

Community, Self, and Identity

World Anthropology

General Editor

SOL TAX

Patrons

CLAUDE LÉVI-STRAUSS
MARGARET MEAD
LAILA SHUKRY EL HAMAMSY
M. N. SRINIVAS

MOUTON PUBLISHERS · THE HAGUE · PARIS
DISTRIBUTED IN THE USA AND CANADA BY ALDINE, CHICAGO

Community, Self, and Identity

Editors

BHABAGRAHI MISRA
JAMES PRESTON

MOUTON PUBLISHERS · THE HAGUE · PARIS
DISTRIBUTED IN THE USA AND CANADA BY ALDINE, CHICAGO

Copyright © 1978 by Mouton Publishers. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical,
photocopying, recording or otherwise without the
written permission of Mouton Publishers, The Hague

Distributed in the United States of America and Canada
by Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, Illinois

ISBN 90-279-7650-3 (Mouton)

0-202-90072-X (Aldine)

Jacket photo by James Preston

Cover and jacket design by Jurriaan Schrofer

Indexes by Society of Indexers, Great Britain

Printed in Great Britain

General Editor's Preface

Anthropology began with the study of the nature and history of human culture as a singular phenomenon, then it moved quickly to the dynamics of the cultures of particular societies, and then to studies of the societies themselves as cultural phenomena. The present book moves in turn to the new “intentional” — often ephemeral — communities which form themselves in response to an increasingly anonymous large society. As usual in anthropology, it places these communities in a comparative framework by providing descriptions of a worldwide array of other, longer lasting societies, which also vary from the traditional anthropological specimens. Religion emerges as important both in the formation and in the maintenance of almost all such societies, hardly less so than in the historic “natural” human communities in which individuals also — but less manifestly — found protection. It is not surprising that a book emphasizing problems of community and identity should be a product of a Congress of scholars from the widest variety of the world's cultures.

Like most contemporary sciences, anthropology is a product of the European tradition. Some argue that it is a product of colonialism, with one small and self-interested part of the species dominating the study of the whole. If we are to understand the species, our science needs substantial input from scholars who represent a variety of the world's cultures. It was a deliberate purpose of the IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences to provide impetus in this direction. The *World Anthropology* volumes, therefore, offer a first glimpse of a human science in which members from all societies have played an active role. Each of the books is designed to be self-contained; each is an attempt to update its particular sector of scientific knowledge and is written by specialists from all parts of the world. Each volume should be read and reviewed individually as a separate volume on its own given

subject. The set as a whole will indicate what changes are in store for anthropology as scholars from the developing countries join in studying the species of which we are all a part.

The IXth Congress was planned from the beginning not only to include as many of the scholars from every part of the world as possible, but also with a view toward the eventual publication of the papers in high-quality volumes. At previous Congresses scholars were invited to bring papers which were then read out loud. They were necessarily limited in length; many were only summarized; there was little time for discussion; and the sparse discussion could only be in one language. The IXth Congress was an experiment aimed at changing this. Papers were written with the intention of exchanging them before the Congress, particularly in extensive pre-Congress sessions; they were not intended to be read aloud at the Congress, that time being devoted to discussions — discussions which were simultaneously and professionally translated into five languages. The method for eliciting the papers was structured to make as representative a sample as was allowable when scholarly creativity — hence self-selection — was critically important. Scholars were asked both to propose papers of their own and to suggest topics for sessions of the Congress which they might edit into volumes. All were then informed of the suggestions and encouraged to rethink their own papers and the topics. The process, therefore, was a continuous one of feedback and exchange and it has continued to be so even after the Congress. The some two thousand papers comprising *World Anthropology* certainly then offer a substantial sample of world anthropology. It has been said that anthropology is at a turning point; if this is so, these volumes will be the historical direction-markers.

As might have been foreseen in the first post-colonial generation, the large majority of the Congress papers (82 percent) are the work of scholars identified with the industrialized world which fathered our traditional discipline and the institution of the Congress itself: Eastern Europe (15 percent); Western Europe (16 percent); North America (47 percent); Japan, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand (4 percent). Only 18 percent of the papers are from developing areas: Africa (4 percent); Asia-Oceania (9 percent); Latin America (5 percent). Aside from the substantial representation from the U.S.S.R. and the nations of Eastern Europe, a significant difference between this corpus of written material and that of other Congresses is the addition of the large proportion of contributions from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. “Only 18 percent” is two to four times as great a proportion as that of other Congresses; moreover, 18 percent of 2,000 papers is 360 papers, 10 times the number of “Third World” papers presented at previous Congresses. In fact, these 360 papers are more than the total of *all* papers published after the last International Congress of Anthropological and Ethno-

logical Sciences which was held in the United States (Philadelphia, 1956).

Among other books in this series which will interest the reader of the present volume are those on psychological anthropology, on education, socialization and youth, on religion and ritual, and on traditional cultures and the effects of urbanization and social change in many parts of the world.

Chicago, Illinois
May 16, 1978

SOL TAX

Table of Contents

General Editor's Preface	v
Introduction by <i>Bhabagrahi Misra</i> and <i>James J. Preston</i>	1
SECTION ONE: COMMUNITY IN SOUTH ASIAN CULTURES	
Gods, Kings, and the Caste System in India by <i>L. K. Mahapatra</i>	7
Commercial Economy of an Urban Temple in India: A Shift from Inheritance to Consignment Rights by <i>James J. Preston</i>	27
The Indian Caste Community as a Social System by <i>M. K. Kudryavtsev</i>	37
Social Cohesion and Reciprocation in a Tibetan Community in Nepal by <i>B. N. Aziz</i>	45
SECTION TWO: CULTURES OF THE SOVIET UNION	
Interaction of Cultures Among Peoples of the USSR by <i>Yu. V. Arutyunyan</i>	79

