

Religion, Ideology and Society

Author(s): Krishna Mohan Shrimali

Source: *Social Scientist*, Vol. 16, No. 12 (Dec., 1988), pp. 14-60

Published by: Social Scientist

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3517417>

Accessed: 08-02-2018 19:49 UTC

## REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[http://www.jstor.org/stable/3517417?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3517417?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*Social Scientist* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Scientist*

KRISHNA MOHAN SHRIMALI\*

## *Religion, Ideology and Society*

The problems I refer to, concern what Friedrich Max Muller called *Religionswissenschaft* or 'science of religions' as early as 1867.<sup>1</sup> Although my own research output is minimal, I have nevertheless ventured to undertake the subject because having taught the subject at the postgraduate classes for nearly two decades, I have often felt there is a paramount need for developing the discipline along scientific lines. I propose to undertake a world view with the objective of placing studies on Indian religions in proper perspective.<sup>2</sup>

We shall not attempt any definition of religion and prefer to take its multi-dimensional character as a convenient starting point.<sup>3</sup> Briefly, it may be mentioned that myths, rituals, doctrines, theology, mystic experience, socio-ethical content, etc., constitute some of the major dimensions of the religious phenomenon.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, *Religionswissenschaft* has been variously defined but one of the best known classifications takes cognizance of the psychology, history, sociology and phenomenology of religion.<sup>5</sup> A bird's-eye view of the major phases in the creation of a 'science of religions' as an important discipline is desirable to understand the Indian scene. Surely, one can easily identify the methodological transformations between Max Muller's writings on comparative mythology with an accent on philology in the latter half of the nineteenth century and Bruce Lincoln's analysis of the Rigvedic religion published about a hundred years later.<sup>6</sup> From the rather simplistic, though not uncritical, presentation of A. Barth<sup>7</sup> to recent writings with pronounced influences of Levi-Strauss' structuralism and Freud's psychoanalysis represents a very long trek.<sup>8</sup>

Lewis Henry Morgan in his classic work *Ancient Society*<sup>9</sup> published in 1877 wrote, 'Religion deals so largely with imaginative and emotional nature, and consequently with such uncertain elements of knowledge, that all primitive religions are grotesque and to some extent unintelligible' (emphasis added).<sup>10</sup> More than half a century before this, August Comte, in his famous *Cours de philosophie positive* (based on his lectures of the 1820s) had pronounced his theory of the

---

\*Professor of History, University of Delhi

'Law of Three Stages' with the theological as the 'lowest' state of development. 'Positivism', the creed of Comte, tended to regard religion as 'merely a survival from Man's primitive past, and doomed to disappear in an era of science and general enlightenment.'<sup>11</sup> Even a synoptic survey of the growth of the science of religion in the last one hundred and fifty years is sufficient to show how wrong both these savants were. Religion is with us all even in the most scientifically advanced societies. Nor is it (not even 'primitive religion') 'grotesque and ... unintelligible' any more.

It is generally accepted that the *Religionswissenschaft* was largely a child of the Enlightenment which is characterized as rejecting religion in the light of scientific and intellectual progress.<sup>12</sup> It is in this background that an attempt can be made to delineate the broad course and framework of the methodology of studying religions.

#### METHODOLOGY OF THE 'SCIENCE OF RELIGION'

The major trends in the growth of the methodology of the 'science of religions' can be broadly studied under four phases:<sup>13</sup>

- (a) Up to the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, the pre-Durkheim-Weber phase.
- (b) 1910 to the 1920s when the sociology of religion took off with the thought-provoking contributions of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber.
- (c) The three decades between the 1920s and 1950s when the anthropological perspective with an accent on fieldwork giving birth to social anthropology was developed by the Functionalists, such as A.R. Radcliffe-Brown (1881-1955) and Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942).
- (d) Writings since the 1950s, where one of the most dominant influences has been that of Claude Levi-Strauss' Structuralism.

#### *Phase I: Up to c. 1910*

In the sphere of *Religionswissenschaft* the nineteenth century was essentially dominated by philologists and ethnologists, focusing largely on myths. The scientific study of myths did not begin until Karl O. Muller's *Introduction to a Scientific Mythology* published in 1825.<sup>14</sup> Needless to mention, however, the peer in the field of studies on myths is Max Muller, for whom the 'key' to comprehend the essence of religion was 'Comparative Mythology,' and this in turn could only be understood by a method of philological analysis.<sup>15</sup> More specifically, he was an exponent of the 'nature-myth school' for which the 'key' was solar mythology.<sup>16</sup> For him the whole supernatural world arose from the limitations, ambiguity and 'illusion of language'.<sup>17</sup>

Shortly after the birth of language-based comparative mythology, ethnologists came to the scene and laid the foundations of the anthropological approach to the study of religion. Apparently

influenced by Darwinian Evolution, ethnologists such as E.B. Tylor, Andrew Lang, Robertson Smith, R.R. Marett, Sir James Frazer, etc. tended to combine their 'positivistic' approach with religious facts. Tylor described the unilinear evolution of religion from animism through polytheism and finally to the monotheism of more 'civilized' cultures.<sup>18</sup> Tylor's animism as 'minimum definition of religion' evoked tremendous reaction and pre-animistic evolutionary and anti-evolutionary theories focusing on *mana*,<sup>19</sup> *taboo*,<sup>20</sup> magic,<sup>21</sup> High God<sup>22</sup>, etc. were formulated. Regrettably, these reactions shared most of the assumptions of Tylor, particularly his 'negative' view of religion in which *homo-religiosus* was placed at the origin of the evolutionary process.<sup>23</sup>

To sum up, the philologists and ethnologists of the first phase of our survey claimed to have established an 'autonomous' discipline for the 'scientific' study of religion. It was, however, far from being so. Nevertheless, by accumulating 'religious facts' and looking for common elements or 'parallels', by locating and translating the 'original sources' and by assuming a critically 'rationalistic' attitude marked by personal detachment, they had certainly taken the first step in that direction.<sup>24</sup>

#### *Phase II: 1910-1920s*

It is remarkable how a short span of less than two decades unleashed such forces in Western Europe as gave birth to a distinctive approach to the study of religion. These years of the early twentieth century saw the emergence of what has now come to be known as the 'Sociology of Religion'. Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) in France and Max Weber (1864-1920) in Germany were the real harbingers of this current. Both shared many common interests, though their raw materials and methodology differed a great deal. Weber's emphasis on the importance of bureaucratic organisations and rational legal authority relationships, his understanding of charismatic leadership, his analysis of 'disenchantment' of the modern world, his explanation of the 'Problem of Meaning' are such elements as easily enable us to draw parallels with Durkheim. The latter's concern with such themes as the major processes of social, economic and political specialisation relating to the division of labour; his notions of 'sacred' and 'profane' and his search for modern equivalents of the sacred beliefs and symbols and above all, his deep-rooted interests in the problems of group cohesion provide links with the German doctrinaire. It may, however, be pointed out that while both savants grappled with the problem of societies' management without religion, their ways of analysing it were dissimilar. While Weber was primarily interested in establishing links between *specific* social stratum distinctions and modes of religious expression, Durkheim concentrated upon *general* social significance of religious experience and belief. Both were, however, concerned with problems of how individuals and groups identify themselves in the

world not only in relation to each other but to the social, cultural and natural conditions of their existence as well.

*Les formes elementaires de la vie religieuse* (*The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*) of Durkheim was published in 1912. Arguing that religion does not rest upon an 'illusion,' as the positivists had thought, but rather upon a 'basic fact of experience', Durkheim defined it as follows:

A religion is a unified system of belief and practices relative to sacred things i.e. things set apart and forbidden—beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them. The second element which finds a place in our definition is no less essential than the first; for by showing that the idea of religion is inseparable from that of the Church, it makes it clear that religion should be an eminently collective thing.

Durkheim had occasionally used the existing writings on Indian civilisation to highlight his general framework of religion. That religion cannot be defined as belief in gods was sought to be established by alluding to the early Buddhism, which had no place for gods but was regarded as religion.<sup>25</sup> He said rather emphatically, that which human beings have meant by God and that which has served as the object of their religious emotions and practices is society. Society has deified itself; religion is the means of symbolically expressing the total collective life.<sup>26</sup>

Durkheim also speculated on the origin of religion and sought to argue on the basis of the Arunta and Central Australia that totemism was the primordial form of religion.<sup>27</sup>

Durkheim's approach has been vulnerable on many counts. By emphasizing only the sociological dimension of religious experiences, he failed to realize that the manifestation of the sacred as social 'does not exhaust the manifestation of sacrality.'<sup>28</sup> Another Durkheimian notion that has not gone unchallenged is that society is necessarily anterior to religion<sup>29</sup> or that cognition is socially determined.<sup>30</sup>

Notwithstanding these criticisms, Durkheim's contribution had potential openings for more fruitful interpretations. He challenged many of the 'negative' assumptions of the first phase. Further, by emphasizing the importance of religious symbolism, he had sown the seeds of structuralism of Claude Levi-Strauss. His impact, from the point of view of India, is apparent in the works of Marcel Mauss and Henri Hubert. Indologists such as G. Held, Georges Dumezil and P. Masson-Oursel also show influences of Durkheim. Mauss-Hubert's pioneering study on the ritual of sacrifice,<sup>31</sup> G. Held's ethnological study of the *Mahabharata*<sup>32</sup> and Dumezil's numerous works on Indo-European society and mythology are some of the indicators of Durkheim's influence on Indian religious studies. Even Masson-Oursel's

attempt to separate the magical elements from the rational in the structure of early Hinduism can be linked with the French sociologist.<sup>33</sup>

Max Weber, a junior contemporary of Durkheim and a product of Bismarckian Germany, is known for his numerous writings not only on religions of specific countries such as India<sup>34</sup> and China<sup>35</sup> but also on specific religions as well as the sociology of religion.<sup>36</sup> His *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*<sup>37</sup> is a great classic.

Weber was deeply interested in distinguishing traits of world religions but not from any theological point of view. Instead, he looked for perceptive and meaningful consequences of theological doctrines for the orientation that men bring to their economic activities. Weber wanted to go beyond a narrow focus on the indirect impact of ideas on behaviour by examining in detail the 'anchorage' of religious ideas in social organisation. From the perspective of sociology of religion he highlighted the following three forms of relationship between social organisation and religious ideas:

- (a) Social groups with particular economic interests often show themselves to be more receptive to some religious ideas than to others. Where they were chivalrous warrior heroes, political officials, economically acquisitive classes or finally, where an organised hierocracy dominated religion, the results were different than from where genteel intellectuals were decisive. The social stratum including artisans, traders, entrepreneurs engaged in industry are attracted by all sorts of individual pursuits of salvation. Everywhere the hierocracy has sought to monopolise the administration of religious values. The individual's quest for salvation or the quest of free communities by means of contemplation, orgies or asceticism has been considered highly suspect and has had to be regulated ritually and controlled hierocratically. From the standpoint of the interests of the priesthood in power, this was considered natural.
- (b) Religious ideas lead to the formation of certain groups, such as monastic orders, guilds of magicians, or a clergy and these groups may develop quite extensive economic activities.
- (c) The gap between the elite and the masses poses a problem with which each of the great religions of the world has had to cope with. With specific references to religion in China, particularly Confucianism and Taoism, Weber shows how the former remained confined to the Emperor and the bureaucratic order but broadly excluded the masses. In contrast, the *brahmanas* in India, who were royal chaplains, spiritual advisers, theologians and authorities on questions of ritual propriety, achieved a 'systematic rationalization of magic' and effected a compromise between their own elite interests in a dignified way of life and their need to provide for the release of the masses from the misfortunes that were their lot.

One aspect of Weber's writings having a far-reaching consequence and an ideological tilt as well is the *antireductionist* tendency.<sup>38</sup> It is argued that this is sociology of religion *sensu stricto*. Throughout his writings, Weber assumes that the specific religious features are at least partially independent of the relevant social and economic conditions and tries to emphasize the 'religious anchorage' of economic, political, social and cultural institutions. Undoubtedly, the most famous illustration of Weber's anti-reductionism appears in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, where the religious determination of life conduct and 'economic ethic' has been the dominant strain—an idea which is underlined in his analysis of Hinduism and Buddhism as well.<sup>39</sup>

Weber's reference to 'ideal interests' and 'material interests' enable us to recall Marx's sharp contrast between 'base/infrastructure' and 'superstructure'. Which is *the determinant* in the last analysis—religion or economy? An answer to the question is rather crucial to our understanding of the role of religion in society. Did religion serve as an ideology? The issue is discussed later.

Weber was bound to draw great attention in view of his specific application of the 'economic ethic' conception to Hinduism and Buddhism. No wonder, after the appearance of the English translation of *The Religion of India*, the National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad organised a symposium in 1966 with the key paper entitled 'Socio-Economic Change and the Religious Factor in India' focusing on Max Weber's views.<sup>40</sup> Weber's contentions have been convincingly questioned, largely because despite his many divergences from Marx, he does share the latter's enthusiasm for what has come to be known as the Asiatic Mode of Production (AMP) based on, amongst many other features, the absence of private ownership of land in Asian civilizations.<sup>41</sup> We would also do well to keep in mind Weber's racial framework as well as the limitation inherent in the sources used by him.<sup>42</sup> Not being a professional Indologist, Weber had to rely on translations little realising that even Sanskritists of the reputation of Monier-Williams had faltered a great deal in giving English equivalents of crucial Sanskrit terms. Further, Buddhist texts in Pali were regarded as somewhat less reliable than brahminical Sanskrit writings. This was obviously far from being justified. If, however, we leave out Weberian notion of the 'economic ethic' and its 'anchorage' in religion, the three broad relationships between social organisation and religious ideas mentioned above do offer useful vistas for enquiries into the religious domain.

The decades when Durkheim and Weber were laying the foundations of the sociology of religion, Sigmund Freud was opening up the psychological approach to the study of religion. In 1913, he published *Totem and Taboo* postulating that 'the beginnings of religion, ethics, society, and art meet in the Oedipus Complex'—religion originated with the 'first patricide,' a 'primordial murder' which is ritually

repeated in the 'totemic sacrifices'. Freud's interpretation of religion has been convincingly refuted by ethnologists of all shades—Marxian and non-Marxian,<sup>43</sup> but his discovery of the unconscious and the method of psychoanalysis are important contributions to the history of religions. In fact, a little later, Jung broadened his analysis by declaring that there are universal structures of the unconscious that keep reappearing in dreams, hallucinations, art, myth, etc. Much of the interest in symbols and myths and in archaic and oriental religions can be traced back to the impact of Freud's writings. Specific mention in this context can be made of Zimmer's writings on Indian art and philosophy.<sup>44</sup>

#### *Phase III: 1920s-1950s*

For almost three decades following the First World War, the sociology of religion languished for want of theoretical sophistication. In contrast, social anthropology really took off in a big way. With phenomenal field workers of the calibre of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, not only social anthropology took roots, religious studies also got a fresh orientation. To them we owe the rise of Functionalism—a point of view which has left a distinctive stamp on the studies of religion in general and that of the so-called primitive religion in particular. The tone set by Brown and Malinowski was further sophisticated by Evans-Pritchard, Raymond Firth Lienhardt and Worsely.<sup>45</sup>

One of the major areas in which the Functionalists have further refined earlier understandings of religion is the relationship between magic and religion.<sup>46</sup> Both Brown and Malinowski are ultimately concerned with the role of religion and magic in social survival.<sup>47</sup> While Radcliffe-Brown's reconstruction of the content of the sacred symbols from the point of view of its 'ritual/social value' and 'utilitarianism' took him away from Durkheim, it also questioned the premises on which Levy-Bruhl had diagnosed the 'primitive mentality'.<sup>48</sup> The stage was now set for the next phase when the concern with the symbolic form was initiated by Claude Levi-Strauss.

#### *Phase IV: 1950s to date*

The post-Second World War studies on religion have been deeply influenced by *Structural Anthropology* of Claude Levi-Strauss.<sup>49</sup> He is concerned with the systems of classification, the 'home-made' taxonomies employed by tribal people to order the objects and events of their world. In this, he follows in the footsteps of Durkheim and Mauss. But rather than looking, as they did, to social forms for the origins and explanations of such categorical systems, he looks to the symbolic structures in terms of which they are formulated, expressed and applied. Myth and in slightly different ways rite, are systems of signs that fix and organize abstract conceptual relationships in terms of concrete images and thus make speculative thought possible. The

objects rendered sacred are selected not because of their utilitarian qualities, nor because they are projections of repressed emotions, nor yet because they reflect the moral force of social organisation ritualistically impressed upon the mind. Rather, they are selected because they permit the embodiment of general ideas in terms of the immediately perceptible realities—the turtles, trees, springs and caves—of everyday experience, not because they are 'good to eat' (apropos of Radcliffe-Brown's view of totem) but because they are 'good to think'. Strauss contends that primitive religions are, like symbolic systems, fundamentally communications systems. They can be understood as an integrated system of thought, logically sound, epistemologically valid and as flourishing in France as in Tahiti.

