the temples in Lempuyang, Besakih, Dasar Bhuana Gelgel, and Silayuki. If you neglect these temples, may you face continuous problems in your family, always be in a state of confusion, unhappiness, always quarrelling with relatives, doing a lot of work but not having enough to eat, so is my message to my descendants ....

The responsibility of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to participate, and take the lead, in the ritual ceremonies and worship of the deities in Lempuyang, Besakih, Dasar Bhuana, and Silayuki (ie. the *Catur Parhyangan*), is also clearly mentioned in the *bisama*. The *bisama* also clearly states that aside from ancestral temples (the *Catur Parhyangan*), members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi
are also urged to participate actively in public temples such as the main temple of Besakih and Lempuyang Luhur. The *bisama* reads:

*Kunang kengetakena mwah, mahayu kahyangan betara maring Basukih, angatutaken walin Bhatara Putranjaya, mwang Bhatara Gnijaya maring Lempuyang, nguni weh ring Gelgel, maring Silayukti, maring Lempuyang betenan, maring Besakih Pura Ratu Gde Pasek (Bisama: 30).*

You have to remember also to pay attention to the temple of Besakih, to conduct festivals for Betara Putranjaya [Besakih], and Betara Gnijaya in Lempuyang [Luhur], as well as in Gelgel, Silayukti, Lempuyang Madya, and in Ratu Gde Pasek temple in Besakih.

3. Rights and duty to be high priest

To become a high priest, or to learn the holy books in general is not merely claimed as a ‘right’ by Warga Pasek Sapt Rsi; more than that, it is considered a ‘duty.’ This is clearly stated in the *bisama*, when Betara Hyang Pasupati gave the following message to the *Panca Pandita*, which had to be conveyed to their respective descendants:

*Putungku makabehan, wakna talinganing pangrenga, aywa lupa ambeking kaparamarthan, putusing kapanditan, titi kamoksan,... wekas yan hana prati santananta, warahen jua payarah hulun mangke, nimitinya kengetaken lingning titi gegaduhan, mwang pandita paramartha, aywa lupa, yan hana santanan manira niento, kita nori nindeng lepihan, ya dudu santananta... (Bisama: 11).*

All my grandchildren, listen carefully, do not forget the highest truth, to be priests, knowledgeable in the way of *moksa* [self-liberation] ... later, if you beget children, convey this message to them, that they must obey their duties, including the duty to be a high priest, do not forget, if any of my descendants forgets, or you do not let them know, they are no longer my descendants....

The duty to be a *pandita* (*dwijati* priest) is also mentioned in the *bisama* of Mpu Pamacekan, Mpu Wiradharma, Mpu Paramadhaksa, Mpu Pratekayadnya, Sang Kul Putih, and Mpu Wiradangkya:

*Santanan i hulun kabeh, mene ring wakna kengeta juga kaya warah ingsun, ling sang Adhi Guru, saking nithi Bhatara Kasuhun. Kita kabeh tan dadi lupa*
All my descendants, now I tell you to remember, with regard to the teachings of our ancestors, Sang Adi Guru. You cannot afford ever to forget your dutiful obligation, to learn the knowledge of moksa, Veda, knowledge of the priesthood, as well as worldly knowledge...

Another bisama, the bisama from Mpu Gnijaya to the Sapta Rsi also states the same message. It reads:

Kita anakku kabel, aywa lupa ring pawekasanku mangke, ndya ta ya, kengetakena ring titi gegaduhan kapanditan, amanggehaken aksara kabel, titi kamoksan mwang lingning rwa bhinedha, sarining nirbana sunya, parama sunya twa kabel, aywa lupa pawarah manirane; riwekas yan hana santananta, saking manira tonto, tan katindihaning aksara andika bhatara uni, moga-moga ta ya amungpang salaku, kweh prabedhanya, salwiring japa wedhanya tampu... (Bisama: 14).

All my children, never ever forget my words, that is, you must remember your duty as priests, to behave according to the written [spiritual] knowledge, the nothingness, the knowledge of moksa and the rwa bhinedha, the essence of spiritual knowledge, do not forget my words; later if you have descendants and it comes to my knowledge that they do not obey the message of the ancestors, may their flow of life be uncertain, [may they experience ] many obstacles, may all their chanting be fruitless....

The use of holy water (tirta) from other warga for the death ceremony is not advised; instead, the holy water must be sought from the kawitan, as a bisama states, “...mwang kang toya pangentas saking kawitan, maka banyu bhaga purusa abra sinuhun...” (“and the tirta pangentas [holy water for the death ceremony] must be from the kawitan, as the symbol of the ‘urine’ of the grandparents...”). This notion, that the death ceremony must use holy water from Lempuyang (“kinentas dening tirtha tunggang Lempuyang”), is also found in another part of the babad. This strengthens the notion that Warga Pasek Sapta

---

25 Rwa bhineda literally means ‘the two opposing things’. This is a basic concept in Balinese Hindu teachings, that dictates that the life and the universe are arranged in opposition such as good/bad, male/female, earth/sky, macrocosm/microcosm, black/white, and so forth. The teaching further states that real happiness can only be achieved if these opposing things can be put in balance.
Rsi must use holy water from their ancestors which is, in the present interpretation, represented by *sulinggih* from the *warga*. Another *bisama*, ie. the *bisama* of Mpu Withadharma states that a Pasek is entitled to be a religious teacher (interpreted as being a high priest) and that members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are “entitled to have [religious] students, since you are the descendants of Mpu Withadharma” (“wenang kita anyisyamin, apan kita tereh aku Mpu Withadharma”).

4. Special rights and privileges

As in other societies, the use of status symbols is central to the Balinese, particularly in the death ceremony. In this regard, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi claims that its members are entitled to use prestigious symbols during their death ceremonies. These symbols concern the number of tiers of the cremation tower (*wadah*) and the forms of the burning coffin (*patulangan*). Among *warga* members, however, these rights differ depending on the status of the dead. High priests (those who have undergone *dwijati*) are eligible to use more prestigious symbols compared to those who are not (*walaka*). Among *walaka*, those who hold high social status (*kawisudha*) are also eligible to use more prestigious symbols than the ‘ordinary’ *warga* members (*pamijian*). This derives from the *bisama* of Mpu Ketek:

*Sang mbujanggain, yan kita siddha atiwa-tiwa, kawenang angangge padmasana mwang jampana.... Mwah yan tan mbujanggain, yan sira molih kawisudhan, ri kapejahanira yan siddha atiwa-tiwa, wenang ngangge bade magunung sya; yan kita pamijian, wenang ngangge bade magunung pitu, kapas sya warnna, mabhoma marep-mungkur, makampid... kang patulangan lembu cemeng (Bisama: 23).*

For you [Pasek] who perform the function of *bhujangga* (ie. *dwijati* priest), in the death ceremony, you are entitled to use a *padmasana*-like or *jampana*-like

---

26 The terms of address and reference commonly used by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to their high priests are *anak lingsir*, which literally means ‘the old people’ or ‘parents.’ This signifies that the high priests are not only wise and knowledgeable in religious matters, but also like the ascending generation, and hence ancestors.
wadah....

And for you [Pasek] who are not priests, if you have gained high position in society, on your death ceremony, you are entitled to use a nine-tier wadah; if you are ordinary Pasek, you are only entitled to use a seven-tier wadah, cotton of nine colours, barong-like accessories in back and front [of the wadah], wings [in the wadah] ... and your burning coffin is a black bull.

Similarly the bisama of Mpu Pemacekan, Mpu Wiradharma, Mpu Paramadhaksa, Mpu Pratekayadnya, Sang Kul Putih, and Mpu Wiradangkya also states:

Kunang Ki Pasek mwang Bendesa sadaya, rikala kapejahanta, wenang matriilaksana, magunung pitu mwang sanga, maancak taman, kapas warunna sya, makarang liman, maadhikara, mabhoma harep-uri, rupa putih bang. mataksaka raja makembaran matemu mantri makembaran, mabhadowgnala, salu tarpana, masalunglung, malembu cemeng, masinga bang... (Bisama: 30).

All you Pasek and Bendesa, for the death ceremony, you are eligible to use wadah of nine or seven tiers, ancak taman, cotton of nine colours, karang liman, barong-like accessories in the front and back [of the wadah], red and white as the dominant colours, a couple of dragons Naga Taksaka, the style of matemu mantri, badawangnala (tortoise), salu tarpana, bale salunglung, a black bull or red lion [as the form of the burning coffin]....

Babad Pasek also notes that because of the meritorious acts performed by Pasek for the Kingdom of Gelgel, Dalem Ketut Kresna Kepakisan gave Warga Pasek Saptaprsi special rights:


---

27 Padmasana is a throne-like shrine, the shrine for the Ultimate God. Jampana is a 'moving-shrine' to carry sacred objects. In this case, both symbolise --and can only be used by-- a holy man.

28 Ancak taman, karang liman, salu tarpana, and bale salunglung are symbols of prestige which are generally used by kingly and priestly families.
You Pasek Gelgel and all your relatives, I have a gift for you forever, also for your descendants, please remember from now on. Your lines are exempt from obligatory presentation and labour contribution, your property cannot be taken by the kingdom, and you are exempt from the death sentence. Guilt for the first, second, and third time is forgiven, and if it should be a death sentence, the sentence is reduced to exile, and if it should be exile, it must be reduced to apology....

5. Reward and punishment of the bisama

The bisama is the most important and sacred part of a babad from the members' point of view. The bisama always contains injunctions and prohibitions, which are followed by rewards and punishments. If members follow the bisama, they will be prosperous and have a long life. A bisama states:

*Yan kita manggeh ring kawitanta, tinemu denira, mwah janna nurageng jagat, wreddhi panjang yusa, mwang kinasihaning de hyang... (Bisama: 24-25).*

If you are faithful to your kawitan [ancestors or ancestral temples], you will find happiness, and you will be famous in the world, always in a healthy state, have long life, and God's love....

The same message is also stated in the bisama from Babad Pasek:

*Mwah yan kita pageh ring piteketku, moga tan wus kita amangguhana dirgha yusa, pradnyan siddhi nguacap, wibhawa sadguna, amangguh wirya gunamanta, janna nuraga, asihin hyang dibyaguna... (Bisama: 42).*

If you always obey my words, you will always be happy, have a long life, be bright, all your speeches will be fruitful, you will be charismatic, achieve high status, be famous in the world, loved by the gods, and able to maintain good character....

In contrast, disobedience to the bisama will result in punishment. The bisama of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi repeatedly mentions that several types of punishments would be sent to those who ignore the instruction of the ancestors. A bisama states that if the descendants ignore the bisama, they would always face misfortune:
Tan wus amangguh rundah, tan mari apacengilan ring apasanakan, sugih gawe kurang pangan, mangkana piteketku ring prati santana... (Bisama: 41).

[If you ignore the bisama, you will] always be in a state of confusion, unhappy, always quarrelling with relatives, doing a lot of work but having not enough to eat, so are my instructions to my descendants....

As stated in previous bisama, maintaining certain temples as well as performing prayers in such temples is an obligatory task for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Neglecting this duty for certain periods is an offence against the ancestors, for which the ancestors will send punishment.

Yan kita lali maring kahyangan manira Hyang Widhi, nora kita angabhakti suwennyia dasa temuan, moga kita anemu kasasar, wastu kita tan anadi janna mwah... (Bisama: 47).

If you neglect my temple and the temple of God, if you do not pay homage for ten cycles [five years in the Balinese calendar], you will never find your way, and upon reincarnation you would not become a human again....

The power of the bisama in governing attitudes and behaviour of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is observable. In any major ritual ceremony, such as a ngaben or a dwijati, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi generally seek holy water from Pura Lempuyang Madya, their kawitan temple. Otherwise, they seek holy water from the other temples of the Catur Parhyangan, ie. Pura Silayukti, Dasar Bhuana, or Padharman Pasek Besakih. The MGPSSR, through its extension program, repeatedly urges this practice, and has also published it several times in Dutta Warga. For practical considerations, however, most members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, especially those from distant places, do not go directly to these temples, but merely nyawang (pray from a distant place, but concentrate on the temple concerned, in this case Lempuyang Madya).

Accessories recommended by bisama to be used in the ngaben ceremony, such as the number of tiers of the wadah, the form of the burning coffin and other symbols, are also followed by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, if conditions
In a collective ngaben in Banjar Baru, Desa Tuwa, Tabanan regency, on 23 October 1995, I observed that the wadah was exactly the same as that recommended by the bisama, i.e. seven tiers, with a winged barong-like accessory (boma makampid), and the cotton used was of nine colours, dominated by red and white, while the form of the burning coffin was a black bull. I Wayan Dongker, a prominent figure in the village, who was also once the chairman of Dadya Pasek Gelgel in Desa Adat Baru, explained to me that they indeed based the bade on the description given by the bisama, and this had been practiced since 1975. He told me:

We have to follow the bisama, particularly in the death ceremony because the death ceremony is supposed to be the last ceremony, by which the soul will return to the worlds hereafter, and physically we will pay homage to them in our family temple or ancestral temple. It would be an irony if we returned the soul of the dead to the ancestral temple, but we did not follow the message of the ancestors, the bisama. It is also in the death ceremony we should show our kulit (‘skin’).

The use of a seven-tier wadah was not a problem, because members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, according to Wayan Dongker, are eligible to do so, “as stated by the bisama.” Banjar Baru invited a pedanda from Desa Tuwa to officiate at this ngaben ceremony. They used a pedanda instead of a sri mpu simply because there was a pedanda in their village (Desa Tuwa), while the gria of the sri mpu was far away. The invited pedanda did not give any comment on the use of these prestigious symbols.

Although they used the service of a pedanda, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Banjar Baru used the kajang (sacred formula written on a white cloth to cover the corpse or the effigy) made by the pemangku of their dadya, instead of asking for one from the pedanda. Again, the pattern of the kajang used was traced from Babad Pasek. The pattern of the kajang had been drawn by Ida Sri Mpu

---

29 It should be noted here that there is a trend to simplify the ngaben ceremony in Bali, whereby a ngaben is performed in simple ways, with a small wadah, without an animal-like coffin. It is common nowadays to perform the ngaben ceremony in this simple way, which needs only two to three days preparatory work. MGPSSR and members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi also follow, and are even active campaigners for, this trend. As such, only in a well-planned collective ngaben are prestigious symbols used.
Parama Dhaksa in 1975, and this is yet another significant symbol representing the ‘skin’ of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

In daily life, reference to the *bisama* is also common in conversations. Following the *bisama*, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi refer to each other as *semeton* ('brother'). They use the genealogical terms of address such as *beli* ('elder brother'), *embok* ('elder sister'), *adi* ('younger sister' or 'younger brother'), and *guru* ('father'), instead of the common terms of address such as *pak* and *bu*. The *sulinggih* are called *anake lingsir* which is sometimes shortened to 'nak lingsir' ('the old man' or 'our elder'), while *walaka* are referred to as *oka* ('sons') before the *sulinggih*, rather than the terms *siwa* and *sisya* (which are used between a *pedanda* and those he serves).

The following conversation between I Made Adi, Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga, and Gurun Putu Sastra is a good example to illustrate this point. The conversation occurred in the *gria* of Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga in October 1994. At that time, Gurun Putu Sastra from Kuta wished to invite Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga to officiate at his house as well as to visit the *Catur Parhyangan*. The visit to *Catur Parhyangan* (doing *tirta yatra*) was planned because Gurun Putu Sastra had family troubles, and after asking a medium, he was told that he was being punished by his ancestors for neglecting to visit the ancestral temples. He was further advised by the medium and by Jero Mangku Gede Ketut Soebandi to pay a visit to *Catur Parhyangan* to ask forgiveness (*guru piduka*).

I Made Adi: “Nunas lugra nak lingsir, niki okan nak lingsir, Gurun Putu Sastra saking Kuta jagi wenten lungsura ring nak lingsir.”

ISM Dhaksa Samyoga: “Men, napi wenten Gurunne?”

Gurun Putu Sastra: “Ampura nak lingsir, nembe tityang tangkil ke gria... [Then he explained his problem]. *Guru* Kut Soebandi ngandikaang tityang tangkil meriki ring *anake lingsir*... , yan dados tunas, mangda kayun ja ida *nake lingsir* iring tityang (*"Excuse me, *nak lingsir*, *nak lingsir*'s *oka*, Gurun Putu Sastra from Kuta, would like to ask a favour from *nak lingsir*."

("So, what is the matter, *Guru*?")

("I am sorry *nak lingsir*, that this is the first time that I have visited the *gria*. *Guru* Kut Soebandi told me to call on *anake lingsir*, if permitted, I would like to accompany *nake lingsir* to perform a pilgrimage to *Catur Parhyangan*, to offer an asking-forgiveness ceremony.")
matirta yatra ke Catur Parhyangan, 
jagi ngaturang guru piduka....”

ISM Dhaksa Samyoga [After a short of 
introductory words]: “Men malih 
pidan rencanan Gurune jagi lunga?”

Gurun Putu Sastra: “Yan dados mangda 
gelis ja. Sakewanten tityang nenten 
uning dewasa.... Nak lingsir ja 
tunasang tityang.”

ISM Dhaksa Samyoga: “Beh, yan bulan 
Oktobere ne..., mirib ja ten nyidayang 
mpu. Kayang tanggal 15, mpu 
giring Ida Nabe ka Buleleng; 
tanggal 17 kanti 25 ngwai 
wenten muput; terus tanggal 27 
wenten paruman sulinggi di warga, ring I 
Raka di Siangan. Bulan Nopember 
mara ja mpu wenten galah.”

Made Adi: “Ring dija nak lingsir muput 
nyabran rahina, nak lingsir?”

ISM Dhaksa Samyoga: “To.. maielhan 
De.... Malu sik semeton De-ne di 
Tabanan, nak mesangih. Sawud to 
semetone di Kaba-Kaba ngelah gae 
di merajanne, nyambung lantas di 
Mengwi, to semeton Gurun Karya 
nyakapang nak cerikne....”

Made Adi (to Gurun Putu Sastra): “Keto 
kone Beli, Beli suba ningeh 
pangandikan anake lingsir. Jani beli 
gitungang ajak semetone di Kuta. 
Adin-adin beline di Maha Yowanajag 
ada gen lakar nyarengin Beli tangkil, 
asal Beli mastiang tanggalalne.”

Made Adi (to Gurun Putu Sastra): “Keto 
kone Beli, Beli suba ningeh 
pangandikan anake lingsir. Jani beli 
gitungang ajak semetone di Kuta. 
Adin-adin beline di Maha Yowanajag 
ada gen lakar nyarengin Beli tangkil, 
asal Beli mastiang tanggalalne.”

Made Adi: “Ring dija nak lingsir muput 
nyabran rahina, nak lingsir?”

ISM Dhaksa Samyoga: “To.. maielhan 
De.... Malu sik semeton De-ne di 
Tabanan, nak mesangih. Sawud to 
semetone di Kaba-Kaba ngelah gae 
di merajanne, nyambung lantas di 
Mengwi, to semeton Gurun Karya 
nyakapang nak cerikne....”

Made Adi (to Gurun Putu Sastra): “Keto 
kone Beli, Beli suba ningeh 
pangandikan anake lingsir. Jani beli 
gitungang ajak semetone di Kuta. 
Adin-adin beline di Maha Yowanajag 
ada gen lakar nyarengin Beli tangkil, 
asal Beli mastiang tanggalalne.”

Made Adi: “Ring dija nak lingsir muput 
nyabran rahina, nak lingsir?”

ISM Dhaksa Samyoga: “To.. maielhan 
De.... Malu sik semeton De-ne di 
Tabanan, nak mesangih. Sawud to 
semetone di Kaba-Kaba ngelah gae 
di merajanne, nyambung lantas di 
Mengwi, to semeton Gurun Karya 
nyakapang nak cerikne....”

Made Adi (to Gurun Putu Sastra): “Keto 
kone Beli, Beli suba ningeh 
pangandikan anake lingsir. Jani beli 
gitungang ajak semetone di Kuta. 
Adin-adin beline di Maha Yowanajag 
ada gen lakar nyarengin Beli tangkil, 
asal Beli mastiang tanggalalne.”

Internal Factions

Compared to other warga organisations, the organisation of Warga Pasek 
Sapta Rsi, the MGPSSR, seems to be quite strong. Viewed from outside, the 
MGPSSR looks intact, as my informants told me. “The MGPSSR is very strong 
because the number of members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is huge, and there are 
a lot Pasek people who have gained high positions in government office, and
these people support the organisation,” so said Putu Agus Wyasa, a Pande from Beratan, who then named a number of high ranking government officers from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. I Gusti Made Oka, a member of Warga Arya Kekapakisan from Ubud, also gave a similar evaluation. For him, the indicator of the increasing strength of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is the fact that more and more members are willing to use their own sri mpu instead of a pedanda, and this must be credited to the warga organisation, the MGPSSR. The governor of Bali, Prof Ida Bagus Oka, in the opening remarks at the Mahasabha V of the MGPSSR in Denpasar, on 24 July 1994 also said that the MGPSSR is the most solid organisasi kewargaan. This, he said, “can be seen from the regular lokasabha and mahasabha, and other program implementations.”

The Split of the Warga

As a matter of fact, there are a lot of problems faced by this warga organisation, both internal and external. Internally, some ‘sub-warga,’ such as Tangkas, Bendesa, and Gaduh, reject being identified with the Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and they have formed their own warga instead. Leaders of the MGPSSR consider Warga Tangkas to be part of Pasek Sapta Rsi, because they are descendants of I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel. A number of sri mpu in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are themselves from Pasek Tangkas. However, quite a number of Warga Tangkas maintain that they are of a different line, ie. from Arya Kanuruhan to Pangeran Tangkas to Gusti Ayu Tangkas Koriagung. As an independent warga, Warga Tangkas Koriagung maintains a kawitan temple in Desa Tangkas, Klungkung. A similar situation exists in the case of Warga Gaduh: some say that Gaduh is part of Pasek Sapta Rsi, and others say that it is different. This has led to a split among the members of Gaduh. Those who claim that Gaduh is not a part of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi consider Pura Gaduh in Blahbatuh as their kawitan, while those who are of the opinion that Gaduh is a part of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi view this temple as a dadya. The same occurs with Warga Bendesa. Some of its members associate themselves with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and indeed some sri mpu of the MGPSSR identify themselves as Pasek Bendesa. On the other hand, others maintain that Bendesa is not a part
of Pasek Sapta Rsi. The latter refuse to call themselves Pasek Bendesa, but merely Bendesa or Bendesa Mas, and argue that their kawitan temple is in Pura Taman Pule, located in the village of Mas (Gianyar).

These divisions of the warga are caused by different interpretations of babad and to some extent this is also associated with a strategy to maintain exclusivity. To clarify this matter, it is useful to examine the split of Warga Tangkas Kori Agung from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

Warga Tangkas traces its ancestry to Majapahit, ie. Arya Kanuruhan, through Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung (Figure 5.8). This is described in the warga's babad, called Babad Arya Kanuruhan Tangkas Kori Agung. The first part of its babad tells the story of the fall of king Dandang Gendis (Kertajaya) of Kediri, in a similar way to that mentioned in Babad Arya Kuta Waringin. After the defeat of Kediri, Jayakatha (a grandson of Dandang Gendis) and his wife surrendered, but later they were adopted as son and daughter-in-law by Arya Gajahpara and Kebo Ijo. Jayakatha begot three children, named Arya Wayahan Dalem Manyeneng, Arya Katanggaran, and Arya Nudhata (or Maduta). Arya Katanggaran married a woman from Kebo Ijo's family, and begot Kebo Anabrang (a commander sent to Malayu during the reign of Kerta Negara of Singosari). Kebo Anabrang married a woman of nobility from Singasari and begot Kebo Taruna, who was better known as Sirarya Singha Sardhula. Singha Sardhula was appointed scribe (kanuruhan) by Gajah Mada during the latter's expedition to Bali, a position which was secured after Gajah Mada appointed Sri Kresna Kepakisan as the ruler (adipati) of Bali. Hence, in Bali, Sirarya Singha Sardhula was better known as Arya Kanuruhan.

\[30\] This babad was composed recently (1977) by leaders of Warga Tangkas. It draws on several sources, including Babad Arya Kuta Waringin, Babad Dalem, Babad Dalem Tarukan, Babad Pulasari, and Babad Pasek. Written in Indonesian, this babad also contains dates (in Isaka and the Western calendar system) for events that can be found in the Indonesian official history. For example, the babad explicitly mentions that the defeat of Kediri occurred in 1222 AD.
Figure 5.8 Genealogy of Warga Tangkas Kori Agung according to Babad Arya Kanuruhan.
Arya Kanuruhan begot three children, named Arya Brangsinga, Kyai Pangeran Tangkas, and Arya Pegatepan. Kyai Pangeran Tangkas was assigned to oversee Kertalangu (now in Kabupaten Badung), because the previous ruler, Arya Demung had left the region (in the babad, Arya Demung was defeated by ants). Kyai Pangeran Tangkas begot only one son, named Kyai Tangkas Di Made, known also as Kyai Kluwung Sakti.

According to the Babad Arya Kanuruhan, an offender was sentenced to death by the king in Gelgel. Instead of directly punishing him in Gelgel, the king asked the guilty man to deliver a letter to Kyai Pangeran Tangkas. The letter read: "pa-pa-nin-nga-tu-se-li-ba-ne-te-tih," a secret message which meant "please kill the bearer of this letter." Unfortunately, when the guilty man reached Kertalangu, Kyai Pangeran Tangkas was out hunting, and no one knew when he would be back. Instead of waiting, the guilty man, ie. the bearer of the letter, gave the letter to the only son of Pangeran Tangkas, ie. Kyai Tangkas Di Made, who did not understand the meaning of the secret message. When his father came home, Kyai Tangkas Di Made personally gave the letter to his father. Upon reading the letter, Kyai Pangeran Tangkas asked if his son had committed any misconduct against the king, for which he had been sentenced to death. Although Kyai Tangkas Di Made maintained that he was not guilty of any crime, since it was an instruction by the king (titah dalem), Kyai Pangeran Tangkas was determined to implement the order out of his sense of devotion. So, after a set of ritual ceremonies, he killed his only son with a keris.

After the death of his only son, Kyai Pangeran Tangkas did not visit Gelgel until he was summoned by the Dalem. Dalem understood the feeling of Kyai Pangeran Tangkas upon the loss of his only son. A son is very important in Balinese belief, both for the continuance of the family line and for the liberation in the life hereafter. On the other hand, Kyai Pangeran Tangkas was already aged, so that it was impossible for him to have another son. Realising this, the Dalem said that he would give one of his concubines, who was at the time pregnant, to continue the family line of Kyai Pangeran Tangkas. This concubine was Ni Luh Kayu Mas, from Warga Pasek Bendesa Mas. The king also advised Pangeran Tangkas that (1) Pangeran Tangkas should not
‘contaminate’ (*anyapuh*) the pregnancy, so that the baby would still be purely the king’s; and (2) the baby should be named in such a way to remember the association with the palace, ie. Kori Agung (‘great gate,’ signifying the great gate of the palace).

After several months, Ni Luh Kayu Mas gave birth to a baby boy, named Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung. Biologically, Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung was the son of the king, while by *adat* rules he was the son of Kyai Pangeran Tangkas, since Ni Luh Kayu Mas was married to Kyai Pangeran Tangkas. Upon reaching a mature age, the king advised Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung to marry a woman from the line of Arya Kepasekan (Pasek Gelgel) in order to reinforce the unity between ‘the Balinese’ and ‘Majapahit people.’[^31]

From his marriage with a woman of Pasek Gelgel, Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung begot only a daughter, I Gusti Ayu Tangkas Kori Agung, who was later married to I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel, her first cousin. This marriage produced four sons, ie. (1) Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung (the same name as his maternal grandfather), (2) Bendesa Tangkas, (3) Pasek Tangkas, and (4) Pasek Bendesa Tangkas Kori Agung. These four Tangkas brothers are considered the originators of the present Warga Tangkas.

There is a continuing debate with regard to how to position Warga Tangkas in relation to Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, as a result of the marriage of I Gusti Ayu Tangkas Kori Agung and I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel. In the version of the central committee of Warga Tangkas Kori Agung, the marriage was a type of *nyeburin*, where the groom (I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel) was incorporated into the family of the bride (I Gusti Ayu Tangkas Kori Agung) because the bride was the only daughter of Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung. In other words, I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel was considered *predana* (‘female’) and I Gusti Ayu Tangkas Kori Agung was the *purusa* (‘male’); thus Warga Tangkas is not part of

[^31]: It is important to note that, according to several *babad*, Arya Kepasekan was the former caretaker of Bali before Sri Kresna Kepakisan, and he was the one, together with Arya Pemacekan and Patih Ulung, who went to Majapahit to ask for an *adipati*, which resulted in the promotion of Sri Kresna Kepakisan as the ruler of Bali. The invitation to an ‘outsider’ to rule ‘insiders’, according to Fox (1994), is a characteristic Austronesian mythical theme. In this view, Bali is an example of “installing the ‘outsider’ inside”.

Pasek Gelgel (or Pasek Sapta Rsi in general). The argument, quoted from Babad Pasek, argues that when the marriage occurred, there was a clear indication that the marriage was nyeburin in nature, since Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung said to his son-in-law, I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel:

> Ada pagelahan bapa, sedaging umah, nanging pada makidik, teken rencang satak, to cai ngawewenangang. Cendekne cai sida nyentanayang bapa kayang kawekas. Wekas yan ada pamutusing Hyang, mati bapa, mangda cai mragatang, ngupakaren bapa. Nanging pangidih bapa apang patuh cara kraman caine, tingkah ngupakarang bapa (Babad Arya Kanuruhan Tangkas Kori Agung: 84; and Babad Pasek, PDKB 734: 84a)

And all of my properties, all valuables in my house, which is not much, and 200 servants, are for you to manage. In short, you are my son forever. When the time comes and I die, could you please treat my corpse accordingly. The request is that you should make rituals for me in the same way as you would do for your own father.

The contrasting view is that the marriage was a 'normal' one, meaning that the bride was predana and the groom was purusa. With regard to the quoted argument, this view maintains that it was Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung who incorporated himself into the family of I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel, his son-in-law. It is unthinkable, this view argues, that a famous high-class family such as I Gusti Agung Pasek Gelgel would accept a nyeburin marriage. In addition, a counter argument is also quoted from Babad Pasek, which reads:

> Malih manggeh anungsung Sang Hyang Kawitan aparab Tegeh Kori Agung apalinggih ring pinggiring we Unda, ika wenang manggeh pasanakan ki Pasek Gelgel, ngaran Pasek Tangkas.... Muang wenang anungsung ring Besakih pralinggan I Ratu Pasek, makumpul sareng sama apasanakan dadi Pasek Gelgel...(Babad Pasek Pura Lempuyang, PDKB 734).

And a panyungsung of the kawitan temple called Tegeh Kori Agung temple, located on the bank of Unda river, who are brothers of Pasek Gelgel, named Pasek Tangkas.... must also worship in Besakih in the temple of I Ratu Pasek [ie. Padharman Warga Pasek], in a group with all brothers, including Pasek Gelgel....

There is also physical evidence put forward by those who are in favour of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. First, in the inner part of Pura Kawitan Tangkas in Desa
Tangkas (Klungkung), there is a shrine complex dedicated to Ratu Pasek (Pasek ancestors). Secondly, before assuming the position of priesthood (pemangku), the priests of Pura Kawitan Tangkas always conduct their purification rituals (pawintenan) in front of the Ratu Pasek shrine in Pura Dasar Bhuana, Gelgel.

These contrasting views have resulted in the split of [those who believed themselves to be] the descendants of I Gusti Ayu Tangkas Kori Agung (Warga Tangkas). Some members, prefer to call themselves Pasek Tangkas, convinced that they are of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. As a matter of fact, a number of prominent figures in, including sulinggih from, Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi are from Pasek Tangkas. Those holding the other view do not go to Pasek temples, but concentrate on Pura Kawitan Tangkas Kori Agung in Desa Tangkas, Klungkung. In Besakih, they go to Padharman Dinasti Kresna Kepakisan because Warga Tangkas has no padharman of its own. 32 I also found many members of Warga Tangkas who go to both temples --Pura Tangkas and Pura Pasek.

Whatever the truth, at present Pura Kawitan Tangkas Kori Agung in Desa Tangkas, Klungkung, is supported by the core group of Warga Tangkas consisting of about 60 families. 33 In addition, around 160 Tangkas families

---

32 There has been an interesting development recently at the Padharman Dinasti Kresna Kepakisan. Previously, the padharman was called Padharman Ksatria Dalem. However, a number of warga outside Ksatria Dalem worship in this ‘family temple.’ These warga include Warga Pulasari, Tangkas, Arya Pengalasan, Bebandem, and a number of descendants of Majapahit Arya. In 1993 the name of the padharman was changed to Padharman Ida Batara Dalem, Dinasti Sri Aji Kresna Kepakisan. Below the name of the padharman, a note reads: “According to the rule of warga (warga sesana), the Padharman Ida Batara Dalem is supported by Dalem’s descendants, ie: (1) Ksatria Dalem; (2) Ksatria Madya: Pradewa, Prasangiang, Pungakan, Bagus; (3) Sentanan Dalem Tarukan; and (4) Arya groups, who do not have padharman in Besakih. A well informed informant told me that the change of name was intended to attract more members, which would then reduce the burden of the temple maintenance. At the same time, there was also an intention on the part of Warga Ksatria Dalem to clarify that those who worship in the temple do not automatically belong to Ksatria Dalem.

33 Because of different interpretations of the babad, Warga Tangkas is further divided. A group within Warga Tangkas maintains that the Pura Kawitan of Warga Tangkas is the one situated in Pagan, Denpasar, because this was the residence of Pangeran Tangkas Kori Agung. For this group, the pura kawitan in Tangkas, Klungkung is the Kawitan of Arya Kanuruhan, but since he had no descendant, Warga Tangkas was asked to manage the temple. Members of Warga Tangkas from this point of view do not visit Pura Kawitan Tangkas in Tangkas. This to some extent explains why the number of members of Warga Tangkas Kori Agung (and hence
throughout Bali regularly visit the temple and pay voluntary contributions (dana punya). This kawitan temple was located on the bank of Unda river. When Gunung Agung erupted in 1963, the temple was destroyed and the land remains covered by sand up to the present day. The temple site was then moved to its present location, close to the kahyangan tiga of Desa Adat Tangkas. For maintenance and ritual ceremonies in this temple, funding is mobilised from the core members. However, the amount to be contributed by the individual members is not very great because most of the needed funds are derived from donations by outside members. As an illustration, for the festival on 31 March 1994, the total expense (putting aside the local materials and labour) was Rp. 1,888,025, and the donation earned amounted to Rp. 1,731,000. There was thus a deficit of only Rp. 77,025, which was met by the core members.

Warga Tangkas has also established a modern style of organisational structure. As a matter of fact, this organising committee is the same as the organising committee of its pura kawitan.34

Members' Hesitant and External Forces

Among those who acknowledge themselves as members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, some are also cynical about the MGPSSR. Some of the MGPSSR's programs have several times led to confrontation with factions in its own warga, and the implementation of the programs has even, at times, widened the divisions between the factions. Some members of the warga refuse to identify their temple as a warga temple, while in other cases Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves refuse to use ida sri mpu or even ridicule them.

The internal problems of the MGPSSR are compounded by external ones. In my discussions with members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, whether they were

---

34 The organisation was chaired by Guru Made Likub (who died in 1995), vice chairman Drs Nengah Oka Bagiarta, secretary I Wayan Rupa, and treasurers I Wayan Jaya and I Nyoman Kaseb. Guru Made Likub has been chairman since 1938, while Drs Nyoman Oka Bagiarta has been there since 1970.
leaders of the MGPSSR or ordinary members, they disclosed that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is being pressed by other warga, especially Warga Brahmana.\(^{35}\) The use of sri mpu is sometimes looked down upon, and sri mpu are rarely involved in paruman sulunggih (priests' meeting) of the Parisada. There is also a rumour that those who are active in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (MGPSSR) will never obtain a position in the government because political power is currently in the hands of people from Warga Brahmana. Hence, a number of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi avoid openly associating themselves with the MGPSSR, though secretly they support the organisation. I found that a number of high ranking government officials from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi acted like this. When the MGPSSR Pusat conducted its mahasabha in 1994, these people donated quite significantly, but they did not want their names included on the list of contributors. When the MGPSSR raised funds to buy the land in Besakih (April 1996), these people also contributed significantly.

Whether those who associate themselves with the MGPSSR would be denied access to high government position is debatable, however, because a number of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi members do hold high positions in government, despite the fact that they are openly active in the MGPSSR.\(^{36}\)

**SUMMARY**

This chapter describes the modern-style organisation of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the MGPSSR, from its genesis in the 1950s to the 1990s. The motive to

\(^{35}\) My discussions with members of Warga Brahmana Siwa support this, particularly the use of sri mpu. Quite a number of those to whom I talked were of the opinion that the movement of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to use sri mpu, instead of pedanda, was not in line with Balinese tradition, and more importantly it would create factions among Balinese Hindu.

\(^{36}\) To mention a few, they include Drs Made Suwenda (the mayor [walikota] of Denpasar), Ketut Ginantra (formerly the Bupati of Buleleng), Nyoman Tastra BA (also a former Bupati of Buleleng, before Ketut Ginantra), Drs I Wayan Dhana (a former Bupati of Badung), Drs Ketut Wiratha Sindhu (the present Bupati of Buleleng), Brigadier General I Ketut Sundria (formerly the Bupati of Tabanan, and since 1996 the chairman of Golkar in Bali), Made Astana SH (the head of a bureau in the governor's office of Bali), Drs Bratha Subawa (the head of the Regional Office of Education and Culture), and Prof Dr I Gde Suyatna, the vice rector of Udayana University.
use the organisation to raise the standing of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi vis-à-vis other warga in Bali was (and still is) clear. However, religious motives, ie. to unite the warga members in taking care of the warga temples were also prominent. The encouragement of a sense of brotherhood among fellow Pasek Sapta Rsi was yet another motive.

Whatever these motives were, the babad was (and is) an important guiding force, particularly the parts of the babad called bisama. As with those of other warga (see Chapter Four), bisama of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi play pivotal roles in constructing attitudes and behaviour of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi members. Leaders of the MGPSSR even claim that principles found in the bisama of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi can be used by other warga because they contain teachings that are relevant to present development. Dr Wayan Mertha Suteja, the former chairman of the MGPSSR, in his article in Dutta Warga (1971) concluded that the bisama of the ancestors of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi should be followed by the present day Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and other warga alike, if the welfare and prosperity of society are the goal. The bisama, according to Mertha Suteja, include five duties of a good citizen (panca sesananing warganiti). These are:

1. **Brahmana sesana**; members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are obliged to learn brahmanic or religious teachings, such as theology (widdhi tattwa), self-liberation (titi kamoksan), priesthood (kepanditan), and leadership (rajaniti).

2. **Pitra sesana**; members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi must respect their ancestors (kawitan). In this context, they are required to visit their ancestral temples, particularly the Catur Parhyangan.

3. **Putra sesana**; members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are obliged to be accountable to their descendants and teach them the instructions (bisama) of the ancestors.

4. **Warga sesana**; members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are taught to have good families. Family (warga) in this context does not mean only nuclear family, but also in its larger sense, to include familial relationship in the dadya and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as a whole.
5. Mitra sesana; members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are taught to have good relationships with other warga in order to achieve village order (kertha desa), island order (kertha dwipa), and national order (kertha negara), and thus to achieve order and prosperity for all (kertha raharja).

At present, there is still a certain hesitation on the part of some people to be active in the MGPSSR because of the feeling that the MGPSSR is a Jaba organisation which aims to overthrow the existing status quo based on birth. And indeed, although stated in different ways, the ideology of homo-aequalis, which means the denial of the hierarchical system based on warga, is observable in the programs of the MGPSSR.