Development of Traditional Aspects of National Culture in the Soviet Central Asian Republics by <i>B. D. Djamgherchinov</i>	87
--	----

SECTION THREE: COMMUNITY AND WORLD JUDAISM

The Jews as an Ethnic Group in the Americas During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries by <i>Seymour B. Liebman</i>	95
--	----

Ancestor Memorialism: A Comparison of Jews and Japanese by <i>Howard Wimberley</i> and <i>Joel Savishinsky</i>	115
---	-----

Some Functional and Structural Aspects of Family Life in a Communal Society: The Financial Sector of the Kibbutz Family by <i>Frits J. M. Selier</i>	133
---	-----

Jewish Communities as Cultural Units by <i>Walter P. Zenner</i>	161
--	-----

SECTION FOUR: COMMUNAL SOCIETY IN AMERICA

Eschatological Living: Religious Experience in the Shaker Community by <i>John H. Morgan</i>	175
---	-----

Religious Orientation of the Communal Counter-Culture: God, Nature, and Mysticism in Contemporary Society by <i>David Buchdahl</i>	187
---	-----

Rituals of Community in an American Religious Youth Group Meeting by <i>E. M. Sciog</i>	209
--	-----

The Country Place: An Intentional, Therapeutic Community by <i>Geoffrey Nusbaum</i>	225
--	-----

Ethnography of Religious Factors in a Politically Oriented Communal Group of New England by <i>Raleigh E. Bailey, Jr.</i>	251
--	-----

<i>Table of Contents</i>	xI
Aspects of Personality in a Communal Society by <i>John A. Hostetler</i>	281
Communitarian Experiments and the Self by <i>Carlos C. Drake</i>	293
Biographical Notes	299
Index of Names	303
Index of Subjects	307

Introduction

BHABAGRAHI MISRA and JAMES J. PRESTON

The recent emergence of various styles of “communal living” in the United States has not been adequately studied. In arranging a session for the IXth ICAES, an attempt was made to contact as many scholars who have pioneered in this new field as was possible. It was decided that older traditional communities such as the Amish and Hutterites could provide a good baseline for comparison with the recent “intentional communities” that were originally to be the primary focus of the session. As the symposium took shape, it became evident that studies of similar communities from all over the world should be incorporated and at that point, the focus became cross-cultural. This presented the difficult task of selecting representative papers that would provide a true foundation for comparative analysis. It was immediately clear that the problem of finding common characteristics on a cross-cultural basis among these divergent communities was much too complex for the present state of knowledge. Therefore, the symposium was designed as a purely exploratory dialogue that would shed some light on this hitherto neglected facet of culture and society.

The papers included here present the broad scope of this symposium. Nevertheless, each study reflects a common need to explain and interpret these heterogeneous lifestyles. This was clearly evident in the discussion that followed the presentation of papers. The participants, at that time, were looking for similar patterns of communal living on a cross-cultural scale. It was generally agreed that it was too early to arrive at any basic conclusions, despite tempting structural similarities noted in several instances.

Perhaps most interesting is the challenge presented by these studies to the evolutionary approach, which traditionally postulates a progressive model of development through various stages of increasing complexity.

The emerging "intentional communities" do not seem to fit the more traditional definitions of "tribe," "peasant society," or "nation-state." Nor do models of religious revitalization movements fully describe or explain these conscious experiments in communal life.

A particularly interesting point of contrast emerges by comparing "intentional communities" in modern technological societies with those of developing nations. There seems to be a significant qualitative difference between the two with respect to community identity. For example, communities in developing societies are caught up in the process of modernization. This results in a kind of status-oriented identity that is generally nontraditional and often based on borrowed Western models.

The "intentional communities" of the United States, by contrast, appear to be essentially transitional, experimental, and volatile by nature. Unlike traditional communities all over the world, these more recent "alternative lifestyles" do not seem to have a common set of philosophical principles. They are, by definition, nontraditional, and their objectives and goals are still nebulous, although all of them try to reject modern technology and its consequences. Despite this disenchantment with the parent society, a deeper, more significant theme may be operating. The negation of established value patterns may be only part of a larger quest to establish a utopian society. This theme is rooted in the perennial search for the nature of "self." Although it is difficult at this stage to suggest the future of these experimental communities, there can be no doubt about their influence on American lifestyles in general.

The papers included in this volume will not completely clarify the issues discussed here. It is necessary for anthropologists from different cultures to collect and codify more ethnographic data before any generalizations can be attempted. It may be that in the future more light will be shed on the durability of American "youth culture." It would be fruitful then to compare such phenomena with new styles of communal living in non-Western urban centers. Investigators would also be encouraged to better define the relations of these communities to the cultures in which they are embedded. Otherwise, the attempt to find common structural themes may result in unnecessary distortions of the unique set of cultural factors involved in the development of each community.

This volume reflects the vast range of problems presented by the study of communal living on a world scale. The arrangement of the papers under several regional headings is an attempt to bring some degree of focus to the material. It is felt that the reader will gain considerable insight from the variety of methodologies and the many different dimensions of "community" represented here. Despite the heterogeneity of these studies, there appears to be some implicit consensus that the search for "self" and "identity" is a theme of increasing significance throughout the

world. In addition, though there are clear differences in the histories and levels of commitment of these communities, the interdependence of world societies today may play a major role in any structural similarities that might be perceived in the material.

We are grateful to all the participants, discussants, and coordinators of the IXth ICAES for providing us with a forum on this topic. We are especially thankful to Sol Tax for his cooperation, valued suggestions, and many vital questions as the session was being arranged around the theme, "Community, Self, and Identity."

SECTION ONE

Community in South Asian Cultures

Gods, Kings, and the Caste System in India

L. K. MAHAPATRA

That the caste system in India is not purely a secular social order, but that religious values, rites, gods, and goddesses are important in it, has been known for a long time. We need only mention the well-known fact that cults of specific deities are associated with specific castes irrespective of status in the caste hierarchy. Hocart's view (1950:59) of a new caste emerging along with a new cult is derived from this view.