Having combined in himself the traditions of French sociology and American cultural anthropology, Strauss also transformed the tenuous link between the nineteenth century comparative philology and anthropology and raised it to the sophisticated level of linguistic and semantic anthropology—a trend which is rather conspicuous in the realm of anthropology. As the recent work of such diverse students as W.E.H. Stanner, Victor Turner, E.R. Leach, Rodney Needham and Susan A. Langer demonstrates, the analysis of symbolic forms is becoming a major tradition in the study of religion in general and primitive religion in particular. This is despite certain reservations being expressed against what has been called 'extreme intellectualism which cerebralizes religion.'<sup>50</sup>

The post-Second World War hermeneutical situation in the *Religionswissenschaft* would be incomplete without a reference to the ecological approach to religion and the emphasis being put on phenomenology of religion. In what seems to be an exaggerated outburst, it is claimed that 'until today every historian of religions is a phenomenologist.'<sup>51</sup> There is no agreement as to the nature and task of the phenomenology of religion.<sup>52</sup> However, more than any other approach, phenomenologists have emphasized the experiential basis of religion and have attempted to describe and to systematize the basic structures of religious experience. In describing such structures, phenomenologists of religion have attempted to approach their data in a specific *antireductionist* manner, insisting upon the irreducibility and uniqueness of the religious dimensions of experience. Though Rudolf Otto's concept of the *Holy*<sup>53</sup> as the *sui generis* numinous experience characterized as *ganz Andere* ('wholly other'), transcendent and *mysterium tremendum et fascinosum* (the 'ambivalent' structure of the sacred) and the non-rational and even G. Van der Leeuw's religious aspects of power formulated in his *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*<sup>54</sup> are considered to be major expositions, it is in the writings of W. Brede Kristensen<sup>55</sup> and Mircea Eliade<sup>56</sup> that the phenomenological approach to religion has been underlined rather emphatically. It is the contention of these phenomenologists that religion must be approached *on its own 'plane of reference'* thereby

making it an 'autonomous' discipline. Though an attempt has been made to dilute such contentions by arguing that (a) 'autonomy' does not mean that *Religionswissenschaft* is a 'self-sufficient' discipline and (b) 'irreducible' does not mean 'purely religious' phenomenon,<sup>57</sup> we feel very strongly that the phenomenologists are methodologically close to Weberian religious 'anchorage' and, therefore, raise similar issues regarding the role of religion in society.

## STUDIES ON INDIAN RELIGIONS

We shall now devote attention to studies on Indian religions by both Indian and foreign scholars in order to underline major trends. However, we shall try to go beyond two useful surveys of writings on various religions published in 1967<sup>58</sup> and 1981<sup>59</sup> and undertake a thematic survey from the prehistoric to the early medieval centuries.

The study of the prehistoric period of Indian history has taken significant strides in the post-Independence decades, particularly since the 1960s. Fascinating monographs on tool-types, pattern of shelters, ecological setting and rock paintings are not unknown<sup>60</sup> and a recent Presidential Address delivered at the Ninth Annual Congress of the Indian Society for Prehistoric and Quaternary Studies in 1982 even focused attention on 'Eco-Functional Frame of Early Man'.<sup>61</sup> In spite of their familiarity with the 'New Archaeology'<sup>62</sup> and 'Analytical Archaeology'<sup>63</sup> Indian archaeologists have not been so much influenced by cultural-social anthropology as to take interest in such areas as prehistoric religion.<sup>64</sup> When we take cognizance of the brilliant theoretical and conceptual studies being brought out under the 'New Directions in Archaeology Series' from Cambridge,<sup>65</sup> the utter poverty of Indian prehistoric studies in the realm of religion becomes all the more conspicuous. A few exceptions to this generally lamentable situation include studies on the Mother Goddess. None of these are products of professional archaeologists but the works of both D.D.Kosambi and N.N. Bhattacharyya<sup>66</sup> need to be singled out for their wealth of data and scientific conceptual framework. Kosambi's study of the Mother Goddess cult-sites is particularly remarkable for the fieldwork in Maharashtra along prehistoric trade tracks. Otherwise one is forced to rely on writings on prehistoric religion in the world context.<sup>67</sup>

As distinct from prehistoric religion, interest in Harappan religion has been somewhat greater. There has been a major theoretical formulation on the role of religion in the process of urbanization in all major centres of ancient civilizations including the Harappan.<sup>68</sup> Paul Wheatley stresses the sacred, symbolic character of the early city<sup>69</sup> much more than this had been stressed by the older theories—not even by Weber for whom religion was an important 'anchorage'.<sup>70</sup> Some recent writings dealing with the growth of the Harappans specifically have described religion as an 'intensifying factor' and a 'catalyst' for the urban process.<sup>71</sup>

*Religion as Ideology*

The issue has wider ideological ramifications and concerns the role of religion as an ideology. Though a prominent role was attributed to religion in the Harappan set-up long before Wheatley's work,<sup>72</sup> the theorising is based more on negative evidence, notwithstanding the highly speculative suggestion of Kosambi regarding the Great Bath at Mohenjodaro being a ritual complex of fertility rites.<sup>73</sup> Fairservis' reference<sup>74</sup> to religion as an 'intensifying factor' suffers from internal contradictions. Apart from strong diffusionist influences in his reconstruction, one finds very little evidence regarding the form(s) of religious manifestations amongst the rural folk. It is now being realized by historians and archaeologists alike that the mature Harappan phase was a product of strong rural hinterland<sup>75</sup> and village communities. Have we got enough empirical evidence of religious beliefs and practices of these people? Further, though Fairservis talks about five stages of the origin, growth and decline of this culture,<sup>76</sup> he insists on looking for a 'static civilization' because he has to rationalize his understanding of religion as an 'intensifying factor'—this perhaps seems to be a hangover of colonialist-imperialist historiography. Finally, his references to 'different kinds' of civilizations of the world with different emphases in their organization also run counter to Wheatley's hypothesis mentioned above.

There are very convincing studies on the conspicuous role of religion in the set-up of some ancient civilizations in Mesoamerica<sup>77</sup> and of the Aztecs and Incas.<sup>78</sup> The empirical data from the Harappan civilization, however, still needs to be probed from the point of view of scientific conceptualization of the problem. The two recent studies on Harappan religion either do not even raise the issues or run counter to some of the assessments mentioned above.<sup>79</sup> Ildiko Puskas' mention of the 'Empire phase' of the Harappan society, for example, is not in keeping with the distribution of economic resources and the mechanism of their harnessing.<sup>80</sup> However, Shubhangana Atre's doctoral thesis on the Harappan Mother Goddess, *The Archetypal Mother*,<sup>81</sup> offers provocative rethinking on:

- (a) The so-called Pashupati seal, which has hitherto been regarded as proto-Shiva is in fact 'Lady of Beasts' and fire and water formed the main elements of her cult.<sup>82</sup>
- (b) The famous depictions of the 'unicorn'<sup>83</sup> had phallic importance and, therefore, fertility associations.
- (c) Use of antlers as hand plough or ploughshares.

Atre concludes that 'the cult of the primitive goddess who rules the world of wild animals was modified to suit a prospering society, sustained basically by a combination of agriculture, animal husbandry and trade.'<sup>84</sup> While all this is very fascinating rationalization of the important features of Harappan religion in terms of the material base and is welcome as a useful contribution, the issue of religion as an

ideology remains unanswered. On the contrary, her references to 'regional variations' of Harappan cults only raise certain question marks against hypotheses of the type of Wheatley's. Even Possehl's recent work on Kulli discusses the problem of Indus urbanization exclusively in the light of Mesopotamian trade with the Indus<sup>85</sup> without any allusion to the so-called 'catalytic' role of religion in it. Further, it would require a more rigorous integration of the Harappan economic subsistence base with the religious phenomenon. This has become particularly necessary in view of the complex functioning of economic activities in the region as shown by some recent writings.<sup>86</sup> In the absence of the integration mentioned above, attempts such as those of Atre look rather simplistic.

### *Max Muller's Influence*

For almost half a century before Max Muller laid the foundations of *Religionswissenschaft*, there had already developed keen interest in Vedic studies, even though specific notices on religion and mythology had been very few. In fact, when Henry Thomas Colebrook published his essay, 'On the Vedas, or Sacred Writings of the Hindus'<sup>87</sup> in 1805, he became the first western scholar ever to write about the Veda. Since then, many European scholars have contributed to a very considerable extent to the knowledge of Vedic religion. The names of Eugene Burnout (1801-52) and his pupils such as Roth, Adolphe Regnier and Felix Neve deserve special mention. In his work *Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Gottertranks* (1859), Kuhn has studied, among others, the legend of Pururavas and Urvashi<sup>88</sup> and of Chyavana from the point of view of comparative mythology.<sup>89</sup> As early as 1850 Albrecht Weber published in the first volume of his journal *Indische Studien*, a paper on the two legends from the *Shatapatha Brahmana*, viz., the flood legend involving Manu and that of Videgha Mathava.<sup>90</sup> Some other scholars who were influenced by Max Muller's parameters of 'science of religion' were Gubernatis,<sup>91</sup> Abel Bergaigne<sup>92</sup> and to a very limited extent John Muir.<sup>93</sup> Barth's reconstruction of the Vedic religions<sup>94</sup> provides some useful insights, which have been utilized by subsequent scholars, for example, his reference to popular religious cults existing along with hierarchical Vedic religion giving rise to Vishnuism and Shivaism later.<sup>95</sup> However, his suggestion that Varuna in the *Rigveda* can by no means be said to appear in 'a state of decadence' or 'god on the wane'<sup>96</sup> still needs to be pursued.<sup>97</sup>

Philological and comparative mythology as bases for the study of religion had influenced Russian writings as well.<sup>98</sup> However, two scholars need to be mentioned at some length for their different but scientific approach. Dmitry Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy (1853-1920) published *The Cult of the God Soma in Ancient India in the Vedic Age*<sup>99</sup> in 1884 and another work entitled *On the History of the Cult of Fire Among the Indians in the Vedic Age* only three years later (1887). He highlights the fact that the development of cults and religious

concepts kept pace with the social developments of the Aryans. Such an orientation of Kulikovsky was perhaps the result of his exposure to the works of Karl Marx and his followers and contemporary French ethnologists. Like Kulikovsky, Dmitry Kudryavsky's (1867-1920) monograph on domestic rituals was also inspired by similar influences. He analysed the essence of rites and social institutions in the context of ethnographic material and stated that the ashrama system was based on the age-group principle.

Barring a very few works influenced by the French sociologists and anthropologists, a great majority of writings on Vedic religion continue to be influenced by the approach of Max Muller. This is true of even such giants of Vedic studies as Macdonell, Jan Gonda and R.N.Dandekar.<sup>100</sup> Broadly, A.B.Keith's otherwise monumental work *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*<sup>101</sup> would also fall in the same category. It is regretted that he did not find Durkheim of much use<sup>102</sup> while his slightly junior contemporary in France, viz., Dumézil was so inspired by the French master.<sup>103</sup> Equally surprising is his inability to harness his data along Weberian lines on the issue of the gap between 'priests and populace'. Instead, he prefers to emphasize that 'it is to those only who deeply busy themselves with religion (Priests) that, for good or bad, changes in popular views are ultimately due.'<sup>104</sup> There are also some veiled echoes of racial bias, as for instance, in his note on 'The Dravidian Element in Indian Thought'.<sup>105</sup> Notwithstanding these criticisms, there is plenty of data in the volumes, which could still be harnessed into a scientific conceptual framework.

Amongst more recent writings, one can safely include J.C. Heestermann's study of the *rajasuya* sacrifice<sup>106</sup> for its healthy combination of Gonda's linguistics and Durkheim's sociology. Some refreshing orientation is also available in Naama Drury's study of the *agnishtoma*, *ashvamedha* and the *agnichayana* sacrifices on the basis of the *Shatapatha Brahmana* which has drawn upon the 'insights of Jungian psychology in the field of archetypes and symbols'.<sup>107</sup> This unfortunately cannot be said about a few recent works on Vedic religion, which, though rich in data, suffer from absence of any meaningful conceptual frame.<sup>108</sup>

From amongst recent writings on Vedic religion which can be regarded as approximating a 'science of religion', special mention should be made of Bruce Lincoln's meticulous work on Indo-Iranian religion with a distinct focus on the *Rigveda*.<sup>109</sup> While Lincoln is relying considerably on linguistics and comparative mythology, the tools of Max Muller, it is more than obvious that the overall orientation does take cognizance of sociological, anthropological and Marxian formulations on religion. In addition, its emphasis on the ecological approach to the study of the religious phenomenon is a novel feature which will be discussed at length later. Though we do not share some of the formulations of Lincoln, e.g. the reservations expressed on the use of archaeology in the

reconstruction of Indo-Iranian religion,<sup>110</sup> or the assumption of neat priestly and warrior classes in the context of the Rigvedic social organisation;<sup>111</sup> it goes without saying that the work does present a refreshing departure from the model set by Max Muller.

### *A Perspective*

Finally, I turn to the perspective on Vedic religion. Simply put, there is an absence of intensive study of Vedic religion in the total perspective of its material setting. Scholars such as R.S. Sharma<sup>112</sup> and Romila Thapar<sup>113</sup> have already laid the foundation with studies of the socio-economic and political structure of early and later Vedic times. We are, as a consequence of these seminal writings, now in a position to comprehend the dynamics of the life of the contemporary populace, their transformation from the largely pastoral to agrarian economic base; from relatively undifferentiated to class society and from lineage to state political apparatus. How did these material changes affect religious manifestations? Postulations such as Varuna religion *versus* Indra religion<sup>114</sup> or Indra-Usha tussle being an Aryan–non-Aryan conflict<sup>115</sup> are rather simplistic formulations. Manifestations of fetishism, totemism, magic, ancestor worship, beliefs in ghosts, spirits, demons, goblins, etc., which are in sociological and anthropological terms, associated with tribal religion, are found in plenty in the *Rigveda* and *Atharvaveda*. Totemistic origins of tribes such as the Matsyas, Ajas, Shigrus; priests being named after Gotama, Vatsa (calf), Shunaka (dog), Kaushika (owl), Mandukya (frog); Kurus tracing their descent from Riksha (bear) are examples of totemistic influences. Malevolent deities such as Kritya, Nirrti and Yatudhana haunting funeral places; Vishvamitra vanquishing his rivals with the help of an evil spirit called Sasarpri; sorcerers such as Rakshasvin, Yatuman and Yatuman and even female sorcerer Yaturmati; ghosts, spirits, goblins, etc. such as Nihsala, Dhishana, Ekavadya, Magundi; *apsaras* residing in tree and water resorts—one such *apsara* is even called *rashtrabhrita* (sustainer of the kingdom) in the *Atharvaveda*; bad dreams occurring due to Grahi, Nirbhuti, Abhuti, etc. are some of the manifestations of religion at the popular level.<sup>116</sup> A recent study has convincingly rationalised the well-known Rigvedic concept of *Rta* in terms of tribal influences and its decline as a product of class differences.<sup>117</sup> Similarly, intensive studies need to be undertaken on major Vedic sacrifices such as *vajapeya*, *ashvamedha*, *purushamedha*, *agnichayana*, etc. to rationalise them in terms of agrarian growth and the emergence of the idea of territoriality.<sup>118</sup> Further, work needs to be done on Indra to explain his transformation from *gopati* to *shunasira* (lord of cattle to the wielder of the plough). Nor can one be content with abstract philosophic discussions of the monistic philosophy of the Upanishads.<sup>119</sup> We have already tried to explain it as a product of the brahmana-kshatriya rivalry for the acquisition of agricultural surplus.<sup>120</sup> Elsewhere, it has been rationalised as man's urge to

overcome alienation consequent upon the emergence of *varna* divisions in the pastoral tribal society of the early Aryans.<sup>121</sup> There has even been a suggestion that the Upanishadic philosophy, a *kshatriya vidya*, had the force of a new ideology.<sup>122</sup>

Studies on Vishnuism and Shaivism<sup>123</sup> have already conformed to a common pattern.<sup>124</sup> Broadly speaking, works on these subjects generally delineate the growth of Vishnu and Shiva from the Rigvedic<sup>125</sup> to Puranic accounts.<sup>126</sup> Occasionally, they also take cognizance of archaeological remains.<sup>127</sup> By and large they tend to be rather descriptive accounts—sometimes even degenerating to a rehash of existing knowledge.<sup>128</sup>

There has been some refreshing writing in the last three decades, beginning perhaps with Jan Gonda's *Aspects of Early Vishnuism*,<sup>129</sup> where the ideas of Vishnu's link with the fertility cult specially through Lakshmi, and his links with Indra were mooted. His later work, a comparative study of Vishnuism and Shaivism<sup>130</sup> was an equally fascinating and incisive study. Perhaps even more perceptive and path-breaking are the contributions of D.D. Kosambi on the cults of Krishna, Shiva and on the social and economic aspects of the *Bhagavadgita*.<sup>131</sup> These are based on not only a profound study of literary sources but also on carefully planned field-work—a unique combination not to be found elsewhere. Sukumari Bhattacharji's work<sup>132</sup> on a comparative analysis of the historical growth of both Vishnu and Shiva delineates the transformation of these deities through the millennia—from the Vedas to the Puranas, and convincingly puts forward the case of dynamism of Indian mythology. However, the works of Suvira Jaiswal and Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, invoke multi-disciplinary tools of analysis. Jaiswal's *The Origin and Development of Vaishnavism*<sup>133</sup> deserves our attention for its scientific approach which never loses historical perspective. The entire growth of Vishnuism has been unfolded in terms of cultic integration of diverse autochthonous elements,<sup>134</sup> particularly in the form of Narayana, Samkarshana-Balarama, Ekanamsha, etc. The work is further noticeable for its utilisation of untapped literary epigraphic and numismatic data, e.g. Jain and Buddhist works. This has enabled her to trace the regional extent and popularity of Vishnuism in detail which had been hitherto overlooked or unknown. The fact that the entire work purports to study the religious phenomenon in the overall context of its material setting makes it a pioneering effort. W.D. O'Flaherty's study on the mythology of Shiva<sup>135</sup> belongs to a different class. A wide range of Indian texts (Vedic, Puranic, Classical and modern) is examined in the light of a dialectic pattern of inter-locking motifs which centre upon the myths of the great ascetic Shiva and his erotic *alter ego*, Kama, to explain an enduring human dilemma: the conflict between spiritual aspirations and human desires. It is a painstaking effort to apply Levi-Strauss' Structuralism but lacks any historical perspective.<sup>136</sup>

Of late there has been growing realization that the epigraphic material has the potential of yielding useful results from the point of view of religious developments. Two studies may be mentioned in passing, in this connection, not for their theoretical or conceptual brilliance but for the richness of their data. V.S. Pathak's *Shaiva Cults in Northern India (A.D. 700-1200)*<sup>137</sup> and Urmila Bhagowalia's *Vaishnavism and Society in Northern India (A.D. 700-1200)*<sup>138</sup> fall in this genre.