In its organisational development, leadership of the MGPSSR has shifted from traditional leaders, who were leaders of dadya or dadya agung, to new-elite leaders, ie. those who hold power in the government bureaucracy, intellectuals from the university and businessmen. These new leaders are not necessarily influential in their own dadya or dadya agung. Although there are advantages in this, it is also at the same time one of the weakest aspects of the MGPSSR.
Chapter Six

IN SEARCH OF DIFFERENCE (3):
THE TEMPLE SYSTEM, THE CONTESTATION ARENA

...pura [temples] assume a transcendent importance as the places where beings and forces from many time cycles come together, linking the Three Worlds. Not only the performances held inside them, but by their very existence pura express the fundamental concepts of the Balinese Indic world view: the "unity of the cosmos, and the inter-relatedness of everything in it." Pura are empty courtyards, whose power to structure the world derives from the power of the "sounding of the texts" (Lansing 1983:74).

I have argued in Chapter Three and Four that ancestral temples are crucial in the making of a warga since they function as points of reference. Amidst the complexity of motivation and the complexity of the temple's roles, I have indicated that the maintenance of ancestral temples was one of the motives in organising Warga Pasek Saptapati into a modern organisation, the MGPSSR. In this chapter I will describe in detail the role of the temple systems in the construction of warga, particularly for Warga Pasek Saptapati. Before discussing the temple system of Warga Pasek Saptapati, however, I will consider the Balinese temple system in general.

I will discuss in this chapter the effort of the MGPSSR in gaining control over temples which it claims as the ancestral temples of Warga Pasek Saptapati. Although ancestral temples are the backbone of the warga, nonetheless this backbone cannot be firmly controlled, and efforts to strengthen the warga through this backbone often result in divisions among warga members.
BALINESE TEMPLE SYSTEMS

There are thousands of temples in Bali, which vary not only in their physical appearance, but more importantly in their functions and in the networks of their supporters. The specific functions and, consequently, the nature of the networks of temples vary, from those temples which are supported by a single family to temples whose networks of supporters encompass all Hindus in Bali and other islands as well. While some temples may be supported by any Hindu, regardless of his warga, occupation, and residence, others are specifically designed for special warga, or special occupations, and are limited by residential boundaries. Based on the complexity of the temple system in terms of its functions and networks of supporters, temples in Bali can be classified into (1) territorial temples, (2) occupational temples, (3) warga temples, and (4) public temples (Parisada nd; Ardana 1989).

Territorial temples are temples which are supported by the population of a given territory. These temples generally belong to the desa adat, and hence they are often referred to as village temples (kahyangan desa), such as the kahyangan tiga. Apart from the kahyangan tiga, most desa adat possess temples specific to the geography and history of the desa adat, such as Pura Beji (at a water source), Pura Pucak (on the top of a hill), or other idiosyncratically named temples associated with the main deity worshipped in such temples.

Occupational temples (pura swagina) are supported by people of the same occupation. The best known examples of this type of temples are subak temples, which are supported by all, but only, those rice land farmers who are members of the subak. There are temples for a subak (called Bedugul), temples for a number of subak who divert water from a common water source (Pura Empelan), and there are temples for a number of subak in a particular region.

\[1\] It must be kept in mind that the 'supporters' of a temple in Bali are classified into pangempon (or pangemong, pamaksan) and panyungsung or panyiwi. A pangempon is a group which is fully responsible for the maintenance and rituals of the temple, while panyungsung are those who visit the temple mainly for prayer. Whereas contribution is compulsory for the pangempon, it is voluntary for panyungsung. See further the section Pamaksan in Chapter Two.
(Pura Ulunsuwi). Other people, even though they reside in the same village, consider it inappropriate to worship in these temples. Other examples of occupational temples are Pura Melanting, which are usually found in market places. These temples are supported by all [Hindu] traders who carry out their activities in a particular market place. A group of fishermen generally also possesses a temple on the coast, called a Pura Segara.

Warga temples or ancestral temples are only supported by people who believe themselves to be members of the warga. In some cases, these temples are also supported by the descendants of the warga’s originator’s assistants. For example, the temples of Warga Ksatria Dalem are also supported by several warga known as Para Arya (‘Arya groups’), while ancestral temples of Warga Brahmana Siwa are also supported by the Brahmana’s sisya.

Warga temples are known by several names. Each warga has a temple of origin (pura kawitan), where the originator of the warga is worshipped. In principle, each warga only has one kawitan temple. However, at present there are more than one kawitan to be found for some warga. This situation is mainly the result of the rivalry among groups within the warga, each of which claims that its temple is the kawitan. Such a situation exists for Warga Pasek Kayu Selem and Warga Tangkas. Aside from kawitan temple, there are also padharman temples for some warga in the Besakih complex, while some warga have also constructed a padharman somewhere else. A kawitan temple is usually situated in the place where the originator is believed to have resided or died; this is not necessarily true for a padharman, although a padharman is built in honour of the originator.

---

2 For a comprehensive account of the subak temple system, see Lansing (1987 and 1991). See also Chapter Two of this thesis.

3 See, for example, footnote 32 in Chapter Five.

4 See also footnote 3 and 33 in Chapter Five.

5 For example, several warga who believe themselves to be the descendants of Dalem Tarukan have constructed a new temple in Kelurahan Kawan (Bangli) in 1993/94, and claim that the temple is the Padharman Dalem Tarukan.
All warga also have dadya or merajan agung. From the sociological point of view, dadya or merajan agung are the largest warga temples that most Balinese visit regularly. The supporters of a dadya usually recognise one another. Padharman and kawitan, although very important in the formation of the warga and in warga identity, are seldom visited, except by warga members who are full supporters (pangempon) of such temples. Most warga members visiting a padharman or kawitan rarely know each other.

If subak temples are only visited by subak members, village temples by village members, and warga temples by warga members, public temples (kahyangan jagat), on the other hand, are open to everyone. Gods or deities who are worshipped in the public temples are generally common gods (Vedic or otherwise) or deified historical figures who are acknowledged to be worthy of worship by all Hindus. The Vedic gods include those who are believed to reside and guard the eight cardinal points, while the deified historical figures include Mpu Kuturan, Mpu Bharadah, and Dang Hyang Nirartha.

Basing its account on oral traditions and a manuscript called Dewa Purana Bangsul, the Parisada states that public temples can be classified based on several concepts. According to the concept of eight cardinal points and the centre (pangider-ider or nwasanga), in the present day Balinese dominant discourse, the major nine public temples are: (1) Pura Lempuyang Luhur as the seat of Dewa Iswara in the East; (2) Pura Andakasa in the South as the seat of Dewa Brahma; (3) Pura Batukaru in the West as the seat of Dewa Mahadewa; (4) Pura Ulun Danu Batur in the North as the seat of Dewa Wisnu; (5) Pura Goalawah in the Southeast as the seat of Dewa Maheswara; (6) Pura Uluwatu in the Southwest as the seat of Dewa Rudra; (7) Pura Pucak Mangu in the Northwest as the seat of Dewa Sangkara; (8) Pura Besakih in the Northeast as the seat of Dewa Sambu; and (9) Pura Pusering Jagat in the centre as the seat of Dewa Siwa (Figure 6.1). Six of these temples (Lempuyang Luhur, Goalawah, Uluwatu, Batukaru, Batur, Besakih, and Pusering Jagat) are commonly known as the Sad Kahyangan ('six [major] temples').

---

6 This classification attracted a heated debate when in 1990/1991 a new major temple (called Pura Semeru Agung) was constructed in Senduro, Lumajang, on the slope of Gunung
centre because this temple is the seat of Dewa Siwa in His three manifestations, ie Siwa, Sada Siwa, and Parama Siwa. According to the concept of binary opposition (rwa bhineda), Besakih is considered male (purusa) and Batur is female (predana).

Relating these major public temples to some babad, it would appear that most of these temples are also temples in honour of the first deities believed to come to Bali. They are Betara Hyang Putranjaya in Gunung Agung (Pura Besakih), Betari Dewi Danuh in Gunung Batur (Pura Ulun Danu Batur), Betara Hyang Gnjijaya in Lempuyang (Pura Lempuyang Luhur), Betara Hyang Tumuwuh in Gunung Batukaru (Pura Batukaru), Betara Hyang Manik Galang in Pejeng (Pura Pusering Jagat), Betara Hyang Manik Gumawang in Gunung Beratan (Pura Pucak Mangu), and Betara Hyang Tugu in Gunung Andakasa (Pura Andakasa) (Figure 6.1). A number of my informants explained that these deities are the local names of the Vedic gods. Hence, for example, Betara Hyang Tumuwuh is the local name of the Vedic god Mahadewa (Mahadev), and Betara Hyang Tugu is the Balinese name of Brahma. This situation seems to be part of the Indianisation of Balinese religion and gods (Lansing 1983).

Public temples of less importance --in Bali-wide discourse-- are called dang kahyangan ('saint-associated temples'). These temples are mostly visited by people from a particular region, such as Tanah Lot in Tabanan, Sakenan in Badung, Air Jeruk in Sukawati, Rambutsiwi in Jembrana, Ponjok Batu in Kubutambahan, Pulaki in Grokgak, and Gunung Raung in Tegallalang. 7

Semeru (East Java). Traditional accounts state that the Balinese Hinduism came from Gunung Semeru, spread by Rsi Markandeya, who later established the foundation of the Besakih temple. The question was, how to position this newly constructed temple relative to Besakih and other major temples in Bali? This is still an unanswered question among Balinese Hindus.

7Some of these temples have recently attracted an increasingly disproportional number of pilgrims, mostly associated with publicity. Tanah Lot, for example, is now visited by people from all over Bali, which is arguably an expression of resistance after a major tourist resort, the BNR, was planned to be established in the area.
Figure 6.1 The name of the temples, Vedic gods, and Balinese deities in the points of the compass and the centre.

KAWITAN AND CATUR PARHYANGAN

As a warga with millions of (potential) members and spread throughout Bali, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi possesses a large number of warga temples. The temples can theoretically --in the MGPSSR accounts-- be ordered in a sequence based on the networks of their supporters. The smallest unit is called sanggah, which usually belongs to an extended family or families associated with one housing lot (pekarangan). A number of sanggah make up a paibon, and a number of paibon compose a panti. A number of panti construct a dadya, and a number of dadya make up a dadya agung. Finally, all dadya agung form one
Based on this account, every member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi should be a member of a paibon, a panti, a dadya, and a dadya agung. However, this theoretical construct does not fit well in reality. In some regions, such as Tabanan, Badung, and Jembrana, the dadya is rarely found because each household tends to construct its own independent sanggah. In regions where the dadya is common (such as Klungkung and Karangasem), such dadya rarely unite to make a dadya agung. Members of each dadya tend to go directly to the kawitan temple of the Catur Parhyangan, without going through the dadya agung. In other words, daily practices do not match the theoretical ordering of the temple system set out by the MGPSSR. In fact it is very difficult to judge whether a temple is a panti, dadya, or dadya agung. In practice these temples share the same characteristics: they are supported by a fixed group (pangempon); the temple priests are elected among the pangempon; and dadya do not necessarily have more members than panti or paibon. Nonetheless, basing their account on the genealogy in the babad, leaders of the MGPSSR have tried to identify the status of the warga temples. In their estimate, there are about 200 dadya, 500 panti, 1,000 paibon, and 150,000 sanggah within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi throughout Bali.

There are two ways in which members of the MGPSSR order their temples. The first is based on the use of a tree metaphor, whereby the kawitan temple (from wit, ‘seed’ or ‘origin’) is referred to as the base (dasar, bongkol) of the warga temples, while dadya agung are called carang (branches), and dadya are referred to as branches of the branches (carang-macarang). The second method in ordering the temples is based on a metaphor of leluhur (from luhur, ‘the above,’ or ‘the peak’) or lelangit (‘the sky’). Originators are commonly referred to as lelangit, and in using this term, speakers usually point their fingers to the

---

8 For these theoretically hierarchical terms, which are not necessarily true, see also footnote 1 in Chapter Four.

9 This botanic metaphor in tracing an origin point is common in Austronesian societies (Fox 1971, 1988, 1995, and 1996). It is common in these societies to conceptualise origin “as a form of growth: derivation from a “source”, “root”, “base”, or “trunk”. In this structure ... growth is either upward or outward toward a “tip” or apical point” (Fox 1995:218). In this idiom, the origin is seen as a ‘base’ which developed “to a myriad of separate ‘tips’” (Fox 1993: 17).
sky. This is associated with the belief that the distant ancestors are close to the God, up there in the sky. Hence, in an effort to communicate with ancestors (through the medium of trance), the ancestors are asked to descend (turun). Based on this metaphor, the kawitan temple is put at the top, followed by dadya agung, dadya, panti, and paibon, resembling the genealogical model.

Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi claims that its kawitan temple is Pura Lempuyang Madya. Besides this kawitan, there are three other temples considered of equal status, ie. Pura Padharman Pasek in Besakih, Pura Dasar Bhuana in Gelgel, and Pura Silayukti in Padangbai (Karangasem). These four temples are collectively known as the Catur Parhyangan (‘four temples’). These temples are dedicated to the Panca Rsi, except for Mpu Bharadah, who lived in East Java. Pura Lempuyang Madya is dedicated to Mpu Gnijaya (the originator of the warga), Pura Padharman Pasek to Mpu Semeru, Pura Dasar Bhuana to Mpu Gana, and Pura Silayukti to Mpu Kuturan. Although Pura Lempuyang Madya is believed to be their kawitan, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, through the MGPSSR, treat the other temples as if they were of the same status, with none being higher or lower. The inclusion of the other three temples as equal to the kawitan is based on the bisama which, among other things, states:

*Yatna-yatna juga, aywa tan prayatna, santanan inghulun kabehe, kengetakna mwah mahayu kayangan, ... ring Gelgel, maring Silayukti, maring Lempuyang Betenan, maring Besakih.... (PDKB 734: 55b-56a).*

Be prepared, do not be negligent, all my descendants, remember to maintain temples ... in Gelgel, in Silayukti, in lower Lempuyang, in Besakih...

**Pura Lempuyang Madya**

Pura Lempuyang Madya is located in Desa Adat Gamongan, Desa Tiyingtali, Kecamatan Abang, Kabupaten Karangasem. Before 1991 this temple was physically small, less than 100 m² in size, located on the slope of Bukit Bisbis (or Bukit Lempuyang), a 1058 metre high mountain. At a glance, this temple looked no more than a poor village temple. It was physically not well-maintained; it had no fence, no gate (pamedal), no public utilities, etc. In this
tiny temple complex, there was a three-tiered *meru* (pagoda-like shrine) which acted as a *pasimpangan* (temporary pavilion) for Betara Hyang Gnijaya, the deity in Pura Lempuyang Luhur, at the summit of Bukit Bisbis.\(^\text{10}\) Besides the *meru*, there were also three *gedong* (single doored shrines), the *pasimpangan* of Mpu Semeru, Mpu Gana, and Mpu Kuturan respectively. The main building was a *sakapat* (a four-pillared-unwalled shrine), erected on a large stone, believed to be the place where Mpu Gnijaya and his wife, Betari Manik Geni, reached their state of *moksa*. This shrine was dedicated to them.

This temple is claimed to be the Pura Kawitan of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. As such, since the establishment of the MGPSSR, this temple has been one of the binding factors and points of references for the *warga*. It was in this temple that the leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi stayed overnight and meditated before conducting the first *mahasabha* (1969); and it was after this that they gained their self confidence. The success of the *mahasabha* was believed to be associated with the blessing of Mpu Gnijaya, the ancestor who is worshipped in Pura Lempuyang Madya.

The core group responsible for the maintenance of this temple (the *pangempon*) is a group of members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from eight *desa adat* surrounding the temple. However, as a *kawitan* temple, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi throughout Bali, via the MGPSSR, have long been active in the renovation and maintenance of this temple. In July 1971, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from three *kecamatan* in Karangasem donated a six-pillared construction (*sakanem*) to shelter the faithful because at that time there was no shelter to protect them from rain. The building was constructed by self-help (*gotong royong*). To do so, a meeting was held in the house of I Nyoman Kompyang (in Bebandem), at which it was decided to establish a committee, chaired by I Ketut Lanus from Desa Adat Macang, assisted by leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from other villages (Bebandem, Selat, Budakeling, Jungutan, Sibetan, and

---

\(^{10}\) As stated in *Babad Pasek*, Hyang Gnijaya is the parent of Mpu Gnijaya and his brothers (the *Panca Rsi*). In the present day cosmology of Bali, Pura Lempuyang Luhur is one of the temples associated with various points of the compass where nine main *dewa* (*nawasanga*), as manifestations of God, reside.
Bungaya), and with I Nyoman Rai from Selat as adviser. This committee managed to raise Rp. 100,000 to buy the materials needed. One day in July 1971, as reported in Dutta Warga No. 4/5 (June/July 1971), around 1000 members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from three kecamatan (Abang, Bebandem, and Karangasem) worked in gotong royong. The ready-made materials were carried climbing the mountain in windy and rainy weather. Within a day, the sakanem wooden structure had been finished.

Major renovation was performed to Pura Lempuyang in 1975. On 13 July 1975, a meeting organised by the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Karangasem took place in Amlapura. This meeting was also attended by representatives of all the MGPSSR Kecamatan in Karangasem (Kecamatan Kubu, Karangasem, Abang, Manggis, Bebandem, Selat, Sidemen, and Rendang). The meeting agreed to establish a committee for the renovation of Pura Lempuyang Madya, and decided that the first stone would be laid on 23 July 1975. Following this decision, on 23-26 July 1975 gotong royong was performed for several tasks, which included: (a) clearing bush in the area of the temple; (b) extending and flattening the temple yard; (c) renovating the rocky footpath leading to the temple; (d) fixing the thatched roof of the wooden structure; and (e) clearing grass and bushes in Pura Telaga Sawang (a smaller temple which is the source of holy water for Pura Lempuyang Madya). These massive tasks were performed by 15 Dadya Pasek from several villages, with a total strength of around 250 persons,\(^{11}\) organised by I Nyoman Djelantik and I Made Polos from the committee.

The renovation project was supported by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from other kabupaten. An informal meeting between leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi

\(^{11}\)These faithful came from Dadya Pasek Banjar Bukit (Kecamatan Karangasem), Dadya Pasek Banjar Sekargunung (Kecamatan Karangasem), Dadya Pasek Banjar Tumingal (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Kubu (Kecamatan Kubu), Dadya Pasek Banjar Baturinggit (Kecamatan Kubu), Dadya Pasek Banjar Simpar (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Ngis (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Kemuda (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Pidpid (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Selat (Kecamatan Selat), Dadya Pasek Banjar Telugtug (Kecamatan Bebandem), Dadya Pasek Banjar Basangalas (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Kelakah (Kecamatan Abang), Dadya Pasek Banjar Kastala (Kecamatan Bebandem), and Dadya Pasek Banjar Ababi (Kecamatan Abang),
Kecamatan Petang and Kecamatan Abiansemal took place on 25 July 1975 in Bongkasa, at the house (gria) of Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa. After hearing advice from Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, the leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi agreed to donate a *meru* to replace the previous one which was in a poor condition. They decided to seek help from the MGPSSR *Pusat* for the transportation of the *meru* to Pura Lempuyang Madya. To do this, a team consisting of Gde Taram, Gde Pasek Suastana, and Ketut Gde Wisnawa, was sent to Pura Lempuyang Madya to measure the existing *meru* and to discuss the planning with the *pangempon*.

Wood needed for this *meru* was cut by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in the village of Bongkasa. Champaka wood was donated by Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, ficus wood was donated by Pan Jimas and Gurun Gde Sukerti, and palm-fibre (*ijuk*) was donated by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from villages in Kecamatan Petang and Abiansemal. The making of the *meru* was also carried out in Bongkasa, at the house of Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, by Pasek carpenters from several villages, for free, while food was prepared by Ida Sri Mpu. Raw materials for the food were donated by several members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Kecamatan Petang and Abiansemal, who also donated cash for other needs. The work was finished on 8 August 1975.

In the early morning of 14 August, as planned, the *meru* was transported by truck from Bongkasa. Together with the ready-made *meru*, a group of 48 persons of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi also went to Pura Lempuyang Madya, where they planned to work for several days. For this purpose, they also brought with them supplies such as rice, vegetables, coffee, and sugar. The group members included Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, carpenters and their wives, and other faithful, led by I Made Taram, I Nyoman Rintig, and I Gde Pasek Suastana. After collecting materials from several villages, the truck left Bongkasa at 10.30 AM and arrived in Desa Adat Basangalas at around 3 PM. Here, the materials were unloaded, and the group started carrying them up Lempuyang mountain, where Pura Lempuyang Madya is located. Some materials, which they could not bring, were left in a house of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in this village. The group arrived at Pura Lempuyang Madya at 6.30 PM. Upon arrival at Pura
Lempuyang Madya, the group prayed, led by Ida Sri Mpu and the pemangku of the temple. After praying, they ate the prasadam (offerings which have been used in rituals) for dinner. The group then prepared everything that would be set up the next day. The next morning the wives prepared food, and the meru construction was started after morning prayer. Other members of the group were sent back to Basangalas to pick up the remaining materials. For this, they were helped by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Desa Adat Basangalas and Desa Adat Gamongan.

The physical construction of the meru was finished on the morning of 17 August 1975. At the same time, offerings were arranged by the women members of the group. A small ritual ceremony, called mlaspas alit ('small purification') was performed by Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, helped by the pemangku. At around 1 PM the group left Pura Lempuyang Madya, and went on foot to Amlapura (around 5 km away from the village of Basangalas). They reached Amlapura at around 4 PM, where they asked I Wayan Pasek Winda, a leader of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Amlapura, to find a bus which could be chartered to drop them in Denpasar and other villages in Kecamatan Petang and Abiansemal.

More gotong royong was performed from 14 to 28 September 1975. In this gotong royong, the main work was to reshape the steps which led to Pura Lempuyang Madya and to link the villages of Margatiga, Ngis, and Basangalas, as well as to renovate shrines in Pura Telaga Sawang.

Renovation of other shrines was also performed in 1976. In this renovation, the MGPSSR Kabupaten Badung took the initiative. The main activity was to replace the upper part of the shrines, ie. the roof and the parts that were made of wood. The shrines renovated were: (1) Ardanareswari, the seat of Mpu Gnjijaja and his wife, Betara Manik Gni; (2) the two-tiered gedong dedicated to Mpu Semeru; (3) the gedong dedicated to Mpu Gana; and (4) the gedong limasari dedicated to Mpu Kuturan. To do this, Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran from Denpasar and five other members were sent to Pura Lempuyang Madya to discuss the program with the pangempon of the temple (Desa Adat Gamongan), and to measure the sizes of each shrine. Based on these measurements, the work on the
shrines was performed in Denpasar. The ready-made materials for the shrines and their roofs (palm fibre) were transported to Pura Lempuyang Madya on 16 March 1976, together with the carpenters. The transportation of the material from Desa Adat Basangalas to the temple was also helped by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Desa Adat Basangalas and Desa Adat Gamongan. The renovation was finished on 30 March 1976, and the purification ceremony for these shrines was performed on 14 April 1976, ie. on the day of the temple festival, led by Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran.

A more extensive program of renovation was undertaken during the period 1991-1993, which was initiated by the MGPSSR Pusat. The activities included the extension of the temple yard, the construction of a wall around the temple and the entrance gate, the renovation of all shrines, and the construction of public facilities, all of which was planned to cost Rp. 233,800,000. Half way through the activity, however, major problems arose. For some reason, a group of the pangempon of the temple insisted that the construction should be stopped. The MGPSSR could not handle this problem, and the project was then taken over by the government.¹²

**Padharman Ratu Pasek Besakih**

Padharman Warga Pasek, which is also called Catur Lawa Ratu Pasek, is located in the Besakih complex, Kecamatan Rendang, Kabupaten Karangasem. The main shrines in this temple are a three-tiered and a seven-tiered meru. The three-tiered meru is dedicated to Mpu Semeru, and the seven-tiered meru is dedicated to the Sapta Rsi collectively (Mpu Ketek, Mpu Kananda, Mpu Wiradnyana, Mpu Withadharma, Mpu Ragarunting, Mpu Prateka, and Mpu Dangka). Other shrines include a padmasana and tepasana as pasimpangan (temporary pavilion) for Mpu Gnijaya, Mpu Gana, and Mpu Kuturan.

---

¹² This was an interesting development, which I will discuss in detail later in this chapter. Suffice to say here that the temple is not only claimed as the Pura Kawitan of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, but also by other warga, ie. Warga Karangbuncing. In addition, other warga claimed that this temple is not a warga temple, but rather a public temple.
Plate 6.1  Pura Lempuyang Madya, the *kawitan* temple of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, after the renovation (1994). The newly elected leaders of the MGPSSR performed an oath-taking ritual in this temple, led by a *sri mpu*.

Plate 6.2  Pura Catur Lawa Ratu Pasek, which is also the *padharman* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, after its major renovation (1995).
The traditional caretakers (pangempon) of this temple are drawn from members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Kecamatan Selat, Karangasem. Members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi throughout Bali, through the MGPSSR, were also intensively active in the renovation and maintenance of this temple. In terms of physical appearance, compared to Pura Lempuyang Madya, this temple was much better maintained, particularly before 1991 (before Pura Lempuyang Madya was totally reconstructed). The MGPSSR focused its attention on the restoration of Padharman Pasek Besakih more than other temples of the Catur Parhyangan. This was mainly due to the fact that Padharman Warga Pasek in Besakih is located amidst a complex of temples, and that the Padharman Pasek is surrounded by padharman of other warga. It would embarrass the MGPSSR if its padharman was poorly maintained in comparison to others'. Accordingly, from 1976 until the present, renovation after renovation has been performed, including the extension of the temple yard and the construction of public utilities. From December 1989 to February 1990, several buildings were renovated at a total cost of Rp. 9,790,050. This was a joint project between the MGPSSR Pusat, the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Karangasem, and the pangempon. After the physical renovation, a major ceremony was performed, called Wraspati Kalpa, on the full moon of 10 February 1990, sponsored by the MGPSSR Pusat. For this, the MGPSSR Pusat, the MGPSSR Karangasem, and the pangempon established a joint committee, chaired by Gde Nuradja from the MGPSSR Pusat. This ritual cost Rp. 3,500,000.

In November 1990 the seven-tiered meru was renovated at a cost of Rp. 7,577,300, fully funded by the MGPSSR Pusat. In 1994-1995 construction activities were also carried out to renew the pawedan (praying platform for the sulinggih) and to construct public facilities in the outer court (jabā) to accommodate the faithful.

In March 1996 the MGPSSR bought 0.135 ha of land at the back of the padharman at a cost of Rp. 20.25 million. It is planned that on this land the MGPSSR will develop a dharmasala (‘education camp’) to train candidates for priesthood, educate the younger generation of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and carry out other religious activities. Some even have proposed that this planned
dharmasala be used as a place for consecrating new priests. The development of the dharmasala, which will include a multipurpose hall (wantilan), accommodation, and other facilities, is estimated to cost at Rp. 362.25 million. The construction is expected to be finished by 1999. At present (1996), the MGPSSR is at the stage of raising funds for this purpose.

The pangempon of this padharman seemed to be happy with the active involvement of the MGPSSR in taking care of the temple, as well as the use of sri mpu. For years, the officiating sulinggih in this temple have been sri mpu from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. I Nyoman Rai, the chairman of the pangempon told me that:

This is a pura padharman of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, which means that all members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi jointly own the temple. We, the pangempon, are merely the daily overseers of the temple. Thank God, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi have been organised in the MGPSSR..., this significantly eases our task in taking care of the padharman. As a padharman, we should use ida sri mpu to officiate at its ceremonies. If no sri mpu is available, then we invite a pedanda.

In terms of ritual performance, before 1976 all rituals were solely the responsibility of the core supporters (pangempon) of the temple, ie. Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Kecamatan Selat, Kabupaten Karangasem. In 1976 this management responsibility was widened to include all Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Kabupaten Karangasem, and for practical reasons the yearly temple festivals have been performed on a rotational basis by all kecamatan of Kabupaten Karangasem. It is also being discussed at present (1996) that the management of the yearly ritual ceremonies be taken in turns by the MGPSSR Kabupaten.

It is worth noting that Pura Padharman Pasek also holds a special position as an integral part of the main temple (Penataran Agung) of Besakih, and that at any major ceremony performed in the main complex of the main temple of Besakih (the Penataran Agung), such as Betara Turun Kabe, Pancawalikrama, Ekadasa Rudra, Tribhuana, and Ekabhuana, the deity worshipped in Padharman Pasek must be present. Three other temples hold the same position in this regard, ie. (Padharman) Ratu Penyarikan, (Padharman) Ratu Pande, and (Padharman) Ratu Dukuh Segening. These four temples are collectively called
Before a major ceremony is held in the main complex, the ‘asking permission’ ritual (atur piuning) is always performed in the Catur Lawa. The deities of the Catur Lawa are maintained ‘standing’ (ngadeg) at each respective temple during the entire period of the ceremony. In the purification ceremony to the sea, deities in the Catur Lawa are invariably included. On the other hand, other padharman are free to take part or not, as they wish.14

Pura Silayukti

This temple, dedicated to Mpu Kuturan, is located in the village of Padang, Kecamatan Manggis, Kabupaten Karangasem. The traditional caretakers (pangempon) of this temple are members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi of Desa Adat Padang. However, the chairman of the pangempon, I Made Puja, refused to call the temple ‘Pura Pasek.’ He argued that the temple is dedicated to Mpu Kuturan, one of the Panca Rsi. Quoting Babad Pasek, he maintained that Mpu Kuturan begot a daughter, Ni Dyah Ratna Mengali, who married Mpu Bahula. Mpu Bahula begot Mpu Tantular. Mpu Tantular begot Dang Hyang Kepakisan (the ancestor of Warga Ksatria Dalem and Maha Gotra Sentanan Dalem Tarukan), Dang Hyang Smaranatha (the ancestor of Warga Brahmana Boda and Warga Brahmana Siwa), and Dang Hyang Siddhimantra (the ancestor of Warga

Catur Lawa.13 Commonly interpreted to mean ‘four petals [of a flower]’, involves the metaphor of a flower. The name signifies that the Catur Lawa temples are integral parts of the main temple, the Penataran Agung of Besakih, which is the centre of the flower. Other padharman, on the other hand, are merely warga temples, and any ritual ceremony at the main temple has nothing to do with these padharman. In the procession during the purification ceremony, the deities of the Catur Lawa must be carried in front of the main deity. The sequence of the deities is fixed: the first is Ratu Pande, followed by Ratu Pasek, Ratu Penyarikan, and Ratu Dukuh Segening. Most of my informants interpreted this to mean that these four temples were among the first ones to exist in the complex, well before the construction of the other padharman. The interpretation goes further that if the deity of the main temple (known as Ratu Lingsir, ‘He, the old one’) is the king, Ida Ratu Pande is the minister of defence, Ida Ratu Pasek is the minister of home affairs, Ida Ratu Penyarikan is the secretary, and Ida Ratu Dukuh Segening is the adviser. At present, these Catur Lawa temples are fully managed by warga, and function as padharman. The temple of Ratu Pande is managed by Warga Pande; Ratu Penyarikan by Warga Gusti Jelantik (or Gusti Penyarikan); Ratu Pasek by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi; and Ratu Dukuh Segening by Warga Dukuh. For a more detailed account of this Catur Lawa, see Stuart-Fox (1987).

13 Catur Lawa, commonly interpreted to mean ‘four petals [of a flower]’, involves the metaphor of a flower. The name signifies that the Catur Lawa temples are integral parts of the main temple, the Penataran Agung of Besakih, which is the centre of the flower. Other padharman, on the other hand, are merely warga temples, and any ritual ceremony at the main temple has nothing to do with these padharman. In the procession during the purification ceremony, the deities of the Catur Lawa must be carried in front of the main deity. The sequence of the deities is fixed: the first is Ratu Pande, followed by Ratu Pasek, Ratu Penyarikan, and Ratu Dukuh Segening. Most of my informants interpreted this to mean that these four temples were among the first ones to exist in the complex, well before the construction of the other padharman. The interpretation goes further that if the deity of the main temple (known as Ratu Lingsir, ‘He, the old one’) is the king, Ida Ratu Pande is the minister of defence, Ida Ratu Pasek is the minister of home affairs, Ida Ratu Penyarikan is the secretary, and Ida Ratu Dukuh Segening is the adviser. At present, these Catur Lawa temples are fully managed by warga, and function as padharman. The temple of Ratu Pande is managed by Warga Pande; Ratu Penyarikan by Warga Gusti Jelantik (or Gusti Penyarikan); Ratu Pasek by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi; and Ratu Dukuh Segening by Warga Dukuh. For a more detailed account of this Catur Lawa, see Stuart-Fox (1987).

14 Previously, padharman, save the Catur Lawa, were not included in this purification ceremony. The padharman were first involved in the 1993 Tribhuana ceremony.
Arya Wang Bang Pinatih and Warga Arya Sidemen). Hence, these warga should be included as ‘the owners’ of the temple. Together with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, these warga are prominent in present day Bali, both in terms of number and influence. In short, the temple should be considered as a public temple rather than merely a temple of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. In Made Puja’s opinion, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is justified in claiming that the temple is one of the Catur Parhyangan, because the Babad Pasek says so, but in so doing Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi should not exclude the other warga. I Made Puja considered that warga other than Pasek Sapta Rsi might also claim the temple as their kawitan.\footnote{This possibility is not without foundation, since Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa also claims that Mpu Kuturan was a follower of Waisnawa, and hence is considered one of the warga’s important ancestors. In the Babad Bhujangga Ring Bali, it is also mentioned that Mpu Kuturan, who lived in Silayukti, is the ancestor of ‘Bhujangga in Bali.’ However, most members of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa to whom I talked interpreted the term ‘bhujangga’ in this case not as Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, but as ‘priest,’ the other meaning of the word ‘bhujangga.’ This view is also held by leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.} In addition to these arguments, it is clear from a deep conversation I had with Made Puja all night long at the temple, that his position is grounded on political and economic motives. He told me:

It is stupid if we put a signboard here to state that this temple is a Pasek temple, since, if we do, only those from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi will pray here, and not the others. This means we limit the number of the panyungsung (‘faithful’). Surely this is not a good policy. In contrast, we should expand the number of the panyungsung, because that will help us in fund raising for the temple’s maintenance and ceremonies. The temple will also be more prestigious if it is considered a public temple (‘kahyangan jagat’), rather than merely a warga temple (1993).

In contrast, leaders of the MGPSSR consider that although Mpu Kuturan begot a daughter, Dyah Ratna Mengali, this daughter was married out, and hence Mpu Kuturan had no direct line. Accordingly, following Balinese adat law, Mpu Kuturan had to be taken care of by his brother’s son, in this case the sons of Mpu Gnijaya, ie. the Sapta Rsi. When confronted with the fact that Mpu Bahula (the husband of Dyah Ratna Mengali) was also Mpu Kuturan’s brother’s son (from Mpu Bharadah), leaders of the MGPSSR maintain that Mpu Bahula was in
Java, so that the closest nephew of Mpu Kuturan was no other than the \textit{Sapta Rsi}.

Despite maintaining that the temple is not just a temple of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, I Made Puja (and the \textit{pangempon}) did not prohibit Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (the MGPSSR) from performing ceremonies in this temple, or from using \textit{sri mpu} to officiate at the ceremonies. The newly elected leaders of the MGPSSR Pusat for the period of 1989-1994 conducted their oath-taking ceremony (\textit{majaya-jaya}) at this temple on 25 August 1989, and five \textit{sri mpu}, ie. Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran, Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra, Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas, and Ida Sri Mpu Adi Wirarunting officiated at this ceremony.
Pura Dasar Bhuana

This temple is located in Desa Adat Gelgel, Kecamatan Klungkung. Pura Dasar Bhuana is a big temple complex where a lot of shrines for various deities can be found. This temple was the palace’s temple (*pura kerajaan*) during the Gelgel era. The name of the temple itself, *Dasar Bhuana*, or ‘the foundation of the world,’ clearly signifies that this temple was expected to be the foundation for the unity of the country (the Kingdom of Gelgel). Aside from a *padmasana*, dedicated to the Supreme God, the main shrines in the inner part (*jeroan*) of this temple are dedicated to ancestors of the *Catur Warga* (‘four *warga’*) in Bali, i.e. ancestors of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (*Ratu Pasek*), ancestors of Warga Ksatria Dalem (*Ratu Dalem*), ancestors of Warga Brahmana Siwa (*Dang Hyang Nirartha*), and ancestors of Warga Pande (*Ratu Pande*). As such, this temple is not solely a temple of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, but is a public temple.

Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi only owns one shrine, in the form of a three-tiered *meru*, called *Ratu Pasek*, dedicated to Mpu Gana. If members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi visit Pura Dasar Bhuana, they perform prayers before this shrine. Nonetheless, Pura Dasar Bhuana was the most famous ‘*Kawitan Pasek*’ among members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and hence, this temple was the one they visited most. The huge number of members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi visiting this temple during its festival caused most ordinary Balinese I talked with to be of the opinion that Pura Dasar Bhuana is a Pasek temple.

As a matter of fact, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is not free to perform ritual ceremonies in this temple at will. In 1990, for example, the MGPSSR planned to perform a major ceremony called *Wraspati Kalpa*. This ceremony was planned because the sacred object in the *meru* was stolen on 12 July 1988, and hence the shrine was considered polluted. To perform this ceremony, a committee was set up, chaired by Wayan Koti Cantika SH from the MGPSSR *Pusat* and staffed by leaders of the MGPSSR Klungkung as well as *pangempon* Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from the village of Gelgel. However, the plan was opposed by Cokorda Ngurah from Puri Klungkung, the chairman of the temple’s advisory body (*pangeling pura*). He argued that a *Wraspati Kalpa* could not be
performed for only one shrine (in this case the shrine of Ratu Pasek) and not for the rest. If Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was keen to perform this ceremony, they were advised do it quietly or not ostentatiously. So the ceremony was performed quietly on 1-5 April 1990, officiated by sri mpu.

The use of sri mpu attracted protest from other warga as well as from some members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Gelgel themselves. However, the protest was expressed days after the ceremony finished. The pangempon of Pura Dasar Bhuana conducted a special meeting to discuss this matter, and decided that next time a sri mpu would not be allowed to officiate at the temple. This angered the MGPSSR and members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi who were in favour of the use of sri mpu. At a meeting in Denpasar on 3 June 1990, there was even a proposal to move the shrine of Ratu Pasek from the temple complex to somewhere else, so that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi would have their own independent temple. Although quite a number of the participants of the meeting agreed to this proposal, they postponed discussion on the moving of the shrine because, at that time, the MGPSSR was concentrating its attention on the renovation of Pura Lempuyang Madya.