Among others, Bouglé (1908:81–82; 1958:24–26) has stressed the importance of the sacrifice and the concepts of purity and pollution as distinctive characteristics of the caste order. Hocart (1950:17–18) conceives of the caste system as a ritual organization, within which the individual castes have been assigned ritual duties or services to perform; the polluting services are relegated to the vassals or serfs who do not have a share in the public or state sacrifices and thus do not have communion with the Aryan gods. This viewpoint of Hocart has certain relevance to our theme, and we shall revert to him later. Incidentally, it is important to note that Hocart has been neglected for various reasons (compare Dumont and Pocock 1958:3 ff.).

Of late, Marriott (1955:189–190) has referred to Hocart while probing the link between the caste hierarchies of little communities and the great tradition of the greater community. Marriott notes the process of filtering down from great to little communities since later Vedic times, when there were two classes of sacrifices, simpler ones of the householders with the assistance of kinsmen and elaborate ones conducted only by kings with the help of professional ritual specialists. The royal sacrifices grew more elaborate, involving greater specialization of the ritualists. Similarly, he thinks that the villagers today practice more elaborate household sacrifices and employ a larger number of specialists. He relies directly on Hocart to trace ritual relationships among castes in villages from those

once prevalent in the royal palace among royal retainers. Hocart (1950:155) points out that “royal ways filter down to the common people, sometimes slowly, sometimes with astonishing rapidity, but naturally shorn of their pomp.” Even a poor householder of Kishan Garhi, according to Marriott, today retains six or seven servants of different castes “mainly to serve him in ceremonial ways demonstrative of his own caste rank.” Marriott adds some other facts throwing light on such royal association:

Householders and their servants formally address each other by courtly titles. Thus, the Brahman priest is called “Great King” (*Maharaj*) or “Learned Man” (*Panditji*), the Potter is called “Ruler of the People” (*Prajapat*), the Barber “Lord Barber” (*Nau Thakur*), the carpenter “Master Craftsman” (*Mistri*), the Sweeper “Headman” (*Mehtar*) or “Sergeant” (*Jamadar*), etc. About half of the twenty-four castes of Kishan Garhi also identify themselves with one or another of the three higher *varna*, thus symbolizing their claims to certain ritual statuses in relation to the sacrifice or the sacrificer of Sanskrit literary form. “Thus, the apparent degradation of the royal style becomes a step in social evolution” [Hocart 1950:155] (Marriott 1955:190).

However, the role of the Hindu kings in the evolution, functioning, and maintenance of the caste system has been very rarely considered (Datta 1968; Bose 1949; Hutton 1951; Srinivas 1952, 1955, 1966; Maynard 1972; Sinha 1972; L. K. Mahapatra 1970). Hocart has given extensive thought to it, but he goes so far when he considers the kings as gods, having priestly functions and working with the Brahman to form a sacerdotal pair, upholding the sacrificial organization for the good life on earth, that he makes the state appear as a ritual organization, and the king’s palace, court, and complement of functional castes are duplicated in the god’s temple, court, and ritual functionaries (Hocart 1927: 10–11; 1970:93, 105). In fact, according to Hocart, “the Church and the State are one in India. The head of this Church-State is the king” (1950:67). “The temple and the palace are indistinguishable, for the king represents the Gods” (1950:68). “. . . everyone likes to imitate his betters, the big feudal nobles the king, the small nobles the big ones, and so on . . .” (1950:155). We shall have to examine Hocart’s insightful ideas carefully in the light of some empirical data from Orissa.

Although implicit in Hocart’s writings, the temple organization of ritual and other services based on a caste division of labor and the relation between the state deity, the divine kings, and the vassal kings, on the one hand, and the caste system at various levels, on the other, have not been expressly analyzed in terms of the relevant empirical data. We shall attempt to do that here within the limitations of space and data. However, it is felt that in analyzing the caste system of India, it is methodologically feasible and substantially profitable to begin with a particular cultural

region because there is much truth in the statement that there is hardly a single caste system, but several, each specific to a linguistic-cultural region (compare Ghurye 1961).

Orissa as a cultural region exemplifies, perhaps in an extreme fashion, the parallelism between the king's court, estates, and services, and those of the state deity. On the basis of this regional empirical study, further implications for understanding the interaction and interdependence between the gods, kings, and temples, on the one hand, and the caste system at the levels of the region as a whole, the princedoms, and the villages, on the other, can be identified and analyzed for India as a whole later on.

GOD-KING IN ORISSA

Perhaps a short introduction to Orissa as a cultural region in this context is in order. Orissa has had a checkered political history, although paradoxically its cultural continuity over a wide area in ancient Kalinga or Utkala is significant. The cornerstone of this cultural continuity in the pre-Islamic past has been the cult of Lord Jagannath, the Lord of the Universe, identified as the penultimate incarnation of Vishnu in the form of Buddha, at Puri, Shrikshetra, one of the four most sacred centers of pilgrimage (*chaturdharma*) for the Hindus. Lord Jagannath is looked upon as the protector and even the sovereign of Orissa, and the Raja of Puri (formerly of Orissa at Khurdha) officiates as his earthly deputy. The king is himself conceived as Vishnu, or Mobile Vishnu (*Chalanti Vishnu*). The institution of a state deity is perhaps as old as urban civilization itself, and we learn of it in the civilizations of Babylonia and Egypt. The Pharaohs were notably the Children of the Sun. So are many Rajput chiefs, as are also the chiefs in Orissa, who are "descended" from the gods, the sun, the moon, the ritual fire-god, Agni, and even from the serpent-god, Naga. Such a conception of divine kingship was also quite widely prevalent for a long time in Southeast Asia, where Shiva, Vishnu, Harihara, Shiva-Buddha, Bodhisatva Lokeśwara of Mount Meru, or Indra were represented in the king on earth, his palace being the sacred microcosm of the kingdom (Heine-Geldern 1942:22ff.). In ancient Cambodia, the king was an incarnation of the God-King Devaraja, who was Lord Shiva himself (Heine-Geldern 1942:22ff.). Similarly, the Raja of Puri, the descendant of the paramount sovereign of Orissa, is referred to as *Thakur-Raja* [God-King], so much so that the pilgrims used to have a *darshan* [audience] of the king before proceeding to the lord's temple. As such, he also functioned as the head ritual functionary of the Jagannath temple; "in the absence of other functionaries in cases of emergencies, [he can] . . . perform all ritual services except cooking and offering food to the Images" (Patnaik 1970:88). Patnaik refers to the similarities between