### *The Role of Bhakti*

Since the late sixties there has been a very noticeable tendency to undertake indepth analyses of the role of *bhakti* in Vishnuism and Shivaism. We shall even go to the extent of saying that a great majority of these writings tend to focus on the rationale of religious developments in terms of their material milieu. R.S. Sharma's epoch making work *Indian Feudalism*<sup>139</sup> based on the practice of land grants, unleashed a force of tremendous magnitude, which has provoked historians to think afresh on practically every sphere of people's activities, whether they be in the realm of economy, polity or society or even in ideas. Our assessment is that the post-Gupta scene in the entire subcontinent is marked by two distinctive strains in the domain of religion, viz., the growth of *bhakti* and the all-pervasive influence of tantric practices. It is possible to explain their widespread dispersal in terms of the growth of the feudal mode of production,<sup>140</sup> which had become almost a pan-Indian phenomenon.<sup>141</sup>

For about half a millennium from the mid-sixth century, Shaiva and Vaishnava saints (Nayanars and Alvars respectively) and their followers practised and propagated *bhakti* in the countryside and went to pilgrim centres singing and dancing. The overall pattern is that of consolidation of classical brahmanical society in early medieval India.<sup>142</sup> Originating in the sixth century Kanchipuram area under the Pallavas, it had traversed the full length of Tamilakam by the end of the ninth century and engulfed all the major kingdoms of the Cholas, Pandyas and Cheras. If we are to believe in recent analysis, the spread of the *bhakti* movement in the north, epitomised in such a popular work as the *Bhagavata Purana*, was also the result of the impetus given by the Tamil saints.<sup>143</sup> The spread of the movement is intimately associated with the temple base, which in turn derived its *raison d'être* and economic sustenance through land grants received from not only kings and men at the helm of political affairs but even from other influential members of society.<sup>144</sup>

To conclude our presentation of Vishnuism and Shivaism, a few more recent studies may be mentioned for the freshness of their approaches. G.S. Ghurye's *Gods and Men* (1962) deserves our attention for its delineation of the growth of these religions with a sociological and anthropological perspective. Hitherto, iconographic studies have remained confined to the identification, description and interpretation

of divine images and their attributes. Largely forming a part of art history, these works have rarely been looked at as an index to socio-religious changes at macro and micro levels. Treating iconography as an integral part of the history of religions as well, R. Champakalakshmi's *Vaishnava Iconography in the Tamil Country* (1981) is a slightly different work. It tries to trace the evolution of the concerned subject through folk movements and integration of tribal cults of pre-Pallavan centuries. Yet another work which undertakes a micro study of the process of cultural coalescence and agencies of acculturation is Fred W. Clothey's perceptive study of Murugan.<sup>145</sup> The growth of this significant deity of the Shiva pantheon is presented as a convergence of two cultural streams, 'Sanskrit' and 'Tamil', without taking any of them as 'monolithic or unidimensional'.<sup>146</sup> David Dean Shulman also analyses sacrifice and divine marriage in the south Indian Shaiva tradition<sup>147</sup> in the light of the many traditions that have contributed to their formation, including Vedic, epic, puranic, classical Tamil and southern folk traditions. Studying the religious meaning of myths contained in these traditions, Shulman uncovers two persistent themes: the approach to power in all its manifestations, and the attempt to reconcile contact with power with the desire for purity. Broadly following O'Flaherty's modifications of Levi-Strauss' Structuralism as his key method, on which we have already expressed our reservations,<sup>148</sup> Shulman's conclusions about the Shaiva myths in terms of the aforesaid two themes seem to be influenced by Louis Dumont's *Homo Hierarchicus*. Though we share the reservations expressed regarding Dumont's assumptions, notions and methods,<sup>149</sup> we do not hesitate to say that Shulman's work is one of the very few stimulating monographs of the last decade.

Tantricism, like *bhakti*, permeates all religions in the post-Gupta centuries, not excluding even the so-called puritanical non-brahmanical religious systems. A recent survey of tantric religion,<sup>150</sup> though fairly comprehensive, is surprisingly unfamiliar with very important contributions on the subject. R.S. Sharma has rationalised it in terms of the preponderance of the cult of the Mother Goddess consequent upon the spread of agriculture as a result of land grants.<sup>151</sup> A fascinating dimension of this analysis is the process of cultural interaction of priestly Sanskritic and tribal elements. A recent study, based entirely on literary data, argues that the *Devi Mahatmya* of the *Markandeya Purana* (c. sixth century AD) is the first comprehensive account of the goddess to appear in Sanskrit—the explanation is sought in terms of Sanskritisation. It is underlined that the basic impulse behind the worship of the goddess is of non-Aryan and non-Sanskritic origin.<sup>152</sup> A survey of Shakti sculptures in Madhya Pradesh alone refers to as many as 400 images.<sup>153</sup> A great majority of their names such as Charchika, Umarimata, Bijasanidevi, Behamata, Birasanidevi, etc. link them with popular tribal deities.<sup>154</sup>

The few writings which have inspired us to study Buddhism and Jainism in the socio-economic milieu include R.S. Sharma's analysis of the origin of Buddhism,<sup>155</sup> A.K. Warder's rationalisation of Mahayana<sup>156</sup> and N.R. Guseva's presentation of the historical and ethnic roots of Jainism.<sup>157</sup>

### *The Material Milieu*

A few general works not restricting themselves to any specific religion but distinctly focusing on the need to study it in its material milieu may now be mentioned. The most striking works falling under this category are of course, D.D. Kosambi's pioneering, provocative and very often even iconoclastic and unconventional studies. Apart from his numerous perceptive comments lying scattered in two path-breaking brilliant surveys on ancient India,<sup>158</sup> the collection of his essays entitled *Myth and Reality* (1962) has inspired the imagination of a generation of historians. The work is extremely refreshing in its range of new material presented and an impressive use of scientific methods in many fields: archaeology, ethnography and philology, without losing an overall historical perspective. Apart from his reflections on the cult-sites of the Mother Goddess, the symbolism and meaning of the legend of Urvashi and Pururavas and the social and economic aspects of the *Bhagavadgita* mentioned above, one may also cite insights provided by him on Shiva's household, fertility rites enacted through primitive dancers and parallels between European Ice-Age drawings and modern Indian representations of certain deities. His masterly analysis is logically consistent and enormously stimulating. The conclusions, though startling, are most often convincing. The work is unquestionably a landmark in the study of the Indian religious tradition.<sup>159</sup>

The writings of Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya are also quite iconoclastic. With an orthodox Marxist framework and a passion for historical materialism, he has consistently tried to explode the myth of the other-worldliness of the Indians. Of the rare absurdities of our times, none is so prevalent and sacrosanct as the belief that mundane or this-worldly matters never entered the hallowed precincts of India. Chattopadhyaya has, through his studies on ancient Indian materialism and atheism<sup>160</sup> been raising his voice against such a naive view of the Indian religio-philosophic ethos for more than three decades. Recently, while delivering the famous Stephanos Nirmalendu Ghosh Lectures of 1981 at the Calcutta University, he struck another blow to Indian chauvinists when he argued, 'Vedic religion in its strict sense, in the sense of being the direct outcome of the Vedic literature and as produced by the Vedic people themselves, is really a misnomer,' and 'the great Vedic gods—Indra, Varuna, Mitra, Soma—have simply no place in the actual religious beliefs and practices of the vast Indian people—the word Veda became only a political tool rather than the source of any genuine religious sentiment.'<sup>161</sup>

The role of productive forces in determining the forms of religious expression has attracted attention of R.N. Nandi as well. He too has, in the last two decades, made numerous contributions to the study of ancient Indian religions in the perspective of material developments covering a millennium from the third to the twelfth century AD. Apart from his doctoral study on *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan*, his latest work *Social Roots of Religion in Ancient India* (1986) also takes up many issues and rationalises them from such a perspective. He has admirably focused attention on the impact of decaying towns, the disintegration of market economy, feudal mode of production and revival of market economy on such developments in the religious sphere as the brahmana-jajamana relations,<sup>162</sup> dispersal of jajamani brahmanas, the beginnings of tirthayatras (pilgrimages), the medieval gift exchange system, the origin of Shaivite monasticism, the occult in Jaina liturgy and the origin of the Virashaiva movement.

Amongst other recent works which investigate the religious phenomenon in the material setting, the important ones are: Francois Houtart and Genevieve Limercinier's *The Great Asiatic Religions and their Social Functions*<sup>163</sup> and Vijay Nath's *Dana: Gift System in Ancient India* (1987). Though a sketchy and skimpy work, the former presents the important phases of the Asian religions down to present the times in an overall framework of historical materialism. The latter adopts a multi-disciplinary approach and presents an exhaustive study of the complex mechanics of the unique institution of *dana* between c. 600 BC and c. 300 AD from a socio-economic perspective. Recently, we had surveyed the changing perspective of contributions on religion presented during the last fifty years of the Indian History Congress to underline that there is, in the last fifteen years, a growing realisation of the necessity to study the religious phenomenon as an integral part of social formations and product of material conditions.<sup>164</sup>

### ECOLOGICAL APPROACH TO RELIGION

More than two decades ago, the Swedish ethnologist and historian of religions, Ake Hultkrantz, proposed a daring new means of attack on the problem of comparing religions rooted in similar cultures.<sup>165</sup> Starting with the insight that religion is rooted in culture and following Julian Haynes Steward in seeing culture rooted in environment,<sup>166</sup> Hultkrantz has argued for what he calls 'an ecological approach to religion.' Just as there are 'types of culture' commonly recognized by anthropologists such as desert, nomad and arctic hunting, so also are there 'types of religion' that are intimately related to and in fact formed by the culture type in which they are found. 'The type of religion is in its essence timeless: in principle it should occur wherever ecological and technological conditions of a similar level and integration appear.' His goal is to establish these types of religion and to describe their essential features, drawing comparisons between cultures

that may have no geographical or historical relation to one another but whose ecologies, technology and subsistence pattern are similar.

The study of the environmental integration of a religion and its implications is the crux of the ecology of religion. It is concerned with forms of religious expression and specific religious contents motivated by these forms, but not with the communication of ultimate meaning and value. 'In my understanding, at least, conclusions as to the latter are not allowed by the ecological approach.'<sup>167</sup> The religio-ecological approach investigates religion in its general environmental framing and should not be evaluated as a tool for economic determinism.<sup>168</sup>

Hultkrantz recognizes three different levels of integration of religion and environment:

*Primary integration*, i.e. the environmental adaptation of basic cultural features, such as subsistence and productive arrangements, technology, etc. and behaviour patterns associated with these features, such as social and religious attitudes.

*Secondary adaptation* is an indirect adaptation of religious beliefs and rituals. These are organised into a framework that takes its forms from the social structure, which is in its turn a model suggested by the economic and technological adaptation to the environment.

The third possibility is *morphological adaptation*, the covering of religious features with forms taken from the physical and biological environment. 'Since religion has a conservative tendency, religious features that were adjusted to earlier ecological patterns often remain in later religious constellations. For instance, in agrarian cultures the spirits of the field appear in animal disguise, most certainly a left-over from the hunting cultures.' Although religious concepts are traditional, they borrow their formal appearance from forms within the immediate biotope and this choice of forms is not arbitrary, but is related to the symbolism that is inherent in them.<sup>169</sup> Obviously Hultkrantz implies that religion is not something made up of environmental influences. He mentions four ways of handling religious forms: (i) to look at the pattern and functioning of a religion through ecological analysis, not as a reductionist approach, but as a study of its functional interweaving with the forms of nature; (2) comparison between religions and between religious traits, and thus also a phenomenological approach; (3) arrangement of types of religion into historical strata, i.e. to bring different historical or archaeological strata, such as gatherers, hunters, cultivators, nomads, etc.,<sup>170</sup> and (4) ecology could indicate an imminent process of religious change; for if the holistic thesis holds good, i.e. that phases of religious expression belong to the primary ecological integration of culture, then changes in the basic structure of the 'culture core', to use Steward's term, should be expected to affect the structure of religion.

The research strategy which postulates that similar technologies applied to similar natural environments tend to produce similar economic and social systems and further, similar systems of religion is

what Marvin Harris had called cultural materialism—the anthropological counterpart to historical materialism.<sup>171</sup> This position does not deny that changes in social organization or religious innovations can bring about changes in technology and thus change the ecological adaptation, but only states that these in general tend to be dependent factors. The distinction drawn by Marx between *base* and *superstructure* is theoretically more fruitful than Steward's distinction between 'cultural core' and 'secondary cultural features'.<sup>172</sup>

That the ecological approach to religion has many vulnerable spots and even an 'ecological fallacy' has been recognized by the exponent himself.<sup>173</sup> The very conception of 'environment' requires clarification. It is not immutable. The identification of environment with nature was correct at some stage but cannot be true of the present times. We are a witness to the process of transition—from the phase of the struggle to master nature, from the phase directed *against* nature to the phase of struggle *for* nature and for its preservation *from* and *for* man. The wasteland landscape of the large mining and steel centres clearly indicates that the 'technical environment' is gradually becoming man's 'ecological' and 'natural' environment.<sup>174</sup> In defence of Hultkrantz, however, it may be stated that he has not argued in terms of a direct link between environment and religion; on the contrary he has repeatedly stressed the middle term in the relation, i.e. technology and the subsistence pattern. Further, it has been argued by some<sup>175</sup> that the ecology of religion deals with religion as a cultural rather than a religious phenomenon. Religion as such eludes the ecologist of religion, 'we need a method of inquiry, a science, which can and will cope with religion religiously, i.e. with religion as religion ...' But the precision with which Hultkrantz has defined his field, not as religiosity of the individual, nor as religion itself, but as the environmental conditioning patterns of religion needs to be recalled here. What was important was not religiosity of individuals within a social system, but the religious qualities of the social system itself. Finally, it ought to be kept in view that a similar ecological setting giving rise to different religious forms or similar religious forms arising in varied ecological conditions are not unknown. The fieldwork amongst Indian tribes such as the Andamanese, Todas, Bihors, Saoras and tribes of Chota Nagpur raises certain doubts about the approach under consideration.

While issues raised by the ecological approach to religion are still being debated, it may be underlined that this approach is not proposed as an alternative to other methods, it never supplants other methods; it is a way of securing new information for other approaches, it offers more solutions and fresh insights.

One recent study, particularly in the context of early India, which highlights the potentialities of the ecological approach to religion is Bruce Lincoln's *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle* (1981) dealing with Indo-Iranian religion, specially the Rigvedic phase. Do cultures which have similar socio-economic and ecological bases also have similar

religious systems? Is religion primarily directed towards abstract universal concerns, or are practical and temporal matters a fundamental part of religious thought? Two cultures, historically and geographically quite separate but ecologically and socio-economically quite similar are taken up as a test case to answer the above queries. The present-day Nilotic people of East Africa (Nuer, Dinka and Masai) and Proto-Indo-Iranian, who flourished around 2000 BC were selected for the purpose because both were 'semi-settled pastoral groups whose livelihood depends on herding of cattle'.<sup>176</sup> The religion of each group is examined in detail, with special emphasis being placed on the myths they recount, the rituals they practise, and the ways in which their societies are organised, as well as on the deities they worship. Strong similarities of detail are readily apparent. Both cultures perform cattle sacrifice as their foremost ritual act; both possess elaborate myths of the first sacrifice and the first cattle raid; both worship celestial sovereigns; and both suffer serious tensions between priests and warriors. More important than these resemblances of detail, however, is the overwhelming similarity of the religious systems taken as a whole. These systems are shown to centre on what Lincoln calls the 'cattle cycle', a pattern in which religious activity and speculation are focused on the acquisition and disposition of cattle, all such thought and action being seen as sacred, chartered by the gods, and established in the acts of creation as recounted in myth. On the strength of these pieces of evidence, the author suggests that cultures with similar socio-economic bases do exhibit similar religious forms, and that religion must be studied as an eminently practical matter, being firmly rooted in culture, and culture in turn being rooted in ecology.