**DADYA AGUNG AND DADYA**

The first branches of the kawitan temple are dadya agung. Each of these dadya agung is associated with one of the seven mpu (the Sapta Rsi), however, the number of dadya agung associated with each of these Sapta Rsi varies. Since the criteria for claiming whether a temple is a dadya agung or merely a dadya are blurred, it is very difficult to count how many dadya agung there are within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Writing in Dutta Warga No. 21 and 22 (1975), I Ktut Soebandi claimed that there were 36 dadya agung of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. In the Mahasabha V/1994, however, it was decided that the number of the dadya agung was 21. The names and locations of these dadya agung and their associated ancestors are shown in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1 Dadya Agung of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The name of the ancestor and the dadya agung</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Mpu Ketek</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mpu Ketek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mpu Ketek</td>
<td>Desa Padangbai, Karangasem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mpu Ketek</td>
<td>Desa Besang, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Mpu Kananda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mpu Kananda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mpu Kananda</td>
<td>Desa Sebudi, Selat, Karangasem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Mpu Wiradnya</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mpu Wiradnya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mpu Wiradnya</td>
<td>Banjar Gaya, Desa Tamanbali, Bangli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Mpu Withadharma</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Banjar Pegatepan, Gelgel, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Banjar Akah, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Desa Manduang, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Banjar Sangkanbuana, Desa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Semarapura Kauh, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Desa Budaga, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Desa Aan, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Desa Mas, Gianyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Desa Aan, Desa Tamanbali, Bangli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Banjar Gaya, Desa Tamanbali, Bangli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mpu Withadharma</td>
<td>Banjar Pag, Denpasar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Mpu Ragarunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mpu Ragarunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mpu Ragarunting</td>
<td>Banjar Bendul, Desa Wangaya, Tabanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mpu Ragarunning</td>
<td>Banjar Bukit Buluh, Desa Gunaka, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mpu Ragarunning</td>
<td>Desa Tojan, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Mpu Prateka</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mpu Prateka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mpu Prateka</td>
<td>Banjar Belatung, Desa Menanga, Karangasem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mpu Prateka</td>
<td>Banjar Pemangir, Desa Gelgel, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Mpu Dangka</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mpu Dangka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mpu Dangka</td>
<td>Banjar Selisihan, Banjarangkan, Klungkung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mpu Dangka</td>
<td>Banjar Penulisan, Keramas, Gianyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mpu Dangka</td>
<td>Desa Penida, Tembuku, Bangli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plates 6.4 and 6.5 A dadya and a dadya agung within the temple system of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.
The designation of a warga temple as a dadya agung seems to be a recent development, created by the MGPSSR. I observed that the objective of this creation was to order warga temples systematically, so that all warga members would be in the temple network system, leading to the Catur Parhyangan. This would also be a means of enhancing a sense of brotherhood. The MGPSSR has tried to make an inventory of all temples and align them in a neat order, ie. paibon-panti-dadya-dadya agung leading to the Catur Parhyangan. Since the basis for the definition of a dadya, paibon, and a panti is not clear, the inventory and categorisation have also been unsuccessful. Nonetheless, a list of temples associated with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and their festival days has been published by the MGPSSR in Dutta Warga. Selected temples from this list were also included on Balinese calendars issued by the MGPSSR Pusat in 1991 and 1992.

SEARCHING FOR THE JAVANESE LINK AND SPREADING INFLUENCE

Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is not only found in Bali; quite a large number of its members can also be found in Lombok, Java, Sulawesi, and Sumatra. The majority of those found in Sulawesi and Sumatra are transmigrants, most of whom left Bali after 1970, while those in Lombok have been there for generations. The presence of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Java, particularly in the Solo region, can be traced back to pre-Islamic Java. At present, a Pasek ‘temple’ is found in Dukuh Kepasekan, Kabupaten Karanganyar, Solo. This temple was constructed from 1988 to 1990 by the MGPSSR Pusat in the place believed to be the hermitage of Kyai Agung Pemacekan. The finding of this place and the later construction of the temple was guided by supernatural indications. The finder of the place, I Ktut Soebandi, told me the following story of the discovery, which was also confirmed by all other informants.

In 1970 I was on duty and spent the night in a hotel in Salatiga. At around midnight, my room’s door was opened, but nobody was there. Half awake, I heard a charismatic voice calling my name and instructing me to find a grave in Java. Because I was very scared, and perhaps because I was trained as a
policeman, I suddenly replied 'Yes,' after which the voice disappeared and the door closed.

I was badly upset by this experience, but had no idea of how to find the grave mentioned, because the voice did not mention the characteristics of the grave, nor its region. In Java, from Blambangan to Ujung Kulon, there are thousands of graves. Though I tried to forget the message, because it seemed impossible for me to do what it asked, deep in my heart I knew that I could never escape from it. It had become a moral duty. Wherever I went in Java, I could not help asking the local people about the grave.

In March 1984, I was invited by Mangkunegara to pay a visit to his palace, after which we went sightseeing to Tawangmangu, Candi Sukuh, and other tourist places. In a remote village in Dukuh ('subvillage') Kepasekan, I met an old woman, who told me that there was a sacred grave nearby. She said several miracles had occurred at the grave. She further told me that a group in the village had several times tried to renovate the grave, but cancelled the plans for unclear reasons. I was interested to see the grave, and so I went there. Upon arrival at the grave, I felt something different, and I then remembered my experience in Salatiga. As I usually do, I prayed at the grave, and in my meditation I heard a voice, with a tone precisely as the one I had heard in Salatiga. "I am Kyai Agung Pemacekan. My wife is Nyi Mayuni, we died here from old age. When we fled from East Java, I brought hundreds of families under three leaders who I assigned to Dukuh Kaprabon, Kebon Tegalsari, and Kepasekan, respectively. I do not have any children, but a lot of nieces and nephews in Bali. I do not want somebody else renovating my sleeping place, I am now waiting for them to take care of my grave." Based on this spiritual experience, I was convinced that this was the grave intended by the voice I heard in Salatiga.16

Upon returning from Solo, I Ktut Soebandi presented the matter to the MGPSSR Pusat, and proposed to follow up the message of one of the ancestors, ie. to renovate the grave in Kepasekan. The first reaction, however, was cynicism. The majority of leaders in the MGPSSR maintained that there are still hundreds of temples in Bali to be taken care of. Why should we think about a temple in Solo? After leaving the matter for a year, at the end of 1984 a committee for the renovation of the grave in Solo was established, chaired by Drs Wayan Arka. The response from Mangkunegaran, the traditional ruler of the village, was positive. However, because higher priority was given to the renovation of Padharman Ratu Pasek in Besakih, the renovation of the grave in Solo was neglected until 1988. In 1989 the first large group of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, around 175 persons, went to Karangpandan to clear the area around

---

16 Aside from this grave, I Ktut Soebandi also found a number of old public temples in Bali, and had similar stories of their discovery.
the grave and carry out other physical work. Unpredictably, they were warmly welcomed by villagers in Dukuh Kepasekan, who prepared food for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi for two days, although most of the villagers were Muslim, while all Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Bali wore Balinese-Hindu adat costumes. This encouraged the MGPSSR, which took the warm welcome as a sign of ‘invisible hands’ that helped them, ie. the hands of Betara Kawitan (the ancestors). The renovation was completed in 1990. The design of the newly constructed grave is unique because it is an effort to combine Balinese and Javanese styles. So the grave is surrounded by a two metre high ‘Balinese fence’ about 15 by 15 meters. Within the fence stands a big walled pavilion. In the pavilion, we find three *padma* (Balinese-style throne-like shrines). As usual in a Balinese sacred place, outside the pavilion, in one corner of the yard, a *panunggun karang* (‘guardian shrine’) was also built. The grave complex is named Petilasan Kyai Agung Pemacekan (in Bali, it is better known as the Pelinggih in Solo).

When the inauguration ceremony for the newly renovated *petilasan* was performed on 9 November 1990, five *mpu* from Bali officiated. This inauguration ceremony was also witnessed by representatives of the local government (the Bupati of Karanganyar and Camat of Karangpandan). My informants said that participants in the ceremony was very reverent (*hidmat*), and a number of *warga* members, including the *sri mpu*, were possessed. In a trance, they said that the ancestor was very pleased and moved (*terharu*) by his descendants. At that time, the former owner of the land where the grave was located, was also converted to become a Hindu, and was directly appointed as the temple priest (*pemangku*), so he is now known as Mangku Sutardjo.

Since then, a yearly festival has been conducted for the *petilasan*, at which time members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Bali flood to pay homage to their Javanese ancestor. In November 1994, as usual, an annual festival was conducted in this *petilasan*. Weeks before the date of the festival, news had been spread by word of mouth, arrangements were made, and donations collected. Some members donated money in cash, others prepared offerings, and still others lent their cars and buses to transport the *warga* and materials from
Bali to the petilasan. At the same time, contact with Mangku Sutardjo had also been made to arrange accommodation and other things.

Three days before the ceremony, the first group of around 25 persons left Denpasar for Solo, to set up the ready-made offerings, clear up the petilasan, and so forth. On the day before the date of the festival, other groups (totaling around 200 persons) went to Solo, including Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran, Ida Sri Mpu Kamareka, and Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Rekananda. In Dukuh Pasekan, they were accommodated in the houses of villagers surrounding the petilasan. Food was cooked collectively in the house of Mangku Sutardjo.

Plate 6.6 Petilasan (tomb-shrine) Kyai Agung Permacekan in Dukuh Kepasekan, Karangpandan, Solo (Central Java), claimed to be one of the ancestral temples of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.
At night, the faithful gathered in front of the petilasan. Led by Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran, they discussed several topics relating to Kepasekan and Hindu religious practices in general, such as the possibility of simplifying the ritual and the need for Balinese to focus more on the philosophical and social aspects of religion instead of merely on ritual aspects. The discussion ended the next morning at around 3.30 AM.

On the day of the festival, after having breakfast together --prepared by the wives-- the ceremony began, led by the three sri mpu. The procedures were exactly the same as those in Bali --a cleansing ceremony, followed by inviting the deity and praying together. The ceremony was also attended by hundreds of Javanese --who claimed to be Hindus-- from villages surrounding the petilasan, some of whom in fact had paid regular visits to the petilasan and helped prepare offerings. It was a very rapture and reverent ceremony, and some people were possessed (trance).

After the prayers, four Javanese Hindus from the region were consecrated (mawinten) by Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran. They would act as pemangku to serve fellow Hindus in their respective villages. They estimated that the number of Hindus in the region is as high as 2000 people. I observed that members and activists of the MGPSSR were very proud of their success in spreading Hinduism back to Java, or to 're-converting' the Kejawen Muslim, back to their ancestors' religion, Hinduism. Those who (re)converted to Hinduism told me that in fact they had just formally declared themselves as Hindus, while the religious practices and beliefs they adhered to, the 'Hindu Kejawen' (so they called it), had never been abandoned.

RENOVATING ANCESTRAL TEMPLES AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

As the establishment of the organisation was motivated by religious considerations, particularly in the renovating of temples, it is not surprising that one of the major activities of the MGPSSR is renovating temples associated with Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, whether Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as a whole or branches of it. However, the impact brought about by this temple rehabilitation has not
been necessarily positive for the unity of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. On the contrary, such renovation has often created factions among warga members.

Rehabilitation of Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Pegatepan

Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Banjar Pegatepan, Gelgel, is one of several dadya agung within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and one of the nine dadya agung within Pasek Gelgel (see Table 6.2 above). The Pasek Gelgel temple in Gelgel was mainly the responsibility of Warga Pasek Gelgel in Gelgel, who comprised 92 households in 1994. In 1988 the prasasti held in this temple was read to clarify the status of the temple and to define who should pay homage there. At that time most Pasek Gelgel from other regions merely paid homage at Pura Dasar Bhuana, which is also in Gelgel, especially at a shrine dedicated to Mpu Gana, a younger brother of Mpu Gnjaya. Very few went to the Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Pegatepan. According to Mangku Ktut Soebandi, who read the prasasti, the prasasti mentions that the temple in Banjar Pegatepan is in fact one of the nine dadya agung of Pasek Gelgel.

Based on this finding and realising that the temple was poorly maintained, the leaders of the temple, under I Ketut Lepik, proposed to conduct a major renovation. A joint committee was established, composed of the pangempon and the MGPSSR Pusat. Members of Warga Pasek Gelgel throughout Bali, thousands of families in number, were invited to contribute. This appeal was very successful, mobilising Rp 45 million, enough to renovate the temple as planned.

After the renovation was completed, a major inauguration ritual, called ngenteg linggih, was performed on Saturday 23 December 1989. Seven sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi officiated at this ceremony. The use of sri mpu instead of a pedanda created endless disputes among members. Some members of the pangempon in Gelgel refused to be sprinkled by holy water from the sri mpu during the ceremony. Instead of uniting the warga, the use of sri mpu had, conversely, split the warga.
Renovation of Pura Lempuyang Madya

In 1984 the MGPSSR Pusat established a special committee, chaired by Drs Wayan Arka, to handle activities in relation to the effort to renovate the Catur Parhyangan in Bali, and to construct the Petilasan Kyai Agung Pemacekan in Solo (Decision No. 01/PP/MGPSSR/XII/1984, 16 December 1984). This committee accomplished several projects, particularly the renovation of the Catur Parhyangan, but failed in the development of the petilasan in Solo. The responsibility was then taken over by the succeeding leadership.

Once the new leadership of the MGPSSR Pusat was installed, based on the Mahasabha IV in Besakih (1989), the MGPSSR Pusat launched a big project, the renovation of Pura Lempuyang Madya, the highest temple in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi’s temple hierarchy. This was not an entirely new plan since the previous leadership had also planned such a renovation. Minor renovations of this temple had been carried out regularly since 1971. The current plan, however, called for a total renovation, which would include the moving and reconstruction of all shrines, redesigning of the layout of the temple, the construction of public facilities to accommodate the faithful, the making of a temple wall and entrance gate, and an extension of the temple yard. At a meeting in Denpasar on 25 November 1989, a committee was set up, chaired by Ir I Wayan Kosaartha (Decision No. 19/PP/MGPSSR/1989). Following this meeting, the committee and other leaders of the MGPSSR made a special pilgrimage to Pura Lempuyang Madya and stayed overnight there on the night of a full moon (purnama) in December 1989. To reach the temple they had to climb the Lempuyang mountain, about a two hour walk. Their arrival at Desa Adat Gamongan, a desa adat located below the temple, and home of the temple’s pemangku, was welcomed by the leaders of the desa adat, the daily caretakers (pangempon) of the temple,

First they prayed in Pura Pasimpangan, a temple located in Desa Adat Gamongan, where there is also a shrine dedicated to Mpu Gnijaya. The prayers were led by the pemangku (Mangku Sri). After praying, the chairman of the MGPSSR Pusat, Professor Ketut Rika, explained that the MGPSSR intended to renovate the temple because it was in poor condition. At that time, the temple
was very small, and there was no fence to prevent people from entering the sacred place, which was on the climbing track of Mount Lempuyang. The condition of the individual shrines was also poor. Ketut Rika proclaimed that 'the owner' of the temple was the pangempon, while members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi outside the pangempon circle were merely 'participants.' However, since they realised that the temple was of their own ancestor, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi throughout Bali were attracted to contribute to the maintenance of the temple, in accordance with the bisama. In the planned renovation project, Ketut Rika invited the pangempon to participate actively, while the MGPSSR or brother (semeton) Pasek throughout Bali would only help in designing, consulting on technical aspects, and funding.

The pemangku and desa adat leaders had long known that Pura Lempuyang Madya is one of the Catur Parhyangan, and the ancestral temple of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Hence, they were pleased to accept the initiative of the MGPSSR, and declared that they would support the project by mobilising labour. After basic principles were agreed upon, the group of leaders of the MGPSSR Pusat, escorted by the pemangku, went up to the temple, performed prayers, meditation, and stayed overnight (makemit).

Based on this agreement, the committee of the MGPSSR Pusat started planning, which included the design, lay out, as well as budgeting. According to its calculations, the funding needed was Rp. 233,800,000. This high cost was mainly due to the location of the project since the cost of transporting the materials to the site would be higher than the price of the materials themselves. To mobilise the funds needed, the MGPSSR invited all its warga members to contribute voluntarily according to their capability. Some well-to-do Pasek donated 100 sacks of cement, ten trucks of stone, or cash. A number of others declared that they would donate a certain percentage of their monthly salary for an indefinite time until the project was finished. For the majority of members, the MGPSSR issued stickers valued at Rp. 1,000, Rp. 2,500, and Rp. 10,000, and these stickers were distributed through kabupaten offices to dadya and thence down to the village level in the hope that each Pasek family would buy at least one sticker. The committee also actively sold the stickers during festivals
in Pasek temples. Fund raising was also carried out through a donation box *(kotak dana punya)* through the *Bali Post*, a local newspaper, which managed to collect Rp. 41,175,050.\(^{17}\)

At the same time, the committee had arranged that the members of Desa Adat Gamongan, the daily caretakers of the temple, would be mobilised as salaried labour, while supervision would be carried out by the MGPSSR *Pusat*, who would send its officers in turn. Hence, the project would be multi-purpose. The main objective was to renovate the temple, while on the other hand it would also be a means to help the *pangempon* —who are mostly poor villagers— by providing paid work. The leaders of the *desa adat* were pleased with this arrangement.

The plan for the temple renovation was reported by the committee to the Bupati of Karangasem on 24 January 1990. At that meeting, the *bupati* advised that he was happy with the initiative taken by the MGPSSR because if all *warga* were willing to do the same, it would reduce the financial burden of the government in temple renovation. The *bupati* also promised that he would support the committee, not only morally but also financially. The committee also paid a visit to the Governor of Bali on 13 March 1990. The governor was also happy with the project and praised *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi* as a good and intact *warga*. He said that renovation of temples was the duty of all Hindus, and since *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi* was keen to renovate *Pura Lempuyang Madya*, the governor could say nothing except thanks. On 24 April 1990 the committee consulted the central committee of the *Parisada* in Denpasar. Just as the *bupati* and governor had done, the central committee of the *Parisada* responded positively, and promised that the *Parisada* would announce the project to the provincial *Parisada* and call for support from them.

In June 1990 physical activity started. After a set of ritual ceremonies led by a number of *sri mpu*, the expansion of the yard was carried out by digging up the hillside at the back of the temple. There occurred a ‘miracle’ during the

---

\(^{17}\) It can be seen from their names that the contributors were not exclusively members of *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi*; members of other *warga* also contributed.
clearing of the land. The committee had previously decided that tons of stones would be needed to strengthen the temple complex. The committee was very pessimistic about this because the stone had to be brought from somewhere else, and this would cost a lot, particularly transporting the materials up from the nearest village to the temple complex. However, all were delighted when they found that the excavations of the hillside produced stones that they had never expected, probably enough to be used for the renovation as planned. This significantly encouraged the committee.

The committee again called upon the governor on 27 June 1990 to ask if he would like to lay the first stone of the renovation project. At that time, the governor said that he had had another important commitment on the same date. Hence, he would assign a representative to attend on his behalf.

The first stone laying ceremony was planned to be performed on 8 July 1990. To finalise the plan, a meeting between the committee and the pangempon was held at the temple on 1 July 1990. The meeting also again discussed the planned layout of the temple, including the movement of the main shrine backward to enlarge the space for the faithful. Since the plan had been discussed several times, everybody agreed on the plan. However, Mangku Sri seemed to be doubtful that the deity (Mpu Gnijaya) would be happy with the moving of His shrine away from the sacred stone. Hence, on the night after the meeting he visited Drs Wayan Mandra, a committee member from Karangasem, to discuss the matter. The day after this discussion, the committee of Karangasem, together with Mangku Sri, went to a medium to ask whether or not the deity agreed with the moving of His shrine. The medium spoke on behalf of the deity and advised that the deity agreed. However, He advised that the temple’s entrance gate should use candi bentar instead of candi kurung as planned; that the existing stone should not be ignored or discarded; and that other pavilions should not be higher that the main shrine.

---

18 Both Candi Bentar and Candi Kurung are entrance gates, usually for holy places or palaces. Candi Bentar is a split-half gate, while Candi Kurung is an enclosed gate where the two sides of the gate meet above the entrance.
As planned, on 8 July 1990, on the day of the full moon of the first month in the Balinese calendar (*purnama kasa*), the Bupati of Karangasem, on behalf of the governor, laid the first cornerstone, simultaneously with the *nasarin* (‘foundation ceremony’) led by several *sri mpu*. The first stone laying was witnessed by DPRD Bali, the chairman of the central *Parisada*, the head of Bali Department of Religion, the head of the *adat* council (the MPLA), and other invited guests. After the first stone was laid, the *bupati* gave a *dharma wacana* (religious lecture), the main point of which was that everybody should support and celebrate the renovation of the temple, and that what had been pioneered by the MGPSSR should be followed by other warga.

Meanwhile, people from other warga, particularly from Warga Karangbuncing and Warga Brahmana, felt offended. They approached the leaders of Desa Adat Gamongan and other *pangempon* of the temple. Warga Karangbuncing, under the leadership of a successful businessman, I Wayan Tangkid Suarsana, claimed that Pura Lempuyang Madya was not merely a Pasek temple. It was also the *kawitan* of Warga Karangbuncing. Hence, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was not entitled to decide on what to do with the temple without consultation. This claim was grounded on *Babad Karangbuncing*, which mentions that Pura Lempuyang Madya was the place of the hermitage of Arya Pasung Girigis, the ancestor of Warga Karangbuncing. This story is also mentioned in *Babad Pasek*, which states that “... Arya Pasung Girigis lived in Lempuyang, having students at the foot of Lempuyang mountain” ("... *sira Arya Pasung Girigis, amukti ring Lempuyang, anyisyanin, sukuning Gunung Lempuyang*") (PDKB 734: 181a).

Another group, Warga Brahmana Siwa in Karangasem, claimed that the temple was a ‘public temple’ because everybody on the way to Pura Lempuyang Luhur (the temple at the peak of the mountain), generally prayed in Pura Lempuyang Madya first. The temple contains shrines dedicated to Hyang Gnijaya (the deity in Lempuyang Luhur), Mpu Semeru, Mpu Gana, and Mpu Kuturan, not just to Mpu Gnijaya. Mpu Semeru is the ancestor of Warga Pasek Kayuselem, and Mpu Kuturan is ancestor of Warga Brahmana through the maternal line. In addition, at that time Mpu Gnijaya was not yet a Pasek, but
still a Brahmana, and hence is entitled to receive homage from all Balinese.\(^\text{19}\)

Hence, Pura Lempuyang Madya is not merely the \textit{kawitan} of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Accordingly, in the view of a prominent figure in Warga Brahmana Siwa in Karangasem, Ida Bagus Pidada Adnyana, who was also the chairman of the Karangasem \textit{Parisada}, the use of \textit{sri mpu} in such a big temple was improper, not because a \textit{sri mpu} is not a \textit{sulinggih} but mainly because a \textit{sri mpu} has not yet been accepted by all. \textit{Sri mpu} as a \textit{sulinggih} of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi could only be used within the \textit{warga}. In a public temple, the \textit{sulinggih} must be from Warga Brahmana Siwa or Brahmana Boda since most Balinese would not question the authority of the \textit{pedanda}. He was worried that, in people’s perceptions, the use of a \textit{sri mpu} might even ‘pollute,’ instead of ‘cleanse,’ the sacred place.

The \textit{pangempon} of the temple, who were mostly simple farmers, were confused and divided in opinion. Some supported the voice of Warga Brahmana Siwa, some believed in Warga Karangbuncing, and some others remained committed to Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. This resulted in uncertainty and interrupted the renovation activities.

Amidst this confusion, Mangku Sri, on behalf of the \textit{pangempon}, sent a letter, dated 7 August 1990, to the Bupati of Karangasem. The main concerns of the letter were that (1) the \textit{pangempon} in Desa Adat Gamongan objected to ‘the construction of a new temple’ in Pura Lempuyang Madya; (2) Pura Lempuyang Madya had been cared for by Desa Adat Gamongan as a public temple for generations; and (3) the renovation project, accordingly, should be stopped. The letter was also signed by Kelihan Adat Gamongan and Kepala Dusun Gamongan, and was approved by Kepala Desa Tiyingtali.

In response to this letter, the \textit{bupati} summoned the leaders of Desa Adat Gamongan, as representatives of the \textit{pangempon} of the temple. They insisted that they did not agree with the renovation, in particular the moving of the main shrine. As the letter stated, Mangku Sri even perceived the moving of the shrine

---

\(^{19}\) Unfortunately, my informant from Warga Brahmana Siwa (Ida Pedanda Istri Nyoman and Ida Pedanda Pidada) could not explain how Mpu Gnijaya later became a Pasek.
as a construction of a ‘new temple’ within the existing temple complex. Also in response to this letter, the MGPSSR Pusat held a meeting on 20 August 1990, at which it was decided that the renovation activities should be continued, at least until the main shrine was finished. The Bureau of Mental and Spiritual Affairs in the governor’s office, who received a carbon copy of this letter, also held a meeting on 25 September 1990. The meeting was attended by representatives of the Bupati of Karangasem, Kepala Desa Tiyingtali, and the committee of the MGPSSR. The meeting decided that the renovation of the temple had to be continued.

Despite this agreement, the situation became worse to the point that some members of Desa Adat Gamongan, led by Mangku Sri, physically prevented the activities. The Bupati of Karangasem held a special meeting to resolve this problem. The meeting was attended by leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (the MGPSSR) Karangasem, Warga Karangbuncing, Warga Brahmana Siwa, the Parisada, the pangempon of the temple, and the royal family of Karangasem, represented by Anak Agung Gde Karang (who was himself once the Bupati of Karangasem). The meeting considered that the continuation of the project by the MGPSSR would be dangerous in terms of its sociological impact, and that it would lead to a traumatic split among the pangempon, among warga, and among Hindus in general. Hence, it was decided that the activity had to be cancelled, and that the project should be taken over by the government, in this case the Kabupaten of Karangasem local government, who would seek funding from the provincial government. All the funds that had been raised by the MGPSSR accordingly had to be turned over to the kabupaten government. Based on this, the bupati decided to take over the project. To do so, a new committee was established by the bupati (decision No. 539/1990, dated 31 October 1990). On the formal issue of this decision, the MGPSSR committee stopped its activities.

The problem was not resolved immediately, since there were rumours that the sri mpu had polluted the sacred temple and, accordingly, a ‘cleansing ceremony’ (prayascita bumi) would be performed to return the purity (sacredness) of the temple. This deeply irritated the MGPSSR since it represented a dreadful humiliation. To counter the rumour, the MGPSSR wrote
a letter to the Parisada, the Office of Religion, and all bupati in Bali, which pointed out that all sulinggih (sri mpu) of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi officiating at Pura Lempuyang Madya had secured a certificate of acknowledgment (piagem) from the Parisada, and that the process of their dwijati had gone through a procedure set by the Parisada. Hence, if these sulinggih were considered to have polluted a temple, the MGPSSR would protest to the Parisada. Moreover, if it was considered improper for these sulinggih to officiate at a major temple, the MGPSSR would also question the Parisada about its own decision, ie Decision No. V/KEP.PHDP/1968, which stated that all sulinggih are equal in status.

The Bupati of Karangasem tried to accommodate the divided positions on this matter by inviting all parties to a meeting on 29 January 1991. This meeting was held in Karangasem, chaired by the bupati himself and attended by the Parisada, the Office of Religion of Karangasem, AA Gde Karang (elder of the Karangasem palace), Mangku Sri (representative from Desa Adat Gamongan, one of the eight pangempon), and three pedanda. The MGPSSR was represented by Ketut Rika, Jero Mangku Gede Soebandi, Wayan Kosaartha, Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran, and Ida Sri Mpu Adi Wirarunting. The bupati could not handle the sharply opposing views; hence, after a hot debate, he decided that the matter would be brought to the governor. Nonetheless, the meeting accepted the strong arguments from the MGPSSR based on the Parisada’s decisions and concluded that the use of sri mpu in the temple could not be claimed as improper and would not be questioned. This meant that the government would take the position that sri mpu had cleansed, rather than polluted, the sacred place. The cleansing ceremony that had been performed by sri mpu would hence not be replaced by a new cleansing ceremony performed by a pedanda.

There was still a crucial problem concerning the divided stance with regard to the plan to move of the main shrine. On 25 February 1991 the MGPSSR Pusat held a special meeting, which was attended by all MGPSSR Kabupaten, Maha Yowana Sapta Putra, and eight leaders of the pangempon. The meeting concluded that out of the eight-village pangempon, only one village, ie. Desa
Adat Gamongan, led by Mangku Sri, disagreed with the MGPSSR on the moving of the shrine.

Another meeting was held by the MGPSSR on 20 March 1991. This was also attended by the MGPSSR Kabupaten, Maha Yowana Sapta Putra, and the pangempon of Pura Lempuyang Madya, except for Gamongan. The meeting decided to take a tough position, which was as follows:

1. The MGPSSR was firm that the new shrine had to be constructed on the place where the first stone had been laid by the bupati, on behalf of the governor, and witnessed by officers from various institutions related to adat and the Hinduism. If the new committee constructed the shrine in another place, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi would continue to construct the shrine at the location of the first stone, and hence, there would be the possibility of having two shrines for the same purpose.

2. If other parties, including the government, wanted to join or to revise the renovation plan or claim that Pura Lempuyang Madya was a public temple (panyungsungan jagat), it did not matter to the MGPSSR.

3. The existing stone (where the previous shrine for Mpu Gnijaya was located) would be considered sacred forever, and would not be removed.

On 5 April 1991, the chairman of the MGPSSR Pusat, Prof Ketut Rika, was summoned by the governor to discuss the matter. At this meeting, Ketut Rika insisted that the shrine had to be constructed on the place of the first corner stone. He presented to the governor the position of the MGPSSR as decided at its meeting. However, after a long discussion, Ketut Rika promised to raise this matter at a general meeting of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. After consulting again with prominent figures in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the previous stand was reinforced. Hence, this position was set out in a letter to the governor dated 10 April 1991. This emphasised the point that if the new shrine was not constructed

---

20 It is worth noting that the personal relationship between Prof Ketut Rika and the governor (Prof Ida Bagus Oka) was quite warm. Both were professors at Udayana University, Denpasar. In the period from 1978 to 1985, Prof Ida Bagus Oka was the Rector of the Udayana University, while Prof Ketut Rika was, at the same time, the Dean of the Faculty of Animal Husbandry.
on the place of the first corner stone, Warga Pasek would insist on constructing another shrine. There would hence be two shrines.

It seemed that the governor and the bupati were concerned by this ultimatum. To resolve the matter, leaders of the MGPSSR were invited to a meeting on 7 May 1991. The meeting, chaired by the governor and attended by the governor’s assistant for social-religious affairs, the head of the Regional Office of Religion, and the Parisada of Bali, forced the MGPSSR to soften its position for the sake of Balinese Hindu unity. Representatives of the MGPSSR at that meeting could not give a direct answer, instead they promised to ask their ancestors again, through spiritual means.

Following this meeting, leaders of the MGPSSR, together with some sri mpu, went to Pura Lempuyang Madya and meditated there all night. All of them received the same message at their meditation that the MGPSSR should not be disheartened if the new shrine was constructed at the place of the sacred stone and not that of the first stone. This, according to them, “had been the will of the ancestor.”

However, the MGPSSR felt that it had failed in its effort to renovate their pura kawitan. This failure shocked and severely irritated the MGPSSR. A special general meeting, to which all the MGPSSR kabupaten were invited, was held in Denpasar on 15 May 1991 to evaluate the failure and to decide on a unified position. At the outset, there were several perceptions regarding the failed project. Some leaders emotionally perceived that this failure was mainly caused by external problems. They considered that:

Warga Brahmana Siwa is jealous of the increasing strength of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and they do not want Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to become stronger and stronger, because this would mean the loss of their privileged position in society. No priest from any other warga had challenged the established position of the pedanda of Warga Brahmana, except the sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (Mudastra 1991).

On the other hand, another leader advised that:

We, members of Warga Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi, should reflect and realise that we are very weak: outsiders can easily destroy us. There is no militancy at all
among us.... We have surrendered before being defeated, we are not brave enough even to have our finger stretched, let alone to struggle to die. And we, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi members, tend to see others in a superior position. If we were strong enough, outsiders would not dare to enter our very internal project (Putu Senter 1991).

The moderate leaders, however, believed that they had done their best, and if the result was not as planned, it must be the will of Betara Kawitan. They referred to a verse of the Bhagavadgitha which teaches that the duty of the faithful is to do their best. They are not entitled to define the results, which must be left to the God to define. In relation to this ancestral will, two opposing interpretations were held by the MGPSSR leaders. On the one hand, it was said that the takeover of the project by the government meant that Betara Kawitan was unwilling (tan kayun) or disagreed (tan suweca) that His temple be renovated by the MGPSSR. This must be a signal for the MGPSSR to reflect and try to understand where the problem was. The contrasting interpretation was that Betara Kawitan was an all-warga deity, or encompassed all warga, and accordingly He was entitled to continue to receive homage from all warga in Bali, not solely Pasek. The takeover of the project, and the announcement by the government that the temple was a ‘public temple’ (kahyangan jagat) proved this. So, this must be joyfully celebrated.

Finally, the MGPSSR reached the unified view that firstly, they did not regret taking the initiative to renovate the temple. The initiative was even considered successful because the maintenance of the temple had been neglected for a long time, and it was the MGPSSR who had stimulated the government to take action on the temple. Furthermore, there was nothing wrong if the government ‘helped’ any warga in the renovation of a temple. Secondly, the claim of other warga that the temple was a public temple must be highly valued since it automatically meant that Pasek’s ancestor, Mpu Gniyaya, would continue to receive homage from non-Pasek warga. This is good, since they then implicitly acknowledge that Mpu Gniyaya was really a great holy man, and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi should be proud of being descendants of an acknowledged great priest. Thirdly, even though the Pura Lempuyang Madya was declared a public temple, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi must continue to see the temple as it always had been, ie. as their very own pura kawitan.
We must keep it firmly in our hearts that the temple is our *pura kawitan*. Pura Lempuyang Madya is explicitly mentioned in our *babad* as our *pura kawitan*. If other *warga* see the temple as a public temple, that is all right, and we must be proud that our *pura kawitan* is also respected by others. Let us see the failure of our project as the victory of our ancestor and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in general (Ketut Rika 1991).

As agreed at the general meeting, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi continue to consider Pura Lempuyang Madya as their *pura kawitan*, without any doubt. At grass roots level, I observed that people from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi firmly believed that Pura Lempuyang Madya was without doubt their very own *pura kawitan*. This is apparent from the fact that at the festival of Pura Lempuyang Madya in 1994, the temple was flooded with thousands of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from villages throughout Bali, who had come to perform prayer in their *pura kawitan*. In major ceremonies (such as *ngaben* and *dwijati*) they sought holy water at this temple.

As for the MGPSSR, in 1994, after the *mahasabha* in Denpasar, the newly reshuffled leadership of the MGPSSR *Pusat* went to Pura Lempuyang Madya to conduct a ceremony called *majaya-jaya* (oath-taking for being leaders). Ida Sri Mpu Kertha Wisesa officiated at this ceremony, helped by Mangku Sri. It is interesting to note that Mangku Sri, who was among the driving forces in rejecting the renovation of the temple by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, should again welcome Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to perform ritual ceremonies in the temple, using sri mpu. This is closely associated with the fact that at present only members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and some members of Warga Karang Buncing visit this temple. Other *warga* who visit Pura Lempuyang Luhur prefer to use the other climbing track, which has been made into concrete stairs by the government. This climbing track does not pass Desa Adat Gamongan and Pura Lempuyang Madya, but goes through other villages.
SUMMARY

In this chapter I have described the temple system of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, particularly the Catur Parhyangan, and the social problems faced by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in these temples.

Lansing (1983) argues that a temple for Balinese Hindus is not merely a place for performing prayer. More than this, the temple system can be seen as the backbone of Bali’s intricate social networks. As such, a temple can offer a battlefield for status and influence. It is an arena for status contestation. This can be seen in the case of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. The temple system of this warga is clearly a battlefield where members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, through the MGPSSR, tried to organise their efforts. Warga temples, especially the Catur Parhyangan and dadya agung, are the backbone or the building blocks of the warga’s organisation, since all meaningful actions refer to these temples. The success of the MGPSSR can be clearly defined by its success in controlling these temples. Nonetheless, previous experience has shown that the MGPSSR cannot fully exercise control over the temples which it claims as the temple system of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. The power of interpreting the texts does not rest solely in the hands of the MGPSSR. External factors are of great significance in defining the way these temples are treated. Of the four main temples (the Catur Parhyangan), only one, ie. the Padharman Ratu Pasek in Besakih, is fully under the control of the MGPSSR. In the other three temples, the strength of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is clearly constrained by other forces. Pura Lempuyang Madya, believed to be the ultimate kawitan of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, was declared a public temple and the use of sulinggih (sri mpu) from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was questioned, whereas decades before (in the 1970s) such sri mpu were welcomed by the pangempon. In the early 1990s, the intention to renovate the kawitan temple to strengthen warga influence resulted in a division among warga members, rather than unity. A similar case also occurred in Pura Dasar Bhuana, where the performing of the Wraspati Kalpa ceremony resulted in a conflict within the warga and a prohibition of the sri mpu.
from being used in this temple. These were serious setbacks for the MGPSSR. The case was not much different at dadya agung level, as is evident in the case of the renovation and purification ceremony in Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Banjar Pegatepan.

Closely associated with these problems is the problem of the psychological gap between the leaders and the mass members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, ie. members of Pasek dadya throughout Bali. The officials of the MGPSSR tend to be elected from those members who are well educated, politically powerful, or materially well-to-do. These kinds of people are not necessarily concerned with dadya, nor are they influential in their own dadya. This results in some pangempon rejecting the notion that Pura Dasar Bhuana, Pura Lempuyang Madya, and Pura Silayukti are solely Pasek temples. This leads to the next problem, which is that some members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves refuse to accept the use of the sri mpu. If officials of the MGPSSR were people influential in their own dadya or dadya agung, such problems would be minimised.

Despite these problems, leaders of the MGPSSR are determined that the struggle of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi must not cease. The efforts of the MGPSSR have not been totally fruitless. Most members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi still consider Pura Lempuyang Madya as their kawitan, even though this temple has been declared a public temple. The number of members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi using sri mpu is also increasing, associated with the increasing number of sri mpu and the awareness of members that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as a distinct warga.

The MGPSSR still insists that sri mpu must be acknowledged as equal in status to their pedanda counterparts, not only on paper, but also in real life. This struggle is the main theme of the next chapters.
Chapter Seven

IN SEARCH OF DIFFERENCE (4):
THE MAKING OF SRI MPU AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

Kunang Ki Pasek mwang Bendesa,
pada wenang kita ngabhujanggain,
apan kita mula wit Brahmana jai... (Bisama: 40)
You Pasek and Bendesa,
you are entitled to be high priests,
because your ‘seed’ was a real Brahmana.

Most of the literature pertaining to Bali states that high priesthood is solely
the monopoly of Warga Brahmana (Hooykaas 1966 and 1976; Geertz 1980a;
Howe 1989; and Bakker 1993). It has become public understanding that only
those of Warga Brahmana can be high priests. The truth is that high priesthood
(kasulinggihan) in present day Bali is open to everyone, regardless of warga, as
decided by the Parisada in 1968. Members of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa
never use a pedanda (priest from Warga Brahmana); they use their own high
priest, the rsi bhujangga. To a lesser degree this holds true for members of
Warga Pande, particularly those from the regencies of Buleleng, Tabanan,
Gianyar, and Jembrana. The majority of Warga Pande members in these regions
use sri mpu. A large number of them reject holy water from a pedanda.
Stemming from the legend about a Pande and a pedanda, they maintain that they
are not permitted to be sprinkled by a pedanda’s holy water (“tan wenang
kasiratin tirtan pedanda”). A great number of Warga Pasek Kayuselem in
Singaraja also maintain the same position. There is also a growing number of
Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi members who use the service of their own high priests,
the sri mpu.

From an historical perspective, members of Warga Pande and Warga
Bhujangga Waisnawa have been using their respective high priests from time
immemorial. One may argue that they have never used the service of a pedanda, whereas the use of sri mpu among members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is a new development. It can only be traced back to 1956, when a couple from this warga underwent a consecration ceremony for priesthood and became titled as dukuh.

The existence of several non-pedanda high priests (pandita or sulinggih) in present day Bali is indeed an interesting phenomenon in the context of the emergence of warga organisations. Priesthood, to a considerable extent, has now become the ‘battle field’ in the struggle for status, and this holds true in relation to Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as well. Accordingly, understanding the priesthood and its related issues within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is crucial to understanding the struggle for equality. This chapter will describe the present development of high priests within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, focusing on their consecrations (dwijati) and on the sociological implications of their existence. Different practices found in these consecrations compared to those in a consecration of a pedanda are also discussed in association with the effort of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to mark its identity.