the rituals of the temple and those of the palace. The palace was considered as a sacred place, the abode of the God-King and Mobile Vishnu; because of this, none were allowed to enter the palace with leather footwear as in the case of a temple (Patnaik 1970). In the painted reliefs on the temple walls, the king is seen performing the twelve important festivals just as they are conducted for Lord Jagannath (Mishra 1971:114–115).

The king and the god underwent similar rituals at the time of waking up, bathing, receiving presents, eating breakfast, putting on clothes, giving audience, making offerings, and other daily rituals. In addition, the king had many special privileges, similar to those of Lord Jagannath himself, when he went to have an audience with the god. The king had vassal chiefs performing several services at the time of royal installation, coronation, and at the time of the temple visit. In the palace, the king's establishment had a vegetarian cuisine, and the queen was subject to no fewer ritual austerities (Mishra 1971:114–115). Only Lord Jagannath and the king were addressed with the reverential terms, *Manima* or *Mahaprabhu*, not only at Puri, but also in other feudal princedoms, because feudal princes are conceived as minor gods in the image of the paramount king. The paramount Raja of Orissa, at least since the days of the Ganga dynasty in about the twelfth century, has made the Jagannath cult a state cult. It may be that this was gradually superimposed on the prevailing state cults of the feudal chiefdoms, where usually some form of *shakti* [tribal goddess] was the *ishtadevata* [patron-deity] of the royal dynasty (Bhattarika in Baramba, Samaleshwari in Sambalpur, Kila Munda in Ranpur, and Hingula in Talcher, and so on.) (compare Kulke 1978).

Lord Shiva has been worshipped almost everywhere in Orissa as *Mahadeva* [Great God] from time immemorial, and the Pashupat cult was in the ascendancy from the fifth and sixth centuries. We may, therefore, visualize that Lord Lingaraj, the King of the Phallus, at Bhubaneswar, *Ekamra-Kshetra*, was the state deity of Orissa by the seventh century, when the temple is said to have been constructed by Yayati Keshari (Panigrahi 1961). But by the time of Shri Shankaracharya of the eighth century, who had visited Puri and whose monastery was established there to campaign in favor of the revival of Hinduism, the worship of Lord Jagannath and the cult center of Puri must have attained a level of all-India importance and all-Orissa supremacy in the spiritual realm.

STATE DEITY AND TEMPLE ORGANIZATION

At any rate, there is evidence that after the days of the Ganga paramount King Aniyankabhima III (who had completed construction of the present

temple of Lord Jagannath), the worship of Jagannath in Orissa was more intensified than during the previous kings' times. Traditionally, thirty-six functional castes were deployed to render services in the temple. It was this king who expressly regarded Purushottama [Lord Jagannath] as the real Emperor of Orissa, he himself ruling as his representative. Thus, by the early thirteenth century Lord Jagannath might have been well established as the state deity (*rashtradevata*) although according to Mishra (1971:38), Purushottama [Jagannath] and Balabhadra were already regarded as *rashtradevatas* of Kongada and Toshali under the later Vaishnav Bhaumas by about the eighth century. Lord Jagannath was believed in so strongly as the lord and protector of Kalinga and Utkal, kingdoms of ancient Orissa (Mishra 1971:43–44), that during the reign of Purushottama Gajapati, both Lord Jagannath and Lord Balabhadra rode horses and led the Orissa soldiers to victory, according to a popular legend painted on the temple walls. This identification of the god with the king of Orissa and the king's empire as the god's realm under his protective arms must have persuaded the feudal chiefs — in addition to the fact of military or political subjugation — to become willing tributaries of a divine King-God-State polity. In fact, there is an inscription in the temple of Lord Jagannath by the paramount king Purushottama Deva that enjoins the vassal kings of Orissa to obey his orders on proper attitude and approach toward Brahmans; transgression of these orders constituted a great sacrilege and sin (*mahapataka*) against Lord Jagannath himself (S. N. Dash 1966:264). At any rate, we find perhaps no princedoms in Orissa under British occupation where we do not come across the worship of Lord Jagannath, usually with his brother, Balabhadra, and sister, Subhadra, and where a complement of functional castes does not serve in the temple as they do in the palace nearby. There is some evidence that in order to legitimize their occupation of territory and curry favor with the Gajapati kings of Orissa, the vassal kings, like the king of Bolangir-Patna, constructed temples of Jagannath, Balabhadra, and Subhadra (S. P. Dash 1962:253). Therefore, we may note that the Jagannath cult has been used for political purposes, both by the emperor and the vassal kings, at least since the thirteenth century. Again, with political purposes of espionage and public propoganda in view, the Panda system was introduced by Aniyankabhima Deva III to court pilgrims from various parts of India by learning their languages and visiting them (Mishra 1971:44). Lord Jagannath is invoked for permission to punish rebellious vassals (Mishra 1971:49). In another inscription in the temple, the paramount king threatens, presumably on the authority of Lord Jagannath, that if the people do not work for the good of the sovereign and avoid the evil path, they will be expelled from the kingdom and all their properties will be confiscated (Mishra 1971:50).