### *The Geography of Religion*

Any discussion of the ecology of religion would remain incomplete if it does not take cognizance of the geography of religion, for the two share common frontiers and are complementary to each other. The impression is sometimes created that since the ecological approach highlights the impact of environment on religion while the focus of the geography of religion is to work out its impact on the landscape, the two are antagonistic. Far from being so. It is not the task of the geographer to evaluate religious experience and neither is he concerned with assessing the validity or otherwise of religious claims and beliefs. This brings him closer to the ecologist interested in religion. The relationship under reference has varied nuances. To illustrate, Biblical geography was an early form of historical geography although today it is left to the archaeologist. Ecclesiastical geography is specifically concerned with mapping out the spatial advance of the Church in terms of its own institutions and the political territories allocated to it.

Though the religious conception forming the central core of the world view or the notions of universe have been known from very early times

and perhaps in most of the centres of ancient civilizations,<sup>177</sup> 'geography of religion' as a concept can be traced to Kasche's work of 1795. As a distinctive approach to religion, it owes a great deal to the works of P. Fickeler and P. Deffontaines in the 1940s and more recently to D.E. Sopher's *Geography of Religions* published in 1967.<sup>178</sup>

We would like to make a fervent plea for a geography of Indian religions, but with an extended scope than had been visualised by Deffontaines and Sopher. It would also take cognizance of Hultkrantz's 'types of religions' and what has been called the 'anthropology of the sacred'.<sup>179</sup> Broadly speaking, ours is a plea for an atlas of Indian religions in which mapping *per se* must have the objective of grappling with some problems of the growth of Indian religions. Perhaps certain specific illustrations can help us in identifying the directions of our plea.

D.D. Kosambi's fieldwork in Maharashtra along what he has called microlith trade tracks suggested such variables as 'highland' and 'lowland' cultures affecting their cultic practices.<sup>180</sup> His perceptive insights about Mother Goddess cult sites in association with 'crossroad' provide fascinating clues to work out Hultkrantz' 'types of religion'. The phenomenon of the Mother Goddess has persisted in India through the millennia, almost as a pan-Indian feature. This is obviously a generalisation that would require considerable particularization in terms of time, space, type and, of course, the material milieu. What type of mother goddesses prevail in a particular geographical-ecological setting and at what point of time? Mapping of such data may enable us to weave a pattern. We have already referred to the problem of religion as a 'catalyst' for the urban growth of the Harappans.<sup>181</sup> It is possible that some light may be thrown by the cartographic delineation of the settlement pattern superimposed on the geographical distribution of antiquities unearthed at various centres of the civilization—particularly different types of seals and sealings and terracotta objects with their quantitative data. This delineation must also include the so-called copper-bronze implements in view of the often repeated contention that since the Harappan state does not appear to be war oriented, religion must have provided the ideological support for policing the 'empire'.<sup>182</sup> The cartographic delineation of antiquities we propose, when seen in relation to the landscape and material base of multifarious centres of the civilization, is likely to enable us to understand processes of 'uniformity' or otherwise of the civilization.

Another problem-oriented approach to the geography of Indian religions may be considered. This relates to the origin and dispersal of Shivaism in north and south India in the centuries up to the reign of the Guptas. i.e. mid-sixth century. It is rather simplistic to argue that Shivaism had 'non-Aryan' origins. It has struck us very often that the pattern of growth of Vaishnavism and Shivaism was, in some respects, very dissimilar. While both the deities were endeavouring to

amalgamate diverse cultic deities, many of whom were of the so-called 'non-Aryan'<sup>183</sup> strain, a concept of *avatara* did not develop within the Shaiva fold; the integration of Ganesha, Karttikeya, Manasa, Ganga, Sarasvati, etc., assumes the form of a family—sons, daughters, wife, etc. In other words, there is a perceptible emphasis on kinship relations. Could we juxtapose this with the *avataras*? Is it possible to argue that the appeal of Shivaism was relatively greater in those areas which retained their tribal moorings and had not been adequately brahmanised? An hypothesis of this nature can be tested if a micro analysis of the Shaiva antiquities, cults, cult-sites is undertaken regionwise along the horizontal axis and in point of time along the vertical axis. As a second stage of such an analysis, one can legitimately juxtapose the post-sixth century Indian scene of the Shiva followers. The little work done on the geographical distribution of temples and monasteries in the Deccan in general and Karnataka in particular between c. AD 500-1200<sup>184</sup> brings out fascinating details of the mutual relationships of brahmanical and non-brahmanical religions. There is obviously a great deal that needs to be done in this context: an intensive mapping of different sects *in relation to land grants* as well as the geographical distribution of other related antiquities is desirable. A close scrutiny of the epigraphical material from present-day Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Kerala has been quite revealing from the point of view of the Shri-Vaishnava settlements and has enabled us to undertake a fresh look at the role of the Cholas vis-a-vis this important sect of the early medieval south India.<sup>185</sup> Charting of this data would be an equally rewarding experience.

A recent attempt to reconstruct the geography of Indian religion along some of the lines being suggested here may be seen in the meticulous presentation of the movement of the Alvars.<sup>186</sup> Delineating more than ninety temples mentioned in the writings of these Vaishnava saints, it not only sketches the general spatial movement of the *bhakti* cult but also endeavours to indicate possible regional variations by showing the data for important individual Alvars separately. Interestingly, it has also been possible to show the correspondence between geographical distribution and the religious and poetic variations in what has been designated as 'temple poetry' by invoking the imagery of landscape.<sup>187</sup> Some of the major findings of this cartographic depiction having a distinctive bearing on our understanding of the developments in the *bhakti* movement in the south are:

- (a) Venkatam Kanchi is the oldest Alvar environment.
- (b) The Alvar movement spread further south from Kanchi; already the attention of the early Alvars was directed to the other parts of the Tamil country and not to the regions north of Venkatam.
- (c) The writings of Nammalvar enable us to comprehend the shifting focus—he knew Venkatam rather indirectly, isolates it completely and the southernmost points of Tamil Nadu and

- southern Kerala emerge as the new focal points of the Vaishnava saints of c. AD 700
- (d) The mid-eighth century scene of the time of Tirumangai, the most 'temple oriented' of the 'sages' shows the emergence of the south Indian temple culture as a complex system. The large number of temples and the systematic arrangements based on a *tirthayatra* in *pradakshina* fashion shows that the pilgrimage started with Venkatam in the north, proceeded towards the south via the large temple complexes in the Thanjavur area, and in Kurukuti, its southernmost point, turned clockwise to the west and then returned to the north to end at Kottiyur.
  - (e) Tirumangai attempted to compile a comprehensive and systematic 'temple geography', but a different trend is noticeable in the later Alvars (c. AD 750-850) such as Periya, Andal, Tiruppan, Kulashekara, etc. when the Srirangam temple becomes the focal point. The concentration on this temple corresponds to the situation found in early Shri vaishnavism.

Though creditable, fascinating and illuminating, Hardy's exercise in the geography of the Alvars could perhaps also do well to incorporate the data on the material base. Some recent writings on the Pallavas, the Cholas and the Alvars as well as the Nayanars (the Shaiva saints, particularly the Tevaram trio of Appar, Sambandhar and Sundarar),<sup>188</sup> have been able to show the gradual importance of paddy cultivation in the Kaveri valley and the resultant pattern of brahmanical settlements, which in turn contributed to the growth of Chola power.

#### *On The Notions of Death*

In recent years there have been some very refreshing and stimulating writings on the notions of Death—in terms of rituals, religious beliefs and practices, art forms and above all, in association with socio-economic developments. These have resulted in a special genre of literature on an obscure field of religious history of the subcontinent. These studies centre round the hero-stones, which are littered over most parts of the Indian sub-continent. There has been a long and almost continuous history of these relics for more than 1500 years and extends to both brahmanical and non-brahmanical religions. Locally called *viragals*, *paliyas*, *govardhana stambhas*, *kirti-stambhas*, *chhaya-stambhas*, or merely, *chhatris*, *stambhas*, *devallis*, etc., these tablets or pillars fall into several groups originating in ritual or cult practices as well as religious or social customs of its patrons. The *chhaya-stambha* is among the earliest archaeological evidence, and it seems to be rooted in the social practices of the Buddhists. The *nisidhi* represents the ritual death practices exclusively by the Jains.<sup>189</sup> The *viragals*, or at least the currency of this term, cross religious demarcations, if not the conventional geographical limits of southern India. The *kirti-stambha*, *paliya*, *chhatri*, *devali* and *stambha* share

the country between the Himalayas and the Vindhyas—mostly in Gujarat and Rajasthan.<sup>190</sup> The accumulation of these data can be of great help in undertaking an ecological and geographical analysis of religious belief patterns through the millennia. The change in the style of hero-stones seems to reflect a change in the status of the hero being memorialised. Many of the earlier stones from Tamil Nadu come from the North Arcot district which is known to have been at that time an area of livestock breeding, where cattle-raiding would be one method of increasing wealth. Later, elaborate stones commemorated heroes who claimed to belong to the upper caste groups, often claiming kshatriya status. The indication of the hero's religious sect may have been due to the influence of the *bhakti* sects.<sup>191</sup> It is suggested on an impressionistic basis: topographically and ecologically there is a frequency of such memorials in upland areas, in the vicinity of passes across hills, and in areas regarded traditionally as frontier zones which often included primarily pastoral regions, the outskirts of forests and the edges of what have come to be called the 'tribal areas of central India'. Hero-stones are relatively infrequent in the large agricultural tracts of the Indus and the Ganga valleys and in the agriculturally rich delta areas of the peninsula. Frontier zones were often maintained as buffer regions where political security was transient and where royal armies did not necessarily guarantee protection to local inhabitants. They would, therefore, inevitably have recourse to their own arrangement for protection, in which the village hero or the local chief played a major role. This would suggest a differentiation of military functions in a decentralised political system.<sup>192</sup> Obviously, substantiation of such a hypothesis would require a cartographic presentation of types and varieties of memorial stones in their ecological setting. Further, since these relics proliferated in the post-sixth century period, it would be worth finding out the correlation and correspondence, if any, between the distribution of land grants on the one hand and that of the memorial stones on the other. This is particularly desirable in view of several assumptions: (a) the phenomenon of land grants is associated with the expansion of agriculture, (b) both memorial stones and land grants are considered to be useful mechanisms of cultic integration,<sup>193</sup> and (c) both phenomena have also been instrumental in the processes of state formation. In view of these, the only way to establish a correspondence between memorial stones and land grants is to undertake extensive mapping. This may also have to be linked up with the geography of the *bhakti* cult mentioned earlier.

The geography of Indian religions must also include the 'anthropology of the sacred'.<sup>194</sup> How ecology and geography have interacted with religion has been shown in respect of many countries. The example of Waldensians in Italy has some bearing in the present context. Though traditionally farmers, members of this community commute to nearby industrial establishments for livelihood. They

have not given up farming, which is undertaken on Sundays; this pricked their conscience as it violated the strict commandment about the observance of feast days. But pastors nowadays interpret the command to observe feast days differently.<sup>195</sup> Similarly, an emphatic plea has been made to analyse the expansion of the cult of Mary in nineteenth century France and the model of pilgrimage in the light of growing urbanisation. The specific methodology suggested for the purpose includes not only the study of old maps but the charting of chapels, oratories or crosses and cult sites to determine the 'rhythms of a sacred space'.<sup>196</sup> It is argued, for instance, 'old maps, place names, still vivid collective memories of cults, or other traces, may point to the existence of churches or chapels which have now disappeared. . . . This approach would necessarily limit one to by now well-established facts, such as the spread of the mendicant orders to the cities, the *intra muros* rivalry between the new congregations and the old religious families who had returned from the countryside, and the passions of the rich and powerful as they used the city as a stage upon which to fight for their own cult sites and for their glory.'<sup>197</sup>

#### *The Study of Sacred Sites*

As far as India is concerned, some anthropologists have tried to work out the methodology of studying sacred complexes in general and specific sacred sites in particular.<sup>198</sup> Though this methodology has been evolved, it is limited to brahmanical complexes and neglects the historical perspective. It is well known that brahmanical literature alone mentions more than 4000 *tirthas* in early medieval times and that the *Mahabharata* and the Puranas alone contain at least 40,000 verses on *tirthas*, sub-*tirthas* and legends connected with them.<sup>199</sup> To this, one can add not only numerous *sthalapuranas* but specific digests on *tirthas* dealing with brahmanical and non-brahmanical centres of pilgrimage. This raises various questions that need to be answered.<sup>200</sup> However, since we are broadly concerned here with the ecology and geography of Indian religions, it needs to be emphasized that there are at least two broad types of inquiries that can be carried out in the context of *tirthas* and sacred complexes:

- (a) Micro studies of specific sites and temples. We have some very good works on individual temples, but most of them are concerned with architectural and iconographic details, though a few also take cognizance of their material setting and role in society and economy.<sup>201</sup> However, there is none which could fulfil the criteria laid down in our perspective of the geography of Indian religions. Recently, an intensive analysis of the Vishnupada at Gaya has been undertaken in the light of tradition and archaeology. The resultant picture is quite illuminating.<sup>202</sup> Such studies need to be carried out at many other complexes and it is hoped that these would enable us to evolve a 'sacred geography'.

- (b) We require more extensive macro analysis of pilgrim centres at regional levels with a view to creating a pattern, if possible, of the types of these centres in terms of the nature of pilgrims, deities associated, extent of appeal, etc. Both lines of enquiry would have to take into account the socio-economic context.<sup>203</sup> Nor is ecology to be sidetracked. Places proclaimed as *tirthas* include crossroads, river-crossings, banks of rivers, hermitages in forests, mountain passes and important towns. Did *tirthayatras* typify medieval *dana*-oriented and agriculture-based gift exchange systems?<sup>204</sup> Did the land grants to monastic establishments and temples contribute to the rise of rural centres?<sup>205</sup> Did the *tirthas*, like the memorial stones, represent yet another manifestation of acculturation in the areas peripheral to the Madhyadesha? Such questions can perhaps be answered effectively if investigations based on ecology and geography are undertaken.

### THE MARXIST APPROACH

Without identifying religion and ideology, it may be safely asserted that writings in the last three decades, particularly those of Marxists in varied disciplines, have considerably enriched the study of both as cultural forms and processes. While the older Marxists thought of religion and other cultural phenomena as mere epiphenomena, as part of a superstructure determined by the economic base, more recent Marxist-inspired debates, particularly in the last fifteen years, have postulated not only a higher degree of relative autonomy but even attributed a hegemonic position to such phenomena in the overall social framework.

Amongst the classic statements about the relations between religion and society one can mention scattered and unsystematic references to religion in Marx and Engels.<sup>206</sup> As early as 1844, young Marx reveals traces of Feuerbach's critique of religious alienation: 'The basis of irreligious criticism is: *Man makes religion*, religion does not make man. Religion is the self-consciousness and self-esteem of man who has either not yet found himself or has already lost himself again'.<sup>207</sup> Yet Marx goes further than Feuerbach. For Marx 'man is no abstract being encamped outside the world.' The only way for man to rid himself of this illusion is to destroy the social world that produces it. As Marx proposes: 'Religious distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and also the protest against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature.'<sup>208</sup> So the struggle against religion is necessarily a struggle against that world whose '*halo* is religion' and 'of which religion is the spiritual *aroma*.' It is in this context that religion becomes the 'opium of people'.<sup>209</sup> Here Marx anticipates one of the crucial elements of his concept of ideology, namely that religion compensates in the mind for a deficient reality; it reconstitutes in the imagination a coherent solution which goes beyond the real world in an attempt to resolve the contradictions of the real world. So Marx

confirms his conviction that the ideological inversion responds to and derives from a real inversion. As he suggests: 'Man is *the world of man*, the state, society. This state, this society, produce religion, an *inverted world consciousness*, because they are an *inverted world*'<sup>210</sup> This basic idea of a double inversion in consciousness and in reality is not only retained by Marx and Engels in their subsequent writings pinpointing the exact economic mechanisms in which this inversion originates and by which it is concealed but one can also see in this double inversion a precursor to the use of 'ideology' by them. The effect of the ideological inversions was also grasped from the very beginning when religion was described by Marx as compensating in the mind for the deficiencies of the world. These are considered to be 'critical and negative connotations of the concept of ideology.'<sup>211</sup>

It was the earliest exponent of the sociology of religion, Durkheim to begin with, who contributed to the discussion on religion as an ideology. Like Marx, Durkheim made clear that religion and ideology have a social basis, particularly in patterns of social relations and organization, but they also have a degree of autonomy, following certain rules peculiar to culture.