PRIESTHOOD (KASULINGGIHAN) IN CONTEMPORARY BALI

To put into context the struggle of the MGPSSR for its own priesthood, let me first describe the general situation of priesthood in Bali, ie. the distinction between ‘priest’ (pinandita) and ‘high priest’ (sulinggih, pandita, or dwijati priest); priesthood and warga of origin; and the classification of high priests based on their main function in society.

Pinandita and Pandita (Sulinggih)

Hindu high priests in Bali are known by several names, such as sulinggih, wiku, pandita, and sang dwijati. They play significant roles in Balinese Hindu

---

1 The word wiku comes from bhikku, ‘Buddhist holy men.’ Sulinggih is a Balinese word, originating from su ('good,' 'clean,' 'pure') and linggih ('seat,' 'position'), implying that a high priest has a very special, respected, position in society. Pandita is believed to originate from pandai (pande) or pandit ('clever,' 'knowledgeable'), to denote that a priest is a person of
society, since Balinese Hindu religion is a ‘priestly religion’ (‘agama pendeta’). Religious matters and knowledge about religion (tattwa) are mainly in the hands of the priests. Although this situation is currently changing, the notion is still valid for the majority of society.

There are degrees of priesthood in Bali. At least two major categories are known. The first is the so-called pinandita, ie. those who have undergone the pawintenan-ekajati ceremony, a special consecration ceremony. These pinandita, however, have not passed the step of spiritual death (amati raga) and are hence not twice-born. Those included as pinandita are pemangku (temple priest), jero kubayan, jero-gede, mangku dalang (puppet-shadow players), jero balian (traditional doctors), or prasutri (temple attendants). Outside Bali there are also wasi, pangemban, and dharma acarya.

The second category of priest is known as pandita or sulinggih, ie. those priests who have been consecrated with a complete set of twice-born rituals (padiksan or dwijati), chief among which include the spiritual death (amati raga), rebirth, and the changing of the name (amari aran or abhiseka). After the second birth, the sulinggih must also change their occupation (amari wesa). They are no longer allowed to carry out worldly activities, eg. economic ones. They must also change their behaviour, ethics, and way of life (amari sesana). In contrast, there is no restriction on a pinandita working as usual in economic activities, although there are some prohibitions on eating certain foods or doing ‘unclean’ work.

whom people can ask anything in relation to religious matters, such as the auspicious day (dewasa ayu, ‘good day’ to perform a certain ritual), tattwa (theology), ways of chasing bad spirits away, and purification. Sang dwijati clearly means that such persons have undergone their dwijati (twice-born) ceremony.

2 It must be kept in mind that in old villages (desa Bali kuna), the kubayan is the highest official in religious matters; the kubayan officiate at all (major) ceremonies in these villages. In this type of village, outside sulinggih are never used. The consecration of a kubayan also includes amati raga, as practiced in the villages of Sukawana, Kintamani. For more detail, see further Thomas Reuter (1996).

3 Jero-gede is also a title for the highest priest in certain temples in desa Bali kuna. For example, Jero-gede Batur (Jero-gede Duwuran and Jero-gede Alitan) are the chief priests of Ulun Danu Batur temple. There is a special ceremony to raise the status from a jero-mangku to a jero-gede. For a consecration of a jero-gede (for the Ulun Danu Batur temple), see Lansing (1991).
The *Parisada* has set limits on the authority of a *pinandita* to officiate at ritual ceremonies. At their own temple, a *pinandita* is permitted to officiate at routine or annual festivals. If the ritual ceremony is higher than these a *sulinggih* must be invited to officiate. At most the *pinandita* can merely use the holy water obtained from a *sulinggih*. In a sacrifice for lower-level beings (*butha yadnya*), a *pinandita* is only allowed to officiate at small rituals up to the sacrifice of five chickens (*panca sata*). For a higher sacrifice, such as the sacrifice of five animals (*panca sanak*), ie. goose, dog, pig, cattle and goat), a *sulinggih* must be invited. In ritual ceremonies for human beings or *rites de passage* (*manusa yadnya*), a *pinandita* is only allowed to officiate from birth to birthday ceremonies (*otonan*), while a *sulinggih* must be invited to officiate at more important ceremonies such as tooth filing and marriage. In the post-mortems ceremonies (*pitra yadnya*) a *pinandita* is permitted up to officiate at the burial ceremony, while above this level all rituals must be led by a *sulinggih* (*Parisada* 1985). This limitation does not operate effectively in reality. In a number of villages and for a number of *warga*, their own holy men (*pemangku, kubayan, or balian*), formally categorised as *pinandita* by the *Parisada*, officiate at all ceremonies.

**Sulinggih and Warga of Origin**

*Sulinggih* do not just come from Warga Brahmana, but can come from several other *warga*, although they are known by different names or titles. Those of Warga Pande and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are called *sri mpu*; those of Warga Brahmana Siwa and Brahmana Boda are called *pedanda*; and so forth (see Table 7.1). It must be noted, however, that it is the prerogative of the *nabe* (the *sulinggih*’s supervisor) to give a name to a new *sulinggih*, including his title, and this is negotiable in practice. This negotiability is clear from the case of the *dwijati* of Ida Dalem Pemayun of Klungkung. Before undergoing his *dwijati* ceremony he was uncertain regarding the name (title) to be used: whether he should use *ida i dewa agung, ida dalem, or begawan*. After consulting the *Parisada* on this matter, he was advised to use the title of his kingly ancestors, ie. *ida dalem*, with a name after the title. This title was then proposed to his
nabe, Ida Pedanda Wayan Datah of Budakeling (Karangasem). This is where the name Ida Dalem Pemayun came from. A similar case also occurred in the naming of a *dukuh* in Karangasem. I Nyoman Sarga, the son of the late Dukuh Upadana of Abianjero, underwent the *dwijati* ceremony in 1978. His nabe, the late Ida Pedanda Wayan Jelantik Dharma, wanted to give the title *dukuh* to I Wayan Sarga, the same as that of his predecessor. In Wayan Sarga's view, the term *dukuh* was considered lower by society than any other *sulinggih* title. Since he is a member of Warga Arya Gajahpara, a descendant of a Majapahit Arya, he preferred to use the title *rsi*. However, the use of the title *rsi* would be socially inappropriate or would seem strange to his *sisya* (followers). As a compromise, he uses both titles, Dukuh Rsi Medana.

Table 7.1 Titles of high priests in Bali, based on their *warga* of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warga of Origin</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warga Brahmana Siwa</td>
<td>Pedanda [Siwa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Brahmana Boda</td>
<td>Pedanda [Boda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Pasek Sapa Rsi</td>
<td>Sri Mpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Pande</td>
<td>Sri Mpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa</td>
<td>Rsi Bhujangga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Pinatih</td>
<td>Rsi (Reshi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Ksatria Dalem</td>
<td>Dalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warga Arya Gajahpara</td>
<td>Dukuh*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*): It seems that *dukuh* was not the title of a priest from a specific *warga*, but it was assigned to priests who stayed in a remote place, in a ‘*padukuhan*’ (ashram, hermitage), and were hence known as ‘*nukuhin*,’ the head of a *padukuhan* (cf. Hooykaas 1974; 1976). Several famous *dukuh* are widely known in Balinese legends or *babad*, such as Dukuh Blatung, Dukuh Sorga, Dukuh Siladri, Dukuh Titigantung, Dukuh Ragasunya, and Dukuh Sunyaadnyana. All of these *dukuh* resided in some remote *ashram*, mostly in the middle of a forest. Some ancestors of Warga Pasek Sapa Rsi were also known as *dukuh*. 
The various names of the *sulinggih* create difficulty in discussion or in collectively addressing *sulinggih* from various *warga* at one time, such as during a *sulinggih* meeting. For this reason, there has been a recommendation to introduce a single name, ie. *pandita*, for all high priests regardless of their *warga*; but this has not been successful.\(^4\) However, the term *sulinggih* is now becoming increasingly popular, although specific names or titles for *sulinggih* from certain *warga* are still maintained.

Data from the Department of Religion of Bali Province show that in 1994 there were 644 *sulinggih* in Bali’s eight *kabupaten* (Table 7.2), most of whom were *pedanda siwa*. Among these *sulinggih*, 2 were *rsi* from Warga Arya; 11 were *rsi bhujangga* from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa; 7 were *sri mpu* from Warga Pande; 30 were *sri mpu* from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi; 1 was *dalem* from Warga Ksatria Dalem; and 4 were *dukuh* from Warga Arya Gajahpara.\(^5\)

Table 7.2 The number of *pandita* (*sulinggih*) and *pinandita* in Bali in 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kabupaten</th>
<th>Number of Sulinggih</th>
<th>Number of Pinandita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buleleng</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jembrana</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tabanan</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Badung/Denpasar</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gianyar</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bangli</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Klungkung</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Karangasem</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>15,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) This recommendation was again put forward, and accepted, in the *mahasabha* of the *Parisada* in Solo (in September 1996). Nonetheless, application of this decision in practice is yet to be seen.

\(^5\) Since several consecration ceremonies had been performed in the period 1994-1996, currently (1996) there are 10 *sri mpu* in Warga Pande; 32 *sri mpu* in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi; and 9 *rsi bhujangga* of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa.
Sulinggih and Their Functions

Ideally, a sulinggih functions as a patirtaning sarat (‘a source for people to seek the water of life, cleansing water, and [spiritual] well being’). People expect a sulinggih to be knowledgeable on all matters relating to religious, spiritual, and adat affairs. Naturally, few sulinggih can fulfil this expectation, and a sulinggih generally adopts a particular specialty. Based on their main function in society, Purwita (1993) and Wiana (1993) classify sulinggih into three categories. The first category of sulinggih is known as lokapalasraya sulinggih, ie. sulinggih whose main function is merely lokapalasraya, ie. officiating at ceremonies and preparing holy water for their sisya. Most sulinggih in Bali currently fall into this category. It is noteworthy that in people’s perception, the frequency of officiating at ceremonies is an indicator of the sulinggih’s prestige or success: the busier the sulinggih’s schedule in officiating at ceremonies, the more prestigious the sulinggih.

The second category of sulinggih is acarya sulinggih, ie. sulinggih who do not just officiate at ritual ceremonies or prepare holy water for their sisya (performing lokapalasraya), but also perform dharma wacana (guiding people in religious and spiritual matters) in order to enhance their understanding of religious knowledge (tattwa). Due to the lack of formal education among the presently available sulinggih, few fall into this category. Ida Pedanda Ketut Sebali Arimbawa, Ida Sri Pandita Buddha Raksitha, Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga, Ida Pedanda Raka Kelaci, and Ida Sri Mpu Reka Anandha may be included in this category. The heavy demand on their services gives little time for sulinggih to perform functions other than lokapalasraya. On an auspicious day (dewasa ayu) for performing ritual ceremonies, it is not uncommon that a sulinggih has to visit more than five places to officiate (muput karya).

---

6 In common understanding, lokapalasraya merely means officiating at a ritual ceremony (muput karya). As a matter of fact, the term lokapalasraya means ‘a place where the society can seek protection, guidance, and the like’ (Titib 1993: 36).
Plates 7.1 to 7.6 High priests (*sulinggih*) from various *warga* in Bali.

7.1 Ida Dukuh Rsi Medana (Warga Arya Gajah Para)
7.2 Ida Pedanda Ketut Sebali Arimbawa (Warga Brahmana Siwa)
7.3 Ida Sri Pandita Budha Raksita (Warga Pande)
7.4 Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga (Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi)
7.5 Ida Pedanda Wayan Datah (Warga Brahmana Boda)
7.6 Ida Dalem Pemayun (Warga Ksatria Dalem)
The third category of sulinggih is ngaraga sulinggih. This type of sulinggih underwent the dwijati ceremony to increase individual holiness,\(^7\) without any intention of serving in ritual ceremonies. Ida Dalem Pemayun of Klungkung might be classified in this category, as well as the late Ida Sri Reshi Anandakusuma, also from Klungkung.

**SRI MPU AS A SYMBOL OF EXISTENCE**

One of the significant efforts of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, through the MGPSSR, has been to consecrate its own sulinggih, called sri mpu, and to have them recognised by the Parisada. The first sri mpu conducted their dwijati in 1956 (the late Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma), with two more in 1962 (Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Dwi Sari and the late Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Gede Reka). However, these sri mpu conducted their dwijati ceremony before the MGPSSR was active. The nabe (religious teacher, guru) of these sri mpu was a priest from Warga Brahmana Siwa, the late Ida Pedanda Gede Kutri (Gianyar).\(^8\) These sulinggih were merely known as jero-gede, and were 'upgraded' to sri mpu in 1969 at the first mahasabha of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

After the MGPSSR became active, it realised that the best way to restructure the Balinese people’s perception of hierarchy was through kasulinggihan (priesthood). Religious authority had previously been held by kings and Brahmana families. After independence and subsequent changes in the political structure of government, religious affairs were no longer in the hands of the kings, but transferred to the Office of Religion (kantor agama) and

---

\(^7\) In Indian Hindu teaching, conducting diksa (dwijati) is compulsory for everyone of the three upper varna, but not allowed for Sudra and Chandala. In Bali, the dwijati is considered compulsory for all, and it is considered as one form of dharma (duty) as stated in the Vrhaspati Tattva (25). If one has not conducted this ceremony during one’s lifetime, a similar ceremony is carried out during the ngaben (cremation), called ngaskara (Titib 1993; cf. Kaler 1993).

\(^8\) It is interesting to ask what the motivation of this pedanda was in consecrating students (putra) from Jaba, which was (and is) very unusual. I do not have enough data to answer this question. I only learned from his son, Ida Pedanda Gede Padangratha, that these people were all close friends; they were together in a group of guerrilla soldiers during the Indonesian revolutionary war.
the *Parisada*, while ritual authority was still held by *pedanda* or Brahmana families. In this Balinese context, ‘religion’ consisted of ritual ceremonies, the ones at which the *pedanda* officiated.

To further the struggle for equality among Balinese Hindus, and to have the standing of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi acknowledged, the MGPSSR recognised the importance of attaining the power of the priesthood. To achieve this end, the MGPSSR used the *Parisada* and *Pancasila* ideology that everyone is equal. The late I Nyoman Suwetja Atmanadi, a prominent figure in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, who was also a *Parisada* man, proposed that the *Parisada* should represent ‘the real structure of Balinese society,’ meaning that leadership of the *Parisada* should come from people representing *warga*. However, this tactic failed to win agreement in the *Parisada*. Nonetheless, quite a number of Jaba people, notably Pasek, secured positions in the *Parisada* and started working from within. This effort, together with the support of others, led to the issuance of decree No. V/Kep/PHDP/1968 at the general meeting (*mahasabha*) of the *Parisada* in 1968. This decision states that anyone is entitled to conduct the *dwijati* ceremony or become a *sulinggih*, and that all *sulinggih* are equal in rights and duties. This general rule was elaborated in the 14th seminar of the ‘Unified Interpretation of Aspects of Hinduism’ (*Kesatuan Tafsir terhadap Aspek-Aspek Agama Hindu*) held on 11-12 March 1987.

With regard to the requirements of a *dwijati* (*padiksan*) ceremony, it is stated that any Hindu from any *warga* is entitled to undergo *dwijati*. The *dwijati* can be performed by (a) a married man; (b) an unmarried man (*brahmacarin*); (c) a married woman; (d) an unmarried woman (*kanya*); and (e) husband and wife as a couple.\(^9\) The candidate (those who want to undergo a *dwijati*), known as *calon diksita* or *calon diniksan*, must already be mature (over 40 years of age), be both mentally and physically healthy, and not be an invalid (*cedangga*). They must be knowledgeable in *Kawi* (Old Javanese), Sanskrit, and the Indonesian language, and in religion from its philosophical, ethical, and

---

\(^9\) Despite these possibilities, most high priests in the present day are couples. I know only four unmarried women priests (*pedanda kanya*), and no unmarried men. Neither do I know any husband or wife who has performed his/her *dwijati* alone without his/her partner.
ritualistic aspects. They must also have a record of good conduct, and never have been convicted of a crime. Since a high priest is expected to concentrate only on religious affairs, the diksita are expected to be free from any worldly occupation, either in government offices or in private companies, except in the field of religion.

A diksita must secure a commitment from his/her to-be-nabe. By regulation, a senior high priest can be selected as nabe if he is physically and spiritually healthy, wise, always consults Veda and other Scriptures, is knowledgeable in the four Veda (Catur Weda), capable of reading holy books (sruti and smerti), consistent in performing dharma sadana (prayer and good conduct), and consistent in taka and brata (asceticism in food, drink, and other worldly pleasures).

If these requirements have been fulfilled, the candidate must apply to the Parisada Kabupaten at least three months before the planned date of the dwijati. The application must be accompanied by (a) a letter from a recognised doctor certifying good health; (b) a letter of good conduct from the police; (c) a curriculum vitae; and (d) additional certificates of knowledge (short-course certificate, pawintenan certificate, and the like), if any. A carbon copy of this application must also be sent to the kabupaten government for their information. Upon receiving the application, the Parisada kabupaten conducts a test. If the applicant passes, the Parisada will issue a permit for the dwijati and give full authority for the nabe to conduct the ritual ceremony. Otherwise, the Parisada kabupaten will consult the Parisada at provincial level. A candidate who fails can apply again after three months, up to a maximum of three times.

A newly consecrated sulinggih can only officiate at a ritual ceremony after he secures a licence (panugrahan) to do so from his nabe. Since the right to officiate at religious ceremonies (lokapalasraya) is given by the nabe, it is the nabe who also has the right to revoke the lokapalasraya right. In addition, since it is the nabe who gives birth to the new sulinggih, it is also the nabe who holds the right to retain or to abolish the priesthood status of a sulinggih, should she/he commit any serious misconduct.
Armed with the decision of the *Parisada*, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, through the MGPSSR, has been active in appointing their own *sulinggih*. The first *dwijati* ceremony sponsored by the MGPSSR took place in 1970, when three *sulinggih* candidates performed their *dwijati* at once.

Right after the first *mahasabha* in 1969, the MGPSSR established a committee to conduct a *dwijati* for those who were ready to be *sri mpu*, and ‘adopt’ *sulinggih* from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi who had already performed their *dwijati*. To do this, the committee tried to seek candidates for *nabe*. A member of the committee, Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Dwijaksara, who at that time was not yet a *sri mpu*, told me of his experience of these efforts:

At first, we, Ida Sri Mpu Kedampal --who was then I Wayan Berata-- and I went to Sidemen, Klungkung to ask a *pedanda* if he would be happy to be a *nabe* of our candidates. We called on at least four *pedanda*, but none of them wished to do so, because for them, only those from Warga Brahmana could be a *sulinggih*. When we said that the *Parisada* had decided that anyone could be a *sulinggih*, they replied sarcastically that if that was the case, then let the *Parisada* perform the *dwijati* and become *nabe*. In short, no *pedanda* wished to be a *nabe* for Warga Pasek because Pasek is considered *Sudra*.

Finally we went to Ida Pedanda Gede Kutri in Gianyar in the hope that he would be willing to be a *nabe*, because we knew that he had been a *nabe* for three *sulinggih* from Warga Pasek and a *sulinggih* from Warga Arya Pinatih. He received us with a warm welcome, but later told us that he would not take any more *putra*. However, he gave us a good way out. He suggested that his *putra* could be promoted to *nabe*. In other words, he himself gave licence for his *putra* to be a *nabe* for candidates from Warga Pasek. He even told us, “if the Warga Pasek is continuously dependent on *pedanda*, what then if there are no longer *pedanda* willing to be *nabe*?,” and hence “it is much more fruitful if I give permission for my *putra* to be *nabe*.” And we were asked to contact any one of his *putra*: Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka, Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma, Ida Sri Mpu Dwisari, or Ida Rsi Agung Pinatih.

We reported this discussion to the *warga*. Following up this result, we agreed to ask Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka to call on his *nabe*, Ida Pedanda Gede Kutri, to discuss the matter, particularly in asking a permission (*panugrahan*) and a holy message (*pawisik*) to be a *nabe*.

There were a number of candidates at the time. But in our evaluation, only two fulfilled our criteria, such as spiritual knowledge, experience in religious duties as a *pemangku* (temple priest), and social standing. We did not, and do not, want to have a *sulinggih* who is of low quality, because the success of the *warga* movement is closely associated with the image of our *sulinggih*. Aside from the two candidates, there was also a *jero-gede* from Warga Pasek who had performed his *dwijati*, under the *nabe* of Ida Pedanda Gede Punggul. For this, we asked permission from Ida Pedanda Gede Punggul if his *putra* could be
adopted by Warga Pasek and his title changed into Sri Mpu. Ida Pedanda Gede Punggul was happy with this, but he said, "be considerate, because it is improper to conduct dwijati more than once. If one conducts it twice, it means that the first one was invalid." We thought this message over, and after consulting Abra Sinuhun ['grand parent'] in Basangbe, we reached the conclusion that the 'real nabe' of the future sri mpu would be still Ida Pedanda Gede Punggul, while the nabe in Warga Pasek, Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka, would be merely a 'foster nabe.'

Based on this understanding, after a set of meetings, we decided to conduct the dwijati ceremony at Pura Gaduh, a Pasek temple in Sesetan (Denpasar). At that time, three new mpu were consecrated: the late Ida Sri Mpu Kamareka, Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas from Kekeran (Denpasar), and Ida Nabe. As I stated earlier, Ida Nabe was not really consecrated (ditapak), but only 'adopted' (kaperas), and hence the dwijati under nabe Ida Pedanda Gede Punggul is still valid.

Since then, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi has continued to promote its sulinggih to become nabe and to conduct dwijati ceremonies for a number of new sulinggih. In 1973 another dwijati ceremony took place in Denpasar for three new sri mpu: the late Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra of Penarukan (Buleleng), Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran of Gemeh (Badung), and Ida Sri Mpu Santika of Kedampal (Badung). Still in 1973, a dwijati ceremony was performed in Kediri (Tabanan) for the late Ida Sri Mpu Upasanta. In 1974 two new sri mpu were appointed in Jembrana (the late Ida Sri Mpu Pastika and the late Ida Sri Mpu Satwika). In 1976 another dwijati was performed in Basangbe (Tabanan) for Ida Sri Mpu Reka Tenaya and Ida Sri Mpu Sedaka Tenaya. In 1979 a dwijati was conducted at a temple of Warga Pasek Tohjiwa in Antosari (Tabanan) for Ida Sri Mpu Sucika Dharma. The dwijati continue, and by 1996 Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi has consecrated 41 sri mpu. Of these, nine have passed away, two live in Lampung (Sumatra) and another lives in North Sulawesi. The names of the sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are shown in Table 7.3 below.

---

10 In referring to those two generations older in the genealogy, a sri mpu generally uses the term abra sinuhun, a very high term for 'grand parent.'

11 By 'Ida Nabe' he meant Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa. Ida Sri Mpu Dwijaksara refuses to directly name Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa because the latter is his direct nabe. It is a strict rule in nabe-putra relationship that a putra must never ever say his nabe's name. There are also some other prohibitions in relation to the ethics (sesana) of a putra to his nabe, as mentioned in the book called Silakrama. For example, a putra should never look directly at his nabe's face, never sit on a place where his nabe had just sat, and never step over the nabe's shadow. See Punyatmadja (1984).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Kamareka</td>
<td>Gria Giri, Sesetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma</td>
<td>Gria Margasunya, Br. Pulugambang, Peguyangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dwisari</td>
<td>Gria Sari, Desa Gerih, Abiansemal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa</td>
<td>Gria Agung, Br. Pengembungan, Bongkasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas</td>
<td>Gria Mas, Br. Dangin Pangkung, Kekeran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran</td>
<td>Gria Penataran, Pasrman Renon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Santika</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Kedampal, Abiansemal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Sedaka Tenaya</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Banjar Abing, Sulangai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Kerta Negara</td>
<td>Gria Sari, Tumbakbayuh, Buduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dwijaksara</td>
<td>Gria Pasunggiri, Pegongan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Manik Wija Adi Wirarunting</td>
<td>Gria Agung Padanglewih, Gaji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Kertha Wisesa</td>
<td>Gria Agung Girimanik, Pegok, Sesetan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Rekaananda</td>
<td>Gria Nataran, Kayumas, Denpasar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Reka Manik Dharmawa</td>
<td>Gria Kepasekan, Dalung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Tenaya</td>
<td>Gria Batursari, Batujimbar, Sanur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Dangka Sutareksa</td>
<td>Gria Giri Kusuma, Br. Gaduh, Sesetan/Laplap, Penatih Dangri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Yoga Maha Birudakska</td>
<td>Gria Asitasari, Br. Lebahpangkung, Mengwi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KABUPATEN BULELENG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra</td>
<td>Gria Panaraga, Penarukan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Parama Manik Dwijakerta</td>
<td>Gria Anyar Dwija Kerthi, Seririt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Yogiswara Darmajaya</td>
<td>Gria Sokasti, Sukasada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Siwanatha Samyoga</td>
<td>Gria Agung Penataran, Banjar Jawa, Buleleng.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KABUPATEN TABANAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>Sri Mpu Gde Reka</td>
<td>Gria Kahuripan, Padangjerah, Basangbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23*</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Upasantha</td>
<td>Gria Pasek, Br. Pande, Kediri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Reka Tenaya</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Kahuripan, Basangbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Sucika Dharma</td>
<td>Gria Penulisan, Antosari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga</td>
<td>Gria Agung Kelaci, Marga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Witha Dharma</td>
<td>Gria Tamansari, Kukuh, Krambitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Darmayoga Manikgeni</td>
<td>Gria Pujungsari, Pujungan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Pangkungprabu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Dharma</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Mandung, Kerambitan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KABUPATEN JEMBRANA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Pastika</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Banjar Puseh, Tuwed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32*</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Satwika</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Pergung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dharma Ekashanti</td>
<td>Gria Pasek Tuwed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KABUPATEN GIANYAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Purwanatha</td>
<td>Gria Pemacekan, Sawan, Siangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Wija Dharma</td>
<td>Gria Kepasekan,Tengkulak, Gianyar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KABUPATEN KLUNGKUNG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Dhyana Dhaksa Dharma</td>
<td>Gria Pasek, Br. Pasekan, Aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Suranata Pramayoga</td>
<td>Gria Giri, Br. Pegending, Sangkanbuana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KABUPATEN BANGILI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ida Sri Mpu Parama Yoga</td>
<td>Gria Silawana, Sala, Susut.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KABUPATEN KARANGASEM

None ***)
OUTSIDE BALI

39  Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Lokantara  Gria Sari, Balinuraga, Kec. Sidomulyo, Lampung
     Gria Kepasekan, Banjar Amerta Winangun, Desa Werdhi Agung, Kec. Dumoga, Kab. Bolaang Mangondow, North Sulawesi

40  Ida Sri Mpu Yoganatha  Gria Kepasekan, Desa Purwasari Paniangan, Kecamatan Jabung, Lampung Tengah.

Note:
*) : These sri mpu have passed away.
**) : I learned that another consecration was performed on 11 May 1996 in Banjar Badeg, Kecamatan Rendang, Kabupaten Karangasem. Unfortunately I do not know the title of the newly consecrated sri mpu and his gria.

THE MAKING OF SRI MPU

Realising that the priesthood is the spearhead of the struggle for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the continuous consecration of sri mpu has been one of the priority programs in the MGPSSR. The present limited number of sri mpu is considered a weakness since it has resulted in very slow socialisation of the sri mpu among members, and some members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are not even aware yet that there are sri mpu entitled to officiate at ritual ceremonies of all levels. Nonetheless, quantity alone is not an appropriate goal. It can even be dangerous if it leads to competition among sri mpu to gain followers. Hence, quality is a matter of great concern for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Aside from intellectual and behavioural qualities, spiritual quality is of no less importance. Experience has shown that, I was told, there are a lot of spiritual or magical

---

12 Competition among sulinggih to attract followers or to be invited to officiate at public ceremonies are observable in present day Bali, as I learned from my fieldwork. See also Hooykaas (1976).
threats encountered by a newly consecrated *sri mpu*. These threats, according to some *sri mpu*, are much more serious than those experienced by a new *pedanda* because “Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi has not had their priesthood banner waving yet, so that more people are willing to try the mental readiness of its *sulinggih*, the *sri mpu*” (Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran 1994). For all of these reasons, the MGPSSR, under the advice of the *Paruman Panca Rsi*, has established a set of procedures to be followed by a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi before undergoing the *dwijati* ceremony. There are mainly two components to these procedures. The first is application of the ‘priesthood ladder,’ which means that a candidate must be a *pinandita* first before undergoing the *dwijati*; and the second is examination of the candidate by a team from the MGPSSR (*diksa pariksa*).

**Priesthood ladder**

Compared to the procedures set out by the *Parisada*, the process for consecrating a *sulinggih* (*sri mpu*) within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is more complicated. First of all, the *Parisada* does not regulate any set of stages before a candidate is eligible to undergo *dwijati*. Within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, an ordinary Pasek (*walaka*) cannot directly progress to the level of high priest (*sri mpu*) by performing the *dwijati* ceremony. He must go through a number of levels of priesthood starting from being a *pemangku* and then a *jero-gede*. This ‘priesthood ladder’ is meant to enable the candidate to become accustomed to the world of the priesthood, including their *brata* (prohibitions). The higher the status of the priesthood on the ladder, the more difficult their *brata*. Hence, the time spent being a *pemangku* is also meant as a training period for the candidate to practice several *brata*, step by step. The position of *pemangku* also gives the candidate time to acquire sufficient practical experience in serving in ritual ceremonies and in mastering the various offerings. In this way, it is expected that the newly consecrated *sulinggih* will not later be nervous and feel uneasy in officiating at ritual ceremonies, a situation which would inevitably reduce the credibility of the *sulinggih* in the eyes of his followers.

After gaining sufficient field experience as a *pemangku*, a candidate can undergo his *ekajati* consecration to become a *jero gede*. The *jero-gede*-ship is,
in practice, an intermediate level between pemangku-ship and sulinggih-ship. If in the pemangku-ship one is expected to gain as much field experience as possible, in the jero-gede-ship one is expected to learn more about the Veda, philosophy, theology, mudra (hand-poses), yoga, spiritual strength and mantra (Sanskrit spells taken from the Veda). If during the time of pemangku-ship one should focus one’s concentration on ‘learning from society,’ after gaining the status of jero-gede one is expected to learn from the nabe, and frequently attend the nabe in officiating at major ceremonies. According to the regulations of the MGPSSR, one is expected to be a jero-gede for at least six months. During this time, the candidate is also expected to rethink his willingness to become a sulinggih --after becoming acquainted with the difficulties of being a sulinggih.

The ceremony to ordain a jero-gede is often a quite elaborate ritual. When the late Ida Sri Mpu Satwika performed the ekajati consecration for Mangku Wayan Wara and his wife Ni Ketut Bakti of Desa Adat Baluk (Jembrana) on 23 November 1994, for example, the ceremony was witnessed by the Bupati of Jembrana, the chairman of the Parisada of Kabupaten Jembrana, the head of the Office of Religion of Kabupaten Jembrana, the Adat Council of Kabupaten Jembrana, and other invited guests, in addition to leaders of the MGPSSR Pusat and kabupaten. Both the bupati and the head of the Office of Religion gave speeches at the occasion. The same scale of ekajati ceremony was also performed for Jero-gede Rudaksa from Banjar Lebahpangkung, Mengwi, with Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga as the nabe.

This ladder of priesthood is set by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in an effort to select candidates so that only ‘qualified’ candidates will pass the long ‘real’ examination, spiritually, mentally, and behaviourally. This is, in theory at least, a preventive measure to avoid performing the dwijati for ‘improper purposes,’ such as using the priesthood as a means of living or for economic purposes. The idea of climbing the ladder of priesthood before performing the dwijati ceremony is, however, not purely an innovation introduced by the MGPSSR. According to MGPSSR leaders, this procedure follows Gedong Besi, an old manuscript, which is acknowledged by the Parisada to be one of the references.
for the priesthood in Bali. The *Gedong Besi* explicitly states that priesthood (*kasulinggihan*) must be preceded by a *pemangku*-ship.

Besides the priesthood ladder that must be followed, the MGPSSR also requires that a candidate must secure support from at least 30 members of his *dadya* or co-villagers. This is meant to prevent a new *sri mpu* from not being used. In the words of my informant:

As a human being, the sense of being called upon and respected is very important for a *sri mpu*. If a *sri mpu* is not respected, and no one uses him, the image of the *sri mpu* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as a whole will diminish, and this will further disturb the emerging pride of being Pasek. The sense of being useless or unused can also frustrate our *sri mpu*. We do not want this to happen. If he has secured support from his *dadya* or co-villagers, at least he will be used by these supporters (I Ketut Rika 1994).

The need for support from a *dadya* also automatically means that the candidate has a clear ‘self-identity,’ ie. is clearly associated with a *panti*, *dadya*, and *dadya agung* within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Besides support from his own *dadya*, the candidate must also secure support from the MGPSSR at *kecamatan* and *kabupaten* levels. General requirements from the *Parisada* are also criteria of the MGPSSR.13

In applying for a permit for *dwijati* from the *Parisada*, a candidate (a *jero-gede*) has first to apply to the MGPSSR Pusat through the MGPSSR Kabupaten. The MGPSSR Pusat has established a special team to handle this process, named *Tim Walaka* (‘non-priest-expert team’). The main task of this team is to examine the readiness of the candidate, particularly as regards the knowledge of *tatwa* (philosophical aspects of Hindu) and *susila* (Hindu ethics). To do this, an oral examination, called *diksa pariksa* (or *diksa turiksa*) is always conducted for the candidate.

---

13 These require that the candidate must have a good reputation in society; and that he has never been a member of a banned organisation (‘*organisasi terlarang*’), particularly the Communist Party of Indonesia. For administrative purposes, he must have secured a letter of good conduct (*Surat Keterangan Berkelakuan Baik*) from the police. He must also be physically and mentally normal (not an invalid) and be healthy, and this must be proved by a recommendation from a medical doctor.
With all the administrative documents required, the candidate applies to the MGPSSR kabupaten, who will continue the process by seeking advice from the MGPSSR Pusat. If agreed, the MGPSSR Pusat will send its Tim Walaka to conduct an oral examination of the candidate. If he passes, the Tim Walaka issues a letter of recommendation which states that the application of the candidate can be forwarded to the Parisada. Based on this recommendation, the MGPSSR of kabupaten submits the application to the Parisada who, on an agreed date, also conducts diksa pariksa. If he passes, as is usually the case, the Parisada issues a letter of recommendation. The ilikita patra (‘certificate’) of a high priest will follow after the dwijati ceremony has been performed.

The Dwijati Process

The processes and requirements to enable one to undergo a dwijati ceremony among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are complicated. The cases of successful and failed dwijati cited below will illustrate the complexity of becoming a sri mpu in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

The Dwijati of Ida Sri Mpu Dhyana Dhaksa Dharma

Appointing a sri mpu is not an easy task for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Both internal and external hindrances must be faced first. At present, the latter are not so difficult to resolve because there are enough constitutional grounds for conducting the dwijati, and the Parisada, as well as the local government, are already accustomed to the dwijati of warga other than Warga Brahmana. However, in some areas, such as Klungkung and Karangasem, external obstacles are still crucial. The dwijati of Ida Sri Mpu Dhyana Dhaksa Dharma will illustrate this point.

In 1985 a jero-gede from Desa Adat Aan, Klungkung, wanted to undergo his dwijati ceremony because he had been a jero-gede for years. In preparation for the ceremony, the committee of the dwijati, chaired by I Made Pasek Diantha SH, called on the kabupaten government to seek permission. At that time dwijati permits in Klungkung and Karangasem were still in the hand of the respective bupati, who were, coincidentally, from the family of the former kings.
After receiving advice from several sources, the kabupaten government decided not to permit the dwijati because the relatives of the candidate were still divided on the matter. The permit would be issued after the family dispute was satisfactorily resolved. In response to this decision, the committee spoke directly to the bupati and asked whether there was a rule saying that a dwijati ceremony could not be performed if the candidate had a family dispute. The committee pointed out that there were a number of family disputes among Warga Brahmana but there was no prohibition on conducting dwijati.

Days later the bupati sent a letter to the committee saying that a dwijati permit could not be issued because the candidate was not supported by the desa adat. In addition, it was said that the candidate had been guilty of misconduct, that it was alleged that he had misused the dadya temple’s rehabilitation funds when he was the chairman of his dadya. The committee again saw the bupati to discuss the matter. Armed with the Parisada’s decision No. V/Kep/PHDP/1968 about the requirements for a dwijati, the committee explained that there was no requirement for desa adat support. Again they made a comparison with the dwijati of pedanda: candidates for pedanda never ever seek support from a desa adat. They also questioned the morality (kesucian, ‘cleanliness’) of candidates for pedanda. They argued that if the candidate had any record of misconduct in the past, this was only human, and a dwijati is indeed a way to cleanse impurities, and to start a new and better life. The bupati, however, was firm in his position. At last, becoming frustrated, the committee questioned the authority of the bupati to issue a permit for a dwijati, since the Parisada had decided that it was the Parisada who issued the permit, as well as the certificate for being a sulinggih. The local government only needed to be informed that a dwijati was taking place in the region.

The committee brought this matter to the attention of the Parisada at provincial level, who resolved the problem. The committee was urged to seek support from the dadya members as well as some desa adat members, not because of a formal requirement but for sociological reasons, ie. to ensure that after conducting dwijati, the sulinggih would be used by some families. This would prevent the development of a negative image of the sri mpu and minimise
opposition from other groups who did not agree with the *dwijati*. To prevent a physical clash between the two opposing groups during the *dwijati* ceremony, the *Parisada* suggested that the *dwijati* be conducted in the *nabe's gria* (in Bongkasa) instead of in Desa Adat Aan, the house of the candidate.

The committee accepted these suggestions, and 108 signatures of support were secured from *dadya* and *desa adat* members in Aan, and the *dwijati* was conducted in the *gria* of the *nabe*, Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Parama Dhaksa. The newly consecrated *mpu* was named Ida Sri Mpu Dhyana Dhaksa Dharma.

**The *Dwijati* of Ida Sri Mpu Siwanatha Yoga**

I Gde Sastra Wijaya was born in Singaraja on 12 September 1952. He married Nyoman Aryatini (born 28 October 1960), and they had six children. After attending a course in *pemangku*-ship, administered by the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng, he was consecrated as a *pemangku* in 1980 by the late Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra. He served as the *pemangku* of his *dadya*, Dadya Pasek Gelgel and Dadya Arya Benculuk, both in Buleleng. In 1988, after eight years serving as a *pemangku*, his status was raised to *jero-gede*, also by the late Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra. He often officiated at ceremonies, including *ngaben*, on behalf of his *nabe*, Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra. In addition to his activity in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (in the MGPSSR Kecamatan Buleleng), from 1992 he was also a member of the *Parisada* of Kecamatan Buleleng. As a graduate from the High School of Technology (STM), he ran a garage in the centre of Singaraja, the capital city of Kabupaten Buleleng.

He planned to undergo his *dwijati* ceremony under the *nabe* Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra. However, this *sri mpu* passed away on 17 August 1994. There were a number of *jero-gede* under Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra who were ready to have the *dwijati* performed. After the death of Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra, some of these *jero-gede* approached other *sri mpu* to be their new *nabe*. Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya approached Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga from Marga. After becoming acquainted, they agreed to be *nanak* and *nabe* and arranged the learning method and schedule. After several (informal) tests, Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga was
convinced that the candidate had sufficient knowledge and necessary skill to be a *sri mpu*. Hence, they began to plan the *dwijati* ceremony.

However, the adoption of Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya by Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga attracted critical comments from some *sri mpu* who were also eligible to be *nabe*. The critics, led by Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran, said that it was improper for Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga to take over a *nanak* of Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra, because in the genealogy of *sri mpu* within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the latter is the *nabe* (uncle) of the former (see Figure 7.1). In the understanding of some *sri mpu* in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, an ‘orphan’ candidate should be adopted by a *sri mpu* of the same generation as the late to-be-*nabe*; and it is inappropriate for a ‘brother’ to adopt the ‘orphan’ as a son. In other words, it would be better, the critics said, if the ex-students of Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra were taken by *sri mpu* of the same generation.