Let us now briefly consider the types of services and the number of

functional castes engaged in serving in the two most important temples of Orissa, that of Lord Jagannath at Puri and of Lord Lingaraj at Bhubaneswar. The world-famous gigantic Sun Temple of Konarak, now in ruins and with no record of organized worship, need not concern us. Although it has been noted that the ritual and other services in the temple of Lord Jagannath were systematically organized in the thirteenth century, there is no justification to infer therefrom that the functional castes were not associated with the temple services much earlier, perhaps from the beginning of the temple worship in the legendary days of King Indradyumna, who, according to the Skanda Purana, constructed the first temple of Puri. Even in the days of Indradyumna, as the legend goes (Mishra 1971:82), the descendants of the Savara chief Visvvasu, known as Daita, the descendants of the Savara girl, Lalita, and the Brahman emissary, Vidyapati, known as Suara (Supakara), and the descendants of Vidyapati (by a Brahman wife?) were to serve as decorators and ministrants, as cooks, and as priests, respectively. Previous to the organization of services by Aniyankabhima Deva III, the local tradition has it that there were nine *sevaks* [servants]: (1) *Charu Hota*, (2) *Patra Hota*, (3) *Brahma*, (4) *Acharya*, (5) *Pratihari*, (6) *Puspalaka*, (7 and 8) *Dyatas* [the washerman and the barber], and (9) *Dvarapalaka* (Mishra 1971:12–121).¹ It is highly probable that every time the temple was rebuilt, it became larger and more complex, and the ritual services were further elaborated; the latter occurred also when dynasties changed. Again, just because there is a close parallel in the temple services in the Puri and Bhubaneswar temples, there is no valid reason to suspect that the services are wholly a carry-over from the temple at Puri to the Bhubaneswar temple. First, the Lord Lingaraj temple is probably 600 years older (compare Panigrahi 1961), and the associated cult center Ekamra-Kshetra is perhaps even older. King Indradyumna is said to have worshiped Lord Shiva there before Lord Jagannath in his present form appeared at Puri. Second, both Lord Jagannath and Lord Lingaraj are, as the legends run, gods of the Savara autochthones who had been recognized in some categories as temple functionaries. King Yayati Keshari, alleged to be a founder of the Lingaraj temple, is said to have brought in some Dravidian Brahmans (Bose *et al.* 1958) as temple priests because, presumably, the local Brahmans were not well versed in Shaivism at that time, and he had to elevate the temple services from tribal rites to Sanskritic ones.

The temple of Lord Jagannath engages temple servants performing

¹ Some of the names of these nine *sevaks* cannot be translated exactly because they are proper names. Possible meanings are (1) *Charu Hota* [the handsome head-priest], (2) *Patra Hota* [the priest in charge of vessels], (3) *Brahma* [the demiurge Brahma], (4) *Acharya* [preceptor], (5) *Pratihara* [garland-arranger], (6) *Puspalaka* [flower-arranger], (7 and 8) *Dyatas* [washerman and barber], and (9) *Dvarapalaka* [gatekeeper].

101 services or roles with their respective names, rights, duties, and perquisites (Mishra 1971). However, the actual number of castes is not ascertained from this, although castes range from Brahmans to some untouchables, and even some descendants from tribal worshippers are known to be involved. Similarly, at the temple of Lord Lingaraj, somewhat less elaborately, in 1958, 41 types of services were recorded (Bose *et al.* 1958), involving 22 separate castes, ranging over almost the same ethnic spectrum. This has also been largely confirmed by M. Mahapatra (1972), who, however, gives a tally of 30 types of services. There is no doubt that there has been wide fluctuation in the total number of ritual services (roles), at least in the temple of Lord Jagannath. Those ritual services were recorded by British officers in 1807, soon after their occupation of Orissa; at that time the number was 219. Apart from this, there were 139 types of services connected with the management of the temple. In the 1950's, the Orissa government compiled a record of rites, which gave the number of ritual services as 140. Again the number of castes involved is not given, and it is seen that many of the priestly and other castes perform several roles at the same time. The fact that specific rajas and even temple managers have been known to have introduced or discontinued specific services, offerings, fairs, and so on points to the prevalence of caste-centered core services in spite of the periodic fluctuations in the elaboration or proliferation of services. This is very clear from the stereotypical reference to *Chhatisha Nijoga* [thirty-six caste-centered ritual servants].

That almost all the caste-centered ritual services performed in the temple of Lord Jagannath were duplicated in the palace of the King of Orissa may not be far from the truth, as indicated by Patnaik (1970) or by Mishra (1971:44). Similarly, one may refer to the royal installation, attended by vassal chiefs in various roles, as bearing close similarity to the divine installation at Poushabhisheka in the month of Pousha when Lord Jagannath assumes *rajavesha* [royal attire] in a series of king-worthy rituals (*raja niti*). There is another divine installation in the month of Jyestha, known as *Rajendra-bhisheka*, auguring the proposal of marriage with Rukmini, as in the *Mahabharat*. Lord Jagannath assumes *rajavesha* again on the day of the full moon in the month of Phalgun. Not only that, but the Lord holds his royal court on Sunian day in the month of Bhadra, when his servants and subjects (temple servants and peasants and other holders of temple lands) offer him loyalty and tribute. Those Sunian rites are celebrated also in the Lingaraj temple, and this had been introduced by a former paramount king, marking the beginning of an indigenous royal calendar of Orissa. But this should not lead us to expect absolute conformity of the royal services with temple services or *vice versa*. Each system of services has its own pattern of proliferation and development, although basically the same complement of castes renders more or less