Surely, it was Max Weber who produced one of the most sensitive and complex accounts of 'elective affinities' between social groups and sets of beliefs or ideologies. His perceptive discussions of the different ideological inclinations of various intellectual strata provide a link with contemporary Marxist insights, such as those of Gramsci on 'organic intellectuals ideologies.'<sup>212</sup> We have already mentioned Weber's notions of 'religious anchorage', his anti-reductionist approach and their ideological ramifications. Even when he showed interest in 'material interests', he could not resist the channelling effects of ideas in determining people's actions.

Recent developments in the analysis of ideology have been concerned with improving the explanation of how and why ideology takes a particular form and of how it works. Two important developments are discernible: first, more attention has been given to what Geertz has called 'autonomous process of symbolic formulation', which entails examining ideologies as systems of interesting symbols and the ways in which they provide plausible interpretations of a problematic social reality for particular groups.<sup>213</sup> This has helped us in appreciating the intricate and complex nature of symbolic processes, which cannot be differentiated simply in terms of false consciousness *versus* true consciousness.<sup>214</sup> Second, there is now an awareness of the field of ideology in relation to classes and groups as being one of contestation and a 'lived relationship', not a mechanical process.

Perhaps no discussion of ideology would be complete without reference to Gramsci's idea of the hegemony of the intellect.<sup>215</sup> From the point of view of our present discussion the major point of interest lies in Gramsci's concern for the autonomous functioning of ideology of which religion, folklore and philosophy constitute essential

components—a notion which is shared by contemporary phenomenologists of religion.<sup>216</sup> A further sophistication of these notions having a direct bearing on the theoretical framework is to make ideology an ingredient of the mode of production and thereby a part of the base/infrastructure.<sup>217</sup> It is this latter proposition which needs to be contested.

#### *The Base-Superstructure Relationship*

The orthodox interpretation of Marx and Engels takes it more or less for granted that the founders identify ideology with an all-encompassing superstructural level determined by the economic base. There are three or four places in their writings where expressions such as 'ideological superstructure', 'idealistic superstructure' or 'ideological spheres' are used. Although the 1859 *Preface* seems to restrict the use of the term superstructure to the legal and political level, other texts such as *The German Ideology* (1845-46), which is considered to be the first formulation of the base-superstructure thesis and the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* subsume both politics and consciousness under the term superstructure. The spatial image of base and superstructure intends to convey the idea that the forms of social consciousness are not autonomous and that they do not emerge out of themselves, but that they have a foundation in the social relations of production. It has been pointed out that this building-like simile (base-superstructure) was mainly directed against spiritualist metaphysics and idealism which confirmed a belief in the self development of the idea.<sup>218</sup>

More recently, the French structuralist anthropologists, particularly Maurice Godelier, have tried to redefine the parameters of infrastructure/base-superstructure relationship by arguing that the distinction between the two is not a distinction between institutions but between functions. Accordingly, infrastructure is defined as a combination of sets of social and material conditions that enable a society's members to produce and reproduce the material conditions of their existence.<sup>219</sup>

These attempts to refine Marxian formulations of historical materialism tend to suggest that the base-superstructure distinction applies to capitalist societies,<sup>220</sup> which is borne out neither by Marx-Engels' writings on pre-capitalist socio-economic formations nor by empirical data collected by sociologists and anthropologists since the turn of the present century. More fundamentally, it is also an attempt to blur the distinction between forces of production and relations of production. Godelier, while recognising them as 'distinct phenomena', also argues, 'they never exist separately; they always exist together in some specific combination'. Relying on Radcliffe-Brown (on Australian aborigines), Dumont (on Indian caste system), E. Will (on politics in ancient Greece) and studies on ancient Sumerian religion (such as those of Frankfort, Oppenheim and Adams) he draws a distinction between

'determination' and 'dominance' by highlighting the 'dominance' of relations of production (supposedly 'superstructure') such as kinship, politics and religion. Marx's formulation regarding the determinant role of base/infrastructure 'in the last analysis' is construed in the sense of the 'universal existence of a *hierarchy of functions* to be assumed by social relations in order for a society to be able to exist *as such* and to carry on reproducing. . .<sup>221</sup>

Our position in this theoretical debate about the base-superstructure and the place of religion and ideology therein is to reiterate the centrality of the mode of production and its role as '*determinant in the last analysis*'. Further, while we appreciate the considerable influence exercised by religion and ideology at a given point of time and perhaps even their functioning as material force due to passage of time,<sup>222</sup> the sort of autonomy-hegemony-dominance attributed to them from the days of Durkheim-Weber to Eliade-Gramsci and Godelier is exaggerated and unwarranted. Religion and ideology and their role in the society should be taken as the components of the 'superstructure' formulated by Marx and Engels. Let us illustrate this position with reference to certain phases of Indian religions through millennia.

Regarding one of the earliest phases, the question of religion being an 'intensifying factor' or 'catalyst' of the urban growth under the Harappans has already been raised.<sup>223</sup> That this role has been attributed to religion on negative evidence is rather apparent to be overlooked. Equally exaggerated is the enthusiasm with which it is treated like an ideology.<sup>224</sup> While it is possible to infer certain social divisions, it is not easy to share Kosambi's dogmatic assertion of the prototype of brahmana priesthood recognizable in the Harappan metropolis. Even if parallels from other contemporary centres of bronze age civilizations are invoked, one would do well to recall V. Gordon Childe's perceptive observation on the priest kings of Sumer, viz., it was the economic system 'that made the God (through his representative) a great capitalist and landlord, his temple into a city bank.'<sup>225</sup> It must have been the potentialities of the people to generate agricultural surplus necessitating huge granaries at Mohenjodaro, Harappa and possibly at Kalibangan too, coupled with the extensive mechanism and network of internal as well as long-distance overland and maritime trade symbolised in the Lothal 'warehouse', which must have been instrumental in giving shape to such forms of religious manifestations as we are able to speculate about.

Asoka's *dhamma*, which is anything but religion in the literal sense of the term, and is perhaps closer to ideology, offers yet another manifestation which could be looked into from the aforesaid perspective. If the imperatives of *dhamma* are to be understood, one will have to go beyond the zeal of the so-called 'philosopher-king' and the 'revolutionary' impact of the great event—the Kalinga War. To concede an autonomous-determinant role to ideas would, in the present case, entrap us in the noose of brahmanical chauvinists who

have rarely taken to the non-brahmanical men at the helm of affairs with kind disposition. Recent studies on the concepts of state and empire striking a severe blow to the notions of 'centralised' Mauryan empire<sup>226</sup> enable us to highlight the compulsions of the economic logic of the set-up and comprehend the driving forces behind Asoka's *dhamma*.

In our references to the Upanishadic thought embodying monistic ideas, early Buddhism of the Buddha, the rise of *bhakti* and tantricism in the post-Gupta centuries,<sup>227</sup> the paramount necessity of seeing these phenomena in the light of material milieu has already been indicated. But how these religio-philosophic manifestations functioned as ideologies in their respective times needs investigation.

There are certain crucial questions which need to be raised before the specificities of early Indian religions are taken up for discussion. If ideology is considered to be subservient to the interests of ruling/dominant classes, do we simultaneously assume the existence of an ideology of the dominated classes? What is the *raison d'être* of dominant ideas? Are they dominant because they are supposed to be widely shared by the dominated classes themselves? Under what conditions do the dominated groups come to share interpretations of the world that legitimize the existing social order not only in the eyes of the dominant group, but also in their own eyes? Do we say that the ideas of the dominated do not constitute an ideology since they do not legitimise the existing social order? The Indian scene may not enable us to answer all these questions. Nevertheless, it would be worth determining the parameters of religion functioning as ideology in early India.

The existence of primary producers and managers of production in the later Vedic period is generally recognized by scholars. We have elsewhere argued not only for an antagonism between the two but amongst the non-producing classes too (brahmanas and kshatriyas) and the latter struggle has been rationalised in terms of the fight for agricultural surplus.<sup>228</sup> But do the exalted sacrificial cult of the *Brahmanas* and the *atma-vidya* of the Upanishads constitute ideologies of brahmanas and kshatriyas respectively? It may be tempting to call both ideologies of the ruling class. It seems to us, however, that such characterization is not only simplistic but also ignores the dialectics of the development of these religio-philosophic systems. That none of them is a monolithic uniform idea should be apparent from the minutiae of various sacrifices. Just one of the numerous ceremonies of only one sacrifice, viz., the *ratnahavimshi* ceremony of the *rajasuya* shows how the tribal and Patriarchal elements and how priestly domination was being replaced by that of the kshatriyas.<sup>229</sup> That sacrifices aimed at the creation of large communities by transcending kinship considerations ought not to be overlooked in the present context. Elaborate rituals were prescribed for the admission of the Vratya chief of Magadha to Vedic society and

the chief of the *nishadas* called *sthapati* finds a place in Vedic rituals meant for higher orders.

Again it is generally accepted that as opposed to brahmanical Sanskrit works, the Pali texts of the Buddhists provided a different rationale of the origin of kingship, and the new monarchs of the Ganga valley in the sixth-fifth centuries of the pre-Christian era were favourably disposed towards non-brahmanical religions. But it would again be an over-simplification to say that the Buddha's was an ideology of the *kshatriyas*. This is being suggested not only because all the concerned monarchies were certainly not in the hands of the *kshatriyas* but also because it would unjustifiedly restrict the social base of early Buddhism. Apart from the material sustenance received by the Buddha from peasants and traders who were certainly out of reckoning of upper class dominance, a fairly extensive popularity of the Master amongst brahmanas too is not unknown.

Finally, such prominent manifestations of the religio-philosophic outlook of people of the Indian subcontinent of the post-Gupta centuries as the rise of *bhakti*, tantricism, pilgrimage, etc. are indeed products of the land grant economy. Though the brahmanas were the biggest beneficiaries of the mechanism and may have also worked consciously in league with contemporary rulers to prepare its philosophic background, it would again be difficult to rationalise these developments only in terms of dominating brahmana ideology. Surely, it is impossible to eliminate the symbiotic relationship between the brahmanas on the one hand and the tribals on the other? The traffic of ideas was certainly a two-way one. And what about the Buddhists and the Jainas? They were also affected by the nuances of the land grant economy. Though the sphere of the influence of the Buddhists was shrinking, this was not the case with the Jainas. In Karnataka, Gujarat and Rajasthan specially, they had carved out a niche for themselves in the mind of people. But ideas such as *bhakti*, tantric practices and pilgrimage were essential components of their creed too. The transparent weakness of the so-called 'Brahman-Peasant Alliance' in post-Gupta southern India has already been convincingly demonstrated.<sup>230</sup> But even the hypothesis of the rural base of the temple movement under the patronage of brahmana-king collaboration leaves many gaps if the role of *bhakti* as an ideology is to be fully appreciated. To illustrate, the Tamilakam where this rural base model has been applied,<sup>231</sup> also witnessed an extensive internal trade network<sup>232</sup> as well as an ambitious programme of maritime trade activity. What was the role of traders and merchants in the growth of the temple movement? Perhaps because of the violent attitude of the Alvars and the Nayanars, at least in the initial few centuries, non-brahmanical religions which used to get the support of these communities, had almost vanished from Tamilakam. Did traders and merchants switch their allegiance to the new temple movement? Or they did not need any ideological prop? Evidence is mounting to show

that even merchants and their assemblies (*nagarams*) exercised control over land and had interest in its agricultural output. Further, did not temples also tend to erect barriers of both language and rituals between peasant laity and the priesthood? If then ideology is to be understood in terms of a mechanism of class interests in general and ruling class interests in particular, how does one explain the role of *bhakti*? This dilemma would apply to other major post-Gupta religious manifestations as well.

Apropos of Gramsci, reference was made to four levels of ideology: philosophy, religion, commonsense (called 'the folklore of philosophy') and folklore. One may not accept the gradation of these levels—particularly the despising tone in which the last level is considered, yet as a conception it has elements which make it very broad-based. The role of religion *in society*, particularly as an ideology ought to be seen in its potentialities to sway masses and not classes.

We may conclude with a recent assessment and also perhaps a warning about ideology as a cultural system. considering ideology as a justificatory and apologetic dimension of culture, Geertz accepts that it refers 'to that part of culture which is activity concerned with the establishment and defense of patterns of beliefs and value . . . the patterns of belief and value defended may be, of course, those of a socially subordinate group, as well as those of a socially dominant one, and the 'apology' therefore for reform or revolution.'<sup>233</sup>

I thank Professors R.S. Sharma, Romila Thapar, R.L. Shukla and D.N. Jha for their comments and suggestions on the first draft of this address.

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The term 'science of religions' had been used by Abbe Prosper Leblanc and Stiefelhagen in 1852 and 1858 respectively but not in the strict sense given to it by Max Muller—the sense in which it is being currently used. Cf. Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, 1961, p. 216.
2. I take this opportunity to thank my numerous students who have, over the years, helped me through their intelligent and lively discussions in developing the perspective being presented here. Mrityunjay Kumar and Dr. Bhairabi Prasad Sahu deserve very special attention in this connection.
3. For the problems of defining religion and its varied dimensions, Cf. J.E. Barnhart, *The Study of Religion and its Meaning—New Explorations in Light of Karl Popper and Emile Durkheim*, The Hague. See also Ninian Smart, *The Religious Experience of Mankind*, Fontana paperback, London 1969, pp. 11-41; Donald Wiebe, *Religion and Truth: Towards an Alternative Paradigm for the Study of Religion*, The Hague, 1981. Haridas Bhattacharyya, *The Fundamentals of Living Faiths*, Stephanos Nirmalendu Ghosh Lectures of 1933, University of Calcutta, 1938, *passim* and Nalinikanta Brahma, *The Fundamentals of Religion* being the Stephanos Nirmalendu Ghosh Lectures of 1951, University of Calcutta, 1960, chs. 1, 2 and 8.
4. While it has been argued by some that at the most primitive levels of culture, 'to live as a human being is itself a religious Act' (Cf. Mircea Eliade's foreword to Douglas Allen, *Structure and Creativity in Religion*, The Hague, 1977, p.viii), others forcefully reject the role of religion within the major cultural traditions of mankind—in the ancient worlds of India, China, Greece, Rome and Israel (Cf. James Thrower, *The Alternative Tradition*, The Hague, 1980, *passim*).
5. Joachim Wach, *Sociology of Religion*, Chicago, 1944, pp.1-2; C. Jouco Bleeker, 'The Contribution of the Phenomenology of Religion to the Study of the History of

- Religions', in Bianchi, Bleeker and Bausani, (eds.) *Problems and Methods of the History of Religions*, Leiden, 1972, pp. 35-45; Idem, *The History of Religions 1950-1975*, Leiden, 1975 and numerous articles on *Religionswissenschaft* by Jacques Waardenburg, published in the 1970s. Cf. also Waardenburg, *Reflections on the Study of Religion*, The Hague, 1978.
6. *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle*, California, 1981. Though linguistic analysis constitutes an important tool of this comparative study of the religion of the East African Pastorals (Nuers, Dinkas and the Masais) and the Indo-Iranians, its focal point centres round its subtitle, viz., *A Study in the Ecology of Religions*.
  7. *The Religions of India*, Trubner's Oriental Series, 1881.
  8. Cf. works of W.D.O'Flaherty (*Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Shiva*, Oxford, 1973 and *Dreams, Illusions, and other Realities*, Chicago, 1984, Delhi, 1987, etc.) and David Dean Shulman (*Tamil Temple Myths*, Princeton, 1980).
  9. Indian reprint, Calcutta, 1958, p.5.
  10. Though Morgan spoke of unintelligibility of only 'primitive religions', we may suggest that even if the word 'primitive' is deleted, it would still reflect the situation obtainable in the field of *Religionswissenschaft* in the mid-nineteenth century.
  11. Cf. Julius Gould, 'Auguste Comte' in Timothy Raison, (ed.) *The Founding Fathers of Social Sciences*, Harmondsworth, 1969, pp. 35-42. In his later writings, Comte introduced his new 'Religion of Humanity', but it was his positivism which most influenced nineteenth century historians of religion.
  12. James Thrower convincingly argues against the widely held belief that the rejection of religious understanding of the world is something which begins no earlier than the period of European eighteenth century *Aufklärung*. Cf. James Thrower, op. cit.; see also *supra*, n. 4. Even in the European thought ferment, a few historians of religions place greater emphasis upon the contribution of Romanticism; their fundamental objective is not the dissolution of religion but its 'transcendental' justification and foundation. In contrast to *religio naturalis* of the Enlightenment thinkers, phenomenologists of religion such as Rudolf Otto and Mircea Eliade insist upon the complexity and the *sui generis* character of the religions. Surely, this may be taken as their reaction against a 'rationalistic bias' inherited from the enlightenment. For the relevant works on this debate see Ernest Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, Boston, 1961, p. 134f; Jan de Vries, *The Study of Religion: A Historical Approach*, New York, 1967, pp. 39-58; G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, Vol. 2, New York, 1963, pp. 691-94.
  13. These last two decades have witnessed the appearance of two brilliant series bearing on analysis of major approaches to study the religious phenomenon. Thirtytwo volumes have already been published under the series *Religion and Reason* (Mouton, The Hague) with Jacques Waardenburg as the General Editor. He has also been working with Leo Laeyendecker to produce the second series entitled *Religion and Society* (Mouton, The Hague), wherein 25 titles have already come out. Jacques Waardenburg's two volumes (nos. 3 and 4 of *Religion and Reason*) entitled *Classical Approach to the Study of Religion* (1973) and Frank Whaling, ed. *Contemporary Approaches to the Study of Religion* (2 vols.) published in the 1980s deal extensively with this problem. Between the two contributions of Waardenburg and Whaling, another substantial work entitled *Science of Religion: Studies in Methodology*, edited by Lauri Honko was published in 1979. Other useful works of the series (*Religion and Reason*) and having a bearing on the problem at hand include no. 8: Th. P. van Baaren and H.J. Drijvers, (ed.), *Religion, Culture and Methodology*, (1973); no. 15: Jacques Waardenburg, *Reflections on the Study of Religion* (1978); no. 20: Donald A. Crosby, *Interpretative Theories of Religion* and no. 25: James Thrower, *Marxist-Leninist 'Scientific Atheism' and the Study of Religion and Atheism in the U.S.S.R.*
  14. For an unusual thematic survey of *myths* see Alexander Eliot, *Myths*, New York, 1976, with useful introductory notes from Mircea Eliade and Joseph Campbell. Indian mythology occupies a conspicuous place in most discussions of the myths; this is seldom done even in world-perspective based works produced in the West. Other useful sources for comparing various interpretations of myth are; Joseph Campbell's four-volumed *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology* (1959); *Oriental Mythology* (1962); *Occidental Mythology* (1964) and *Creative Mythology* (1968); Thomas J.J. Altizer, William, A. Beardslee and J. Harvey Young, (eds.): *Truth, Myth and*