The matter was discussed at a meeting of *Paruman Panca Rsi*, and it was decided that a candidate is free to find his own *nabe* based on his willingness. This is so because the relationship between *nabe* and *nanak* in priesthood is personal and, once decided, cannot be changed. Finding a *nabe*, as mentioned in a *lontar Silakramaning Aguron-Guron*, is really a crucial matter since any misconduct performed by a *nabe* must also be shouldered by a *putra*. The same situation applies in selecting a student, because a sin committed by a student (*putra*) means a hundred sins for the *nabe*.14

---

14 From my observations and in-depth interviews with some informants (both *walaka* and *sri mpu*), it was clear that there was competition among *sri mpu* to be *nabe*. Becoming a *nabe* is considered very prestigious. This is in line with the tough criteria in selecting a *nabe*. Logically, being a *nabe* or having a *putra* means that one is already acknowledged as a highly qualified *sri mpu*. The more *putra* one has, the more prestige one has. This factor clearly played a role in the debate about the adoption of Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya by Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga.
Figure 7.1 Genealogy of *Sri Mpu* in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.
After obtaining the agreement from Paruman Panca Rsi, Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya sent an application to the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng, dated 16 October 1994. The case of Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya was a new experience for the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng because it had never before handled a dwijati ceremony. The three sri mpu from Buleleng had been consecrated in Denpasar and Tabanan. In addition, the status of kewargaan (warga membership) of Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya was unclear since he belonged to two warga, i.e. Warga Pasek [Gelgel] and Arya Benculuk. Because of this, the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng was very careful in handling the matter. A special meeting was held to discuss this situation on 30 October 1994. The meeting decided that the dwijati ceremony for Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya should be postponed for several reasons. First of all, his identity was unclear. He was a member of both Dadya Pasek Gelgel and Dadya Arya Benculuk in Singaraja. Arya Benculuk and Pasek are different warga, each with its own kawitan, pemangku, festival day, and sesana (prescribed way of doing things or ethics). Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya could not make clear which of these two dadya was the purusa and which was the predana. He in fact was aware of this problem. Hence, as a compromise, it was decided at a meeting on 11 October 1994 between members of Dadya Arya Benculuk and the MGPSSR of Kecamatan Buleleng, that Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya belonged to Warga Pasek Benculuk. This meant that he was from Warga Arya Benculuk but used the ways of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (called sesana kepasekan) when performing rituals.

The second problem was his age. He was only 42 years old, while his wife was only 34. According to the rules of the MGPSSR, the suggested minimum age for undergoing dwijati is 50 years. This age requirement is associated with dependent children since a sri mpu is expected to be free from the economic demands of any dependent children so that he can concentrate solely on religious

---

15 Attached to the letter was a letter of good conduct from the Lurah of Banjar Jawa, a letter of good conduct from the police, a health recommendation from a doctor, a certificate from the office of political affairs that he had never been a member of any banned political party, a curriculum vitae, and a letter of support signed by 46 members of Warga Pasek Benculuk.

16 Although a Balinese can only have one dadya (following the purusa line), it is not uncommon that one is active in the dadya of the predana line.
matters. In the case of Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya, his eldest child was in grade 3 at high school, while the youngest one was only four years old. This inevitably necessitated special consideration, particularly in economic terms, as one is prohibited from engaging in economic activities after becoming a *sulinggih*. It would be dangerous for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi if its *sri mpu* used their religious authority to seek money or used the priesthood to gain a living.

The third problem, according to the meeting, was the matters of teaching procedures and *nabe-nanak* relationship (*aguron-guron*). The time since he and Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga had mutually agreed to become *nanak-nabe* was short and hence the *nabe* would not have had sufficient opportunity to gain a thorough knowledge of his *nanak*. Moreover, because of the short time, the candidate had never become *pagandan* (assistant) to his *nabe* in officiating at ceremonies.\(^\text{17}\)

The term ‘Warga Pasek Benculuk’ was also unacceptable because this term is unknown. There is no branch of Pasek called Benculuk. If the candidate was from Warga Arya Benculuk and not a Pasek, the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng would not hinder him since he was eager to undergo *dwijati*. Since he was not a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, however, the MGPSSR would naturally not take part in the *dwijati* process.

On the other hand, some leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Denpasar argued that his identity was of no great importance. The secretary general of the MGPSSR Pusat, Nyoman Ambara Dhyasa, held the position that:

> The *warga* identity of the candidate must not be a reason to deter his willingness to undergo *dwijati*. In case he is not a Pasek, this should not be a problem for us. We have strived so far to have our *sulinggih* acknowledged and used by others, not merely by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. So, if Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya is from Warga Arya, we must be proud that our *sulinggih* is used as a *nabe* by Warga Arya. That is the first reason. Secondly, we have to look back at the history of the existence of our *sulinggih mpu*. Who were the *nabe* of our first *mpu*? They were *pedanda*, not *mpu*. Thus, if other *warga* helped us in this crucial matter, it is our moral duty to help other *warga* in return. Aside

\(^{17}\)It is generally expected that a candidate serve as assistant to his/her *nabe* in officiating at several ceremonies before performing *dwijati*. This is meant to give the opportunity for the candidate to observe his *nabe* officiating.
from the moral duty, I am sure that the warga we have helped will support us in struggling for the existence of our sulinggih vis-a-vis pedanda. In addition, there is nothing wrong with helping other warga to perform the dwijati ceremony..., it is a kind of yadnya [sacred sacrifice], ie. rsi yadnya. And if we have committed ourselves to organise the warga in order to strengthen Hindu religion in general, not just the condition of Warga Pasek, this is indeed a good opportunity to do so....

On 4 December 1994, a special meeting was held between Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya, Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga, the MGPSSR Pusat, the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng, and Paruman Panca Rsi, to overcome this problem. At the meeting, Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya convinced the others that he was a Pasek from purusa line, while his maternal dadya was from Arya Benculuk. Since he was considered knowledgeable in religious and adat affairs, his maternal dadya had used him as adviser in the dadya organisation. Since he was a pemangku, he had also been asked to officiate at ceremonies in this dadya. Nonetheless, some leaders of the MGPSSR were not satisfied with this confession. To convince them, Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya was asked to conduct a mapinton ceremony, ie. to go to Catur Parhyangan temple (Lempuyang Madya, Padharman Pasek Besakih, Dasar Bhuana, and Silayukti) and confess that he was indeed a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. As a follow up to the meeting, Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya paid visits to the Catur Parhyangan temple to perform the mapinton ceremony.

After this was done, he again put forward his formal application, and this time everything went smoothly. The diksa pariksa by the Tim Walaka of the MGPSSR Pusat was held on 7 October 1995 with good results. The diksa pariksa by the Parisada of Kabupaten Buleleng, on 9 October 1995, also went smoothly.

The dwijati ceremony started on 13 October 1995. On that day, Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga arrived at the house of Jero-gede early in the afternoon. He then purified the house of the diksita to make it a gria (‘house of a sulinggih’). Afterwards he went to the Dadya Pasek Gelgel of Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya in Banjar Penataran, around 3 km away, where the dwijati ceremony would take place. At 7 PM in the evening, visitors started to come, including Ida Sri Mpu Parama Manik Dwijakertha who would be the guru saksi (‘witness’), Ida Sri Mpu Yogiswara who would be the guru waktra (‘co-
supervisor’), Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran who would protect the ceremony from spiritual attack, representatives from the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng and Kecamatan Buleleng, and a number of jero-gede from throughout Buleleng. By 8 PM hundreds of visitors and supporters had flocked into the dadya.

At 9 PM the ceremony started, with the three mpu beginning their prayers. The diksita (husband and wife), already in white clothes, were seated behind the nabe. After around half an hour of prayer, the nabe turned to face the diksita, and the diksita were purified using tirta panglukatan (‘cleansing holy water’). After purification, they were asked to pray to their ancestors, to ask permission to ‘die’ to their walaka status, to enter the state of death, and to be reborn later. Soon after this prayer, the nabe sprinkled the diksita with tirta pangentas (holy water that is used in the death ceremony). This was then followed by the taking of the soul of the diksita by the nabe. Upon this, the male diksita suddenly collapsed and was carried by male supporters to the prepared room. The female diksita also collapsed and was carried to the same room by female supporters. In this room, both diksita were wrapped in white cloths and treated like dead persons. The souls of the diksita were placed in a small offering made of coconut, called daksina, which was then placed at the head of the bed, on which the diksita were lying.

That night, the nabe, guru saksi, and guru waktra remained alert through the night, while supporters chanted religious songs (kekawin). At 5 AM the next morning, the diksita were sprinkled with a holy water (tirta tetangian) by the guru saksi to awaken them. First, the male diksita woke up and was directly carried to a makeshift bathroom which had been constructed for this purpose. The male guru saksi bathed the male diksita using special water that had been mixed with a holy water (tirta pasiraman). After bathing, the diksita was returned to the room to be dressed as a sulinggih, and for the first time his hair was tied in the manner of a high priest. The same process was also performed for the female diksita, but everything was done by the female guru saksi and female supporters.
At 7 AM, after everything was ready, the nabe, guru saksi and guru waktra returned to the praying platform and started chanting Vedic formulas, while the diksita were carried there by their supporters. The dwijati ceremony then started. It included the cleansing ceremony (mabyakala), life-cycle ceremony (madudus, three-month, and pabersihan ceremonies), followed by the transfer of knowledge through the licking of the nabe's middle finger, after which the nabe put his palm on the head of the diksita. This action was in fact the napak (dwijati) itself, and hence this was the starting point for the rebirth of the diksita. After the birth, the nabe then conferred pewisik and cecatu (holy messages as guidance for living). This part of the ceremony was followed by the diksita paying homage to the nabe. After that, all dadya members paid homage to the newly born sulinggih.

Since the nabe considered that the diksita had sufficient knowledge of the priesthood, he asked the diksita to show his ability by chanting puja at that time, called ngalinggihang Weda or ngalinggihang puja. After ngalinggihang puja, the nabe immediately gave the diksita the right (panugrahan) to perform lokapalasraya ('to officiate at any ritual ceremony').

At 10 AM, the formal ceremony began, attended by officials from the government (the bupati and his staff), head of the Office of Religion of Buleleng, the Parisada of Buleleng, camat, kepala desa, bendesa adat, leaders of the MGPSSR Pusat and kabupaten, and many more. The Parisada then announced that Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya had been consecrated, and hence had become a sulinggih, whereupon the nabe gave him a new name, Ida Sri Mpu Siwanatha Samyoga.

---

18 Generally ngalinggihang puja is performed months after the dwijati, waiting until the diksita is ready. Most sulinggih who underwent their dwijati without being a pemangku first, perform their ngalinggihang puja months after the dwijati. The late Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra underwent dwijati on 18 April 1973, but he performed the ngalinggihang puja on 30 May 1973; Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran also underwent dwijati ceremony on 18 April 1973, but he did the ngalinggihang puja in August 1973. Ida Sri Mpu Satwika, who underwent dwijati on 30 October 1974 performed ngalinggihang puja on 27 March 1975. In the dwijati of Ida Pedanda Putra Manuaba, ngalinggihang puja was not done on the day of the dwijati.
The *Dwijati* of Ida Sri Mpu Reka Manik Darmawa

Drs I Made Gendra Suryanatha was born in Dalung, Kecamatan Kuta, Kabupaten Badung, on 28 March 1928. He married I Gusti Ayu Yuliadi, and had four children. He was a senior staff member at the Regional Office of Education and Culture of Bali, and then served as a lecturer at the Institute of *Hindu Dharma* in Denpasar until he retired in 1993. He was also a leader of the MGPSSR *Pusat* in the period 1989-1994.

In 1993 he was sick for months. After consulting mediums and doing meditation in *Catur Parhyangan*, he received inspiration that he had been assigned by *Betara Kawitan* to serve society, ie. to become a *sri mpu*. Once he had promised to do so, his health gradually improved. Following his promise, he applied to the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Badung in January 1994 to undergo *dwijati*, with Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas as his *nabe*. As he was a leader in the MGPSSR *Pusat*, he was well aware of the process and so he did everything according to the standard procedure. Everything went well; there was no obstacle from either within or outside *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi*. This was also, to some extent, associated with the fact that the candidate was a leader in the MGPSSR who also held respected positions outside (he was a senior officer in a government office and a lecturer at a Hindu university). *Dwijati* ceremonies for *Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi* had also been held very often in Denpasar and Badung, hence the *Parisada* and local government had no questions at all about this. In addition, people knew that he was the elder brother of an army brigadier-general, I Ketut Sundria, the former Bupati of Tabanan and at that time the chairman of Golkar for Bali. This may also have facilitated the process.

The *diksa pariksa* for the *diksita* conducted by the Tim Walaka of the MGPSSR was performed on 15 May 1994, while the *Parisada* Badung performed the *diksa pariksa* on 25 May 1994. Questions asked by the *Parisada* were similar to those of the MGPSSR, and these covered basic knowledge. The matters covered in fact can be found in books used by primary school students. Before putting their questions, the examiners from the *Parisada*, Drs Ida Bagus Oka, stressed that the *diksa pariksa* was not a test because “according to *Silakrama*, it is the *nabe* or *dang acarya*, who is entitled to examine the...
candidate, while the Parisada merely deals with administrative matters, as well as putting forward some basic teachings to refresh the diksita."

The exchange during the diksa pariksa by the Parisada went as follows.

Parisada: "... Why do you want to undergo a dwijati ceremony for yourself: is it because you are forced by others; because it is your own intention; or for other reasons?"

JG Gendra: "I feel obliged to purify myself, to follow the path that was laid down by my ancestors."

Parisada: "... I am sure, as a candidate for diksita, you have heard about panca yadnya. Just from memory, can you name them one by one?"

JG Gendra: "Panca yadnya consists of dewa yadnya, pitra yadnya, manusa yadnya, rsi yadnya, and butha yadnya"

Parisada: "Yes, that is correct! ... [the examiner then explained the panca yadnya one by one]. As a candidate to become a sulinggih, I believe that you are aware of some brata restricting the behaviour of a sulinggih. The basic prescriptions, as you know, are panca yama and panca nyama brata. Have you heard about them?"

JG Gendra: "I will try to remember. Panca yama brata [consists of] ahimsa, brahmacari, awyawahara, satya, asteya."

Parisada: "Yes, ahimsa is a brata that we should not kill any being, ... [the examiner described in detail the components of panca yama brata]. Now, what about the other group of brata, ie. panca nyama brata?"

JG Gendra: "Panca nyama brata [consists of] akroda, guru-susrusa, sauca, aharalagawa, and apramada."

Parisada: "Akroda (anger) is the most powerful enemy; nobody can escape from this enemy.... [further explanation was given on all five of these panca nyama brata].

As mentioned by Parisada representatives, the diksa pariksa was more a lecture than a test for the diksita. At the end of the ‘lecture,’ the examiner reiterated that since the nabe had committed himself to be a nabe of Jero-gede Gendra, the Parisada was convinced that the candidate had been trained and tested by the nabe. Hence, the Parisada announced without hesitation that the candidate was considered to have ‘passed’ and hence the dwijati could be undertaken as planned.

The dwijati was carried out on 24 June 1994, preceded by a mati raga on 23 June 1994. The processes of the mati raga and dwijati were exactly the same as those described for the case of Ida Sri Mpu Siwanatha Samyoga (Jero-gede Sastra Wijaya). The newly consecrated sri mpu was named Ida Sri Mpu Reka Manik Dharmawa. The ngalinggihang puja ceremony was performed directly
after the *dwijati* because the *nabe* was convinced of the capability of his *putra.* The new *mpu* was also given the full right of *lokapalasraya* by his *nabe.*

The formal ceremony of the *dwijati* was attended by representatives from the Bupati of Badung, the *Parisada* of Kabupaten Badung, the head of the Office of Religion of Kabupaten Badung, *camat,* and hundreds of invited guests, in addition to MGPSSR leaders at various levels. As usual in any *dwijati,* *bupati,* the *Parisada,* and the MGPSSR Pusat gave speeches at this ceremony.

**The Failed *Dwijati* of Jero-gede Siman**

The *Parisada* usually passes the candidate in *diksa pariksa.* In fact, so far no one has been failed. But this is not the case in the *diksa pariksa* administered by the *Tim Walaka* of the MGPSSR. This team has several times frustrated a candidate, as it did in the case of Jero-gede Siman.

Jero-gede Siman is a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi living in *Desa Bali* Nuraga, Kecamatan Sidomulyo, Lampung (Sumatra). He was a good friend of Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Kertha Wisesa from Sesetan (then I Wayan Ronda). In August 1991 he wrote a letter to Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa asking if Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa would like to be his *nabe* for the *dwijati* ceremony. He further mentioned that if Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa was willing, he would like to have the *dwijati* performed in Sesetan, together with Jero-gede Wayan Ronda, who had already applied for a permit for *dwijati* with Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa as his *nabe.*

Upon receiving this letter, Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa consulted the MGPSSR *Pusat.* One of the main points of the discussions was that Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa had had six *putra.* If Jero-gede Ronda of Sesetan was granted a permit by the MGPSSR for the *dwijati,* he would be the seventh. There had been a decision within the MGPSSR that a *nabe* should be restricted to a maximum of seven *putra.* After consultation, the MGPSSR *Pusat* sent a letter to Jero-gede Siman explaining that in principle the MGPSSR supported any member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi who wished to become a *sulinggih.* However, a set of procedures had to be followed and a set of requirements had to be fulfilled first. The letter also explained that Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa
could not be his *nabe* because he had already had seven *putra*. A joint *dwijati* in Sesetan on 24 September 1991 would be unlikely because the time was too short and a number of processes had to be followed, not only involving Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, but also government offices and the *Parisada*. The process would be more complicated and time consuming because Jero-gede Siman lived in Lampung, which meant that his ID card, letter of good conduct, letter of non-affiliation with any banned political party, and recommendation from the *Parisada* had to be obtained in Lampung, while other letters and processes had to be carried out in Bali. Further, it was recommended that it would be preferable if Jero-gede Siman would conduct his *dwijati* in Sumatra, in the temple of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Lampung, and select Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Lokantara, who lived in Lampung, as his *nabe*. To facilitate this, the MGPSSR Pusat promised to send help in terms of skill, labour, and financial support to Sumatra, and that a number of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi leaders would witness the *dwijati* ceremony in Sumatra.

This letter was answered by Jero-gede Siman with a telegram, in which he stated that if Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa was unavailable to be his *nabe*, Jero-gede Siman would choose Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran. In reaction to this application, special meetings were held by MGPSSR Pusat and *Paruman Panca Rsi*. At the meeting in Denpasar on 13 October 1991, it was decided that the *dwijati* should be performed in Lampung, and the recommended *nabe* should be Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Lokantara. If Jero-gede Siman was not satisfied with this *mpu* as a *nabe*, the second possible *nabe* should be Ida Sri Mpu Satwika from Negara. If still dissatisfied, another possible *nabe* should be Ida Sri Mpu Sucika Dharma from Antosari, Tabanan.

To speed up the process and avoid any further misunderstanding, a team of representatives with full authority from the MGPSSR Pusat was sent to Lampung to consult with Jero-gede Siman. This team, consisting of Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi, Jero-gede Ketut Samba, and Nyoman Ambara Dhyasa, departed Denpasar for Lampung by bus on 16 October 1991. Upon

---

19 In Desa Balinuraga, Lampung, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi had constructed a small temple as *pasimpangan* (temporary stop-over) of the *Catur Parhyangan*, better known as Pura Pasek.
arrival in Lampung (late on the afternoon of 17 October 1991), the team was hosted by a leader of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Guru Sudiartha, who was to act as the chairman of the committee of the *dwijati* ceremony. As usual in the process of *dwijati*, the team collected information from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Desa Bali Nuraga, including information from Ida Sri Mpu Jaya Lokantara. The *diksa pariksa* for Jero-gede Siman was conducted on 20 October 1991. In the team’s evaluation, Jero-gede Siman did not have sufficient knowledge and mental readiness to be a *sulinggih*. In short, Jero-gede Siman did not pass. He was advised to learn more before forwarding his next application, if he decided to reapply. This result was reported by the team at a meeting held in Sala (Bangli) on 17 November 1991.20

**The Postponed Dwijati of I Nyoman Subiakta**

I Nyoman Subiakta is a Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi member from Desa Adat Wanagiri, Kecamatan Sukasada, Kabupaten Buleleng. He had studied religious knowledge as well as Balinese *adat* seriously for quite a while, and in April 1991 had undergone a cleansing ceremony, called *pawintenan*, which was performed by Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas. In March 1992 he sent an application to the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng, requesting to undergo the *dwijati* ceremony and to become a *sri mpu* (letter dated 9 March 1992). He planned to undergo this ceremony on 19 March 1992 with Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas as the *nabe*, Ida Sri Mpu Dwija Kertha as the *guru waktra*, and Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga as the *guru saksi*.

---

20 Until 1996, Jero-gede Siman has not reapplied, for reasons that are unclear to me.
Plate 7.7  Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Parama Dhaksa, the chairman of the council of priests in the MGPSSR.

Plate 7.8  Some *sri mpu* of the MGPSSR at a regular meeting of the council of priests.
Plates 7.9 and 7.10  Consecrating a *sri mpu* in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi.

7.9  Death ritual for the candidates (*amati raga*).
7.10  Rebirth ritual, symbolised by the licking of the teacher’s middle finger.
Upon receiving this application, the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng forwarded the application to the MGPSSR Pusat to ask for advice and diksa pariksa if the application could be processed. In response, the MGPSSR Pusat consulted Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas (the nabe) through its Tim Walaka, and inquired whether the candidate had been a pemangku and a jero-gede. Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas told the Tim Walaka that the candidate had never been consecrated as a pemangku, let alone as a jero-gede. He had only undergone a pawintenan (spiritual cleansing ritual).

Based on this information, the MGPSSR Pusat replied to Nyoman Subiakta’s letter, saying that, in principal, the MGPSSR strongly supported the intention of Nyoman Subiakta to undergo his dwijati ceremony. However, since there are rules in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi that any candidate of sulunggih must proceed up the ladder of the priesthood from pemangku-ship to jero-gede-ship before performing the dwijati ceremony, I Nyoman Subiakta was advised to postpone his dwijati ceremony and to follow the procedures established by the warga organisation (letter dated 16 March 1992). Carbon copies of this letter were also sent to Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas, Ida Sri Mpu Dwija Kertha, and Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga, as well as the chairman of Paruman Panca Rsi, Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa. In addition to the letter, the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Buleleng was assigned to visit the I Nyoman Subiakta and to explain the matter tactfully.

THE MAKING OF A PEDANDA

In order to have a better understanding of the process of the dwijati among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, it is instructive to compare it with the dwijati performed by other warga. For this purpose, I will describe a dwijati ceremony of Warga Brahmana Siwa to become a pedanda, which occurred in the village of Sanur Kauh, Kecamatan Denpasar Selatan. The dwijati was performed for Ida Bagus Astika (born in 1939). He is an adopted son of the late Ida Pedanda Oka, who passed away in 1976. Since the death of Ida Pedanda Oka, there had not been a sulunggih in his gria (‘house of a sulunggih’).
Ida Bagus Astika applied for a dwijati permit from the Parisada of Denpasar on 23 April 1994, attaching all the documents required. He chose Ida Pedanda Gede Padangratha from Singapadu as his nabe, while Ida Pedanda Ketut Sidemen and Ida Pedanda Gede Timbul, both from Sanur, acted as guru waktra and guru saksi, respectively.

The diksa pariksa for his dwijati was held by the Parisada on 29 June 1994 in his house, witnessed by the future nabe, a number of pedanda from Sanur, and Ida Rsi Agung from Penatih. After the test, the examiners announced that the candidate had passed and was hence allowed by the Parisada to continue the planned dwijati, and the letter with the decision (surat keputusan) or the permit for the dwijati would soon be issued.

As planned, the dwijati ceremony was held on 23 July 1994, while the mati raga ceremony, an important stage of the dwijati, was performed on 22 July 1994. On that day, at around 5 PM, the nabe, Ida Pedanda Gede Padangratha arrived in the house of the diksita, joining the guru saksi and guru waktra who had arrived earlier. Witnessed by a crowd of supporters, the ceremony was commenced at around 6 PM. In this ceremony, only the nabe performed the mapuja (officiated), while guru waktra and guru saksi merely witnessed the process. After a set of prayers, the nabe sprinkled the diksita with tirta pabersihan ('cleansing holy water) and tirta pangentas (holy water for the death ceremony). The diksita then prayed to their ancestors, asking permission to 'die' from their state of walaka and to be born later as sulinggih. After this prayer, the nabe told the supporters that the pre-ritual for mati raga had finished and that the diksita had to be accompanied to the room that had been prepared for the mati raga. In this room, both the male and the female diksita sat down and meditated for the rest of the night. The nabe, upon finishing the prayer, returned to his own gria in Kutri, Singapadu, about 20 km away from Sanur.

The next morning (23 July 1994), at around 4.30 AM, the diksita were bathed by guru saksi in a makeshift bathroom specially prepared for this purpose, using special holy water which had been prepared by the nabe. The male diksita was bathed by the male guru saksi, and the female diksita by the female guru saksi. The bathing ceremony was followed by religious chanting,
the same as that for the death ceremony. After the bathing, the *diksita* were carried to the room where they had spent the night and were dressed up by the *guru saksi*. This was the first time that the *diksita* dressed their hair like *sulinggih*.

The *nabe* also arrived early in the morning on that day. At 7 AM he started praying, and the *diksita* were called to sit behind him. After a while, the *nabe* turned to face the *diksita* and then performed the birth ceremony for them. The *diksita* washed the big toe of the *nabe* and used this washing water to wash their own faces. The washed toe was then licked by the *diksita*, after which the *nabe* used his foot to trample down the head of the *diksita*, symbolising the birth of the new *pedanda*. This gesture, the stepping on the head of the *diksita*, was in fact the culmination of the *dwijati* itself, called *napak*. After the *napak*, the *nabe* gave the *diksita* pawisik and cecatu (holy messages as guidance for living), written in Balinese characters on a white cloth. This was later followed by prayers in which the *diksita* paid homage to their *nabe*.

After the ritual ceremonies finished, at around 10 AM, the formal ceremony started, attended by the Parisada, local government officials, and hundreds of invited guests. On this occasion, the Parisada announced the new name of the *diksita*. The newly consecrated male *sulinggih* was named Ida Pedanda Putra Manuaba, while the female *sulinggih* was Ida Pedanda Telaga Manuaba. As usual, the mayor of Denpasar also gave a speech.

**INTERPRETING DIFFERENCES**

The 'standard procedures' of the *dwijati* set up by the Parisada are clearly heavily influenced by the procedures practiced by Warga Brahmana Siwa, since *dwijati* ceremonies were most commonly performed by this *warga*. Compared to this standard, there are apparently a number of differences in the practices of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. These include the path that must be followed by a candidate for the priesthood and the need to secure support from members of the *dadya* or co-villagers. In the *dwijati* itself, the exotic practice of *mati raga* is praised by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. For them, courage to practice
the *mati raga* in a very ‘exotic’ manner, ie. going through the dramatic death ceremony and treating the *diksita* as if they were dead, proves the readiness and quality of their *sri mpu*.

If they do not have self confidence, they would not dare to do so, because it is really a dangerous practice. Guarding a *mati raga* is very hard work, because *mati raga* is very susceptible to disturbance, and the risk is fatal (Mudastra 1994).

According to some *nabe*, the *mati raga* is the most difficult stage in the *dwijati* process since this is not merely a formality, but a real test for both the *nabe* and the *diksita*. It is during this stage that spiritual war usually occurs between the *nabe* and his group (the protectors of the *diksita*) on one side and their opponents on the other. The offerings of the *mati raga* are the same as those for the *ngaben* ceremony. Hence, “if the *nabe* is defeated, the *dwijati* ceremony would turn into a *ngaben* ceremony” (Suastana 1994).

Disturbances during the *mati raga*, according to my informants, are very strong. The late I Gde Pasek Suastana, who had been active in the MGPSSR for decades and several times participated in guarding *mati raga*, told me of numerous attacks experienced during the *mati raga* in previous *dwijati*.

In the *dwijati* of Ida Sri Mpu Satwika in Pergung, a woman wanted to enter the room where the *diksita* was kept during the *mati raga*. After being prohibited, the woman suddenly disappeared. In Tumbakbayuh [during the *dwijati* of Ida Sri Mpu Kerta Negara], I saw a white-clothed woman trying to turn the body of the *diksita*. I pushed the woman out of the room, and she disappeared at once. In Gaji [in the *dwijati* of Ida Sri Mpu Adi Wirarunting], an explosion was heard in the backyard, similar to the sound of the fall of three bunches of coconuts. We were all alert, but nothing happened....

During the *mati raga* in the *dwijati* of Ida Sri Mpu Reka Manik Dharmawa in Dalung in 1994, I was surprised that at around midnight Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa and others suddenly ran to the front gate of the housing lot of the *diksita*. Afterwards he commented that there were enemies trying to attack the *diksita*. “They cannot enter the housing lot, or otherwise they have to sacrifice their lives,” he said, while the other *mpu* nodded their heads. An informant also told me that there was a big battle during the *mati raga* of Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna...
Yogattama in the village of Pawirama (1995). As a result, my informant said, a man from the attacking side died the next day.

When I compared the *mati raga* as practiced by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi to the one practiced by Warga Brahmana Siwa (particularly in the case of the *dwijati* of Ida Pedanda Putra Manuaba), a prominent figure in Warga Brahmana Siwa, who was also a chairman of the *Parisada* of Kabupaten Badung, told me that:

*Mati raga* is merely a symbol, symbolising the death of the *walaka*-ship, to be born later as a *sulinggih*. The main point in the *mati raga* is the effort of the *diksita* to ‘kill’ (*mematikan*) all desires common to a *walaka*, such as *sadripu* and *sad atatayi* (Ida Bagus Oka 1994).

He further explained that the main point of the *dwijati* is not the *mati raga* as such. The emphasis of the *dwijati*, according to him, should be on five aspects: (1) *puja*, where the *diksita* must have a sufficient mastery of worshipping God and the ancestors with *mantra*; (2) *sikha*, the cutting of the water lily and the hair of the *diksita* by the *nabe*, which symbolises that the *diksita* has achieved a certain degree of purity; (3) *jihwa*, i.e. the action of the *diksita* to lick the big toe of the *nabe*, which symbolises the total surrender of the *diksita* to his *nabe*; (4) *siwadwara*, the use of the *nabe*’s foot to step on the head of the *diksita*, as a symbol of the transfer of knowledge; and (5) *amari aran*, the change of the *diksita*’s name, which is followed by *pawisik*, *panugrahana*, and *cecatu* from the *nabe*. If these five points have been performed, the *dwijati* is ritually complete.

In contrast, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi severely criticised some gestures during the *dwijati* of Warga Brahmana Siwa, especially the cleansing of the *nabe*’s foot and the use of the washing water to wash the face of the *diksita*, as well as the licking of the *nabe*’s big toe by the *diksita*. In defending their position, members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi said that such a practice is inhumane, or at least it is too feudalistic. The use of the *nabe*’s foot to step on the head of the *diksita* in the *napak* is also criticised by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi for the same reasons. That is why the palm of the hand is used by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in the *napak* instead. They associate the title of
sulinggih of Warga Brahmana, pedanda, with the use of the foot ('pada') in the napak. Pedanda is then perceived as padan-ida, 'his foot,' or "sulinggih who were born from the pada ('foot') of their nabe."

Another marked difference is that the 'genealogy of knowledge' is very important among sulinggih in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, whereas this is loose or hardly exists in other warga. In Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, how an mpu should address the other mpu is an important matter. Since 'genealogy' is so important in defining 'seniority,' a younger mpu, in terms of his priesthood, might be called nabe by a more 'senior' one. Take Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti and Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga, as an example. Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti, who was consecrated in November 1983, is the youngest putra of the late Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka. Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga is the putra of Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, himself an 'adopted putra' of Sri Mpu Gde Reka. Hence, genealogically, Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti is the younger uncle of Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga (Figure 7.1).

Although Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga is older, having been consecrated in April 1983, he must address Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti as 'nabe.' The term 'nabe' is crucial in this matter. Not only does it denote seniority in genealogy, but also 'seniority in knowledge and experience,' and a putra must obey whatever is said by the nabe. On the other hand, there is a feeling of superiority on the part of Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga over Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti. For this reason, a genealogical-nephew mpu would rather maintain nyaru basa ('unclear words'), i.e. avoid directly addressing his younger uncle. Instead of addressing him as 'nabe,' which is too high, or merely as 'mpu,' denoting equal status, which he dare not do, the term 'ida' is often used. Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti also uses 'ida' in reply because he also feels uneasy at being called nabe and addresses Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga as 'nanak' ('son' or 'student'). Several times I heard conversations between them using the nyaru basa strategy. On one occasion, for instance, the conversation flowed as follows:

Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga: "I plan to go to Nusa Penida next month, in the coming Purnama (full moon). I would be very happy if ida could go along with us."
Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabuakti: “Well, I would love to, but I have to eat in several places at that time. Who will go with ida?”

Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga: “Raka (‘elder brother’) in Pegongan and Rai (‘younger brother’) in Sala.”

Not only is being nabe and putra important, but so is the relative seniority within a generation since this defines who should be called ‘raka’ (‘elder brother/sister’) or ‘rai’ (‘younger brother/sister’). This is clear in the case of the inharmonious relationship between Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Parama Dhaksa and Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Manik Mas. Each of these mpu claims himself to be the elder. According to Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa, when the dwijati ceremony was conducted in Sesetan for three new mpu, he was the first one consecrated, or more precisely, ‘adopted’ putra by the nabe, Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka. Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas was one of the two diksita consecrated later in the same dwijati. Hence, Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa is older, meaning that Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas should address him as ‘raka.’ On the other hand, Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas claims that he was the first one consecrated, and hence he is older, and Ida Sri Mpu Parama Dhaksa should call him ‘raka.’ The claim of who is raka and who is rai remains unsettled to the present day (1996), and the two sri mpu avoid addressing one another directly. In conversation, they practice the strategy of nyaru basa, making the form of address unclear.

---

21 ‘Eat’ or ngrayunin in Balinese word, is a common vernacular term to indicate that a sulinggih is officiating at a ritual ceremony. The more formal term is muput (‘to complete’) or ngalokapasraya.

22 The raka-rai position is not the only source of the conflict between these two senior sri mpu. According to Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Parama Dhaksa, he had been offended several times by Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Manik Mas, the most notable time being at the paruman sulinggih in Denpasar in 1978. “At that meeting I was late, and came when the meeting was already in progress. Ida Sri Mpu Nabe Manik Mas sarcastically said, ‘Ah, this is the most important mpu who has just arrived. He looks like Bima...’ and I was offended, and answered his words by saying ‘yes, I am a coarse mpu like Bima... but if you are so refined like Arjuna, see first your face in the mirror.’ He was offended too, and since then we have practiced avoidance, a sort of puik.” (Puik is a common practice in Balinese social interactions where two parties, because of ill feeling, do not speak to each other. In particular, in the state of puik, it is considered derogatory to the self or embarrassing to mention the other party’s name.)
CONFLICT AFTER THE DWIJATI

Although sri mpu have been welcomed by society in general, in some regions the use of sri mpu is still hotly disputed, not only by other warga, but also among the members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves. Of the several consecrations performed by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, open conflict has occurred in two cases, both in Kabupaten Klungkung, i.e. at the dwijati of Ida Sri Mpu Dhyana Dhaksa Dharma in Desa Adat Aan and Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna Yogattama in Desa Adat Tribhuana.

Conflict in Desa Adat Aan

In the case of the dwijati of Ida Sri Mpu Dhyana Dhaksa Dharma in Desa Adat Aan, Klungkung, his consecration was strongly contested by his own relatives. This was later used by the bupati as grounds to refuse issuing him a dwijati permit.

Those who objected to this dwijati had their own particular reasons for their refusal. Some said that the appointment of a sri mpu is a baseless idea (ngae-ngae), and some maintained that a sri mpu is not needed in society because there are already pedanda. A well-informed informant from Desa Adat Aan described his position in rejecting the dwijati of Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Dharma as follows:

I do not have any doubt about the right of a members of Warga Pasek to be a sulinggih, as mentioned in the Babad Pasek. But what matters for me is that the harmony of the village might be disrupted. By tradition we have been using pedanda, and nobody refuses. Ritual ceremonies go on smoothly, and I believe they are well accepted by Ida Betara. So, in what sense do we need another kind of sulinggih or sri mpu? In contrast, the presence of sri mpu would split the desa adat and the warga. Especially here in Klungkung, where the Triwangsya are very strong, specifically the gria and puri. It is not yet time to make a sri mpu, particularly in this village, since our village members are mostly unaware (tidak mengerti). What we need is order, harmony, unity, brotherhood, etc. In other regions, such as Tabanan, Badung, and Jembrana, I know that the sri mpu is accepted. But again, it is not here...!

And you can see, my fear comes true! After the dwijati, my desa adat has split; some insist on using the sri mpu while others maintain tradition and insist on using pedanda. The two groups inevitably have ill-feeling towards each other, which often explodes into exchanging dirty words. I know Warga Brahmana in this village feel that their authority is being challenged and,
naturally, they do their best to protect what they have held for generations. The pedanda feel that their sisya are taken by the sri mpu. In short, the village has fallen into feuding. So, what are we trying to seek? (Made Warta 1994).

It was true that the desa adat had split into two factions, and the ill-feeling of one to the other was evident. One group continued supporting the pedanda, who was also in Desa Adat Aan, while the other was determined to use the sri mpu, “as the bisama says.” A number of informants also told me that after the sri mpu returned home from the dwijati ceremony in Bongkasa, his house (after dwijati, called gria) had stones thrown at it several times by unidentified people, most probably by those who did not agree with the dwijati. Until 1994 (when I conducted my fieldwork), degrading words over the sri mpu were still heard. Nonetheless, around half of the desa adat members used the services of the sri mpu. The sri mpu was also used by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from neighbouring villages.

Conflict in Desa Adat Tribhuana

A worse case occurred in Desa Adat Tribhuana, Dalem Kauh, Klungkung, regarding the dwijati of Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna Yogattama from Banjar Pawirama.

I Nengah Siman (born in 1940) was a bendesa adat of Desa Adat Tribhuana in the 1960s, after which he served as a pemangku of Pura Desa for decades. In 1993 he and his wife, Ni Wayan Murki (born in 1943), had the ekajati ceremony performed to become jero-gede, with Ida Sri Mpu Dwijaksara as their nabe. On 6 February 1995 I Nengah Siman applied for a permit for dwijati from the Parisada of Kabupaten Klungkung. The application was accompanied by all the required documents.

The same letter was also sent to the MGPSSR Pusat, which in fact had been made aware of this plan well in advance, since the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Klungkung often consulted with the MGPSSR Pusat about the situation in Klungkung. The diksa pariksa from the Tim Walaka of the MGPSSR Pusat was administered on 23 March 1995 in Denpasar, witnessed by the MGPSSR of Kabupaten Klungkung. This diksa pariksa resulted in the issuance of decision
no. 38/MGPSSR/III/1995, which stated that Jero-gede Siman was eligible to undergo *dwijati*, and hence the MGPSSR Pusat gave full authority to the *nabe*, Ida Sri Mpu Dwijaksara, to do so. However, the letter said that full consideration had to be paid to the local situation. A letter of support was also issued by *Paruman Panca Rsi*, saying that Jero-gede Siman was ready to become a *sulinggih*.

The *Parisada* of Klungkung conducted *diksa pariksa* on 24 March 1994, after which it issued a letter which stated that Jero-gede Siman was granted a permit to undergo a *dwijati* ceremony. In the letter of approval, No. 132/PHDI.Kab/95, dated 3 April 1995, it was said that (1) the application of Jero-gede Siman to undergo *dwijati* was granted; and (2) the decision letter for the permit would follow.