similar secular and ritual services in the temple as well as in the palace. With this limitation, we may properly appreciate the concept of *temple community* developed by M. Mahapatra (1972) under this author's guidance, wherein Lord Lingaraj is seen wielding both ritual and secular authority and performing other roles through kinship, kingship, and property institutions among gods and men in his Ekamra-Kshetra. The temple servants here, as at Puri, invite the God on the occasion of auspicious ceremonies in their families; the funeral pyre is ignited with fire from the temple, at least in the case of Brahman *sevaks*; and the *Daitapati* [descendants of Savara, worshippers of Lord Jagannath] perform "funeral rites" of the Lord when a new set of images is made every twelve years. Besides the *Daitapati sevaks* take charge of the Lord's decoration, worship, and offering of fruits, and so on from the day the Lord falls ill until the end of the *Car* festival. As the *Daitapati* are considered to be family members of Lord Jagannath, they share the familial (*gyantisara*) dishes (Mishra 1971:93-96). All of this corroborates Hocart's view (1950:67) that in India, the Church and the State are one.

STRUCTURAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE GOD-KING AND TEMPLE-STATE IDENTITIES

If we accept the implications of the observations made so far, we may agree with Hocart on the essential identity of the caste organization as mediated through temple organization and the organization of services to the king's establishment. Our assertion is that such identity is all the more pronounced in the case of state deities of a kingdom, like Orissa, in which the deity is not monopolistically owned (as, for example, the Brahman priestly families monopolize Lord Pandurang of Maharashtra) and in which tribesmen abound, among whom the caste system has yet to take strong roots. That the two acclaimed tribal deities came to be elevated as state deities, one after the other, opens up a new field of promising research into the building of the Hindu state, empire, and society in Orissa, much of which was part of the Dandakaranya forests of the Ramayana era or of Jharkhand jungles of medieval times; but this is not within the scope of our discussion.

At any rate, we may still consider the major structural consequences of God-King and temple-state (or palace) identities. First, the caste system became well differentiated; rights and duties as well as hierarchical relative positions became established with reference ultimately to their ritual relevance and importance; caste regulations were not only backed by state authority, but they also acquired the character of divine dispensation. This last development can be well documented from the temple inscriptions or *Sanad* grants by various paramount kings, wherein

the caste and other regulations were enjoined upon all, including the vassal chiefs and Brahmans, and which could be transgressed only at the cost of committing a sin against Lord Jagannath. In this connection, we may bring in the supreme council of Brahman scholars at Lord Jagannath's temple (*Mukti Mandap Pandit Sabha*), which sat in judgement on caste matters and rituals, among other things. The present building for this *Pandit Sabha* was constructed in 1578, but the institution appears to be much older than the buildings.

Second, the caste system, in its supposedly ideal differentiation and elaboration at the temple of the state deity and the palace of the paramount king, became the model for emulation at the temples and palaces of the vassal princes, with a *Pandit Sabha* of some sort to adjudicate on caste matters. Everything was not necessarily an exact replica of the model at the state capital and state temple. Actually, the roots go deep into the Hindu society and polity, where the king is looked upon as the authority in caste matters and is advised by Brahman scholars, who together constitute the supreme authority on caste matters in a principedom. Appeals from the level of the vassal chiefs lay before the *Mukti Mandap Pandit Sabha*, which had derived royal authority and divine ordination from the paramount king and the paramount god, respectively.

Third, the superposition of the state deity, the paramount king, and the paramount council of *pandits* on caste matters signified the spiritual, political, and social leadership of the Mobile Vishnu or God-King combination at the heart of the state and society in Orissa. That the paramount kings derived political sustenance from this trinity is without question, but this is outside the scope of the present paper. However, we have seen how the state deity cult was used for political purposes to achieve the subjugation and integration of vassal principedoms in an empire.

CASTE IN PRINCEDOMS

Although the above structural consequences have been cast in a static, timeless frame, this is not at all the case objectively. Let us take the second situation for a closer view, the one in which the caste order, political setup, and the ritual organization at the level of the principedom is shown as more or less modeled after the system evolved at the political and religious centers of the state in Orissa. This author has tried to throw some light in one of his national lectures (L. K. Mahapatra 1970) on the dual role of the Hindu king as the preserver of, and also as the catalytic agent for change in, the caste order within his domain. It can be argued, as Maynard (1972) has done, that in his original role of maintaining the

traditional order, the raja gradually also, driven by logic and pragmatism, became the authority to accord recognition to the relative interactional status attained, in addition to keeping the relative ascribed status of the castes (apparently) fixed. This transition from fixity to flux gave the essential leverage to the caste system insofar as individual castes or their sections could be recognized or not recognized as having this or that ritual or caste status in a specific politically autonomous domain. It has also been this author's thesis that in India, as in Orissa, such politically autonomous entities also tended to behave as economically and socially autonomous units. This, at any rate, has been the situation in most of the former princely states and zamindaries of Orissa, where the political, economic, and social (caste interactions, status equivalence, and hierarchy) boundaries tended to coincide in the recent past. If a caste or its subgroup attains a higher relative status in one principedom, perhaps because of its political or economic power or ritual purity or because of its value to the state or the king himself, this becomes the signal for the same caste or subcaste in other principedoms to claim such higher status. That the *Pandit Sabha* was not always obliging to the king or the castes in their claims is not very important. The fact that this avenue was open to the castes, by going to the local king and *Pandit Sabha*, or by going over their heads to the *Mukti Mandap Sabha* for final judgement in matters of caste rituals and status determination, added an element of dynamism to the caste order. This is not so clearly evident from the traditional model of the caste system, whether in the Hindu scriptures or in early Western "scriptures" on Hindu society. This author has even come across cases of flouting of the decision of the *Mukti Mandap Pandit Sabha* in one or two principedoms. This happened during the late British regime, when the political hold of the descendant of the paramount king of Orissa was nonexistent and the local princes did not need to fear either social or divine retribution from their people because of the prevalence of overwhelming secular trends towards social and economic freedoms in a countrywide democratic and capitalistic order.