- Symbol*, Prentice-Hall, 1962; Thomas A Sebeok, (ed.) *Myth: A Symposium*, London, 1958; Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, New York, 1963, Henry A. Murray, (ed.), *Myth and Myth Making*, Boston, 1968; Perry C. Cohen, 'Theories of Myth', *Man* (N.S.), no. 4 (1969), pp. 337-53; G.S. Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures*, Cambridge, 1970 and Jean Pierre Vernant, 'The Reason of Myth' in *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, 1980, pp. 186-242.
15. For the evolution of Max Müller's thought process see Nirad C. Chaudhuri, *Scholar Extraordinary*, Oxford, 1974, particularly chapters 1 and 3, part 2 and chapter 5 of part 3. His concern for origins and primordial forms was not accompanied by the common nineteenth century formulation of a unilinear, 'progressive' evolutionary account of the development of religion. Cf. *Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. 1, p. 48.
  16. Other comparative philologists such as Kuhn, Schwartz and Preller placed greater emphasis on storm-clouds, wind and the sky respectively. See also Richard M. Dorson, 'The Eclipse of Solar Mythology' in Thomas A. Sebeok, op.cit., pp.15-38 and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religion* (Sir D. Owen Evans Lectures of 1962), Oxford, 1965, p. 22. The latter refers to absurdities of nature mythologists.
  17. For a recent writing on 'disease of language' contributing to the birth of religion, see William A. Lessa and Evan Z. Vogt, (eds.), *Reader in Comparative Religion*, New York, 1958. Further, the 'inherently metaphorical' nature and 'inherent ambiguity' of language in the scheme of Max Müller finds a prominent place in Ernst Cassirer's works, viz., *An Essay on Man*, New Haven, 1944 pp. 109-10 and *Language and Myth*, New York, 1946, pp. 3-4, 85-86. For a critical analysis of Max Müller's method and his writings providing a backdrop of the psychological theories on religion see E.E. Evans-Pritchard, op.cit., pp. 20-47.
  18. E.B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 1871.
  19. R.H. Codrington first talked about this impersonal, dynamic and universal supernatural power. Cf. *The Melanesians*, pp. 118-20. Soon, the anthropologists began to find concepts comparable to Melanesian *mana*. Thus, we have Polynesian *mana*, the Sioux *wakanda*, the Algonquin *manitou*, the Iroquois *arenda*, the Crow *maxpe*, the *hasina* of Madagascar, the *ramat* of the Ainu, the *baraka* of Morocco and many others. See particularly E. Gellner's analysis of *baraka* in 'Concepts and Society' in D. Emmet and A. MacIntyre, (eds.) *Sociological Theory and Philosophical Analysis*, London, 1970, p. 142 and Talal Asad, 'Anthropology and the Analysis of Ideology' (Mallinowski Lecture for 1979), *Man*, vol. XIV, 1979, pp. 622-23. For other decisive criticisms of the preanimistic theory of *mana*, see Mircea Eliade, *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries*, New York, 1960, pp. 126-31 and *Pattern in Comparative Religion*, London, 1958, pp. 19-23.
  20. R.R. Marett submitted 'the taboo-mana formula' as the 'minimum definition of religion'. Significant writings on taboo are those of A. Gennep, Frazer, French, E.S. Handy, R. Lehmann, Radcliffe-Brown, H. Webster and F. Steiner. See also Meyer Fortes, 'Totem and Taboo', *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 1966, pp. 5-22.
  21. W. Mannhardt had in his *Wald und Feldkulte* (*Cults of Forest and Field*, 1875-7) formulated his hypothesis of 'demons of vegetation', a concept of 'corn-spirits' and claimed that the lower mythology still surviving in the culture of various peasants disclosed an earlier stage than even Müller's naturalistic mythologies. James Frazer's *The Golden Bough* was deeply influenced by Mannhardt and is notable for fascinating empirical data. However, his theories have been strongly criticized in R.H. Lowie's *Primitive Religion*, New York, 1924, pp. 137-47.
  22. High God (the belief in a primal being, a Maker, undying, usually moral, 'All-Father') was worked out by Andrew Lang who had argued vehemently against Max Müller and Tylor. Cf. *Custom and Myth: Myth, Ritual and Religion and The Making of Religion*. See also Edwin Smith, (ed.) *African Ideas of God*, Edinburgh, 1950.
  23. We feel that the climax of ethnologists' writings of the first phase is reached in the works of Lucien Levy-Bruhl of France (1857-1939). His *Ethics and Moral Science* (1903) and six volumes of *Primitive Mentality* (1922) typify the caricature worked out by ethnologists, who would not attribute much rationality to the so-called primitives. Surprisingly, even sophisticated thought of China and India was also included in it by Bruhl. For a critique of Levy-Bruhl see Herbert Read, *Art and Society*, Faber (ed.), 1967, pp. 28-30; E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religion*, chapters 1 and 4. It may however, be mentioned that Levy-Bruhl seems to

- have abandoned his hypothesis of pre-logical primitive mentality. Cf. his *Las Carnets*, published posthumously by Maurice Leenhardt in 1949.
24. James Hastings, (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (13 vols., 1908-21) typifies this. But contrast this with two recent encyclopaedias: Richard Cavendish, (Editor in Chief), *Man, Myth and Magic: The Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Mythology, Religion and the Unknown*, 12 Vols. 1983 and Mircea Eliade, (Editor in Chief), *The Encyclopaedia of Religion*, 16 vols, 1986, Macmillan and Free Press.
  25. E. Durkheim, 'De la definition des phenomenes religieux', *L'Annee Sociologique*, Vol.II, pp. 1-28. It may, however, be pointed out that since Durkheim was basically concerned with so-called primitive, pre-class societies, phenomenon such as Hinduism may not have interested him. Obviously, the second element in his classic definition of religion, viz., its inseparability from the Church and collectivity of things would leave out such a phenomenon from the domain of religion. There is, of course, a great debate on the extent to which Hinduism can be regarded as an 'ism' at all.
  26. Cf. *The Elementary Forms* . . . pp. 418-9 and *passim*.
  27. Though Durkheim's view of the function of religion evoked keen interest amongst sociologists, his theory of totemism being a primordial form of religion is not taken seriously. Cf. Mircea Eliade, *Australian Religions: An Introduction*, Ithaca and London, 1973, *passim*.
  28. Cf. Charles H. Long, 'Prolegomenon to a Religious Hermeneutic', *History of Religions*, VI, no 3 (1967), pp. 260-2. Division of 'sacred' and 'profane' is admissible but the identification of the profane with the individual and sacred with social creates problems. To say that the social factors in rites and ceremonies tend to fortify and crystallize the religious emotions is one thing, to regard them as its only or basic source is another (see also discussion on Radcliffe Brown under phase III). Kingsley Davis has suggested an improvement upon Durkheim's formulation which follows Parson's analysis—sacred objects, instead of symbolising society, symbolize the 'unseen world'. Cf. *Human Society*, New York, 1948, p. 529. Hans Mol, *Identify and the Sacred: A Sketch for a New Social-Scientific Theory of Religion*, Oxford, 1976, tries to resolve the 'conflicting but complementary relationship between the sacred and profane' by using 'sacralization' (the process of becoming, or making sacred) rather than 'the sacred' (being sacred). See also John Sturrock, *Structuralism and Since*, Oxford, 1980 and W.S.F. Pickering, *Durkheim's Sociology of Religion: Themes and Theories*, London, 1984.
  29. George Dumézil, founding father of what has come to be known as 'the new comparative mythology' and who had been influenced by Durkheim's writings has raised serious doubts against this proposition. With his extensive knowledge of comparative Indo-European mythology, Dumézil argues that the social as well as supernatural phenomena (the content of myths) were but surface manifestations of a deep-seated set of 'ideal' ideological principles, which provide a 'method of analysis' and thus permit one to come to grips with the forces affecting human existence. Cf. *Mythe et eposée*, vol II, 1971, p. 15—relevant passage has been translated by C. Scott Littleton, 'Dumézil versus Levi-Strauss: Some Theoretical Implications of the New Comparative Mythology' in Charles Frantz, (ed.), *Ideas and Trends in World Anthropology*, New Delhi, 1981, pp. 91-99. See also C. Scott Littleton, *The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil*, Berkeley, 1973, and Jean-Pierre Vernant, 'The Reason of Myth' in *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, 1980, pp. 186-242. For the idea of creation of community through myth and ritual, see Frederick J. Streng, Charles L. Lloyd and Jay T. Allen, *Ways of Being Religious*, Prentice-Hall, 1973, Introduction and pt. 2.
  30. Maurice Bloch took up this theme in the Malinowski Memorial Lectures delivered in the London School of Economics and Political Science on 7 December 1976, cf. 'The Past and the Present in the Present', *Man* (N.S.), XII, 1977, pp. 278-92. The notion that Durkheim's sociology developed in a substantial degree as a response to the 'problem of order' is taken as myth and analyzed by Anthony Giddens. 'Four Myths in the History of Social Thought', *Economy and Society*, I, no. 4, 1972, pp. 357-85. For the importance of Durkheim in understanding belief systems and the notion of belief as 'creating' society, see Michael Mann, *Sources of Social Power*, vol. I, From the Beginning to 1760 AD, Cambridge, 1986, ch. I and John A. Hell. 'The Land of the Brahmans' in *Powers and Liberties*, Basil Blackwell, 1985, pp. 58-83. There is

- rather undue emphasis on Burton Stein's recent writings in the aforesaid contribution of Hell, who supports the questionable Weberian view of Hinduism as an obstacle to capitalist growth. For an exhaustive critique of Purton Stein's assumptions and methodology, see D.N. Jha, 'Relevance of 'Peasant State and Society' to Pallava-Chola Times', *The Indian Historical Review*, VIII, nos. 1-2, 1981-82, pp. 74-94 and 'Validity of the 'Brahmana-Peasant Alliance' and the 'Segmentary State' in Early Medieval South India', *Social Science Probing*s, I, no. 2, June, 1984, pp. 270-96.
31. *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*, London, 1964.
  32. *The Mahabharata: An Ethnological Study*, London, 1915.
  33. For the potentialities of Durkheim's method for an analysis of the interrelations between caste and religion, see Celestin Bouglé, *Essays on the Caste System*, Cambridge, 1971; Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus*, London, 1972 and Romila Thapar, 'Durkheim and Weber on Theories of Society and Race Relating to Pre-Colonial India', in Marion O' Callaghan (compiler), *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*, UNESCO, Paris, 1980, pp. 93-116.
  34. *The Religion of India* (first published, 1920-21) New York, 1958; for a scathing criticism of this translation by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale, see Detlef Kantowsky, 'Max Weber on India and Indian Interpretations of Weber', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (N.S.), vol.16, no. 2, 1982, pp. 141-74.
  35. *The Religion of China*, translated and edited by Hans H. Gerth, New York, 1951 (first published 1915).
  36. *Ancient Judaism*, translated and edited by Hans H. Gerth, New York, 1952; *Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft* (1922), translated as *The Sociology of Religion*, London, 1965 and *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*, London, 1976 (first German edition in 1909).
  37. First published in 1904-5. Translated by Takot Parsons with a Foreword by R.H. Tawney in 1930; reissued with an Introduction by Anthony Giddens, London, 1976. See also R.J. Anderson, J.A. Hughes and W.W. Sharrock, (eds.), *Classic Disputes in Sociology*, London, 1987 for a review of the Protestant Ethic Debate.
  38. Anti-reductionist approach is one of the distinguishing characteristics of contemporary history of religions. For an analysis of 'the irreducibility of the sacred', Cf. M. Eliade, *Australian Religions: An Introduction*, Ithaca, 1973, chapter on Death and Eschatology. The ideological ramifications of anti-reductionist approach are discussed in detail in Section V.
  39. See also Nigel Harris, *Beliefs in Society*, Harmondsworth, 1968, pp. 81-85.
  40. Charles P. Loomis and Z.K. Loomis were the authors of this paper. Later, they also edited papers presented at this symposium and published under the same title in 1969 (New Delhi).
  41. For an effective recent critique of not only Marxian notion of the AMP but some recent Indian attempts to resurrect it through the back door, see D.N. Jha, (ed.), *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, Delhi, 1987, Editor's Introduction.
  42. Cf. Romila Thapar, op.cit.
  43. Cf. The writings of Rivers, Boas, Kroeber, Malinowski and Schmidt. See particularly V. Basilov, 'The Study of Religions in Soviet Ethnographic Science' in Ernest Gellner, (ed.), *Soviet and Western Anthropology*, London, 1980, pp. 231-42.
  44. e.g., *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization*, 1946; *Philosophies of India*, 1951 and *The Art of Indian Asia*, 1955. See also Joseph Campbell, *Masks of God: Oriental Mythology*, 1962. More recently, W.D. O'Flaherty's writings on Epic Puranic mythology (*Women, Androgynes and Other Mythical Beasts*, Chicago, 1980; *Dreams, Illusion and other Realities*, Delhi, 1986) acknowledge debt to both Freud and Jung. However, for an incisive critical comment on the psycho-analytical approach to early Indian history, see R.S. Sharma, *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India*, New Delhi, 1983, p.11.
  45. Among important works which outlive the diversification and specialisation of anthropological approaches to *Religionswissenschaft*, one can mention: Michael Banton, (ed.), *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*, New York, 1966; Allan W. Wister, (ed.) *Changing Perspectives in the Scientific Study of Religion*, London, 1974; W.A. Lessa and E.Z. Vogt, (eds.) : *Reader in Comparative Religion*, New York, 1958; Sol Tax, (ed.), *Horizons of Anthropology*, London, 1965; Anthony F.C. Wallace, *Religion : An Anthropological View*, New York, 1966.
  46. Bronislaw Malinowski, *Magic Science and Religion, and Other Essays*, New York, 1954; A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Taboo*, Cambridge, 1939; *Idem, Structure and Function in*