The *dwijati* was performed on 15 April 1995, preceded by a *mati raga* on 14 April 1995 in Banjar Pawirama, Desa Adat Tribhuana. The newly consecrated *sulinggih* was named Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna Yogattama, while his wife was named Ida Sri Mpu Diksita Prami. After *ngalinggihang puja* on the *dwijati* day, the new *sulinggih* was given the full right of *lokapala*slraya. The formal ceremony of the *dwijati* was also witnessed by a representative of the Bupati of Klungkung, chairman of the *Parisada* of Klungkung, and other invited guests, in addition to leaders of the MGPSSR Pusat and the MGPSSR Kabupaten. Both the *bupati*’s representative and the *Parisada* gave speeches at this *dwijati*.

The consecration of this *sri mpu* resulted in severe conflicts within the *desa adat*. The *desa adat* split into two groups: one group supported the *sri mpu* (‘pro-mpu’), while the other was ‘anti-mpu.’ The majority of *desa adat* members fell into the ‘anti-mpu group,’ so that out of 257 members of the *desa adat*, only 30 were ‘pro-mpu’. On the day of the *dwijati* (15 April 1995), the ‘anti-mpu group’ of Banjar Pawirama ostentatiously conducted a feast-party in the *banjar* hall, at which they slaughtered pig, apparently to compete with the

---

23 These terms, ‘*pro-mpu*’ and ‘*anti-mpu*,’ were commonly used by the villagers themselves in referring to the two opposing groups.
dwijati celebration in the house of the diksita. A guest from Denpasar, who did not know the house of the diksita, told me that when he asked the location of the dwijati, he was informed wrongly by the desa adat members he met in the banjar hall. The day after the dwijati (16 April 1995) there was a fight between two teenagers from the two groups, and this was handled by the police. A month later, on 15 May 1995, the desa adat performed a special ritual ceremony called ngeningang raga ('cleaning ourselves'), the main purpose of which was to take an oath that they would not follow the group loyal to the sri mpu. Those who initially refused to participate were intimidated and told that there was a considerable possibility that those who were loyal to the sri mpu would be expelled from the desa adat. For fear of this, some moderate members, who had abstained before, half-heartedly participated in the ceremony. At the end of the ceremony the desa adat informally decided to expel ida sri mpu from the desa adat.

Soon after the dwijati, there was a temple festival at the Padharman Pasek in Besakih. To give moral support and to introduce the new mpu to the public, Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna was deliberately assigned by Paruman Panca Rsi to officiate at this temple festival on 22 April 1995, and again on 6 May 1995. Some members of the 'anti-mpu group' paid a visit to the Padharman Ratu Pasek on 22 April 1995 and saw Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna Yogattama officiating at the ceremony there. This led one of them to write an open anonymous letter addressed to the Parisada, which appeared in the Bali Post on 3 May 1995. The writer of the letter, who claimed himself to be a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, did not question the use of the sri mpu in Padharman Pasek Besakih, but the validity of the priesthood of Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna Yogattama. He claimed that I Nengah Siman

...on his own initiative had conducted a dwijati ceremony on 15 April 1995 in his own house... without getting permission from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Desa Adat Tribhuana... and he gave himself the title Sri Mpu Wiryaguna.”
The writer of the letter further asked the Parisada whether the priesthood of I Nengah Siman was valid. The Parisada, however, did not make any response to this letter. A response came from a leader of the MGPSSR (Jero Mangku Gede Ktut Soebandi), whose letter appeared in the Bali Post on 11 May 1995. Ktut Soebandi referred to the process of the dwijati, the involvement of the Parisada and other government officers in the process, and the rules set down by the Parisada. Finally he concluded that the priesthood status (kasulinggihan) of I Nengah Siman or Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna was valid.

The culminating point of the desa adat antipathy to Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna occurred on 26 May 1995. On this day, the desa adat held a general meeting at which it was decided that Ida Sri Mpu Wiryaguna Yogattama was expelled from the desa adat, in the sense that (a) members of the desa adat were forbidden to talk to him (puik); (b) he could not be active in desa adat affairs; and (c) he was not allowed to perform prayers in the village temple. Together with the sri mpu, 30 families of the ‘pro-mpu group’ were also expelled and treated in the same way as the sri mpu. Whoever spoke with one of them would be fined 250 kepeng (Chinese coin), multiplied by the number of households in the desa adat. Since the number of desa adat members (minus those who were expelled) was 227, any one who dared to speak with the sri mpu would be fined 250 x 227 or 56,750 kepeng, equivalent to Rp. 5,675,000 (around US$ 2,478). This was definitely an amount that a villager could not afford.

Aside from the expulsion of the sri mpu and the members of the ‘pro-mpu’ group, the expelled members were continually terrorised. Their houses were

---

24 The Parisada employed the politics of silence (politik diam) in this case. Leaders of Parisada told me that the best strategy for the Parisada was to be silent since this issue was sensitive and in fact the dispute merely involved a warga. “This is a very sensitive matter, a conflict between ‘religious truth’ on one hand and ‘sociological truth’ on the other. It is in fact a dispute within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and hence let the MGPSSR resolve it” (Cok Semarapura 1995). Despite this reason, I observed that the politics of silence was employed by the Parisada because it could not take a firm stance on the ‘religious truth.’ Apparently, decisions of the Parisada are currently dominated by the interests of the Triwangsa, particularly of Warga Brahmana.

25 For comparison, the annual per capita income of Bali in 1993 was Rp. 1,410,197 (around US$ 615.8). This figure was apparently less among farmers, the majority of members of Desa Adat Tribhuana.
subject to damage 'by unidentified persons.' From May to October 1995, nearly every night house stoning was reported. In September 1995 a half hectare of standing rice belonging to I Ketut Margi, a member of the ‘pro-mpu’ group, was burned at night. These criminal actions were reported to the bendesa adat, lurah, camat and police, but such actions continued.

The matter was noted by Golkar officials who sent a representative to investigate the matter. The team was headed by Dr I Made Titib, the chairman of the Religious Bureau of Golkar of Bali. In this investigation, members of Desa Adat Tribhuana disclosed that I Nengah Siman underwent his dwijati ceremony without a permit from the desa adat. Accordingly, he was considered to have cut his relations with the desa adat (ninggal sesana). In return, the desa adat had also cut its ties with him by expelling him, his family members, and his supporters, from desa adat membership. After becoming a sulinggih, he was prohibited from officiating at the kahyangan tiga temple because the use of sri mpu was not accepted in the village.

The Golkar team, in its report dated 7 June 1995, wrote that “the police of Klungkung had given protection [to the ‘pro-mpu group’] since the disturbances had occurred, and are continuously monitoring the developments in Desa Adat Tribhuana, but up to now the police has not been successful in catching the culprits of the criminal actions.” The Golkar team held the view that the majority of the desa adat members in Tribhuana had insufficient knowledge of Hinduism and believed that if a member underwent the dwijati ceremony to become a sulinggih, he was considered ninggal sesana (‘cutting the relations’), which was totally baseless. Further, the expulsion of a sulinggih is a humiliation (pelecehan) of the Hinduism and national laws since the permit to become a sulinggih was issued by the Parisada, the highest Hindu council, and witnessed by government officials. Although the desa adat has its own autonomy, if this autonomy is used against religion, Pancasila, and national laws, the government must take action.

The report also mentioned that a desa adat might prohibit certain sulinggih from officiating at kahyangan tiga if members of the desa adat agreed. However, there should be no such restriction. If a member of a warga decides to
use his selected sulinggih to officiate at his own ceremony in the kahyangan tiga, this does not mean that the sulinggih is “officiating at the kahyangan tiga,” but merely “officiating at an individual ceremony taking place in the kahyangan tiga.” Based on this position, the team urged the relevant agencies to approach the desa adat and give more guidance on religious matters.

Seeds of the Conflict

The conflict of the Desa Adat Tribhuana did not occur solely because of the consecration of the sri mpu, although it was associated with this event. The situation was compounded by other factors. Conflicts leading to the split of desa adat members into two groups emerged in 1993, and its seeds might have already been there even years before. In January 1993 a ngaben ceremony was held for I Made Pasek, the former kepala desa of Tribhuana. In this ngaben, a sri mpu (Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Dharma of Aan) was invited, instead of a pedanda, which had been the usual practice. The villagers grumbled over this change, but they did not take action because the ngaben was an individual ceremony. However, the seeds of ill feeling had been sown, both among members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi who are the pangempon of Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Tribhuana, and among desa adat members in general.

In August 1993 a collective ngaben was performed by the desa adat. Since the majority of desa adat members were Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, the ngaben ceremony was, in practice, administered by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. In preparation for this ngaben, several meetings were held, the first one being in May 1993. At this meeting the desa adat members were divided regarding the sulinggih to be invited to officiate at the ngaben. After a long discussion, the bendesa adat, I Made Nitha, decided that two sulinggih would officiate at the ngaben ceremony, ie. a pedanda and a sri mpu; and desa adat members agreed on this plan. In early June 1993, a second meeting took place, at which the ngaben schedule was decided, and it was reiterated that there would be two sulinggih, a sri mpu and a pedanda.

In mid June 1993, another meeting was held, at which it was decided that the cost for the ngaben would be around Rp. 300,000 to Rp. 500,000 per body
cremated. However, there were two different positions among desa adat members associated with the cost. On the one hand, some members wanted to have a total ngaben (meaning that all rituals associated with the ngaben would be performed at one time), and this would cost Rp. 500,000. On the other hand, the rest maintained that there should only be ngaben, while the associated rituals (ngaroras and mamukur) could be done at another time. Such a ngaben would cost only Rp. 300,000. Although a total ngaben would be more efficient in the end, most members preferred to have ngaben without ngaroras, because they could not afford the cost of the total ngaben at once. Since they could not reach an agreement, the ngaben was classified into two groups, they called them Group A and Group B. Group A, the majority, would perform only ngaben, without ngaroras or mamukur, at a cost of Rp. 300,000; while Group B, the minority, consisting mostly of more wealthy members of the desa adat, would perform ngaben with ngaroras, at a cost of Rp. 500,000. The idea of using different sulinggih sharpened this grouping, where Group A (the majority) decided to invite a pedanda, while Group B (the minority) decided to invite a sri mpu. Since then, these group were better known as ‘anti-mpu’ and ‘pro-mpu’ groups respectively.

Competition leading to conflict was unavoidable. The conflict culminated on the day of the ngaben, 6 August 1993. According to members of ‘pro-mpu’ group, the group of the majority (anti-mpu group) planned to destroy the wadah (cremation tower) of the ‘pro-mpu’ group. In response, the ‘pro-mpu’ group (the minority) promptly invited the police and army to protect them. So the ngaben ceremony was guarded by police and military men.

After the ngaben, the conflict continued, and the pangempon of the Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Tribhuana as well as the desa adat members remained polarised. In October 1993, in a ritual ceremony called ngusaba kapat, a number of youth from the majority group refused to be sprinkled with holy water by the pemangku on duty because the pemangku, Mangku Suharta, was from the ‘pro-mpu’ group; in fact he was a leader of the group. The pemangku and his group members were irritated, and this matter was brought to a desa adat meeting in February 1994. However, they lost at the meeting because their
number was small in comparison to desa adat members from ‘anti-mpu’ group (the majority). Instead of blaming the youths who had harassed (melecehkan) the pemangku as an officer of the desa adat, the pemangku was fired.

The feud continued. Those who used pedanda called themselves Kelompok Pecinta Pedanda (‘the pedanda loving group’), and informally started to excommunicate members of ‘pro-mpu’ group from the desa adat. Since the conflict began in 1993, there have been three deaths in the ‘pro-mpu’ group, and the ‘anti-mpu’ group families did not pay visits to them. They preferred to be absent (nosa) from these banjar affairs and paid the fine. The ‘abstaining group’ also did not dare to visit the ‘pro-mpu’ group, because they were afraid that they would be treated in the same way as the ‘pro-mpu’ group. Hence, the ‘pro-mpu’ group of 30 families was practically isolated. A member of this group told me,

The terror has been above our capacity to bear. Not only physical terror such as stone throwing, or psychological means such as excommunication and humiliation, but also magical terror.

We have several times tried to approach them. For example, when a member of their group died, we paid a visit..., but no one talked to us. We were considered no better than a rotten dog (cicing berung). When they conducted ngaben, they deliberately kicked and broke our fence on the way to the cemetery. Around March 1994, a ngaben ceremony was performed by Group A for Mangku Suma. In carrying the cremation tower to the cemetery, the group brutally ran over a fence belonging to a member of Group B. In November 1994, another ngaben took place for Mangku Sukri. In this ngaben, there were also fences knocked down intentionally (Komang Ardana 1994).

On the other hand, a member of the ‘anti-mpu’ group told me that the ‘pro-mpu’ group members are arrogant people, and this arrogance was mainly due to the high socio-economic status gained by them.26

They are very arrogant because they feel they are successful in education and wealth. But wealth and high education are not enough to be a good Balinese.

---

26 Indeed, it is evident that members of the ‘pro-mpu’ group generally are economically better off than members of the ‘anti-mpu’ group. A number of people from the ‘pro-mpu’ group had gained good positions in government offices and at Udayana University.
In terms of the use of a sri mpu instead of a pedanda, initially we did not pay so much attention. But later, they tried to force everyone to follow them, and forced the desa adat to use a sri mpu in the kahyangan tiga, which, of course, was rejected by those from outside Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, as well as members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves. They wanted to have a revolution in our village, and their ways were improper. Once they had a sulinggih, a sri mpu, they started to be proud of their mpu and looked down on the pedanda, who had for generations served us. So, let them now receive their own self-inflicted punishment (Nengah Karda 1994).

The conflict continued in physical terms. In August 1994, a motor bike and a rice field belonging to members of the ‘pro-mpu’ group were destroyed. On 1 October 1994, a car of a member of the ‘pro-mpu’ group was destroyed, followed by stone throwing at houses belonging to members of the ‘pro-mpu’ group. Despite the terror, the ‘pro-mpu’ group was determined. In the annual festival of their dadya agung on 21 December 1994, each group invited their respective sulinggih. Hence there were two sulinggih (a pedanda and a sri mpu) officiating at the ceremony, but at different times. Each group openly refused the holy water from the other’s sulinggih.

This continuing conflict was brought to the attention of the police by the ‘pro-mpu’ group. They also reported the matter to the MGPSSR Pusat, requesting that necessary action be taken. In an effort to settle the conflict the MGPSSR has several times consulted with the bupati of Klungkung as well as the police.

The matter has in fact drawn the attention of the Governor of Bali. In a letter dated 10 October 1994 (No. 454/15186/Binsos), the governor asked the Bupati of Klungkung to investigate the matter. In response, in a letter dated 23 November 1994 (No. 454/2899/Sosial), the bupati reported that in fact a team from the bupati’s office had approached prominent figures of the two opposing groups (on 17 and 26 September 1994), and advised that (a) ritual ceremonies had to be officiated by sulinggih, ie. those who had undergone their dwijati; (b) it is not advisable to force anybody to use either a sri mpu or a pedanda to officiate at their ceremonies; and (c) since the sri mpu was not yet well accepted in Desa Adat Tribhuana, a pedanda should be used in officiating at all ritual ceremonies, particularly in the kahyangan tiga, as had been the practice so far.

A letter with exactly the same content was also sent by the Parisada of
Klungkung to the Parisada of Bali on 28 September 1994 (letter No. 67/PHDI.KAB/IX/94).

Members of the ‘pro-mpu’ group seemed to be frustrated by the failure of the police to handle the criminals. It seemed, according to them, that the police of Klungkung was half-hearted in taking action because people of the Parisada of Klungkung and other government officers seemed to quietly favour the ‘anti-mpu’ group. Hence, the ‘pro-mpu’ group tried to attract the attention of higher level police. To do this, two educated members of this group (both graduated from the faculty of law), wrote a letter on 8 June 1995 asking for more attention from the police and military. This letter was addressed to the police and military district of Klungkung, and carbon copies were sent to (1) the head of police of Nusa Tenggara in Denpasar; (2) the military commander of Udayana/Nusa Tenggara in Denpasar; (3) the military rayon in Klungkung; (4) the police sector office of Klungkung; (5) Golkar of Bali; (7) Golkar of Klungkung; (7) the prosecutor of Klungkung; (8) the prosecutor of Bali; (9) the MGPSSR Pusat; (10) Camat Klungkung; and (11) Lurah Dalem Kauh.

Despite these efforts, the conflict had not been resolved as of November 1995, and the situation of the desa adat was still tense.

SUMMARY

This chapter has shown that, at present, the priesthood is a battle field between the ideology of homo-hierarchicus and homo-aequalis, or a means in the struggle for status and identity, particularly among Jaba. The Parisada, as the highest Hindu council, has since 1968 recognised that all sulinggih are equal in status, which means that all sulinggih, regardless of their warga of origin, theoretically have the same rights and duties. This formal acknowledgment by the Parisada has been effectively used by some warga in Bali to channel their struggle for status through the priesthood.

This is clear in the case of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Through the MGPSSR, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi has been active in consecrating their sulinggih. Since the
establishment of the MGPSSR in 1969 they had consecrated 42 sri mpu, and there are many jero-gede, candidates for new sri mpu, who will undergo their dwijati ceremonies in 1996 or soon after. In order to be able to use their sulunggih to spread their ideology, the MGPSSR tries to produce sulunggih of ‘high quality.’ This is partly achieved through the rules of a ‘priesthood ladder,’ where a walaka from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi cannot directly undergo a dwijati ceremony without first becoming a pemangku and then a jero-gede. Another means to ensure quality is through a diksa pariksa, where a special team from the MGPSSR Pusat examines the readiness of the candidate from several aspects, which include knowledge of theology (tattwa) and ethics (susila), as well as the candidate’s behaviour. Only after a candidate meets all these requirements, will he be allowed to apply for a permit for dwijati from the Parisada. Compared to other warga, the process determined by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is more complicated since in other warga (Warga Pande, Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, Warga Brahmana Siwa, and Warga Brahmana Boda), priesthood ladders and diksa pariksa conducted by the warga organisation are unknown.

Aside from the effort to achieve quality, several practices found in the consecration of a sri mpu from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are also meant to mark identity by marking ‘differences.’ In this regard identity is not a fixed or stable condition. It is dynamic, continually in process, and contextually determined. Identity is reproduced in the context of social interaction with others, and created through meaningful actions, where boundaries of the ‘we-ness’ and ‘other-ness’ are constructed. These boundaries are strengthened by celebrating ‘differences.’ Some of these differences are to be seen in the dwijati ceremony of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, where its members are proud of the exotic mati raga (death ceremony before dwijati), and the gesture of the dwijati itself (the use of the palm, instead of the foot). The existence of the sri mpu genealogy, with rigid rules of conduct, is yet another marked difference.

Despite some success in introducing and acquainting warga members with sri mpu, as indicated by the increasing number of warga members who have turned to sri mpu recently, in some areas the presence of the sri mpu is hotly
disputed. Ironically, the objection not only comes from other warga, but more importantly from the members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves. The use and consecration of a sri mpu in Desa Adat Tribhuana and Aan have created continuing conflicts. In the case of Tribhuana, the conflict has led to the expulsion of the group loyal to the sri mpu, though this situation seems to have arisen from several other factors. Associated factors include the socio-economic gap between the two groups of the desa adat members, where the expelled group members are economically better off.

Although the Parisada has acknowledged that all sulinggih are equal in status, this recognition is still merely on paper, and there is no strong force within the Parisada to implement it in real life. The leaders of the Parisada, particularly those from Triwangsa, still hold personal views that non-pedanda sulinggih are lower in status than the pedanda, the sulinggih from Warga Brahmana Siwa and Warga Brahmana Boda. This can be seen in the selection of sulinggih to officiate at major ritual ceremonies for the public. On the other hand, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, as well as other warga who have their own sulinggih, are willing to struggle to gain formal acknowledgment at the social level. This struggle will be the main focus of the next chapter.
Chapter Eight

IN SEARCH OF DIFFERENCE (5):
IDA SRI MPU IN PUBLIC CEREMONIES

Caturvarnayam maya srstam, gunakarmavibhagasah, tasya kartaram api mam, viddy akartaram avayam.

Brahmanakstariyavisam, sudranam ca paramtapa, karmoni pravibhaktani, svabhava prabhavair gunaih.

I created catur varna in due consideration of the differences of the qualities and aptitude (guna and karma) among men. Although I am the author of this system, one should know that I am immutable and eternal (Bhagavadgitha IV: 13).

Of Brahman, Ksatrya, Vaisya, and Sudra, O, Arjuna, vocation is separately assigned in conformity with modalities arising from their own talent (svabhava) (Bhagavadgitha XVIII: 41).

The struggle for equality by the MGPSSR is carried on in several ways. One of the most important ways is through the struggle over priesthood. The priesthood has been the spearhead of the struggle because, in the view of the MGPSSR leaders, sociological equality among the Jaba and the Triwangsa can only be achieved if their priests have been sociologically recognised as equal in status. The position of priesthood is strategic in Balinese Hindu practices.

This chapter will describe the use of the priesthood by the MGPSSR, and its counter actions, both by other warga and by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves. As the use of sri mpu is a relatively new practice --in comparison to the use of pedanda-- it is evident that this practice has not gained strong recognition; in some areas, it has even been ridiculed. People’s perception of the sri mpu and their use is wide ranging. This is to say that the perception of the existence of the sri mpu depends on who is asked and in what situation. Despite some frustration on the side of the MGPSSR, the use of sri mpu in
present day Bali is gaining ground, supported by the rationalisation and Indonesianisation of Balinese Hinduism, as well as by the strong ‘back to the Veda’ movement.

**NGABEN MASAL AS A SHOW OF FORCE**

One of the first projects launched by the MGPSSR was a mass cremation ceremony, locally referred to as *ngaben masal*, for three *desa adat* in Desa Munggu, a village in the vicinity of Denpasar. This project was carried out in 1971. Before proceeding to describe this project, it is worth outlining the *ngaben* ceremony in Bali in general to understand the context of the Pasek-sponsored *ngaben masal* more clearly.

**Ngaben, Returning the Borrowed Elements**

There are two worlds in Balinese Hindu cosmology, called *bhuana agung* (‘the great world,’ the macrocosm or the universe) and *bhuana alit* (‘the little world,’ the microcosm, or the human individual). The two worlds are the same, except in size. Both worlds are made up of five main elements (*panca maha buta*), i.e. *peritiwi* (soil or solid matter), *apah* (water or liquid matter), *teja* (light or radiant matter), *bayu* (wind or gas matter), and *akasa* (ether or undefined, void). The *panca maha buta* in the microcosm originate from the *panca maha buta* of the macrocosm as ‘borrowed property.’ When these borrowed elements are no longer in use by the soul (*atma*), the elements must be returned to the macrocosm.

*Ngaben* is philosophically a post-mortuary ceremony the aim of which is to return the *panca maha buta* of the dead body to their source, the macrocosm. To hasten the process, the best way is through the medium of fire; in other

---

1 Elaborate descriptions of these ‘five great elements’ can be found in Katharane Edson Mershon (1970).

2 For an elaborate description of *ngaben*, its offerings and philosophy, see I Gusti Ketut Kaler (1993).
words, burning the dead body. Accordingly, *ngaben* is commonly regarded as a ‘cremation ceremony,’ although this conception cannot represent the deep meaning of the ceremony. Further, by returning ‘ashes to ashes’ and ‘dust to dust,’ it is believed that the soul of the dead is freed from its boundedness to its previous body, and hence this eases its journey to heaven (*Yama loka*).

Cremating the corpse directly after death involves a great deal of preparation and requires considerable funding. Since death is an unplanned event, this practice is often beyond the financial means of less fortunate families. In addition, there are other reasons for delaying the *ngaben* ceremony, such as religious prohibitions (there might be a major ritual ceremony in a certain temple at the time of the death), or in the case of bad death (i.e. being killed in an accident, natural disaster, or suicide). In such cases, the dead are first buried and the *ngaben* ceremony will take place later when circumstances allow.

In regard to what is actually cremated during the *ngaben* ceremony, the Balinese have developed three terms for *ngaben*. The first is called *sawa wedana* ('caring for the dead body'), where the body of the dead (called *sawa matah* or ‘fresh corpse’) is immediately cremated. This is the preferred practice provided other factors allow it, and for priests this is the prescribed way of *ngaben*. The second is named *asti wedana* ('caring for the skeleton'). In this case the corpse is first buried, and after a certain time the skeleton is dug up to be cremated. This is the most common practice in Kabupaten Klungkung and Gianyar among people of ordinary status, i.e. not priests or royal families. The third is called *swasta* ('symbol'), where the dead is represented by an effigy made of sandalwood and thatch grass, and this effigy is cremated as if it were the corpse. This type of *ngaben* is commonly found in Kabupaten Badung and Tabanan. This is also practised, naturally, if the dead body cannot be found, for example if the deceased is lost in battle or drowned at sea. This type of *ngaben* is also a compulsory practice in several villages surrounding major temples such as Besakih, Batur, and Batukaru. The reason, according to the villagers, is to prevent the smoke and dust of the burning corpse rising above the temples, which would spiritually pollute them.
Although there are significant differences in the details of these three types of ngaben, the principles and sequence of events are the same. All have to go through several steps, such as mrateka sawa (‘preparing the body of the dead’), cremation (the narrow meaning of ngaben), nganyut (throwing the ashes into a river or the sea), atma wedana (‘caring for the soul’), nyekah (‘calling the soul back to the family shrine’), and ngajar-ajar (touring the soul round several temples, called also nyegara-gunung or ‘touring to sea and mountain’).

Ngaben is the most elaborate ceremony in Balinese tradition, and accordingly it is the most costly one. It was common for peasants to sell their land to finance a ngaben ceremony. The high cost of this ceremony attracted criticism from Balinese intellectuals in the 1920s, who proposed simplifying it by giving more attention to the philosophical aspects of ngaben (and other ritual ceremonies) rather than concentrating merely on its ritualistic aspects. This proposal was unsuccessful in changing the tradition because, at that time, the majority of the Balinese perceived the scale of the ngaben as an index of one’s status. However, the intellectuals were successful in reducing the individual financial expense for ngaben by introducing collective ngaben (called ngaben masal or ngerit) instead of the individual ceremony. The collective and simplified ngaben was also supported by the government in the early 1960s when planning was taking place for the Ekadasa Rudra ceremony in Besakih in 1963. Before this once-in-a-century ritual could be conducted, all corners of the territory of Bali had to be cleansed, and this meant that no corpse could remain uncremated. To meet this goal, the government (through the Office of Religion) urged people to conduct collective ngaben. At the same time, every step of the ceremony was simplified, for which purpose an old text, ie. the Yama Purwana Tattwa manuscript, was reintroduced and used as a guide (Kaler 1993; Connor 1996). Since then, collective ngaben has become a common practice in Bali.

There are at least four ways of grouping people to conduct collective ngaben (ngerit). The first, and the most common, is based on warga or close relatives within a desa adat, so that those of the same sanggah-gede or dadya

---
3 The extravagance of the ngaben ceremony, even for the poorest Balinese, has been a subject of extensive writing. See, for example, Covarrubias (1937).
within a banjar or desa adat collectively perform ngaben. In this case, the preparation of the ngaben is usually made in the house of the sponsoring family, usually in the house where the sanggah-gede or dadya temple is located. Those outside the dadya circle usually hesitate to involve their not-yet-cremated ancestors (or relatives) in this ngaben. The second form of ngaben masal is based on the banjar or desa adat. In this banjar-sponsored ngaben masal, everything is organised by the banjar (or the desa adat), and all warga within the desa adat are urged to include their uncremated dead. As this is a banjar or desa adat project, preparations are usually done in the banjar's facilities (in the bale banjar). The third form of ngaben masal is based on a patron-client (ratu-panjak) relationship. If a former royal family performs ngaben, its traditional subjects may also join in. This is popularly referred to as ngaben ngiring ('following,' in this case, following the king). Since it is sponsored by a noble family (usually puri 'palace'), all preparations are done within the complex of the puri. Similar to this type of ngaben masal is another model of collectivity which is based on a siwa-sisya relationship. This is also called ngiring, in this case not following a royal family, but a priestly family. If a priest (a siwa) dies and is, as usual, immediately cremated, his sisya (disciples) who were uncremated generally join the ngaben.

Ngaben Masal in Desa Adat Cemagi

The ngaben masal is strongly supported by many modern Balinese intellectuals since it significantly reduces the expense of the ceremony without neglecting its essence. The MGPSSR is also a supporter of ngaben masal and in fact has sponsored several for its members. The first ngaben masal sponsored by the MGPSSR took place in 1971 and was for all members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in three desa adat in Munggu, ie. Desa Adat Munggu, Desa Adat Cemagi, and Desa Adat Seshe. This ngaben masal was the first mass project of the MGPSSR, and was undertaken to achieve a number of purposes simultaneously. At that time, sri mpu were hardly known by the mass of society, including members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves. Most members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi --some put the figure at more than 95 percent-- had used
the services of pedanda for centuries in a siwa-sisya relationship. The ngaben masal in Cemagi was intended to introduce the use of sri mpu among members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and also to cut the siwa-sisya relationship between members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and pedanda by preventing the members from both following (ngiring) a pedanda in the ngaben and by performing ngaben without inviting a pedanda to officiate. The ngaben masal was also used as a means of bringing together warga members and thus to develop a sense of brotherhood among members who were not yet ‘aware.’ More importantly, it was intended to have a strong external-effect, ie. to show that Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was strong, so that other warga could not belittle it. Internally, it was also hoped that the ngaben masal would increase a sense of pride in being members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. All of these motivations were kept secret except among the circle of leaders. For external communication, the ngaben masal was said to help poor families who could not perform the ngaben individually. Individual ngaben were (and still are) indeed expensive. My informants told me that according to the village standards, they had to have at least two big cows and four big pigs to conduct an individual ngaben; thus, in 1971 prices, a ngaben cost around Rp. 700,000. In the ngaben masal, in this case at least, the charge for each cremated corpse was only Rp. 85,000 or around one tenth of the cost of an individual ngaben.

In planning the ngaben masal, the MGPSSR Pusat continuously encouraged the desa adat leaders of the three contiguous desa adat in Desa Dinas Munggu to do their best to ensure the success of this first mass project. Fortunately, all the leaders of these desa adat were from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, and the members of these desa adat were also mostly Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Preparatory meetings were conducted among the Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in these three desa adat. The formal designation of the meetings did not refer to the desa adat, but to ‘Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Desa Dinas Munggu.’ After they had reached an internal agreement, the warga members called a meeting at desa adat level to

---

4 Because sri mpu was hardly known at that time, very few families used their service. Informants told me that they were mostly used only by their close relatives or members of their respective dadya. The strong ties of siwa-sisya between Brahmna families and their respective clients inhibited the sri mpu from attracting followers (clients).
ask permission to use desa adat’s facilities, i.e. the bale banjar, village road, and particularly the cemetery, for the ngaben masal. Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi also invited any non-Pasek family who wished to join the ngaben masal. At the meeting, all desa adat members agreed to lend the desa adat facilities to Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi for this ngaben masal. Several families from Warga Brahmana Siwa had no objection either since Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi are also members of desa adat, and accordingly, were entitled to use desa adat facilities. Moreover, two non-Pasek families from Warga Arya Pandega also agreed to participate in the planned ngaben masal.

The idea of using sri mpu was crucial in this ngaben masal. When the Pasek leaders insisted on the use of sri mpu to officiate at the ceremony instead of pedanda, some members initially refused. There were two main reasons for this objection. First, they were worried about the success of the ceremony since the forsaken pedanda and their followers might harbour ill feelings and take revenge by spiritually obstructing the ceremony. In Balinese belief, the ngaben ceremony is susceptible to magical attack, because the ceremony involves a lot of ‘unclean supernatural beings’ such as polluted souls and lower-level spirits (buta kala). The second reason was not because they did not believe in sri mpu, but more importantly they subscribed to the teaching that ngutang siwa (‘to leave one’s priest,’ in this case to seek holy water from another priest) is a great sin. In addition, for most members at the time, the use of sri mpu was also less prestigious since the sri mpu is a Jaba, not a ‘Brahmana.’

To allay the fear of an unsuccessful ngaben, some Pasek elders, who were famous as spiritually powerful (sakti) men, came together from several villages throughout Bali and guaranteed that they had anticipated the matter and were prepared to meet any circumstance. One of the committee members told me:

We assured our warga that we were not a weak group that could easily be defeated from any aspect. I told our warga that the fear of spiritual disturbance was irrelevant because we had a lot of sakti people, and the sri mpu themselves were not ‘empty persons.’ If they were not ‘full’ (empet, bek), they would not dare to become sri mpu. They had passed various examinations and magic disturbances (ISM Wira Ragarunting 1994).
To overcome the second objection, the fear of the sin of leaving siwa, leaders of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi emphasised that following the holy message of the ancestor (the bisama) is much more important than following a siwa. This was supported by excerpts from the epics of the Ramayana and Mahabharata which showed how Hanuman and Rama (in the story of Ramayana) or Pandawa (in the story of Mahabharata) afforded parents (particularly their mother) the highest authority, whose command must be followed. However, as a compromise, all participants in the ngaben masal were allowed, and even urged to seek holy water from their respective siwa, provided that the holy water was only ‘cleansing holy water’ (tirta pabersihan), and not ‘opening-way holy water’ (tirta pangentas). At the official public ceremony all participants would use only holy water from sri mpu. This strategy meant that no one left their siwa, since they still sought holy water from their own siwa but at the same time they all used holy water from sri mpu.

Nonetheless, some pedanda were offended by this strategy. An informant told me of his experience as follows.

I was very very scared to go to my previous siwa, a pedanda in Desa Munggu, to ask only for tirta pabersihan, without inviting him to officiate at the ngaben ceremony. I was sure that he would harbour ill-feeling towards me. However, since we had agreed to use sri mpu, and this was decided by all, I had to follow the decision. I was told by the committee and Pasek leaders that if my siwa asked me about the decision to use sri mpu, I had to answer that I did not know anything about that, and I was just following the decision taken by the committee. I was instructed also by the committee that my duty was to ask for tirta pabersihan from my siwa; while the result, whether or not he would give the holy water, was not my responsibility. If he gave it, that was OK, and if not, it was even better..., because the refusal meant that he was the one leaving me, and not me leaving my siwa...!

It was true that my previous siwa took offence. He asked me, “why do you use sri mpu? Do you know that a sri mpu is a Sudra? Why do you let your head be rubbed by a Sudra?” As I had prepared at home, I answered, “I am sorry, Ratu

---

5 There are several kinds of holy water needed in ritual ceremonies in Bali. In the ngaben, the principal holy water would include: (1) tirta pabersihan, to ‘cleanse’ the corpse, so it is ready for the performance of the ritual; (2) tirta pangentas, to cut the emotional bonds between the soul and its previous body, and to open the way for the soul on its way to heaven; (3) tirta kawitan (from the ancestral temple), to ask blessing from the ancestors to free the soul from obstacles on the way to heaven; and (4) tirta kahyangan tiga (from village temples), particularly from the Pura Dalem, also to ask the blessing of the village deities.
Pedanda..., I know nothing about this matter. I am just only one of the hundreds of participants in this ngaben masal, and they have decided to use sri mpu. I have no say about this.” Then he looked very disappointed at my answer, and cynically asked me further, “if you have agreed to use sri mpu, why should you come to me again for the holy water? You had better ask your sri mpu to finish everything.” Again, I answered as I was told by our leaders, “Well, even though they said that sri mpu can provide every holy water needed for this ngaben, I feel uneasy without holy water from this gria, since I have been a follower of this gria for generations....”

The pedanda looked very unhappy, but he did not refuse to give me tirta pabersihan. Until now, I always ask for holy water from that gria, even though since then I have never again used a pedanda to officiate at my ceremonies (Mangku Puseh 1994).

Other informants, however, told me that their siwa welcomed their decision to use sri mpu, citing the concept siwa-raga (‘self-siwa’) and mujanggain (muja-angga, ‘self-enchanting’) found in several babad. This concept states that some warga, such as Pande, Bhujangga, and Pasek Sapta Rsi as well, are allowed to use their own elders to officiate at any ceremony within their respective warga.

In this way the ngaben masal went forward as planned on 3 September 1971. At the ngaben, four sri mpu officiated. They were Ida Sri Mpu Dwi Sari, Ida Sri Mpu Kamareka, Ida Sri Mpu Manik Mas, and Ida Sri Mpu Gde Reka.

This ngaben masal had a significant impact for both Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and other villagers. As the first ngaben masal ever performed in the village, its success in reducing the financial burden for such a ceremony without neglecting the essence of the ritual was of great importance for the villagers. It was successful in creating the impression that a ngaben masal is not inferior to an individual ngaben, which had been the impression until then. Since then, the ngaben masal has become the preferred alternative to an individual ngaben. Since this first ngaben masal, another development can also be noted particularly within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in Desa Adat Cemagi. If a member of the warga wants to perform a ngaben ceremony, he is obliged to include all uncremated dead within his dadya, regardless of the financial readiness of the owner of the dead. This is meant to help poor warga members, on the assumption that the cost of performing a ngaben ceremony for one dead person is not much more than the cost for several, and that the owners of the uncremated dead at least will contribute their labour. In practice, they usually
contribute at least one pig as well as rice, coconut, spices, etc., partly because of
the prestige, and partly because of the belief that the soul of the cremated dead
would be ashamed if it had to be a completely dependent on others, and this, in
turn, might anger the ancestors and cause them to send diseases on the living
relatives.

The success of the *ngaben masal* in Munggu inspired another *ngaben masal*
in Desa Adat Tumbakbayuh, a village located around 6 km from Munggu, also
in Kabupaten Badung. This *ngaben masal* was performed on 11 October 1971
and was also successful, in the sense that the *ngaben masal* went as planned, and
enhanced the pride of members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in their *sri mpu*. A
similar *ngaben masal* was then sponsored by the MGPSSR in Jembrana in 1975.
This ritual was even bigger, since it covered dozens of *desa adat* in Kabupaten
Jembrana. The *ngaben masal* took place in Desa Adat Pende, in the vicinity of
Negara, the capital of the *kabupaten*. More importantly, this tradition, ie.
*ngaben masal* for members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from several villages in
Jembrana, continues. The last *ngaben masal* was performed in 1994, taking
place in Desa Adat Pergung.

**OFFICIATING AT PUBLIC CEREMONIES**

In formal discourse, the equality of all *sulinggih* would not be disputed
publicly in present day Bali. This is in line with the formal position of the
*Parisada* (decision No. V/KEP/PHDP/1968, which was reinforced again in a
seminar in 1987). Sociologically, however, *sulinggih* in Bali are still viewed
hierarchically as belonging to at least two levels: *pedanda* (*siwa* and *boda*), on
the one hand, and non-*pedanda*, on the other. *Pedanda* are considered higher
than the non-*pedanda*, particularly by those of the *Triwangsa*. Most of the
*Triwangsa* people use *pedanda* for officiating at their individual ceremonies.
Only a few, whom I encountered in Kuta, Mengwi, and Denpasar, use non-
*pedanda* priests. The selection of priests for officiating at public temples or
public ceremonies shows the same pattern: only those of Warga Brahmana
origin are appointed. This practice implicitly negates the formal
acknowledgment of equal status, and angers the other warga from which sulinggih come, particularly Warga Pande (Maha Semaya Warga Pande), Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi (MGPSSR), and Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa (Keluarga Besar Bhujangga Waisnawa).

Geertz and Geertz rightly suggest that “homo hierarchicus and homo aequalis are engaged in Bali in war without end” (1975: 167). This is not only true of society in general, but also of priests, with the support of their warga organisations. All of the warga organisations state that their main objective in organising their members is to strengthen unity (persatuan) in line with the bisama (sacred instructions) of their ancestors, and maintain their warga’s temples (pura kawitan, padharman, or dadya agung). It is clear, however, that the emergence of these warga organisations has been strongly motivated by a desire to gain a sense of ‘being,’ to gain status, and to contest the dominance of other warga, particularly in religious and customary matters. This is particularly true for Jaba who have sulinggih of their own. Priesthood (kasulinggihan) is used in the struggle for equality; only after their sulinggih are equal can ordinary members of the warga say that they are really ‘equal.’ In short, to seek acknowledgement as being equal, the sulinggih must be made equal first.