CASTE DUTIES AS RITUAL SERVICES

It is necessary now to point out two important things. First, in the temples and palaces of principedoms, the caste organization did not exhibit as much differentiation and specialization as evidenced in the state deity's temple organization, where services were highly elaborate and sophisticated. In the variety and elaboration of caste-based services, the paramount king's palace and establishment appear to parallel closely the local Jagannath temple.

Second, the tasks allotted to particular families of particular castes in

the temple, as well as in the palace, on a hereditary basis came to be invested with sanctity and privilege. It was one's religious duty, as well as a privilege, to perform the hereditary job, much as the "calling" was a religious duty in Christian medieval Europe. Hence the well-known Sanskrit saying *Swadharme nidhanam shreyah, parodharmah bhaya-vahah* [One's own duty is the best to perform, others' duties are bound to give fear]. This notion of religious duty elevated caste duties to what one might call ritual services. Therefore, transgression of caste duties in general came to be looked upon as sacrilege, not merely an act of criminality to be punished by the king, who was the preserver of the social order. According to Hocart, these caste services were born of the sacrifices, especially the public or state sacrifices, whose elaborate, ritual requirements were functionally differentiated, coordinated, and mediated through the caste system. He says:

... the caste system is a sacrificial organization, ... the aristocracy are feudal lords constantly involved in rites which require vassals or serfs, because some of these services involve pollution from which the lord must remain free (Hocart 1950:17).

Again, "... the worthy or excellent castes are those which alone are admitted to share in the sacrifice, with whom alone the gods hold converse" (Hocart 1950:18).

It is very difficult to pronounce on Hocart's theory of the origin of caste. The only positive comment one may offer is on its plausibility. The state sacrifice to which he explicitly refers is a king's consecration or priests' installation ceremony. From what is known of such rituals in the palace of the present descendants of the paramount kings of Orissa, it appears that these services are not so elaborate or differentiated as in the temple of Lord Jagannath, although there is close resemblance. Apart from that, there are many vassal rajas of the former princedoms who had been assigned services in the royal procession and other state ceremonies (Patnaik 1970:62). One vassal chief was to hold a betel leaf container, another to hold a spittoon, and still others to hold swords, golden canes, or daggers as insignia of royal authority. Such services did not always conform to the royal roles, which the godlike Kshatriya rajas were supposed to perform. On the other hand, in the daily and periodic ritual services at the state deity's temple, all the castes from the very low untouchable castes to the Veda-knowing Brahmans had their assigned tasks and statuses inside or outside the temple. Hocart might not have attached importance to the temple organization, as at the most important Temple of the Tooth in Ceylon (which he cites as an empirical source of his theory). He notes how all who officiated inside the sanctuary were Buddhist farmers. But inside the temples at Puri and Bhubaneswar

several castes have ritual duties. Therefore, even if we do not accept his theory of origin of the caste from public sacrifices, because there is a lack of adequate empirical evidence to support it, at least the continuing organization of temple services in Orissa and elsewhere may supply an important basis for his assertion that caste is born of ritual, or caste is a ritual organization. Further, we may, on the basis of the facets of equivalence of the palace and the temple, agree largely with him that:

. . . the temple and the palace are indistinguishable, for the king represents the gods. Therefore, there is only one word in Sinhalese and in Tamil for both (S. *maligava*; T. *maligai*). The god in his temple has his court, like the king in his palace: smiths, carpenters, potters all work for him (Hocart 1950:68).

Again, we may also go along with him when he asserts:

. . . just as each clan has a chieftain, and the whole tribe a chief, so each clan has a temple and the whole tribe a state temple of the chief god. Thus as usual, the human organization reflects the divine, and vice versa, since the two are one. . . . (Hocart 1927:105).

Hocart (1950:16), however, goes too far when he says that in India: “every occupation is a priesthood” because all craftsmen including the dancing girls, worship the objects with which they earn their livelihood. While priesthood is meaningful in the context of a community, and family rituals are far from public ceremonies, we may concede that a degree of sanctity is ascribed thereby to the caste duties, to be performed with reference to their respective religio-ethical norms. But this is true of each caste taken *individually*; there is no clue to how *a system of castes* can be viably organized, put into execution, and maintained over a long period in a particular region.

CASTE IN VILLAGES

Hocart, however, becomes very effective when it comes to the functioning of caste at the village or intervillage level:

The king’s state is reproduced in miniature by his vassals; a farmer has his court, consisting of the personages most essential to the ritual, and so present even in the smallest community, the barber, the washerman, the drummers and so forth (Hocart 1950:68).

Hocart (1950:8) logically identifies the farmers, with “feudal lords to whom the others owe certain services, each according to his caste.” If we find fault with him over his ill-chosen epithet, “feudal,” what he actually means is clear from the following:

The gods of the farmers, the Maruts, act as Indra's bodyguard. Since divine society is a replica of human society, we must conclude that the farmers are the king's mainstay in battle. They are just as military then as the nobles (Hocart 1950:39).

But Hocart uses a back door to induct the farmers into the sacrificial organization thus: "The farmers . . . are the support on which the monarch and the priesthood rest, and their duty is to feed the sacrifice from their lands and cattle" (Hocart 1950:39). In the state, which is a ritual organization, the others have different duties and if they cultivate, they do so only to feed themselves (Hocart 1950:41). We may not agree with him wholeheartedly on the place of the sacrificial organization at the base of the caste system and especially on the role of the farmers *vis-à-vis* the sacrificial organization. For, this role of the farmer also agrees well with the view of the society as a military organization, which he himself pointed out.