- Primitive Society*, London, 1952. See also Meyer Fortes, in 'Totem and Taboo', *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 1966, pp. 5-22.
47. George C. Homans, *The Human Group*, London, 1951, reconciles certain differences between Brown and Malinowski. While the latter focuses attention on situations, in which rites originate and the functions they perform once they are established, Brown does not consider the situations of their origin; he shows how they function once they are established. For a review of differences amongst major Functionalists, see Carl G. Hempel. 'The Logic of Functional Analysis' in Llewellyn Gross (ed.), *Symposium on Sociological Theory*, also published in May Brodbeck, (ed.), *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, New York, 1968, pp. 179-210, Hans H. Panner, 'The Poverty of Functionalism', *History of Religions*, vol.II, 1971, pp. 91-97.
  48. That the clear-cut 'gulf' between the primitive and ourselves is dubious is also shown by the brilliant findings of Alexander Marshack, 'Cognitive Aspects of Upper Palaeolithic Engraving', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 13, nos. 3-4 (1972), pp. 445-77; M. Eliade, 'On Prehistoric Religions', *History of Religions*, vol. 14, no.2, 1974, p. 141. See also, Whitney Davis, 'The Origins of Image Making', *Current Anthropology*, vol.27, no.3, 1986, pp. 193-216.
  49. First published in 1958. His other major works are *The Savage Mind* (1962), *Totemism* (1963) and *The Raw and the Cooked* (1964).
  50. For recent writings on Levi-Strauss, his method and significance, see Malcolm Crick, *Explorations in Language and Meaning*, London, 1976; John Sturrock, (ed.), *Structuralism and Since*, Oxford, 1980 and Anthony Giddens and Jonathan Turner, (eds.), *Social Theory Today*, 1987. The last named work claims to be an 'Obituary of Structuralism'. That this is far from being the case should be apparent from such contributions as: Bob Scholte, 'Critical Anthropology since its Reinvention', *Anthropology and Humanism Quarterly*, vol.III, pp. 4-17; Joel S. Kahn and Josep R. Llobera, etc., *The Anthropology of Pre-Capitalist Societies*, London, 1981 and Mark Kline Taylor, 'Symbolic Dimensions in Cultural Anthropology', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 26, no. 2, April 1985, pp. 167-85.
  51. Charles J. Adams, *The History of Religions: Essays on the Problem of Understanding*, p.178.
  52. Cf. C.J. Bleeker, 'The Contribution of the Phenomenology of Religion to the Study of the History of Religions,' in U. Bianchi, C.J. Bleeker and A. Bausani, (eds.), *Problems and Methods of the History of Religions.*, Leiden, 1972, p. 39.
  53. *The Idea of the Holy* (first published in 1917), translated by J.W. Harvey, 1923.
  54. First published in 1933 and translated by J.E. Turner in 1938.
  55. *Meaning of Religion: Lectures in the Phenomenology of Religion*, The Hague, 1960.
  56. Cf. Douglas Allen, *Structure and Creativity in Religion: Hermeneutics in Mircea Eliade's Phenomenology and New Directions*, The Hague, 1977.
  57. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
  58. P.J. Chinmugund and V.V. Mirashi, (eds.), *Review of Indological Research in Last 75 Years*, Pune, 1967, pp. 561-773.
  59. N.N. Bhattacharyya, *History of Researches on Indian Buddhism*, New Delhi, 1981.
  60. H.D. Sankalia, *Prehistory and Protohistory of India and Pakistan*, 2nd ed., Pune, 1974; Idem, *Prehistory of India*, New Delhi, 1977; Idem, *Prehistoric Art in India*, New Delhi, 1978; Vidula Jayaswal, *Palaeohistory of India*, Delhi, 1978; Idem, *Chopper-Chopping Component of Palaeolithic India*, Delhi, 1982; Yashodhar Mathpal, *Prehistoric Rock Paintings of Bhimbetka*, New Delhi, 1984; K.K. Chakravarty, (ed.), *Rock Art of India*, New Delhi, 1984; D.P. Agrawal and B.M. Pande, (eds.), *Ecology and Archaeology of Western India*, Delhi, 1977. See also *Man and Environment and Puratattva*, journals of the Indian Society for Prehistoric and Quaternary Studies and Indian Archaeological Society respectively. Former issued its vol.XII and the latter its no 17 early this year.
  61. K.V. Soundararajan, 'Eco-Functional Frame of Early Man—Some Factors' *Puratattva*, no. 12, 1980-81, pp. 9-15.
  62. G. Willey and P. Phillips, *Method and Theory in Archaeology*, Chicago, 1958; L.R. Binford and S.R. Binford, *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, Chicago, 1968.
  63. D.L. Clark, *Analytical Archaeology*, London, 1970 & 1979; Idem, *Models in Archaeology*, London, 1972 and *Spatial Archaeology*, London, 1977. Also, Harold Hietala, (ed.), *Intrasite Spatial Analysis in Archaeology*, Cambridge, 1984.

64. This is despite the expanding interests of American archaeologists in India, for whom 'archaeology is anthropology or it is nothing.' Cf. Willey and Phillips, op.cit., p.2; Cf. also Gregory L. Possehi, 'Culture and Process', *Puratattva*, no. 9, 1977-78, pp.43-46.
65. Being edited by Richard Bradley, Tim Earle, et.al. The earliest volume in the series is dated 1979. The relevant volumes from our point of view are : Daniel Miller and Christopher Tilley, (eds.), *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, 1984; and Dorothy K. Washburn, (ed.), *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*, 1984; and Dorphy K. Washburn, (ed.), *Structure and Cognition in Art*, 1983. Apart from this series, some other writings on prehistoric religion are provocative and challenging, e.g., Whitney Davis, 'The Origins of Image Making', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 27, no. 3, June 1986, pp. 193-215.
66. D.D. Kosambi, 'At the Crossroads: A Study of Mother Goddess Cult Sites' and 'Pilgrims's Progress: A Contribution to the Prehistory of the Western Deccan Plateau', both included in author's *Myth and Reality*, Bombay, 1962, pp. 82-151; N.N. Bhattacharyya, *The Indian Mother Goddess*, 2nd rev ed., Delhi, 1977. See also Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Lokayata*, Delhi. 1959.
67. Numerous writings of E.O. James, *Prehistoric Religions*, London, 1957; *The Cult of Mother Goddess*, London, 1959; *Seasonal Feasts and Festivals*, London, 1961; R. Briffault, *The Mothers* (3 vols.), London, 1952; J. Marringier, *Gods of Prehistoric Man*, London, 1960; E. Norbeak, *Religion in Primitive Society*, New York, 1961. See also O.R. Ehrenfels, *Mother Right in India*, Hyderabad, 1941.
68. Regions discussed are Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Indus Valley, the North China Plain, Mesoamerica, the Central Andes and the Yoruba territories of S. W. Nigeria.
69. 'Whenever in any of the seven regions of primary urban generation, we trace back the characteristic urban form to its beginnings we arrive not at a settlement that is dominated by commercial relations, a primordial market, or at one that is focussed on a citadel, and archetypal fortress, but rather at a ceremonial complex. . . religion permeated all activities, all institutional change, and afforded a consensual focus for social life' (emphases added), Paul Wheatley, *Pivot of the Four Quarters*, Chicago, 1971, pp. 280-320; see also David N. Keightly, 'Religion and the Rise of Urbanism', being a review of Wheatley's work, in *Journal of American Oriental Society*, vol. 93, no. 4, 1973, pp. 527-38.
70. Max Weber, *The City*, 1921 (Eng. trans., 1958) and *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*, 1909 (Eng. trans., 1976); Gideon Sjoberg, *The Preindustrial City of Past and Present*, New York, 1960; Lewis Mumford, *The City in History*, London, 1961; V. Gordon Childe, 'The Urban Revolution' (first published in 1950), reprinted in Gregory Possehl, *Ancient Cities of the Indus*, New Delhi, 1979; pp. 12-17; Robert McC Adams, *The Evolution of Urban Society*, London, 1966; Philip M Hauser and Leo F. Schnore, *The Study of Urbanization*, New York, 1965; Karl Polanyi, C. Aresberg and H.W. Pearson, *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*, Chicago, 1957.
71. Walter A. Fairservis, Jr, 'The Harappan Civilization: New Evidence and More Theory' in Gregory Possehl, op. cit., pp. 51f; David N. Keightly, op. cit. The volume edited by Possehl and a subsequent collection, *Harappan Civilization; A Contemporary Perspective*, New Delhi, 1982, also edited by Possehl, are valuable additions from the point of view of the much-needed multi-disciplinary orientation. However, they are inadequate works in the present context. The same is true of Shashi Asthana, *Pre-Harappan Culture of India and the Borderlands*, New Delhi, 1985 and Jerome Jacobson, *Studies in the Archaeology of India and Pakistan*, New Delhi, 1986.
72. Cf. S.C. Malik, *Indian Civilization: The Formative Period*, Simla, 1968, pp. 99-105.
73. D.D. Kosambi, *Culture and Civilization of Ancient India in Historical Outline*, London, 1965, pp. 66-68; Idem, *Myth and Reality*, Bombay, 1962, pp. 71, 78-79. For a more recent reconstruction of religion-based Harappan set-up, see Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Religion and Society* (Stephanos Nirmalendu Ghosh Lectures of 1981, Calcutta University), Bangalore, 1987.
74. Walter A. Fairservis, op.cit.
75. Cf. Possehl's reconstruction of the pattern of Harappan settlements in Gujarat, vide, 'The End of a State and Continuity of a Tradition: A Discussion of the Late Harappan', in Richard G. Fox (ed.), *Realm and Region in Traditional India*, New Delhi, 1977, pp. 234-54; Idem, *Indus Civilization in Saurashtra*, New Delhi, 1980.

76. Walter A. Fairservis, Jr., 'The Origin, Character and Decline of an Early Civilization', in G.L. Possehl, (ed.), *Ancient Cities of the Indus*, pp. 66-75.
77. Grant D Jones and Robert R. Kautz, (eds.), *The Transition to Statehood in the New World*, Cambridge 1981, pt. 4 which discusses 'Ideological Factors in State Formation' with special reference to religion in the context of Mesoamerica and Peru.
78. Geoffrey W. Conrad and Authur A Demarest, *Religion and Empire—The Dynamics of Aztec and Inca Expansionism*, Cambridge, 1984.
79. Ildiko Puskas in her short contribution ('Society and Religion in the Indus Valley Civilization' in Bridget Allehin, (ed.), *South Asian Archaeology 1981*, Cambridge, 1984, pp. 162-65) persists with the decades-old suggestion of John Marshall about 'priests kings', though she distinguishes between 'primitive rural form of religion' (not studied by her) and 'the sophisticated religion of the urban centre.' She also makes some fanciful suggestions such as the so-called proto-Shiva being proto-Brahma and the Mother Goddess being proto-Parvati (and later even Tara of Mahayana Buddhism). However, her suggestions about tensions amongst deities of 'bull and tiger totem line' and '*ashvattha* and *nim* trees' need futher probing.
80. Cf. Marcia A. Fentress, 'Regional Interaction in Indus Valley Urbanization: The Key Factors of Resource Access and Exchange', in Sylvia Vatuk, (ed.), *American Studies in the Anthropology of India*, New Delhi, 1978, pp. 389-424.
81. Published from Pune in 1987.
82. Shubhangana Atre, 'Lady of Beasts - The Harappan Goddess', *Puratattva*, no. 16, 1985-86, pp. 7-10. For analogous reconstruction see also H.P. Sullivan, 'A Reexamination of the Religions of the Indus Civilization', *History of Religions*, vol.4, 1964, pp. 15-23. Other writings on the subject include, K.L. Sastri, *New Light on the Indus Civilization*, New Delhi, 1957, vol I, pp. 7-13 and D Srinivasan. 'The So-called Proto-Shiva Seal from Mohenjodaro: An Iconological Assessment', *Archives of Asian Art*, 1976-7, pp. 47-58.
83. Shubhangana Atre, 'The Harappan Riddle of Unicorn', *Bulletin of Deccan College Research Institute*, 1985, pp. 1-10.
84. Atre emphasizes that the Harappans chose a composite animal—a combination of 'ruminants' to bear the antler on its forehead clearly illuminating the awareness of the interdependence of agriculture and animal husbandry, *ibid*.
85. Gregory L. Possehl, *Kulli*, Durham, USA, 1986, ch. 5. See also, Shereen Ratnagar, 'Some Problems Concerning the Urbanization of the Indus Valley in the Third Millennium B.C.', in J.S. Grewal and Indu Banga, (eds.), *Studies in Urban History*, Amritsar, 1978-79, pp. 18-28 where the author refers to 'merchant oligarchy' as a determining influence.
86. Shereen Ratnagar, 'An Aspect of Harappan Agricultural Production', *Studies in History*, vol.II. no. 2, 1986, pp. 137-53; *Idem*, 'Pastoralists in the Prehistory of Baluchistan', *Studies in History*, vol III, no 2, 1987, pp. 137-54.
87. *Asiatic Researches*, VIII, M. 369-476.
88. For a provocative scientific analysis of legend, see D.D. Kosambi, *Myth and Reality*, 1962, pp. 42-81.
89. *Mythologische Studien von Adalbert Kuhn*, published posthumously by his son in 1912, it includes such papers as 'Ditaras as phenomena of light', 'Dwarfs a souls of the dead' and 'Dwarfs as phenomena of light'.
90. Weber pointed out the implication of Videgha's legend for the eastward expansion of the Sanskrit speakers For the treatment of this legend as representing 'eastward march of the sacrificial cult', see G.V. Devasthali, *Religion and Mythology of the Brahmanas* (with special reference to the *Shatapatha Brahmana*), Poona, 1965, p. 121.
91. Author of *Zoological Mythology*, London, 1873.
92. Three volumes of *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig Veda*, published from Paris, 1878-83.
93. The fifth volume of his *Original Sanskrit Text*, London, 1872 has the subtitle, 'Contribution to a Knowledge of the Cosmogony, Mythology, Religious Ideas, Life and Manners of the Indians in the Vedic Age.' Though Muir insisted that the Vedic religion should be studied primarily from the Vedic sources, he had not renounced comparative mythology completely. His identification of Varuna with Ouranos and attempt to link him with Ahur Mazda are indicators of this continuing influence.

94. A. Barth, *Les religions de l'Inde*, Paris, 1879, Eng. trans. by J. Wood, *The Religions of India*, London, 1881.
95. One such recent attempt is Sukumari Bhattacharji, *The Indian Theogony*, Cambridge, 1970.
96. A. Barth, op.cit. pp. 17-19.
97. For reference to 'colonial' and the 'romantic' bias of nineteenth century West European Indology, cf. G. Bongard-Levin and A. Vigasin, *The Image of India*, Moscow, 1984, p. 61.
98. *Ibid.*, ch.2.
99. Being vol. I of the work, *A Study of Bacchanal Cults of Indo-European Antiquity in the Context of the Role of Ecstasy in the Early Stages of Social Development*.
100. A.A. MacDonell, *The Vedic Mythology*, 1897; reprinted, Varanasi, 1963; Jan Gonda's numerous works include *Notes on Brahman*, Utrecht, 1950; *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*, The Hague, 1965; *Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India*, Amsterdam, 1970, *The Dual Divinities in the Religion of the Vedas*, Amsterdam, 1974; *The Vedic God Mitra*, Leiden, 1972 and J. Gonda, (ed.), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol I. fasc. (*The Vedic Literature*) and fasc. *Mythological Tracts*, Delhi, 1979; *Insights into Hinduism*, Delhi, 1979 and *Exercises in Indology*, Delhi, 1981.
101. In two volumes, published as vols. 31 and 32 of the Harvard Oriental Series in 1925; reprinted, Delhi, 1981.
102. *Ibid.*, vol. I, preface, p. x
103. *Supra*, paragraphs 2, 10 & 11 and n. 29.
104. A.B. Keith, op. cit., pp. 55-57.
105. *Ibid* vol. II, pp. 629-34. Much ground has been covered on this issue since the days of Keith. For a recent survey of the problem: Madhav Deshpande and Peter Edwin Hook, (eds.), *Aryan and Non-Aryan in India*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1979.
106. *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*, The Hague, 1957.
107. Naama Drury, *The Sacrificial Ritual in the Shatapatha Brahmana*, Delhi, 1981. For some useful writings on comparative studies on sacrifice and allied subjects see E.O. James' works, viz., *The Nature and Function of Priesthood*, London, 1956; *Sacrifices and Sacrament*, London, 1962 and *Origins of Sacrifice*, London, 1971.
108. e.g. Jogiraj Basu, *India of the Age of the Brahmanas*, Calcutta, 1969; Ganesh Umakant Thite, *Sacrifice in the Brahmana Texts*, Poona, 1975; G.V. Devasthali, *Religion and Mythology of the Brahmanas*, Poona, 1965; Usha Choudhuri, *Indra and Varuna in Indian Mythology*, Delhi 1981 Usha Grover, *Symbolism in the Aranyakas and their Impact on the Upanishads*, New Delhi, 1987.
109. *Priests, Warriors, and Cattle*, published in 1981 under the *Hermeneutics: Studies in the History of Religions* series of the University of California under the editorship of Kees W. Bolle.
110. *Ibid.*, appendix, pp. 179-84.
111. *Ibid.*, *passim*.
112. *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1983 and *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India*, Delhi, 1933.
113. *From Lineage to State*, Bombay, 1984.
114. R.N. Dandekar, 'Asura Varuna', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vol. 21, 1940, pp. 157-91; Contra, Wash Edward Hale, *Asura in Early Vedic Religion*, New Delhi, 1986.
115. D.D. Kosambi, 'Urvashi and Pururavas', in his *Myth and Reality*, 1962, pp 42-81.
116. Cf. J.R. Joshi, *Some Minor Divinities in Vedic Mythology and Ritual*, Pune, 1977; N.J. Shende, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Atharvaveda*, Poona, 1952; V.V. Karambelkar, *The Atharvavedic Civilization*, Nagpur, 1959; Chhanda Chakraborty, *Common Life in the Rigveda and Atharvaveda—An Account of the Folklore in the Vedic Period*, Calcutta, 1977.
117. N.N. Bhattacharyya, *Ancient Indian Rituals and their Social Contents*, Delhi, 1975.
118. Research on Ashvamedha and Purushamedha along these lines is already in progress under the supervision of the present author.
119. Paul Deussen, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, first published in 1906, Dover paperback, 1966; A.B. Keith, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, Delhi, reprint, 1970, ch. 28; R.D. Ranade, *A Constructive Survey of*