The struggle of several warga to have their sulinggih equal in status to their pedanda counterparts is not an easy task. The cases cited below will illustrate this struggle, the arguments, and counter-arguments which surround it. The examples can be extended further, but for present purposes it is enough to cite just a few cases, particularly focusing on public ceremonies, ie. ceremonies covering more than one warga.

1. Tribhuana ceremony in Besakih

In contemporary discourse, Pura Besakih is positioned at the apex of the temple hierarchy of Balinese Hindu religion, and is often termed as the mother temple of Bali. Besakih is in fact not one temple but a complex of temples,
consisting of 20 public temples and 17 warga temples (padharman). There are numerous ceremonies performed in this temple complex, and the ones that attract the most participants from all over Bali, as well as Hindus from other islands, are Betara Turun Kabeh (every year) and Pancawalikrama (every 10 years). The largest ceremony, which is performed once in a century, is called Ekadasarudra. The last Ekadasarudra was performed in 1979. The Ekadasarudra is followed by other ceremonies, ie. Tribhuana and Ekabhuana. The Tribhuana, as one facet of the Ekadasarudra, was performed in 1993, while the Ekabhuana took place in 1996.

For the Tribhuana ceremony in 1993, three warga organisations, ie. Maha Semaya Warga Pande, Keluarga Besar Bhujangga Waisnawa (through its youth organisation, Eka Bhuna Sutha), and Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi, insisted that their sulinggih be included as officiating priests at the core ceremony. Leaders of these three warga met in early February 1993 and agreed that they had to struggle for the acknowledgment of their sulinggih, and that this acknowledgment had to be pursued through the inclusion of their sulinggih in the Tribhuana. For this purpose, they decided collectively to put forward this proposal to the committee organising the ceremony. To start with, they would invite the committee to give a general lecture (ceramah), which was planned to be conducted on 15 February 1993. In their joint letter of invitation (8 February 1993), they expected the team from the committee to give a lecture on (a) the relevance of the Tribhuana for Hindus and (b) the policy of the committee in selecting sulinggih to officiate at the ceremonies. However, realising that they would be placed in a difficult situation, the committee refused this invitation.

---

6 See Wayan Surpha (1979), Ktut Soebandi (1981) and David Stuart-Fox (1987) for further details.

7 In fact, before the one performed in 1979, an Ekadasarudra ceremony had been performed in 1963. However, this ceremony was considered improper, particularly because of the miscalculation of its timing. Several natural disasters which occurred after the ceremony, such as the eruption of Gunung Agung in 1963 and the earthquake in 1976, were cited as signals of this improper timing, and hence a new Ekadasarudra had to be performed. In the combined meeting between Paruman Sulinggih and Paruman Walaka on 24 July 1977, it was decided to perform a new Ekadasarudra on the new moon of Isaka year 1900, or 28 March 1979 (Surpha 1979).
Another joint meeting of these three warga to discuss the matter was held on 15 February 1993 in the house of the late Nyoman Oka, the chairman of the Maha Semaya. The meeting reiterated the proposal to involve sulinggih from all warga in Bali, the main argument being that Pura Besakih is a ‘public’ temple, ‘owned’ by all Hindus and accordingly, all warga that make up the membership of the Balinese Hinduism must be given the opportunity to participate. To convey this proposal to the organising committee, representatives from these warga called on the committee on 24 February 1993, and again on 5 March 1993. Both meetings resulted in a deadlock. The committee stood firm on its selected sulinggih, while the leaders of the three warga continued to insist that their sulinggih had to be involved. In rejecting the proposal of the three warga, the committee argued that ‘traditionally’ only three priests, called trisadhaka, comprising a pedanda boda, a pedanda siwa, and a rsi bhujangga (sengguhu) officiate at major ceremonies in the main complex. They used the terms mentioned by David Stuart-Fox (1987) which dichotomise ‘pemangku ceremonies’ on one hand and ‘pedanda ceremonies’ on the other, the latter being major ceremonies that must be officiated at by pedanda. In addition, the chairman of the committee, Drs Dewa Made Beratha, told the leaders of the three warga that the choice of the sulinggih to officiate at the ceremonies had been decided on at a priest meeting of the Parisada.

Leaders of the three warga questioned these arguments, pointing out that Pura Besakih had been there long before the advent of both Dang Hyang Astapaka, the originator of Warga Brahmana Boda, and Dang Hyang Dwijendra, the originator of Warga Brahmana Siwa. Logically, then, before the arrival of these pedanda originators, all ceremonies performed there were officiated by non-pedanda. They argued that the term trisadhaka, denoting ‘three priests,’ is not restricted to pedanda siwa, pedanda boda, and rsi bhujangga. The term had been in use long before the presence of pedanda boda and pedanda siwa, since this term had been used during the reign of Udayana and his wife Gunaprya Dharmapati (10-11th Century AD). The term trisadhaka is a general term for priests from the three major sects in the Balinese Hinduism, ie. Siwa (Sivaism), Boda (Buddhism), and Waisnawa (Vaisnavism). In short, descent line is not defined in the concept of trisadhaka, but merely priesthood based on sects. The
three warga also questioned the legitimacy of the priest meeting which made the selection of the sulinggih, since sulinggih from their warga --who were members of the council-- were never invited to discuss the matter. The committee, dominated by Warga Brahmana, could not give a proper answer to these arguments, but they were unwilling to compromise.

Despite the rejection of the committee, the three warga were determined to resume their struggle. To do this, they wrote a joint letter (dated 11 March 1993), addressed to the organising committee with carbon copies to the governor, the head of the Office of Religion, and the chairman of the Parisada. The letter, which was signed by the chairman of the MGPSSR (Prof Ketut Rika), the chairman of the Maha Semaya (Nyoman Oka), and the chairman of Eka Bhuana Sutha (Made Rai Suarthana), stated:

1. The three warga would each assign a sulinggih to participate in the ceremony at Klotok beach (as an integral part of the Tribhuana ceremony) on 21 March 1993.

2. The three warga would each assign a sulinggih to officiate in Bencingah Agung Besakih and in Penataran Agung Besakih, at the peak of the Tribhuana ceremony on 23 March 1993.

3. In relation to items 1 and 2 above, the committee should prepare platforms and the offerings needed for these sulinggih, both at Klotok beach and in Besakih.

This dispute was brought to the governor, who was acting as adviser to the organising ceremony. To resolve the problem, the governor held a tripartite meeting between himself, the committee, and the three warga on 19 March 1993. To ensure the success of the Tribhuana ceremony and in order not to create problems which might obstruct the smooth flow of the ceremonies, the governor (himself a member of Warga Brahmana Siwa) advised the three warga to be tolerant for the time being. The governor further promised that for future ceremonies (such as the forthcoming Ekabhuana in 1996) sulinggih from these warga would be included. Leaders of the three warga could do nothing except accept the advice bitterly.
2. *Ekabhuana* ceremony in Besakih

The *Ekabhuana* ceremony is another integral part, at the tail-end, of the once-in-a-century ceremony in the Besakih complex. This ceremony was performed in March-April 1996, with its culmination taking place on 20 March 1996. Although in terms of physical scale this ceremony was smaller than either the *Ekadasarudra* or the *Tribhuana*, it was said that the *Ekabhuana* was of no less importance, since it was the culmination of all the ceremonies. In the *Ekabhuana*, everything was cosmologically returned to the 'zero point,' the perfect harmony of all in the universe. As a major ceremony, it involved a number of significant related rituals, at which, altogether, hundreds of *sulinggih* officiated.

In their effort to include their *sulinggih* in the *Ekabhuana*, the three protesting *warga* in the case of the *Tribhuana* seemed to adopt different attitudes. The *Maha Semaya Warga Pande* chose a 'silent strategy'; the *Eka Bhuana Sutha* openly protested the use of its *sulinggih*; while the *Maha Gotra Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi* modified its strategy, to give more attention to its internal cohesion.

It came to my knowledge that I Made Raka Santeri, a prominent figure in *Eka Bhuana Sutha*, wrote a short article to be published in the *Bali Post*. The article put forward several points, which included the following:

1. *Sulinggih* from various *warga* should be given an equal opportunity to officiate at ceremonies in Besakih, since Besakih is a public temple.

2. The inclusion of *sulinggih* other than *pedanda* in the *Ekabhuana* had been promised by the Governor of Bali. The governor, who was also the adviser of the organising committee in this ceremony, had to keep his word.

Instead of publishing the article, the editors of the *Bali Post* assigned their journalist to inquire about the matter from the deputy chairman of the organising committee.

---

8 I learned from some members of the *Maha Semaya* that since the death of its former leader, Nyoman Oka (better known as Nang Lecir), the *Maha Semaya* tends to adopt a low profile, in the sense that it no longer openly criticises religious practices with which it does not agree.
committee, Drs Ida Bagus Agastya. After interviewing him, the *Bali Post* published a report which stated that *sulinggih* from various *warga* would be involved in the ceremonies. However, the non-*pedanda* *sulinggih* would officiate in their own *padharman*, while in the main complex only *pedanda* would be used. At the peak of the ceremony, on 20 March 1996, the sacrifice ceremony would be officiated at by *trisadhaka*, ie. *siwa*, *boda*, and *bhujangga* (*Bali Post* 7 March 1996). This was apparently a very diplomatic statement. Officiating in their own *padharman* has been practised for years by *sulinggih* from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Bhujangga Waisnawa, and Pande. The statement implicitly meant that non-*pedanda* *sulinggih* would not be used for the general public in relation to the *Ekabhuana* ceremony.

More importantly, the selection of *sulinggih* from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa irritated leaders of Warga Bhujangga. Its *sulinggih*, who was to be invited by the organising committee to officiate on 20 March 1996 was Jero-gede Sibang. As his name indicates, this *sulinggih* did not bear the title *rsi bhujangga*, the common title of a *sulinggih* from Warga Bhujangga. In response to this, the chairman of *Eka Bhuana Sutha*, Made Rai Suartha, wrote an open letter, which appeared in the *Bali Post* on 15 March 1996. The letter raised several issues.

1. That Warga Bhujangga had written a letter to the organising committee of the *Tribhuana* (whose membership was practically the same as the committee of the *Ekabhuana*) on 29 January 1993. This letter stated that if the committee was willing to include a *sulinggih* from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa to officiate at the ceremony, the committee should contact the *warga* or one of the *rsi bhujangga* whose names appeared on the list attached to the letter.

2. That one of the *rsi bhujangga* was a member of the council of priests of the *Parisada*. However, this *rsi bhujangga* had never been invited to discuss

---

9 The report also disclosed that according to Agastya, each member of the *trisadhaka* has his own tasks. *Rsi bhujangga*’s task is to invite *bhuta* (evil spirits), after which the invited *bhuta* will be pacified by the *pedanda boda*. Finally, the *bhuta* are converted into *dewa* (good spirits) by the *pedanda siwa*, to be seated in the shrines.
anything related to ceremonies in Besakih, including the Tribhuana and Ekabhuana.

3. That Warga Bhujangga was upset since its sulinggih had always been represented by a jero-gede (ie. Jero-gede Sibang) in the trisadhaka. In the opinion of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, the jero-gede was not a rsi bhujangga. This position had been put forward several times, but the selection of bhujangga in composing the trisadhaka had never changed.\textsuperscript{10} This injured Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. Hence, Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa questioned, “what was the purpose of the committee in continually injuring a group of Balinese-Hindus?.”

4. That based on these grounds, Warga Bhujangga questioned the sincerity of the prominent Balinese-Hindu figures who happened to be decision makers for the Tribhuana and Ekabhuana ceremonies. It said, “let us really harmonise our words and our actions, since the value of religious persons is not measured by the amount of theories they can preach, but the real evidence of their actions. One gram of action is much more useful than tons of theories”.

 Nonetheless, the letter said that since at the time all Balinese were obliged to exercise \textit{yasa kerthi} (‘self-control’) for the success of the Ekabhuana, Warga Bhujangga would leave the matter as had been decided by the committee. But \textit{Eka Bhuana Sutha} challenged members of the committee to discuss the matter, particularly regarding the priesthood, after the ceremony finished.

 This open letter was met by silence from the committee. Ida Bagus Agastya, one of the chairmen of the committee, to whom the letter was apparently addressed, was irritated. Late in the morning on the day of its publication, I talked to him and he angrily said that he had no time to discuss the

---

\textsuperscript{10} I learned that the committee, which was dominated by members of Warga Brahmana, felt more comfortable with Jero-gede Sibang than any of the other rsi bhujangga because this jero-gede had a very low profile, and had never questioned the fact that he was seated at a lower platform. It seemed that this jero-gede acknowledged that he was lower in status than his pedanda counterparts. In addition, Ida Pedanda Istri Kanya from Sibetan, Karangasem, told me that “only sulinggih who manabe ka pedanda [‘use pedanda as their nabe’] are eligible to officiate at a large temple like Besakih.” Jero-gede Sibang was the only sulinggih from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa whose nabe was a pedanda. The nabe of other sulinggih from this warga were all senior rsi bhujangga.
letter, as he had to concentrate on the ceremony. Another chairman of the committee, Ida Bagus Putu Purwita, told me that the letter should be ignored for a while, and an agenda to discuss the matter should be set after the Ekabhuana ceremony had finished.

The MGPSSR took a different strategy. Reflecting on its experiences in several villages where the use of the sri mpu had been opposed by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi themselves, the MGPSSR was of the view that this internal problem had to be solved first. A leader of the MGPSSR told me that:

Pasek Sapta Rsi is the largest warga in Bali, in terms of number of members. If these members can be unified, no one outside the warga would dare to look down on the sri mpu and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi as a whole. Hence, a priority program should be directed to strengthening the internal factors of the MGPSSR.

This did not mean that the MGPSSR ceased its efforts to have its sulinggih acknowledged. The chairman of the MGPSSR, Prof Ketut Rika, disclosed his opinion in a meeting in Denpasar on 4 March 1996, saying that:

We do not need to be aggressive at present. First, we have to educate ourselves that it is our members who have been refusing the use of ida sri mpu. This is apparent from the conflict in Banjar Tribhuana. If most of our members had used the service of ida sri mpu, other warga would not be a problem for us. Accordingly, I strongly recommend that in relation to the Ekabhuana we must concentrate in our own temple, particularly Padharman Ratu Pasek in Besakih.

Secondly, the governor had promised that in this Ekabhuana, sulinggih from all warga would be invited. And this promise had been made public. So we hope he will not break his word. If the committee invites our sri mpu, we will definitely appreciate the invitation. Otherwise, we should not appeal to be invited. Let the governor and the committee bear all the sin of breaking their promise. For me, this is not merely a promise to fellow humans, but to the God and Betara Kawitan.
The position of not ‘asking to be invited’ was also reiterated at a meeting in the gria of Ida Sri Mpu Reka Anandha in Denpasar on 10 March 1996. Although initially some leaders put forward their proposal to continue the 1993 struggle, the meeting finally accepted the advice of Ida Sri Mpu Reka Ananda, who said that:

Officiating at public ceremonies should not be our highest priority at present. I do agree that we should struggle for that, but there are several factors which must be taken into consideration at the moment. We have first to embrace our members. I believe that all members of our warga will visit Besakih at least once during this ceremony. And before praying at the Penataran Agung, they will invariably perform prayers first at our padharman. We have to ‘catch’ them there: there must be at least a sri mpu all the time, every day, at the padharman to lead the prayers. In each shift of the prayer we should announce, “my brother Pasek altogether, now please prepare your flower to worship our ancestors, and this prayer will be led by Ida Sri Mpu So-and-So....” Hearing that their prayer is led by a sri mpu, will those who at present refuse the use of sri mpu stand up and cancel their prayer? I do not think so!...

As predicted, aside from one jero-gede, ie. Jero-gede Sibang, not one non-pedanda sulinggih was invited to officiate at the public level during the 42-day ceremony. Non-pedanda sulinggih were only invited in the rsi bojana, ie. ceremonial feast for priests after the performance of a major ceremony. However, it is noteworthy that a sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, ie. Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti, officiated at Pura Ratu Dukuh Segening, one of the four temples in the Catur Lawa group, closely associated with the Penataran Agung. Sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi have been used in this temple since the 1993 Tribhuana ceremony. Prior to this time, only pedanda were used.

---

11 There is a general tradition that before proceeding to the main temple complex of the Besakih (the Penataran Agung), the devotees perform prayers in their respective padharman.

12 The pangempon of Pura Ratu Dukuh Segening is a group of Jaba called Warga Dukuh. Leaders of this warga claimed that the warga consists of dozens of ‘sub-warga,’ such as Dukuh Sorga, Dukuh Blatung, Dukuh Badeg, Dukuh Pangkungprabu, Dukuh Sebudi, and Dukuh Sedaning. However, I observed that some of these ‘sub-warga’ are members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Ida Sri Mpu Dukuh Prabusakti --the one who officiated at Pura Ratu Dukuh Segening-- is a member of Warga Dukuh in the opinion of the leaders of Warga Dukuh. However, this sri mpu is a member of the council of priests of the MGPPSSR. His nabe was the late Ida Sri Mpu Gede Reka, the first sri mpu of the MGPPSSR (see also Figure 7.1 about the genealogy of priests in the MGPPSSR). In 1996, a member of Dukuh Badeg also underwent the dwijati ceremony, administered by the MGPPSSR, under Ida Sri Mpu Pemuteran as the nabe.
In Padharman Ratu Pasek, as planned, there was a sri mpu on duty almost every day. I observed that members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from the villages of Sangkanbuana, Gelgel, and Aan who objected to the use of sri mpu in their own villages did not react when they knew that the prayers were led by a sri mpu. They also did not refuse the holy water produced by the sri mpu. A member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from Desa Adat Tribhuana, who was among the hard-liners in the 'anti-mpu' group in his village, disclosed to me that:

We have to recognise what we call desa-kala-patra ['place, time, and circumstances']. In this padharman, I am merely a humble panyungsung, and hence I have to follow whatever situation has been agreed to by the pangempon. I know that the sri mpu have been used here for years. In my village, I object to the use of a sri mpu because of several considerations, not simply refusing the sri mpu itself... (Made Dana 1996; similar points were also stated by other informants, such as Putu Arsana, Nyoman Dana, and Nengah Swara 1996).

3. Mlaspas and Mendem in Pura Ulun Danu Batur

Pura Ulun Danu Batur is located in the village of Songan, Kecamatan Kintamani, Kabupaten Bangli. According to the concept of rwa bhineda ('the two opposites') in the Balinese Hindu context, Pura Ulun Danu Batur is the...
partner of Besakih, with Pura Ulun Danu being the *predana* (female) and Pura Besakih is the *purusa* (male). As such, Pura Ulun Danu Batur is considered to be the second highest temple in Bali, after Besakih.

This temple has long been neglected, overshadowed by Pura Ulun Danu Batur in Batur Village. Physical isolation, transportation problems, people's lack of knowledge, and the success of the rival temple in claiming to be 'the original Ulun Danu,' are important factors in this negligence. In 1991, Desa Adat Songan, the *pangemong* of the temple reshuffled its temple committee. Under the leadership of Ir I Putu Mahayuna, a member of the younger generation and a lecturer at Udayana University, the committee has been active in its efforts to 'return the temple to its original status and function,' ie. as the irrigation temple for Bali as a whole. In doing so, the committee translated the *prakempa* (the old description of the temple) and made it known. The *prakempa* states that all kingdoms in Bali were originally members of the temple's supporters. Armed with this *prakempa*, the committee invited all palace (*puri*) families in Bali to be members of the committee for the temple renovation, or at least to assist with its funding. This effort has been quite successful.

After the completion of the main structures (*meru, candi bentar, padma*, etc.), a major ceremony had to be conducted, comprising *mlaspas* (purification) and *mendem padagingan* (burying sacred materials under the shrines). In line with the strategy to broaden the congregation of the temple and to make the status of the temple acknowledged throughout Bali and to encompass all *warga*, the committee, all from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and Pasek Kayu Selem, proposed to use *sulinggih* from all *warga* available in Bali, ie. *sri mpu* of Warga Pande; *rsi* of Warga Arya Wangbang Pinatih; *pedanda* of Warga Brahmana Boda; *pedanda* of Warga Brahmana Siwa; *sri mpu* of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi;

---

14 However, Jembrana is not mentioned in the *prakempa* as a member of the temple's supporters. This is interpreted to mean that when the *prakempa* was written, Jembrana was still under the direct control of Mengwi. According to an historical account, in the 18th century the kingdom of Mengwi included the territory of Western Bali, which later became Jembrana.
and *rsi bhujangga* of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. The expected total number of the *sulinggih* was nine.\(^\text{15}\)

It was not an easy task to bring together all the *sulinggih*. The idea was initially rejected by the Bupati of Bangli and the *Parisada* of Bangli, who were members of Warga Brahmana Siwa and Warga Prasangiang, respectively. They said that it was not common practice to combine several *sulinggih* from different *warga* and that the use of *pedanda* alone was enough. Furthermore, they said that if non-*pedanda* *sulinggih* were to be used, *Triwangsa* people would refuse to pray in the temple. The committee insisted, however, and put forward the following strong arguments:

Ulun Danu temple is a ‘public,’ not a ‘*warga*’ temple. Hence, its officiating *sulinggih* must be ‘representative of the public.’ If the *bupati* does not agree, it does not matter, because it is the right of the committee to decide, and we must separate the temple from politics. If the *Parisada* rejects the presence of the non-*pedanda* *sulinggih*, we will make this position known to the public, and it would backfire on the *Parisada*, since we know that the *Parisada* admits all *sulinggih* are equal in status. It is the *Parisada* who examines the *sulinggih* candidates before the *dwijati* ceremony, and the certificate of priesthood is issued by the *Parisada*... Then, if it were true, that *Triwangsa* people do not want to pray in a temple officiated at by non-*pedanda* *sulinggih*, we are not worried at all about that. *Triwangsa* make up only around 10 percent of Balinese... so we retain the remaining 90 percent (Putu Mahayuna 1994).

The next challenge came from *pedanda*. A number of *pedanda* refused to sit at the same height at an altar as their non-*pedanda* *sulinggih* counterparts. To overcome this problem the committee consulted the general chairman of the central committee of the *Parisada*, Ida Pedanda Telaga who is *ex-officio* the chairman of the *Parisada*’s council of priests. He said that it is the individual right of any *sulinggih* to define with whom he agrees to sit, for example, a *sisya* priest will never sit at the same altar with his *nabe*, and this matter is not regulated by the *Parisada*. He advised the committee to make separate altars,

\(^{\text{15}}\) Dukuh, however, were not on the committee’s list. I discovered that the committee was unaware that dukuh were in existence in Bali. This is understandable since the number of dukuh and their followers is very small. I know only four dukuh in Bali, ie. Dukuh Abianjero, Dukuh Kantuarah, Dukuh Abang (all in Karangasem), and Dukuh Istri Tektek, also known as Sri Mpu Istri Sewaka Dharma (in Denpasar ). Further, not all of these dukuh actively perform lokapalasraya.
one for each sulinggih, but all of the same height. This idea was accepted by both the committee and the invited sulinggih.\textsuperscript{16}

In the end, eight of the nine invited sulinggih officiated at this ceremony on 29 July 1994; one sulinggih from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa was unable to come. The sulinggih were divided into three groups, officiating at ceremonies in the jeroan (inner court), jaba tengah (outer court), and Pura Patirtan (the source of holy water) respectively. However, only two priests officiated in the jaba tengah because ida rsi bhujangga, who was supposed to be there, was unable to come. In defining ‘who should sit where,’ the sulinggih decided among themselves. As I observed in Pura Patirtan, the three sulinggih decided that their relative position ought to be based on the ‘length of their priesthood,’ i.e. the year of their dwijati ceremonies. Based on this agreement, the line from north to south was: Ida Sri Mpu Santapala (Pande), Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga (Pasek), and Ida Pedanda Gede Ketut Sebali Arimbawa (Brahmana Siwa).

Aside from thousands of the faithful, the ceremony was also attended by high-level officers in Bali, such as the Governor of Bali (Prof dr Ida Bagus Oka), the Bupati of Bangli (Drs Ida Bagus Agung Ladip) and representatives of all bupati in Bali, the chairman of the Parisada (Drs IBG Agastia), the chairman of Majelis Pembina Lembaga Adat of Bali (the Balinese Adat Council, IGP Raka SH), and many more dignitaries, including members of Bali’s parliament.

Although they had accepted the arrangement, some Triwangsa seemed not to accept the non-pedanda sulinggih in their hearts. At the height of the ceremony, I observed that a Parisada officer, Ida Bagus Uttara, approached a pemangku (the temple priest), Jero Mangku Gede Raka and quietly instructed him that the holy water for the pedagingan (the most important set of ritual materials in this ceremony) had to be the holy water from the ‘Brahmana jati’ (the ‘real Brahmana’), by which he meant a pedanda, not another sulinggih. While Mangku Raka nodded his head, another younger pemangku, Jero-Mangku

\textsuperscript{16} It is noteworthy that the committee did not directly invite sulinggih, but the warga organisations. The committee left the decision to warga organisations as to which sulinggih would be selected from each warga for this ceremony (except for pedanda, because there is no such organisation yet for Warga Brahmana), and to bring their sulinggih based on the number needed.
Rai, who was by chance standing beside the first pemangku, spontaneously asked Ida Bagus Uttara, “what do you mean by a Brahmana jati?” He sarcastically answered himself:

All of these sulinggih are Brahmana jati... they all have undergone the dwijati ceremony, and all hold a certificate of acknowledgment (piagam) that they are sulinggih, issued by you people, the Parisada. Do you want to ignore the truth? Who do you want to cheat?

While the pemangku was speaking, a number of people, including some committee members, came to the scene. And, as I saw from their faces, all of them supported the young pemangku. Realising the situation, Ida Bagus Uttara quietly left the scene.

4. Jagatnatha Inauguration in Singaraja

The construction of Pura Jagatnatha in Singaraja was initiated by the Bupati of Buleleng in 1991, supported by the Parisada and other related agencies. The main objective of the construction of the temple was to have a public temple which could accommodate all Hindus regardless of their origin groups, geographical residence, or socio-occupational status, following the example of a similar temple in Denpasar. The planning, lay-out and design of the temple were discussed in meetings attended by sulinggih from all warga, the Parisada, officers from the Office of Religious Affairs and others, coordinated by a committee, and chaired by the Buleleng secretary (sekwilda), I Made Wijanaya, SH.

Once the physical structure had been completed, the next step was to conduct ritual ceremonies called mlaspas and ngenteg linggih, which would be performed from 19 June to 11 July 1993. To organise this, the Bupati of Buleleng established a committee (SK No. 243/1993). The committee decided on the agenda for the ceremony, such as mendak tirta (picking up holy water), wisuda bumi (cleansing the earth), tawur agung (major sacrifice for lower-level beings), mlaspas (purification), and ngenteg linggih (inviting God to sit in the shrine), all with their respective officiating sulinggih. It was planned to involve
in these ceremonies *sulinggih* from all *warga* available in Kabupaten Buleleng given that Jagatnatha temple is a ‘temple of all *warga.’’ As such, aside from *pedanda boda* and *pedanda siwa*, there were also *sri mpu* of Warga Pasek, *rsi* of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, *sri mpu* of Warga Pande, and *rsi* of Arya Gajahpara. According to the agenda, Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra (from Warga Pasek Saptan Rsi), Ida Rsi Bhujangga Anom (Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa), and Ida Rsi Tejakula (Warga Arya Gajahpara) were to be assigned on 29 June 1993, together with five *pedanda*, to officiate at the ceremonies called *wisuda bumi* and *tawur agung*. Non-*pedanda sulinggih* were also assigned for daily prayers (*panganyar*) during the days of the ceremony. Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra was also to be assigned to officiate at the *ngaturang pakelem* (the drowning of sacrificial animals) in the Batur Lake, while three *pedanda* would each do the same in other lakes (Beratan, Buyan, and Tamblingan). The proposed agenda was accepted at a meeting on 2 June 1993. However, a few days later the chairman of the *Parisada* of Buleleng, a *pedanda siwa*, and a number of other *pedanda* objected to the participation of the non-*pedanda* priests. They delivered the ultimatum that, if non-*pedanda sulinggih* were involved the invited *pedanda* would boycott the ceremony. On the other hand, after hearing the ultimatum of the *pedanda*, a number of *sri mpu* and *rsi* retaliated by declaring that they would not participate in the ceremonies even if they were invited because the ultimatum of these *pedanda* had been very insulting. A *sri mpu* questioned, “should priests, so-called holy men, behave like that?” and, “why should I sit with arrogant people like them?”

The Bupati of Buleleng and his staff, the organising committee, and the *Parisada* faced a dilemma in trying to resolve this matter. After a heated and lengthy debate, and skilful diplomatic work on the part of the committee in approaching individual *sulinggih* and their *warga* organisations, the committee finally reached the decision that only one non-*pedanda sulinggih* would be involved in the *tawur agung* (ceremony for chasing buta-kala), i.e. a *rsi bhujangga*; while in other parts of the ceremony, *sulinggih* would be restricted to *pedanda boda* and *pedanda siwa*. All *sulinggih* in Buleleng, however, would be invited to the *rsi bojana* (ritual feast for priests) at the end of the ceremony. For future yearly festivals, however, all *sulinggih* would be given an equal
chance to officiate by taking turns. This has indeed happened. In the 1994 temple festival, Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi was one of the officiating sulinggih, alongside several pedanda.

5. Jagatnatha Cornerstone Laying in Negara

As in Singaraja, it was also planned to erect a Jagatnatha temple in Negara, but of an even greater size. The first set of ceremonies in relation to this project was nasarin (cornerstone laying). The Bupati of Jembrana was aware of the strength of the non-Brahmana organisations and their sulinggih, at least in Jembrana. Warned by the conflict involving sulinggih in Buleleng, the bupati and the committee decided from the outset that sulinggih from all warga available in Jembrana would be invited to officiate at the ceremony. In its planning, the committee assigned its members from the various warga, to select their respective sulinggih. Since there were three places where the sulinggih would officiate, it was decided that the total number of the sulinggih would be a multiple of three, ie. 18 sulinggih.

As planned, at the nasarin ceremony in October 1993, 18 sulinggih participated: 2 pedanda boda; 2 sri mpu of Warga Pasek; 2 sri mpu of Warga Pande; 2 rsi bhujangga; and 10 pedanda siwa (since the total number of the pedanda siwa in Jembrana is much greater than the others). They were located in the tri mandala ‘three realms’ of the temple: (1) nista mandala (jaba, outer, the profane court); (2) madya mandala (jaba tengah, the middle court); and (3) uttama mandala (jeroan, the innermost, the most sacred court). In defining who should sit where, the sulinggih discussed the issue among themselves and reached the unanimous decision that both the pedanda and the non-pedanda sulinggih should be represented in all three courts. The two sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi available in Kabupaten Jembrana, Ida Sri Mpu Satwika and Ida Sri Mpu Dharma Ekashanti were also involved in this ceremony and were assigned to the jaba tengah and jaba, respectively.
6. *Ngaben* in Desa Adat Baluk

There was a *ngaben* ceremony in Desa Adat Baluk, Kabupaten Jembrana, in September 1994, at which 109 uncremated dead (*sawa*) from various *warga*, including Pasek Sapta Rsi, Bhujangga Waisnawa, Pradewa, and Pragusti, were cremated. The committee, backed by the *desa adat* head, proposed to the *desa adat* meeting that three *sulinggih* be invited to officiate at the ceremony: a *sri mpu*, a *pedanda*, and a *rsi bhujangga*. There was no problem within the *desa adat* because everyone agreed. In fact, the use of *sri mpu* among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in this village was already common. The invited *pedanda*, Ida Pedanda Sigaran, however, initially refused to officiate at the ceremony with his non-*pedanda* counterparts. The committee had been prepared for this response and were also ready with their response, which was that if he did not accept the condition, the committee would invite another *pedanda*. The committee gave the *pedanda* three days to think the matter over.

Three days later, the committee came again to the *pedanda* to discuss the matter, and after a long discussion, the *pedanda* finally accepted the invitation with certain conditions. Thus, three *sulinggih* of different *warga* officiated at the *ngaben* ceremony: Ida Pedanda Sigaran (Brahmana Siwa), Ida Sri Mpu Dharma Ekashanti (Pasek), and Ida Rsi Bhujangga Tegalcangkring (Bhujangga Waisnawa). They were seated at the same platform in accordance with the length of their priesthood, and their holy water was used by all members of the *desa adat*.

According to a leader of the committee, the decision of Ida Pedanda Sigaran to accept the condition, ie. to officiate at the same altar with non-*pedanda* *sulinggih*, after he had initially refused, was due to the fear of losing his followers. The prestige of a *sulinggih* is commonly measured by the number, geographic spread, and the diversity of the *warga* of his followers. The more followers he has, the more prestigious he is. In addition, it is also general knowledge that officiating at ritual ceremonies is a source of income for a priest’s family. This is more so in the region of Jembrana (and also in some
urbanised regions), where family members of the *sulinggih* usually take the role of offering sellers. 17

7. *Ngaben in Desa Adat Tegeh*

A different scenario occurred in Desa Adat Tegeh, Kecamatan Baturiti, Kabupaten Tabanan, in 1991. Initially, *desa adat* members agreed to use more than one *sulinggih* based on existing *siwa-sisya* linkages. However, the invited *pedanda* refused if he were to be seated equally with the non-*pedanda* *sulinggih*, and told the committee that if they wanted to use non-*pedanda* *sulinggih*, he would not participate. In this village, most *desa adat* members are *sisya* of *pedanda*, so the *desa adat* decided to used only a *pedanda*.

However, the new elite members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in the *desa adat* insisted that they would use a *sri mpu*. This hotly debated problem finally reached a compromise: all ceremonies for individuals could be officiated at by their priests --be it *pedanda* or *sri mpu*-- but at the *desa adat* level, the communal ceremony ought to be performed by a *pedanda*.

**OBJECTIONS FROM WITHIN**

While the MGPSSR (and Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in general) is struggling to have their *sulinggih* acknowledged by other *warga*, they cannot ignore the acute internal problem that within Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi itself, not all members are happy with the use of *sri mpu*. There is still a prevalent image that high priests (*sulinggih*) must be from Warga Brahmana, or that a *pedanda* is higher in status.

---

17 In these regions, the term *meli banten* (‘buying offerings’) is very common, in the sense that the *sulinggih*’s family prepares and sends the ready-made offerings to the place of the ceremony. As this is buying and selling, the economic price is negotiated between the parties involved, in precisely the same way as price negotiations found in markets. I often heard people saying to each other that they were “*meli banten lengkap kayang ka sulinggihne*” (‘buying offerings as a complete set with the *sulinggih* [to officiate]’). This implies that the main concern is the offerings, while the *sulinggih* is an accompanying element. This seems to be associated with the fact that the price of the offerings is much higher than the ‘payment’ for the *sulinggih*. Some even cynically commented that they had bought the offerings and ‘rented’ (nyewa) the *sulinggih*. 

than a *sri mpu*. This definitely weakens their external struggle. *Sri mpu* have been refused by members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi in a number of places. Quite a number of members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi explicitly stated that the use of *sri mpu* was improper. As far as they are concerned:

> We have long been using *pedanda*, and there has not been any sign that we have made a mistake. *Yadnya* [ritual ceremony] goes smoothly, and everybody is happy. For what reason should we move from *pedanda* to a *sri mpu*? My *pedanda* has been very kind to me, and we have developed a good relationship. Further, is there any guarantee that if we use *sri mpu*, things will be better? I do not think so! (Made Somnia 1994).

Even a prominent figure in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, I Wayan Dana, the secretary of the *pangempon* of Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Pegatepan, told me that the use of *sri mpu* is dangerous for the *warga*, particularly in Klungkung, where social stratification is still relatively rigid compared to other regions.

The use of *sri mpu* can split the *warga* and cause the ritual ceremonies to confront more problems. We want to be peaceful in conducting *yadnya*, so that we try to minimise the potential problems. The use of *sri mpu* is obviously a potential problem because among our relatives, or among members of the *pangempon* of our temple, there will undoubtedly be some who do not agree with us. Then, conflict easily explodes. So, what are we looking for in doing *yadnya*? How can we do the *yadnya* when we are in conflict among ourselves? How can we worship dutifully after quarrelling with each other? This is not to mention the threat from outside. Our *banjar* members who might have had ill feeling towards us will easily use this moment. Any misfortune we experience will be associated with the use of *sri mpu*. Also, as a human being, the forsaken *pedanda* and his family will definitely have some sort of ill feeling towards us. This is yet another potential problem. So, while I myself, personally, do not reject the use of *sri mpu*, I think it is not yet time to do so here in Gelgel, or in Klungkung in general.

Some cases indeed illustrate precisely what Wayan Dana was worried about. His view stemmed from his experience as a leader in Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Pegatepan. After the accomplishment of the renovation of Dadya Agung Pasek Gelgel in Pegatepan, the inauguration ceremony was officiated by *sri mpu*. The use of *sri mpu* was rejected by some members of the *warga*, who openly refused to be sprinkled with holy water made by the *sri mpu*. When the *sri mpu* were officiating at the ceremony, this opposing group deliberately seated
themselves at the corner of the temple and showed their unhappiness. After the ceremony, the then leader of the temple, I Ketut Lepik, was forced to resign from his leadership position, and a newly reshuffled committee was established. This committee resumed inviting pedanda to officiate at the yearly temple festival. However, sri mpu are not prohibited from officiating at the temple, and they do, but they do not officiate at the yearly ceremony.

A similar but even worse case occurred in the village of Sangkanbuana, in Klungkung, a village dominated by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Conflicts associated with the consecration and the use of sri mpu led to physical clashes.¹⁸

The split of warga members because of the use of sri mpu has also occurred in Desa Kaliangget, Buleleng regency. An informant told me the following story:

After the Seririt earthquake in 1976 we renovated our destroyed dadya temple. The problem arose when we discussed the matter of who should officiate at the inauguration ceremony. Some educated warga who were acquainted with the babad or history of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi proposed to use [the late] Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra of Singaraja. According to these people, the use of sri mpu for Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is a must, in line with the bisama. This proposal was rejected by other members. Their arguments seemed to be quite valid to me. Firstly, they argued that we had been using pedanda for generations, and it seemed OK. We never encountered any problem (sickness, bad luck, and the like) associated with the use of pedanda. In short, everything went well. This meant that our ancestors welcome the use of ida pedanda. Secondly, the use of sri mpu would result in the ill feeling of the pedanda that we leave behind, while the use of pedanda would not cause ill feeling for the sri mpu. Thirdly, there are four dadya of Warga Pasek in our village, and all used pedanda. So, if we alone use sri mpu it would seem awkward. If something goes wrong, the villagers would say that it is because of the use of sri mpu. Lastly, they also used an important person (orang besar) from our village, ie. Drs Sembah Subhakti, the then secretary of Bali Province (sekwilda Bali) as an example. Sembah Subhakti is a member of one of the dadya of Warga Pasek in our village. He, a big man, still uses a pedanda; we should follow him.

The lengthy debate was then won by the educated members, and Ida Sri Mpu Dwitantra finally officiated at our dadya temple. However, the warga has been split since then. For individual ceremonies, some use sri mpu, others pedanda. These differences were taken to heart by each group, resulting in ill feeling towards one another.

In 1993, as usual, we conducted an annual ceremony in our dadya. We used a sri mpu because most of our dadya members agreed. However, some people

¹⁸See Chapter Seven, especially in the section ‘Conflict after the dwijati.’
refused to be sprinkled with holy water from the sri mpu. In 1994 we conducted a ngaben ceremony for five dead. We used a pedanda. I was surprised that when the pedanda sprinkled holy water, a number of people stood up and left the praying place. I then realised that they had not only ceased using pedanda, but also perceive that holy water from a pedanda is not good enough to be sprinkled on them. This has widened the gulf between the two groups (I Made Tirta 1995).