However, there is substantive truth in what he says:

This ritual organization has spread downward to such an extent that the poor cultivators in the jungle have their retainers to play the part which they alone are qualified by heredity to play at births, weddings, and funerals, but these are retainers of the community, the village, not of one lord (Hocart 1950:68).

We must again warn against absolute identities or replicas. The model is set by the court of the paramount king and the temple of the state deity, and the vassal chiefs and the temples, especially the Jagannath temple, in the princedoms largely follow suit. When we come to the village and intervillage level, this model is still valid and is looked upon as ideal, although the circumstances at the operational, interactional level do not allow for a 100 percent compliance. But let us recall how at the princedom level, representing the subregional organization of castes, the element of dynamism and flux has been as clearly evident in the variations of circumstances of each caste as in the variations between princedoms. The caste organization at the state deity's temple and the king's palace seems immutable and sets the standard by which the caste status, activities, and norms are to be tested when in doubt or dispute. Thus, this apparent immutability and stability is an important structural aspect of the regional caste system of Orissa.

Let us examine briefly the social structure of villages in Orissa, in the first instance. A large multicaste village usually has a complement of functional castes: blacksmiths, carpenters, barbers, washermen, and Brahmans, with or without potters and astrologers, who have remained, in most cases until recently, in *jajmani* relationships with the clean castes. In most villages of Orissa the cultivating caste (*Chasa*) or the militia-cum-cultivator caste *Khandayat* [the wielders of swords] were the land-

owning and economically powerful castes, which were served by all the functional castes. They conform to the significant features of *dominant castes*. The *Khandayats* especially behaved like lords and held in many cases military service *jagirs* [land grants], although there are some villages whose owners and/or dominant castes were Brahman, braziers (*Kansari*), oilmen (*Teli*), or even fishermen, and so on. The dominant castes or at least their representative, the headman of the village, who was appointed by and represented the king, exercised authority over the organization of caste-based services within the microcosm of the village. In many princely states or zamindaries in Orissa, the headman had the power to appoint or evict the village servants of functional castes, and he often took the initiative to bring a washerman or a barber to be settled on some *jagir* land under his control. He, or vicariously his (dominant) caste members, saw to it that the ritual services and other services, performed by the various resident and peripatetic members of other castes serving the village, were attended to properly, without conflict and disruption, and without intruding upon the privileges of other castes. He thus secured what is called by Srinivas *vertical solidarity* in the village. We need not go into all the facets beyond pointing out the phenomenon. The headman also saw to it that all the important agricultural and related rituals and crisis rites for village welfare were performed and that each section played its assigned role. In this sense, the headman and the dominant caste ensured the functioning of the village as a ritual, economic, and social organization. Hocart would give pre-eminence to ritual organization and derive the other facets from it. We may not grant him that; but this is not very important.

Although there may be a temple of the village goddess or other minor gods, the rituals are not elaborate and one or two castes (usually a non-Brahman, sometimes even a tribal priest) may be involved in the temple services. Thus, the services of the castes in the area cannot be readily invested with sanctity from their ritual relevance in the temple organization, and no public sacrifices are normally held on a large scale in the villages. But the chief deity is drawn into the caste disputes and into the village organization and well-being because the village assembly and the caste councils usually sit near the abode of the deity. Thus, the deity's blessings are easily invoked to seal the decisions that are made, or the deity acts as divine witness to the oaths and contracts. There is a belief that the deity will punish a transgressor if caste norms are violated. Therefore, although caste services have their ritual character derived primarily from the temple-palace ritual network, this is also locally reinforced by the involvement of the main deity of the village. The close parallel between this situation at the village level and that at the state level with the state deity and king may easily be perceived.

The question as to why the functional castes are looked upon as village servants and not as servants attached to temporal or spiritual lords can be

resolved simply. In the villages there are no such powerful or affluent lords as are available at the capitals of the state or of the princedoms. Basically the peasants have a subsistence economy and do not grow much beyond their needs; hence, they have to pool their common resources, village land, or their individual resources to support the members of the functional castes (compare Hocart 1950:155).

We may also briefly note that the caste headmen in a princedom in Orissa were invested with royal authority by the kings, who formally appointed them. Thus, we find how even at the village and intervillage levels, the gods and the kings have lent their authority and sanctity to the caste organization. It is not meant that there is only a filtering down of the great tradition from upper layers of the society or from their acknowledged centers. The very fact that minor gods, caste gods, various local cults and fairs, village headmen are of crucial importance in village India indicates that the vitality and importance of local traditions are not to be belittled.

KINGSHIP AND THE HINDUIZATION OF TRIBES

In fact, there is some evidence to show how the king was instrumental in integrating minor tribal traditions with higher traditions through a process identified by Marriott (1955) as *universalization*. Thereby the king has often taken some steps to make it easier for a hill tribe to become gradually accepted as a clean Hindu caste. We may consider one case from Orissa as an illustration.

A Hill Bhuiyan priest was worshiping Kanta-Kuanri, a goddess allegedly represented by a *tantrik yantra* found by chance in the area. The Raja of Benai came to learn of its importance in the Hill Bhuiyan lore and belief. He then arranged for the annual circuit of the goddess to go up to the palace temple of the state deity and back to the hill sanctuary. On the way, the goddess was worshiped by all castes and tribes inhabiting the villages, where the ritual procession came to scheduled halts. Gradually, the tribal goddess became allied to, and even identified with, a form of Durga, a Sanskritic goddess of the great tradition, and the Bhuiyan and other low priests of the goddess thus gained higher ritual and social status from the viewpoint of Hindu society (compare Roy 1935:104–117).

In Hindu Orissa, there is a hierarchy of gods and goddesses, with the state deity, Lord Jagannath at the top, and the minor tribal gods and spirits at the bottom. The recognition of this hierarchy, as well as the several grades of purity and pollution attached to different occupations and ethnic communities, belongs to an initial phase of the process of Hinduization. To this, we may add the other concessions granted by this