PEOPLE’S PERCEPTION ON SULINGGIH STATUS

It should be clear from these examples that people’s perceptions of the equal status of all sulinggih vary widely, and this is obviously associated with several factors, such as their education, socio-occupational status, and more importantly, I believe, their warga of origin. Nonetheless, in formal discourse, no one dares to say that a group of sulinggih is higher or lower than the others.

A Variety of Views

Individual views regarding the relative status of sulinggih vary from a fully equal to a rigidly hierarchical positioning based on their warga. Ida Dalem Pemayun, a priest from the royal family of Klungkung explicitly told me that only pedanda, and of course sulinggih from the royal family of Klungkung like himself, are entitled to officiate at public ceremonies. The non-pedanda sulinggih are only entitled to officiate at their family’s minor ceremonies, such as the ceremony for the three-month old baby (nyambutin) and Balinese six-month birthday (ngotonin) and not even at major ceremonies like marriage, tooth filing, or cremation. In his view, although the sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi or Warga Pande, and rsi bhujangga of Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa have undergone dwijati ceremonies to become sulinggih, they are still Sudra, and not Brahmana. Hence they cannot be eligible to officiate at ceremonies for the public. The only public ceremonies where a rsi bhujangga is entitled to officiate are pecaruan (chasing away evil spirits). Only pedanda (siwa and boda) and dalem from the royal family of Klungkung are entitled to officiate at all levels of ritual ceremonies. In addition, a dalem, he told me, encompasses pedanda siwa
and *pedanda boda*, because a *dalem* is “Iswara, Siwa ya Budha ya” (like Dewa Iswara, He is a *Siwa* and a *Boda* at the same time).

Ida Pedanda Gede Ketut Sebali Arimbawa, a *sulinggih* from Warga Brahmana Siwa who was an English teacher in a senior high school, holds precisely the opposite view. For him, as he told me when we held a gathering for *Gandhi Jayanthi* (the celebration of Mahatma Gandhi’s birthday) in Candidasa:

Certainly, *sulinggih* are equal to each other. In what manner are *pedanda* superior to the non-*pedanda* *sulinggih* such as *sri mpu, rsi,* or *dukuh*? Are the *pedanda* more *sakti* [have more magico-spiritual power]? I am a *pedanda*, but I am not *sakti*! Does God love *pedanda* more than the others? Are *pedanda*’s spells more powerful than others’? The answer is definitely NO! All of these are individual characteristics, depending on each person concerned. Moreover, who is the ancestor of the *pedanda*? *Mpu!* There was no *pedanda* before the era of Dang Hyang Nirartha. There were *mpu* or *rsi*, as we know from history, ie. Mpu Kuturan, Mpu Gnjaya, *Rsi* Markandeya, also in Java, such as Mpu Bharadah, Mpu Bahula, Mpu Prapanca, and so forth. So, only those, who are stupid and narrow-minded will perceive *pedanda* as superior to *mpu* or *rsi*, and behave accordingly.

Ida Pedanda Gede Ketut Sebali Arimbawa was not just giving lip service to this view, that all *sulinggih* are equal. In Pura Ulun Danu Batur he officiated together with Ida Sri Mpu Santapala (Pande) and Ida Sri Mpu Dhaksa Samyoga (Pasek Sapa Rsi) at the same altar. He seated himself at the southern end of the altar, while in Balinese cosmology the south is lower than the north. His position was due to his priesthood age, that Ida Pedanda Ketut Sebali Arimbawa was the youngest of the three officiating *sulinggih*.

A moderate view comes from Ida Pedanda Nyoman Pidada, who was once the chairman of the *Parisada* of Karangasem. For him, as long as a *sulinggih* holds a certificate from the *Parisada*, his rights and duties are equal to the others. However, in real life, “we have to be careful, because this is a new development, and the majority of society still consider that *pedanda* are the highest *sulinggih*.” As such, “let the users themselves decide who they will use; and those who are not used should accept the situation open-heartedly, and try to improve their capacity, credibility, respectability, and reliability.”
A similar perception is held by Ida Pedanda Nabe Padangratha, whose father, the late Pedanda Gede Kutri, was the nabe of several non-pedanda sulinggih (ie. Ida Sri Mpu Gede Reka, Ida Sri Mpu Dwisari, Ida Sri Mpu Sewaka Dharma, and Ida Rsi Agung Pinatih). He believes that his father had fundamentally valid reasons to be the nabe for several non-pedanda. These fundamental grounds are arguably based on Scriptures, such as babad, tutur, pamancangah, bisama, and purana, as well as higher level holy books (Veda and Upanishad). For Ida Pedanda Padangratha, “we must celebrate if more and more qualified people are willing to be sulinggih because this will strengthen our Hindu religion.” For him, no one would follow the path of priesthood (kasulinggihan) unless there were enough grounds to do so, and there must be a very strong motivation to seek a certain level of spiritual life, let alone for those of the non-pedanda. “Priesthood is not for enjoyment, and not a way of gaining worldly pleasure,” he told me once. He also said, “do not think that being a sulinggih is easy. It is indeed a very hard, tough life, so many prohibitions, full of tapa and brata.”

As regards the use of sulinggih by society, he maintains that “we should leave it to the people concerned in order not to destroy the harmony, so that the flow of, and the concentration on the performance of, ritual ceremonies is not obstructed.” In this regard he warns that the selection of sulinggih by people is not merely based on the criterion of pedanda versus non-pedanda, but also, more importantly, on the individual character of the sulinggih. He referred to the fact that one pedanda might be very busy in giving service to society, while another pedanda might only be rarely invited to officiate at ceremonies. “This is clearly associated with their respective individual qualities,” said Ida Pedanda Padangratha.

The same view is also held by Ida Bagus Oka Punyatmadja from Warga Brahmana Boda, who was a prominent figure in the Parisada. He maintains that equality, particularly among sulinggih, should be taken for granted. This view was also publicly announced, both in the mass media and in published books. In the opening ceremony of the mahasabha of the MGPSSR in Besakih (1989), he even publicly acknowledged that “if we trace back, within less than twenty
generations we will find that we are brothers. Hence, as brothers, we should cease to consider that one person is superior by birth to another.” He further suggested that Hindus should return to the concept of Varna instead of ‘caste.’

This statement is rare from a warga whose members consider themselves high in the status hierarchy.

However, most Triwangsa people, and Jaba alike, perceive pedanda as higher than the others. Sri mpu and rsi bhujangga are often referred to as ‘pedanda Jaba,’ which indicates that they are not ‘pedanda brahmana’ and hence, are of lower status. Nevertheless, there are Triwangsa (Anak Agung and Gusti families) in Kuta, Mengwi, Denpasar, and Tabanan who use sri mpu of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi for their individual ceremonies.

Prominent figures in Warga Pande, Pasek Sapta Rsi, and Bhujangga Waisnawa, of course, maintain that there are no higher or lower sulinggih. Sri mpu, rsi, pedanda, dukuh, or rsi bhujangga are equal in status. The different symbols and names used by them do not represent hierarchical status, but merely ‘a difference.’ Their famous analogy for legitimising the concept of difference, and not hierarchy, is derived from the colours symbolising gods, ie. black for Wisnu, red for Brahma, white for Iswara, yellow for Mahadewa, pink for Maheswara, and so forth. In no way one can say that any one of these colours is superior to any other. The same also applies to the colours of the uniforms of the armed forces (ABRI):

The uniform of the army is green, while that for navy is white; brown for police and blue for air force. Which is higher? No one! They are different, but of equal status. Just a difference, to ease their identification (Soebandi 1994).

The Role of External Factors and the Parisada

Several studies indicate that it was not until the late 1960s that people began to talk about equality between pedanda and non-pedanda high priests, let alone about having both a pedanda and non-pedanda officiating equally at public

---

19 See also, for example, his article in Cendekiawan Hindu Bicara (1991).
ceremonies. Traditionally, this role had been solely the monopoly of pedanda. If a non-pedanda sulinggih was involved, such a sulinggih must have been a rsi bhujangga, cynically called sengguhu, and his task was merely to chase away buta-kala (the evil spirits at the below-human level in Balinese cosmology). In this case, one would never expect that the sengguhu would sit at the same level as his pedanda counterparts.

Discussion of the equal status of sulinggih in Bali has become widespread in recent years. Exogenous factors play a significant role in relation to this, particularly the global issue of human rights, equality, and social justice. Discussions with several people, notably among Jaba, especially the more educated, clearly indicate this. In an informal discussion in 1994, a speaker said:

Those of very different races and different origins, such as the Black and the White in America, or the White and the Aborigines of Australia, have recognised themselves as being equal. Why do we, the Balinese, who are of the same race, the same colour of skin, the same colour of hair, the same in most of our physical characteristics, consider one to be higher than the others? Hierarchy in terms of warga is irrelevant in this era of globalisation (zaman globalisasi). And if we really want to strengthen Hinduism, as a minority in Indonesia, and if we are really keen to have our religion recognised as equal to other religions, we must stop quarrelling with each other. Equality among us is the very key to real unity. We cannot have a single voice to the outsiders if we

---

20 Although conflict between the Jaba and the Triwangsa can be traced back to the 1920s (the Surya Kanta movement), and the fact that the Surya Kanta supported the use of sri mpu by Warga Pande, there is no evidence that the Surya Kanta proposed the use of non-pedanda sulinggih in public ceremonies. There is also no report which suggests that a rsi bhujangga refused to be seated lower than his pedanda counterparts.

21 I have mentioned in Chapter Four that there is a degrading version of a tale about the existence of the rsi bhujangga or sengguhu, which implies that a sengguhu is not a ‘real priest.’ The tale explains that the term sengguhu came from ‘sengguh,’ ‘mis-addressed,’ or ‘mis-identified’ because the servant of Dang Hyang Dwijendra, I Gota, after learning some mantra (sacred formulas) behaved like a priest and went around officiating at ritual ceremonies, and hence he was (mis)-addressed (ka-sengguh) as a priest by the people. When Dang Hyang Dwijendra learned about this, he did not become angry but instead gave I Gota licence to officiate at ritual ceremonies, particularly in driving away buta-kala. In Babad Pasek (Kr.Va.936/6 and PDKB 734), the same story is also mentioned, but the master priest was Mpu Dwijaksara instead of Dang Hyang Dwijendra. This version, of course, is strongly rejected by Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. In their version, the word sengguhu came from sang guru (‘the teacher’) because the sengguhu were teachers for some Balinese, including the kingly family during the Ggel era.

22 See, for example, Hooykaas (1973 and 1976).
are still internally divided (I Gusti Ngurah Santika 1994; similar points were also made by other speakers).

At the national level, the state ideology, the Pancasila, which recognises equality for everybody, is clearly a powerful factor. Nobody would (openly) dare to reject the Pancasila. Accordingly, no one would declare that he is ‘higher’ than any other in formal discourse.

The role of the Parisada, the highest Hindu council, is also prominent. Although often severely criticised,²³ its influence on the religious life of the Balinese is significant. It is not uncommon to hear villagers say that “this is a Parisada decision, and we must follow it.” This situation is used by warga organisations. In particular in the matter of the priesthood, people often use the Parisada to legitimise their actions. The fundamental basis for this in particular is the decision of the Parisada No. V/1968 that everyone is eligible to be a sulinggih, and that all sulinggih are equal in status. The fact that the examination (diksa pariksa) for all sulinggih candidates is administered by the Parisada, and that the certificate of priesthood is also given by the Parisada, adds to the willingness of the Jaba to use the Parisada as a source of formal protection. People from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Pande, and Bhujangga Waisnawa often assert that:

Sulinggih are not owned by warga so-and-so; they are the sulinggih of all Hindus because they have been given a certificate by the Parisada. So, they are ‘sulinggih Parisada,’ and accordingly, the Parisada must give them protection; treat them fairly (Made Adi 1994; the same point was also made by Wayan Sudana and Mangku Gede Oka).

Indeed, all certificates given by the Parisada are the same in form and content, stating the name (bhiseka) of the sulinggih, the nabe, and his right to perform lokapalasraya (except for Ida Dalem Pemayun, who has no lokapalasraya right). The Parisada, as a formal body, does not question this. However, some officers of the Parisada clearly show different attitudes, and

---
²³ For critical views on the Parisada, see for example articles appeared in the Bali Post, on 17, 18, and 19 September 1996; and in a number of issues of Raditya.
quietly work to block the use of non-*pedanda sulinggih* in public ceremonies. This is clear from the cases cited before, such as the ceremonies at Pura Ulun Danu Batur, Pura Jagatnatha in Singaraja, and Pura Besakih.

**‘Return to the Veda’ Movement with Selected Readings**

For those in favour of equality, written Hindu teachings are important sources of justification. As I have mentioned in *Chapter Three*, citing *Vedic* holy books such as *Rg Veda, Bhagavadgitha, Sarasamuccaya*, and *Manawa Dharmasastra*, is becoming popular among Balinese people, especially among the educated.

The *Vedic* teachings can be interpreted from extremely opposing positions, depending on which verses and from what era of the *Vedic* teachings are taken. Those from the *Jaba* --and some progressive *Triwangsa*-- only quote and (re)interpret those verses in favour of equality. Within the discourse of the Indonesian state ideology, the *Pancasila*, the citing of verses in support of equality is apparently more popular. There are verses in the *Vedic* books which implicitly and explicitly mention the equal status of people before God; differences in people’s status are based on *guna* and *karma* (individual talent and achievement), and not by birth. This is parallel with the concept of *budi*, introduced by the *Surya Kanta* movement in the 1920s. The most important concept in relation to the ‘Return to the Veda’ movement is *tat twam asi* (‘you are me’), taken from *Chandogya Upanishad* (VI.8.7). This teaching dictates that all human beings are the same (equal). Hence, there is no difference between *Triwangsa* and *Jaba*; no difference in status between one *warga* an another.

The ‘Return to the Veda’ movement is not organised in a structured fashion. However, there are groups who subscribe to this movement, such as *FPHDI* (*Forum Pemerhati Hindu Dharma Indonesia* or ‘Forum for Observing Indonesian Hinduism’), *IPHI* (*Ikatan Pemuda Hindu Indonesia* or Indonesian Hindu Youth Association), and *FPMHDI* (*Forum Persaudaraan Mahasiswa Hindu Dharma Indonesia* or Forum for Brotherhood of Indonesian Hindu University Students). All of these organisations are critical of the practices of the Balinese Hinduism which, in the perception of the movement’s adherents,
are not in line with the Vedic teachings. It is worth noting that members of these organisations are not exclusively Jaba. FPBDI, for example, is led by Dewa Ngurah Swastha SH, a businessman from Warga Ksatria; yet the organisation is critical of the hierarchical notions of Balinese society.

Besides these organisations, there are also individuals who are influential in the ‘Return to the Veda’ movement. To mention a few, they include the prolific writer Nyoman Swandi Pendit (a university graduate from India), Dr Made Titib, who holds a PhD in Vedic literature from Gurukula Kangri University, India, and is now a member of Bali’s DPRD, Putu Setia (a journalist), Prof Dr I Gusti Ngurah Bagus (an anthropologist from Udayana University), Drs Ketut Wiana (a deputy chairman of Indonesian Parisada), Dr Wayan Jendra (a lecturer at Udayana University), and Made Raka Santeri (a journalist). The Bali Post, the most-read media source in Bali, is also of a great help in disseminating ideas of this movement.

The Jaba warga organisations, such as Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Pande, and Bhujangga Waisnawa, found strong support from this movement. Vedic teachings are effectively used. In defending the right to be sulinggih of the same status, for example, Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi uses a Vedic quotation from the Yajur Veda (26:2), which states that learning the Veda is the right of everybody, not just of one particular group.24 Aside from these direct quotations, actors from Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Pande, and Bhujangga Waisnawa are fond of citing examples from the Mahabharata and Ramayana epics, which indicate that many famous high priests were not ‘Brahmin born.’ Maharsi Vasishta was born of a prostitute woman; Bhagawan Wyasa, the compiler of the four main Veda, was the son of a fisher woman; while Maharsi Parasara’s mother was a Chandala, an Untouchable.

In combination with Indian sources, Balinese literature is not neglected. At the local level, for particular warga --including Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi-- the

24 The verse reads, “Yathama wacam kalyanim avadani janebyah, brahma rajanbhyam sudrasya caryaca swaya caranaya ca” and is translated as follows: “Convey these holy words [Veda] to everybody, to Brahmana, Ksatria, Sudra, and Wesia, to your countrymen, as well as to foreigners” (cited in Titib 1994).
*babad* remains the most important source for the claims to priesthood and equality. *Babad and bisama* are used as bases to claim that priesthood in Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi is not a newly invented tradition, but it has been there for hundreds of years. In more political terms, it is said that “the claim for priesthood is not a challenge to Warga Brahmana, but a call to follow the path that has been drawn by the ancestors, which unfortunately has long been neglected” (Wayan Kosa 1996).

**SUMMARY**

Warga Pasek Sanak Sapta Rsi (the MGPSSR) has made a considerable effort to have their *sulinggih*, the *sri mpu*, sociologically acknowledged by the Balinese public, rather than merely by formal acknowledgment. The struggle to use *sri mpu* in public ceremonies stems from the belief that ‘social equality’ will not be a reality until the non-*pedanda* *sulinggih* are considered equal to their *pedanda* counterparts.

The first successful mass project in this struggle was the conduct of a *ngaben masal* for several *desa adat* in 1971. This was intended to give recognition to the *sri mpu*, to cut the ties of the *siwa-sisya* relationship between members of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi and their respective *pedanda*, and to demonstrate the strength of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. Later, the struggle was directed toward the involvement of the *sri mpu* in public temples and/or public ceremonies. Despite some success, there have also been failures. In most cases, however, the result has been a compromise which has minimised offence to the *pedanda* while including the *sri mpu*. The results of the struggle mirror the various perceptions held by different people in regard to the status of the *sri mpu* in comparison with their *pedanda* counterparts. This perception varies widely, ranging from total equality to a rigid hierarchy.

The struggle of the MGPSSR to promote their *sulinggih* has also relied on the *Parisada*, the highest authority in Hindu affairs in Indonesia, whose decisions are mostly in favour of equality. Nonetheless, some personnel of the
*Parisada* at the same time quietly operate behind the scene to block the movement toward the equal status of the *sulinggih*.

Another factor of great help for the MGPSSR in this regard is the *Pancasila*, the Indonesian state ideology, which acknowledges that human beings are equal. Better access to Hindu teachings from more ‘valid’ sources, not merely Balinese sources, is also a significant factor. This is associated with education and the betterment of the economic status of Balinese. Education allows the Balinese to read, while economic gains provide the opportunity to buy the books and other needs for acquiring more knowledge. All these have led to a strong movement to ‘return to the Veda’ and to ‘purify’ corrupted Hindu teachings in Balinese practices. Naturally, *Vedic* teachings used in this context are taken from verses which support the ideology of equality. In a sense, this may be referred to as another ‘internal conversion,’ following Geertz (1973). These in turn strengthen the ground of the struggle for equality. Contemporary global issues such as social justice and human rights are also contributing factors.
Chapter Nine

IN SEARCH OF DIFFERENCE, IN SEARCH OF IDENTITY: A CONCLUDING REMARK

The domain of social life in essentially a domain of differences
(Marcell Mauss 1969, quoted in Lamont and Fournier 1992: 1)

I have argued from the outset of this thesis that the rigid hierarchical notion of the four-caste system, which has predominated in discussions of Balinese social structure, is questionable. It is indeed difficult to reach a straightforward conclusion on the Balinese caste system, as the very basic question, whether ‘caste’ really exists in Bali, is subject to various interpretations. While most anthropological literature on Bali invariably discusses the existence of caste, some scholars question whether there is caste in Bali. Some have argued that Balinese ‘caste’ is “known more as an academic term than a descriptor of social organisation” (Vickers 1989: 49). To decide whether caste exists in Bali or not, “depends on what perspective one takes [and] what level of abstraction one uses” (Howe 1989: 52). One commentator has even stated that “caste is, strictly speaking, not present” in Bali (Howe 1989: 54).

My own research, as I have shown throughout this thesis, suggests that although the discourse of caste is indeed strong among Balinese people, the classical theory of caste which classifies Balinese people into four caste groups - Brahmana, Ksatria, Wesia, and Sudra-- is not supported by empirical evidence. At most, at the practical level, people are commonly referred to as either Triwangsa or Jaba, the former being those who bear honorific names, while the latter do not (see Chapter Three). But again, this is more a ‘category’ or an aggregate of ‘similar people’ (Howe 1989) than actual social groupings. The sense of ‘we-ness’ or group membership in these categories is absent.
I have argued that *warga*, or what Fox (1995, 1996) refers to as ‘origin group’ in eastern Indonesia and Austronesian societies in general, is a better focus for the analysis of the dynamics of contemporary Balinese society, since it carries both sociological and religious significance. A *warga* invariably has a common --real or presumed-- originator (hence a common shared origin temple, *kawitan*); it has unified sacred symbols to mark identity (especially ornament-formulae for death ceremonies and specific forms for burning coffins); and it has brotherhood solidarity or ‘we-ness’ (the *sidikara* network). Balinese self-identification also refers to *warga*.

Although the sense of different status between *warga* is obvious, no *warga* can claim special privileges in contemporary Bali, not even in Balinese traditional organisations. As I have stated, in the life of the *desa adat*, *banjar*, and *subak*, all members, regardless of their *warga*, bear the same rights and duties. Those who feel that they should be privileged because they come from a certain *warga* invariably end up being expelled from membership of *banjar/desa adat*.

At present, pride in *kewargaan* (*warga*-hood) is arguably increasing. This can be seen from the emergence of dozens of *warga* organisations, which unite *warga* members, whether they reside in Bali or on other islands, and the massive movement in search of origin temples (*kawitan*). Festivals at ancestral temples are also attended by many more *warga* members than was formerly the case. A considerable amount of voluntary contributions by members for temple maintenance also indicates this point.

Organising a *warga* into a formal organisation has been inspired by several motives. All *warga* claim that the organisation is intended to unify *warga* members in the worship of their ancestors (in *kawitan* temples), the equivalent to ‘remembering origins’ in eastern Indonesia. Closely associated with the worship of ancestors is the mobilisation of *warga* members to renovate and maintain the ancestral temples. All *warga* also assert that one of the objectives of their *warga* organisation is to strengthen the sense of brotherhood, in accordance with the sacred instructions of the ancestors (*bisama*) found in their respective *babad*. *Babad* play an important role in the making of a *warga*. The *bisama* are even
more important since they are considered sacred by Balinese. For a warga to be united is a salient theme in the bisama. In acknowledgment of the role of babad and bisama in influencing Balinese attitudes, warga organisations continually devote resources to popularising their babad. National rhetoric on development is also used to legitimise the importance of organising warga. All warga claim that they organise their members to be united to support the development (pembangunan) of the nation. This is closely associated with the position promulgated by the Parisada, that the Hindu religion dictates that its followers should perform both religious duties (dharma agama) and duties towards the country (dharma negara) simultaneously.

The formally unstated objective of warga organisations, however, is of no less importance, and has even become one of the highest priorities in the agenda of the warga. This is what I refer to as the search for ‘difference.’ The concept of ‘difference’ implies that all warga are not, or should not, be positioned in a hierarchy where one is permanently superior to others. ‘Difference’ simply means that they are different, without necessarily implying any superior-inferior relationship. Colours are commonly used as a metaphor to explain the concept of difference. Blue, green, white, red, yellow, etc. are different colours, but it does not mean that blue is superior to green, green to red, and so forth. All are of the same quality. One may take precedence on a particular occasion, while at other times the order of precedence could be changed contextually. By the same token, the concept of difference supports the ideology of equality, homoaequalis, and denies a fixed hierarchy defined by birth. This all means that the social and religious status of the Triwangsa is challenged by the Jaba. To put it in another way, the Jaba also claim a high status, equal to the Triwangsa. The strategy to achieve this status is not by means of claiming the honorific initial names of the Triwangsa; the warga of the Jaba do not claim themselves to be Triwangsa. The strategy is for the warga as a whole to be proclaimed of high status. The introduction of the concept of difference, then, is a search for status recognition, a search for equality, a challenge to hierarchy, and an effort to have the same footing in societal life. Difference also means ‘distinctiveness,’ that a warga invariably tries continually to maintain its ‘boundaries’ by marking its distinctive symbols and identities. Of primary importance in this distinctiveness
is the strategy for choosing an originator. Thus each *warga* must choose an originator who has not been claimed by others. Hypothetically, if the search for difference or distinctiveness were absent, most *warga* in Bali at present could be merged to form one large *warga*, by choosing a distant ancestor as their common originator. Amidst the effort to maintain distinctiveness, there is also a paradox among *warga* with *Jaba* status. This is clear in the case of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi. To strengthen its claims for equality, this *warga* tries to include other smaller *warga*—such as Warga Tangkas Kori Agung, Warga Gaduh, and Warga Bendesa Mas—as its branches.

The discourse of difference is salient among *warga* organisations, particularly of the *Jaba*, notably Pasek Sapta Rsi, Pande, and Bhujangga Waisnawa. The struggle for difference, as opposed to hierarchy, has been continually carried out by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi through its organisation, the MGPSSR, together with Warga Pande and Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa. A variety of strategies are employed in this effort, chief among which is the use of the *warga*’s own high priests, not only for *warga* members but also for the general public. Although the *warga* of the *Jaba* have been faced by internal and external problems, to some extent their struggle has been supported by contemporary discourses of equality, human rights, social justice, and by the rationalisation of Balinese Hindu religion, based on a ‘return to the *Veda*’ discourse. In this case, the *Veda*’s verses are eclectically selected to support the ideology of equality, to ‘purify’ (*memurnikan*) and ‘enlighten’ (*mencerahkan*) Balinese Hindu practices. Old traditions and texts are continually reinterpreted to adapt to contemporary situations and, more precisely, to legitimise present claims. Equality and respect based on individual quality, which are proposed as the leading principles in social interaction and religious practices, are argued to have their validity originating in the past. This is similar to what is labelled ‘the reinvention of tradition’ by Eric Hobsbawm (1983).

From the study of *warga* in Bali, it is possible to expand a step further, relating these findings to the theory of status contestation, traditionality in modern Bali, and the position of Bali in Austronesian studies.
STATUS, ROLES, AND CONTESTATION

It is widely accepted that status is always a contested domain in every culture. Nonetheless, status contestation in contemporary Bali, as seen in the movement of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, raises another interesting issue. Western social theories usually assume that contestations involve only those who are situated in the adjacent positions in a status hierarchy. But this is not the case in Bali. Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa, and Warga Pande, who are among the Jaba, directly challenge those who are at the summit of the hierarchy, ie. Warga Brahmana Boda and Warga Brahmana Siwa.

This situation can be interpreted in several ways. The first possibility is that the hierarchy of status among warga in Bali is fluid. In other words, Warga Brahmana does not necessarily encompass, in Dumontian terms, the rest of the society all the time. This is associated with a very important principle of social interaction in Bali, according to which one is contextually positioned in society, as suggested by the saying 'sesana manut linggih, linggih manut sesana' (one's behaviour must accord with one's position, and one's position must accord with one's behaviour). As I have argued in Chapter Two, Balinese invariably hold multiple identities since they are members of more than one organisation. One's status in one organisation is rarely the same as one's status in another. This means that Warga Brahmana might be on the summit of status hierarchy in one aspect of societal life (ie. religious), but not necessarily in others. In addition, social status in Bali does not correlate well with economic status, in the sense that those of high social status may be, and often are, low in economic status. All these factors result in the span of the hierarchy being narrow, since the difference between the lowest and the highest is not very wide.

A further interpretation may well be provided by sociological theories relating to status and role. It is widely known that role is the dynamic aspect of status. A social status will fade if the roles associated with it are not performed, or if the same roles are also performed by groups of different status. All warga with Triwangsa status, other than Warga Brahmana Siwa and Brahmana Boda, have lost their social and political roles since Indonesia gained independence, which was followed by the restructuring of political power. The traditional
Balinese rulers no longer hold commanding power, since this power has been taken over by modern state institutions. People of the Triwangsa are also not necessarily wealthier than those of the Jaba, which inhibits them from performing their expected role as patrons of the Jaba. Warga Brahmana Siwa and Warga Brahmana Boda, on the other hand, still hold religious authority since this authority has not been taken over by modern institutions. Since only the Warga Brahmana plays its traditional role in society, only this warga still effectively maintains its status, while other warga of the Triwangsa have gradually experienced fading status.

Consequently, there is no point in the Jaba wasting their energy challenging these warga. In Balinese idiom, there is no need to stab a dying man, because he will eventually die himself. Concentrating their energy on challenging Warga Brahmana, the real status holder, is apparently more productive. Moreover, challenging Warga Brahmana represents a challenge to religious authority, believed to be the most fundamental aspect of the culture, hence the most difficult to change. If they succeed, the Jaba will celebrate a great victory because once equality in the priesthood and in religious practices is achieved, equality in other aspects of Balinese life would soon follow. This helps explain the eagerness of the warga of the Jaba, notably Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, continually to produce high priests. Among the Triwangsa (except Warga Brahmana), there is hardly any willingness to consecrate their own high priests. At present only three high priests are known from Triwangsa other than Warga Brahmana, and one of these three has no right to officiate at ritual ceremonies for the public (lokapalasraya). In addition, challenging Warga Brahmana, which holds religious authority, is seen as crucial because status contestation inevitably involves symbols. In the Balinese context, status symbols are mostly expressed in religious activities.

Challenges to the authority of the high priests from Warga Brahmana (pedanda) by the Jaba is a new development. Although Warga Pande and

---

1 Two of these high priests are from Warga Arya Wang Bang Penatih, i.e. Ida Rsi Agung Penatih and the late Sri Reshi Ananda Kusuma. The other one, who has no lokapalasraya right, is Ida Dalem Pemayun from Warga Ksatria Dalem.
Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa have used the services of their own (high) priests for generations, there is no evidence that these high priests openly challenged the authority of the pedanda until the 1970s. As reported by Hooykaas repeatedly (1964a, 1964b, 1974, 1976), priests from Warga Bhujangga Waisnawa were happy to be positioned lower than the pedanda. The challenge to the pedanda's sole authority started after the Parisada formally recognised, in 1968, that any Hindu is entitled to perform the dwijati ritual and to become a high priest, and that all high priests are equal in status. This decision was strongly influenced by the struggle of Hindu intellectuals to rationalise (or more precisely to 'Indonesianise') their religion, to be formally acknowledged by the Indonesian government, and to make the Hindu religion comparable to Christianity and Islam (cf. Forge 1980; Bakker 1993). The Indonesianisation of Balinese religion at that time included the effort to reach a consensus regarding the name of the religion (whether the religion should be named Agama Bali, Agama Siwa, Agama Siwa-Buddha, or Agama Hindu); the search for a single holy book; the search for a 'representative' prophet for the religion (equivalent to Nabi Muhammad); and the struggle to convince outsiders and followers alike that the Hindu religion is monotheistic; as well as the recognition that humans are equal before the God.2

IDENTITY AND STATUS

Questions about identity have currently surfaced again in anthropological discussions (cf. Friedman 1993; Kipp 1993; Robinson 1993; Gomes 1994). This seems to be associated with the fear that by the intense global unifying process, ethnicity and local identity may cease to exist, and that "transformations in self identity and globalisation... are the two poles of the

2 This was in line with the criteria set by the Indonesian government that a religion could only be formally recognised if that religion (1) is monotheistic, (2) has a holy book, equivalent to the Koran or Bible, and (3) has a prophet equivalent to Nabi Muhammad. See further Kipp and Rogers (1989) and Bakker (1993).
dialectic of the local and global in the condition of high modernity” (Giddens 1991b: 32).

Identity is roughly the answer to the question “who am I,” which further defines, locates, and orders someone in relation to others in societies. Identity is internalised to become a self-concept (Turner 1982), and always emerges “under condition of contrasts, most often conditions of opposition” to others (Friedman 1993: 740).

Although ethnic identity, ‘Balinese-ness,’ is important for Balinese, warga identity is more important. Warga identity is crucial because it not only locates people in social relationships in this life, but also defines how they are treated after their death. In Balinese idioms, identity of warga is skin (kulit), not just an accessory or clothing (baju). An accessory can easily be changed, but skin must be carried, attached to the body all the time. Thus Balinese are obsessed with warga identity.³ People without a clear warga identity are jokingly labelled as people who have lost orientation (anak paling)⁴ or as people who do not know themselves (tan wruh ring raga).

Identity in the Balinese context is closely associated with status, since identity of warga is manifest in symbols, and these symbols are in practice symbols of status. It is in relation to this that the warga of the Jaba are keen to introduce the concept of difference, implying that symbols used by different warga are merely different, without necessarily indicating hierarchy.

The identity and status of the Jaba, in particular, are gleaned from the distant past, through the narratives in the babad. As I have indicated in this

---
³The warga identity obsession is clearly manifest in the strong movement to find a kawitan among Balinese. When I carried out my fieldwork in Besakih, during the Ekabhuana ceremony, I observed that people took the matter of warga identity very seriously, indicated by the question ‘where is your padharman,’ which was heard frequently among the faithful. There is also a tradition that before proceeding to the main complex of the Besakih temple (to worship God and gods), one should go first to one’s padharman, to worship one’s ancestors.

⁴Geographic orientation (north-south or east-west) is very important in Balinese cosmology. Hence, the loss of orientation (paling, ‘being confused’) is an uneasy state for a Balinese. Those who are stupid, illiterate, or know nothing are referred to as having lost orientation, sing nawang kangin kauh (‘do not know east and west). For discussion of the importance of this orientation, see Bateson and Mead (1942).
thesis, warga identity and status are shaped by a process of moving back and forth from old local traditions and texts (babad) to contemporary global issues. This process is also influenced by power relations of groups among Balinese Hindus.

The movement to look back to history in the search of identity and recognition is, however, not the monopoly of the Balinese. This practice has been documented throughout Austronesian societies, so that, Fox (1995) argues, ancestral manipulation can be seen as one of the prime features of these societies. Nor is the process of going back and forth between the old tradition and the modern world unique to Bali. From South Sulawesi, Robinson (1993) reports that achievement in the modern sectors of the economy is invested back to manipulate traditional symbols and to strengthen the sense of high status. Thus, she writes:

People whose claim to status is based on material success in the modern world still aspire to make claim to high status through traditional architectural form (1993: 234).

One may even speculate that the search for identity and status in history is a common strategy in all societies, since people are always embedded in their past in different degrees. Stuart-Hall (1991) writes that people are

neither locked in the past nor able to forget the past. ... You cannot be something else than who you are. You've got to find out who you are in the flux of the past and the present (quoted in Keng 1994: 80).

TRADITIONALITY AND MODERNITY, GLOBALISATION AND LOCALISATION

Bali has long been an active locus of 'global culture,' triggered by mass media, Western education, and tourism. International tourism arguably has internationalised Balinese society and culture. In turn, one may even say that tourism has become part of Balinese culture since the society has undergone a
'touristification process' (Picard 1990; cf. Hassal 1992). As such, one might expect Balinese society to have been strongly affected by global unifying forces, as theorised by modernisation theories (Giddens 1984, 1991a and 1991b; Haferkamp and Smelser 1992). While in some ways this is true, the other side of the coin is equally important, that the Balinese remain attracted to their traditional beliefs, their ancestral cults. Differentiation of the society is not merely based on modern activities, but equally importantly is based on origin groups. While the modernisation and globalisation processes are going on, the search for traditional values or localisation is also strengthened, a process which modernisation theorists pejoratively label as 'irrational.' The economic advancement achieved by the Balinese has not been invested in 'productive' ways, but is used to renovate ancestral temples and to perform rituals, in the search of status. This negates the theory of economic rationalism, one of the core assumptions in modernisation theories. In the case of the Balinese, having a good, decorative ancestral temple is part of the sense of being modern. Stated differently, modernity and traditionality are mixed in Bali, in that the senses of being modern are also gained from traditional resources (cf. Vickers 1996). At the same time, the rhetoric of the modern state, such as Pancasila and development (pembangunan), or global issues such as human rights (hak azasi manusia) and social justice (keadilan sosial), have been adopted by the Balinese to examine their own traditions, particularly in challenging the ascribed status of those of the Triwangsa. In short, the local and the global, modernity and traditionality, state discourses and Vedic teachings as well as traditional written sources, are all rendered in a dialogue on Bali. The process of globalisation goes hand in hand with the process of localisation or indigenisation. This results in continual reinterpretation of old traditions, and finally transforms traditions and religious practices to become 'worldly wise,' a process Geertz (1973) has called 'internal conversion.'
BALI IN REFERENCE TO THE AUSTRONESIAN SPEAKING WORLD

"[C]ommon origin... becomes a prime maker of identity," writes Fox (1995: 12) after analysing the origin structures of selected Austronesian societies. In these societies, where a number of origin groups exist in a domain, there are always groups of an elite who take precedence over others, and an originator is a means for claiming special status and exclusivity. Fox notes that "throughout the Austronesian world the same formal structure has been devised for achieving this exclusivity" (1995: 223).

Bali seems to resemble this model. As I have argued in Chapter Four, exclusivity is an important criterion in the choice of an origin point for a warga. The use of Dalem Ketut Ngulesir instead of Dalem Kresna Kepakisan by Warga Ksatria Dalem; the use of Mpu Nirartha instead of Mpu Bharadah by Warga Brahmana Siwa; or the use of the Sapta Rsi instead of Mpu Gnijaya by Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi, are examples of this.

Previous analyses of Bali usually made reference to India with which, as this thesis suggests, Bali has more differences than similarities. Although it would be too speculative to conclude that Bali is closer to its Austronesian neighbours than to India, it might be more fruitful to see Bali in reference to Austronesian societies. This thesis, to some extent, has demonstrated that there are similarities between them, and this is worthy of future study.

FUTURE AGENDAS

This thesis was based on fieldwork in various regions in Bali. However, I have not paid enough attention to desa Bali kuna. This is mainly because the echo of the warga movement in these villages has been minimal. This relates to the fact that in these villages Triwangsa are seldom found, and that the Brahmanic dwijati priest has not successfully penetrated the village’s religious sphere. From this point of view, it would be interesting to explore further the
discourse of Balinese society by contrasting my findings in this thesis with those of Thomas Reuter (1996). Reuter sees the strength of the desa (and banua) in networking, while warga plays no role. In contrast, I have shown in this thesis that the network of warga is strengthening Bali-wide, while desa adat have no such system of networking. These two different perspectives may offer a new paradigm in understanding contemporary Balinese society.

From my limited knowledge of desa Bali kuna, I may note here an interesting paradox, which occurs among Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from desa Bali kuna. A prominent leader of the MGPSSR, Jero Mangku Gde Ktut Soebandi, claims that his dadya belongs to a branch of Pasek Gelgel (ie. Pasek Gelgel Songan). However, in his village, Desa Adat Abangsongan (a desa Bali kuna in the Kintamani area), he only uses the services of jero mangku and jero kubayan, and never invites a sri mpu. High priests (sulinggih) have never been used in this village. In a neighbouring village, Desa Adat Suter (also a desa Bali kuna), the service of high priests has also never been used. Interestingly, a member of Warga Pasek Sapta Rsi from this village, who lives in Lampung, performed a dwijati ritual in this village in April 1996, to serve as sri mpu in Lampung. These situations could be a potential source of conflict in the future, between desa adat with their established system and the warga movement, particularly the advocacy of using the sri mpu. This is yet to be seen, and is in itself worthy of another study.

By posing these questions, I admit that this thesis is far from being complete in understanding contemporary Balinese society. On the contrary, I hope that this thesis will be a key to open the door for further studies.

---

5 Although Reuter reports the intention of some families to build a shrine as their warga temple in Pura Penulisan, he notes that this intention was easily overruled by the banua.
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