- Upanishadic Philosophy*, Bombay, 1916; A.K. Lad, *A Comparative Study of the Concept of Liberation in Indian Philosophy*, Burhanpur, 1967.
120. K.M. Shrimali, *History of Panchala*, vol. 1, Delhi, 1983, pp. 173-77.
  121. K. Damodaran, *Man and Society in Indian Philosophy*, Delhi, 1970, p. 45.
  122. Romila Thapar, General President's Address, *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 44th Session, Burdwan (1984), pp. 15-17.
  123. There is need to recognise grammatical aberrations involved in the use of more popular forms, viz., Vaishnavism and Shaivism. The forms being used here need to be popularised. Alternatively, we should use Vaishnava religion and Shaiva religion. Incidentally, usage is Buddhism and not Bauddhism. Of course, the form should be Jinism rather than Jainism.
  124. One of the earliest works is H.H. Wilson, *A Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus*. Originally appeared in two parts in *Asiatic Researches*, vols. XVI (1828) and XVII (1832); published independently in 1846, later included in vol. 1 of the *Collected Works of the author* in 1862. Though a pioneering work, it deals largely with the Vaishnava sects of the post-twelfth century period.
  125. Scholars have followed clues given by A. Barth, cf. *supra*, paragraph 3.6.
  126. For historiography of writings up to the 1960s see the contributions of Ajay Mitra Shastri and G.T. Deshpande on Vaishnavism, Shaivism and Shaktism in P.J. Chinmulgund and V.V. Mirashi, (eds.), *Review of Indological Research in Last 75 Years*, Pune, 1967, pp. 597-657.
  127. In J.N. Banerjea's *Religion in Art and Archaeology* (Radha Kumud Mookerji Lectures of 1961-2), Lucknow University, 1968, it forms a major theme rather than incidental allusions. See also R.P. Chanda, *Archaeology and Vaishnava Tradition*, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, no. 5, 1920.
  128. e.g. U. Dhal's monograph on *Lakshmi*.
  129. First published from Utrecht in 1954 and later reprinted from Delhi in 1969 For its limitations, see Suvira Jaiswal, *The Origin and Development of Vaishnavism*, New Delhi, 1981, p. 6.
  130. *Vishnuism and Shivaism*, first published in London in 1970, reprinted, Delhi, 1976.
  131. Cf. *Myth and Reality*, 1962, *passim*. For a recent review of Kosambi's hypothesis on the *Bhagavadgita*, see Vivekanand Jha, 'Social Content of the *Bhagavadgita*' *The Indian Historical Review*, vol. XI, nos. 1-2, 1984-85, pp. 1-44.
  132. *The Indian Theogony*, Cambridge, 1970; reprinted in India.
  133. First published from New Delhi in 1967. Second rev. ed., also from New Delhi, 1981.
  134. See also T.J. Solomon, 'Vaishnava Bhakti and its Autochthonous Heritage', *History of Religions*, vol. X, no 1, August 1970, pp. 32-48; D.D. Kosambi, 'The Avatara Syncretism and Possible Sources of the *Bhagavadgita*', *Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society*, XXIV-XXV, pp. 121-34.
  135. *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Shiva*, Oxford, 1973, Indian edition also from Oxford, Delhi, 1975.
  136. The author writes, 'I have used 'versions' of the Siva myths written by modern Hindu authors (R.K. Narayan, Nirad C. Chaudhuri), eighteenth century European scholars and even one contemporary Western novelist (David Staction)' (emphasis added), *op. cit.*, p. 13. In her enthusiasm to 'understand the myths *in situ*. . . and extract meanings without reducing the myths' (*op. cit.*, p. 2), she rejects text-historical method and accepts Levi-Strauss' treatment of all 'versions' of a myth, including what are usually called interpretations, as equally relevant. This methodology creates difficulties for making proper analysis of myths from the standpoint of relevance to specific material milieu. Indeed, the nature of *Religionswissenschaft* demands a proper blend of the structural and historical approaches.
  137. Published from Varanasi in 1960.
  138. Published from New Delhi in 1980.
  139. First published from Calcutta in 1965; second edition from New Delhi, 1980.
  140. For reservations on the feudal mode of production, see A Rudra, *Some Problems of Marx's Theory of History* (R.C. Dutt lectures on Political Economy, 1985) Calcutta, 1988. For a forceful and convincing rebuttal of arguments against feudal mode of production, see D.N Jha, 'Validity of the "Brahmana-Peasant Alliance" and the "Segmentary State" in Early Medieval South India', *Social Science Probing*, Vol. 1, no. 2, June, 1984, pp. 2-0-96.

141. For leading contributions in the debate on Indian Feudalism dealing with the problems of origin, feudal society, economy and ideology, see D.N. Jha, (ed.), *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, New Delhi, 1987 and for the current position of issues involved, see specially the editor's introduction therein.
142. Cf. M.G.S. Narayanan and Velutha Kesavan, 'Bhakti Movement in South India', in D.N. Jha, op. cit., pp. 348-75 for the limits of social radicalism of the movement.
143. Friedhelm Hardy, *Viraha-Bhakti: The Early History of Krishna Devotion in South India*, Oxford, 1983 For Tamil Myths as part of wider world of Sanskrit tradition, see David Dean Shulman, *Tamil Temple Myths*, Princeton, 1980.
144. Some of the recent and influential writings on the subject include, apart from the reference cited in n. 142. Kesavan Velutha. 'The Temple Base of the Bhakti Movement in South India', *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 40th Session, Waltair, 1979 (1980), pp. 185-94, reprinted in Krishna Mohan Shrimali, (ed.), *Essays in Indian Art, Religion and Society* (Indian History Congress Golden Jubilee Year Publication Series, vol. 1) New Delhi, 1987, pp. 151-59; D.N. Jha, 'Temples as Landed Magnates in Early Medieval South India (AD 700-1300)', in R.S. Sharma, (ed.), *Indian Society Historical Probing*s, Delhi, 1974, pp. 202-16 and his contributions mentioned in n. 30; M.G.S. Narayanan, 'The Philosophy and Socio-Economic Context of Land Grants in Ancient India', paper presented at the 41st session of the Indian History Congress in 1980, cyclostyled copy through the courtesy of the author; Rajan Gurukul, 'From the Royalty of Icons to the Divinity of Royalty: Aspects of Vaishnava Icons and Kingship in Medieval South India', in Ratan Parimoo, (ed.), *Vaishnavism in Indian Arts and Culture*, New Delhi, 1987, pp. 119-24 and S. Setter, 'From Vaishnavism to Shrivaisnavism: A Study of Shrivaisnava Settlements of Pre-Ramanuja Era', in Ratan Parimoo, op. cit. The overpowering influence of land grants was not confined to theistic Shaiva and Vaishnava currents. It had permeated the non-brahmanical monastic order as well and even worked for introducing theistic traits amongst these. These developments are admirably shown in such writings as, R.N. Nandi, *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan* Delhi, 1973; Idem 'Origin and Nature of Shaivite Monasticism: The case of Kalamukhas' in R.S. Sharma, (ed.) op. cit., pp. 190-201; AK. Warder, 'Feudalism and Mahayana Buddhism, in *ibid.*, pp. 156-74 and Ram Bhushan Prasad Singh, *Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka*, Delhi, 1975.
145. *The Many Faces of Murukan—The History and Meaning of a South Indian God*, The Hague, 1976-77.
146. *Ibid.*, p. 194. For another substantial work with a similar orientation and a much larger canvas, see M.G.S. Narayanan, 'The Vedic-Puranic-Shastraic Element in Tamil Sangam Society and Culture', in Krishna Mohan Shrimali, (ed.), op. cit., pp. 127-40.
147. *Tamil Temple Myths*, Princeton, 1980.
148. *Supra*, n. 136.
149. Suvira Jaiswal, Presidential Address (Ancient India Section) at the 38th Session of the Indian History Congress held at Bhubaneswar in 1977, Cf. its *Proceedings* p. 25f. See also her article, 'Studies in Early Indian Social History', *The Indian Historical Review*, vol. VI, nos. 1-2. 1979-80, pp. 1-63.
150. N.N. Bhattacharyya, *History of the Tantrik Religion*, New Delhi, 1982.
151. 'Material Milieu of Tantricism' in R.S. Sharma, (ed.), *Indian Society: Historical Probing*s, Delhi 1974, pp. 175-89; reprinted in D.N. Jha. (ed.) *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, Delhi, 1987, pp. 376-90. For agrarian expansion as a result of land grants, see R.S. Sharma, *Urban Decay in India*, (c 300-1000), Delhi, 1987, pp. 168-77.
152. Thomas B. Coburn, *Devi Mahatmya: The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition*, Delhi, 1984, see specially the Prolegomenon. Other recent works to highlight the Goddess tradition in early medieval times are: Cheever Mackenzie Brown, *God as Mother: An Historical and Theological Study of the Brahmavaivarta Purana*, Hartford (USA) 1974. John Stratton Hawley and Donna Marie Wulff, (eds.), *The Divine Consort*, first published from California in 1982. Delhi reprint, 1984. For a phenomenological study of the Shakti Cult, see Wendell C. Beane, *Myth, Cult and Symbols in Shakta Hinduism*, Leiden, 1977.
153. O.P. Misra, *Mother Goddess in Central India*, Delhi, 1985. See also Maheswar Neog, *Religions of the North East*, Delhi, 1984, chs. 5, 10, 11 and 12.
154. That even puritanical non-brahmanical religions were also forced to incorporate mother goddesses and tantric practices as a result of land grants is shown by studies,

- on trans-Viindhyan regions. Cf. R.N. Nandi, *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan*, Delhi, 1973, pp. 114–67 and Ram Bhushan Prasad Singh, *Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka*, Delhi, 1975, pp. 23–60.
155. 'Material Background of the Origin of Buddhism' first published in Mohit Sen and M.B. Rao, *Das Kapital Centenary Volume: A Symposium*, Delhi, 1968, pp. 59–66, revised and updated in author's *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1983, ch. 7. Uma Chakravarti's *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*, Delhi, 1987 is a useful addition. Though not very original, it enlightens us further on the role of *gahapatis* in the growth of early Buddhism, which is in essence, only an amplification of Kosambi's hypothesis. On the early medieval context, however, R.A.L.H. Gunawardana's *Robe and Plough* University of Arizona, 1979, is an incisive work, though dealing with Ceylonese Buddhism.
  156. Warder, 'Feudalism and Mahayana Buddhism', in R.S. Sharma, (ed.), *Indian Society: Historical Probing*, Delhi, 1974, pp. 156–74.
  157. N.R. Guseva, *Jainism*, Translated from Russian by Y.S. Redkar, Bombay, 1971.
  158. *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, 2nd ed., Bombay, 1975 and *The Culture and Civilisation of Ancient India in Historical Outline*, London, 1965.
  159. For an assessment of Kosambi's method see D.N. Jha, 'A Marxist View of Ancient Indian History' in Mohit Sen and M.B. Rao, op. cit., pp. 166–80.
  160. *Lokayata*. New Delhi, 1959 and *Indian Atheism*, Calcutta, 1969.
  161. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Religion and Society*, Bangalore, 1987, pp. 90–115.
  162. See also R.N. Nandi, 'Client, Ritual and Conflict in Early Brahmanical Order', *The Indian Historical Review*, vol. VI, nos. 1–2, 1979–80, pp. 64–118.
  163. First published in Belgium in 1983; Indian reprint, New Delhi, 1984.
  164. Krishna Mohan Shrimali, (ed.) *Essays in Indian Art, Religion and Society*, New Delhi 1987. Introduction, specially f5. 8.
  165. Ake Hultkrantz, 'An Ecological Approach to Religion', *Ethnos*, vol. 31, 1966, pp. 131–50; Idem, 'Ecology of Religion: Its Scope and Methodology', *Review of Ethnology*, vol. 4, 1974, pp. 1–12.
  166. Julian Haynes Steward, *Theory of Culture Change*, Illinois, 1955.
  167. Hultkrantz, 'Ecology of Religion: Its Scope and Methods', in Lauri Honko, (ed.) *Science of Religion: Studies in Methodology*, The Hague, 1979, p. 222.
  168. Ecological approach to religion is perhaps traceable to the Frankforts' description of ecological situation that influenced Near Eastern religions and was also implied in the doctrine of the older evolutionists that experiences of Nature provided man with gods and myths. Cf. H. and H.A. Frankfort, 'The Emancipation of Thought from Myth' in H. Frankfort et al., (eds.), *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, Chicago, 1946, pp. 363–73 and Max Müller's views (*supra*, paragraphs 2.2 and 3.6). But there had not been any attempt to systematize a theoretical framework.
  169. Cf. Hultkrantz in Lauri Honko, op. cit., pp. 227–28. See also discussion of Levi-Strauss' structuralism, *supra*, paragraphs 220–21.
  170. While Hultkrantz has clearly been influenced by the cultural ecology of Steward, another enthusiast of the ecological approach to religion, viz., Svein Bjerke ('Ecology of Religion, Evolutionism and Comparative Religion', in Lauri Honko, op. cit., pp. 242–46) adopts the model of a few other cultural ecologists, i.e. Sahlins and Service (Cf. M.D. Sahlins and E.R. Service, *Evolution and Culture*, University of Michigan, 1960 and E. Service, *Primitive Social Organization*, New York, 1962). The latter model enables Bjerke to postulate 'new evolutionism' in religion. He argues: 'By grouping together societies of roughly the same technology and socio-political level of integration, one can distinguish between the familistic band level. . . characteristic of hunters and gatherers, the tribal level of horticulturists and pastoralists, which lacks any centralized political system, the chiefdom level which is defined on the basis of redistributive economic system, and the state level defined on the basis of the claim for monopoly in the use of force made by the political authorities.'
  171. Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, New York, p. 1968, p. 4; see also, Marvin Harris, 'The Cultural Ecology of India's Sacred Cattle', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 7, no. 1, February 1966, pp. 51–66. For contra, see Alan Heston, 'An Approach to the Sacred Cow of India', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 12, no. 2, April 1971, p. 191–209. The basic dispute between Harris and Heston is on the relative utility of ecologic and economic models.
  172. For a critique of Hultkrantz's distinction between the ecologically explainable type of religion and the historically explainable features which are not part of the type

- of religion', which is based on his adopting of the aforesaid model of Steward, see Svein Bjerke in Lauri Honko, *op. cit.* pp. 240-42.
173. e.g. Hultkrantz is aware that Steward dismissed the importance of historical factors in forming culture. Morris Freil tested Steward's cultural ecology on Negroes and East Indians of Trinidad and found that these groups, who differ in cultural traditions but make the same ecological adaptation, lack a 'common core' related to the mode of adaptation. Though Hultkrantz is not convinced of this argument because 'subsistence activities' of the two groups have not been taken into account, he is willing to consider another objection to this approach. *viz.*, we have no fixed criteria by which to judge whether features should be attributed to the culture core or to invention, diffusion or cultural heritage.
  174. Notwithstanding the need to undertake further sophistication of different fields of ecology and the need for differentiation and qualification when speaking about the ecology of religion (cf. G.C. Oosthuizen's comments on Hultkrantz's views in Lauri Honko, (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 271-85), it may be said to the credit of Hultkrantz that he is not unaware of the possibilities of applying his approach to religions in modern cultures, e.g. different patterns of urban and rural religions, cf. also D Luth et al., 'An Ecological Approach to the Study of Religious Movements', *Bulletins of the American Anthropological Association*, 1-3 (1968), pp. 87f. The technological environment penetrating into the contents of belief is shown by fieldwork amongst Waldensians in Italy (cf. Manfred Buttner in Lauri Honko, *op. cit.*, pp. 253-55) and patterns of pilgrimage and cult sites in nineteenth century France, cf. Alphonse Dupront, 'Religion and Religious Anthropology, in Jacques Le Goffe and Pierre Nora (eds.), *Constructing the Past: Essays in Historical Methodology*, Cambridge, 1985, pp. 123-50.
  175. Edmund Perry in Lauri Honko, *op. cit.*, pp. 286-87.
  176. Given this crucial importance of cattle to both cultures, the comparison between the Nilotes and the Indo-Iranians (or even Indo-Europeans) has been suggested fairly often in the past. V. Gordon Childe wrote as far back as 1926, 'In my opinion the state of things observed among many of the cow-keeping tribes of the Sudan and other parts of Africa approximates most closely the primitive Aryan economy', *The Aryans*, New York, p. 84. H.S. Nyberg, Widengren, Piggott, Lommel and Duchesne-Guillemin have also suggested the comparison, but no systematic study had been made till Lincoln took up the problem.
  177. e.g., Anaximander, the first known Greek map-maker, looked on the world as a manifestation of a religious principle, *viz.*, the inviolability of the spatial order. The brahmanical and Jaina view of universe in India similarly look upon geographical and topographical features from a purely sectarian perspective.
  178. For a brief survey of work done in the western world, see John D. Gay, *The Geography of Religion in England*, London, 1971.
  179. Alphonse Dupront, 'Religion and Religious Anthropology', in Jacques Le Goffe and Pierre Nora, (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 123-50.
  180. D.D. Kosambi, *Myth and Reality*, Bombay, 1962, pp. 82-151.
  181. *Supra*, paragraphs 3.3-5.
  182. This contention has been reiterated by Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, cf. *Religion and Society*, pp. 62-68, where Joseph Needham's analysis of Confucian China as depicted in his *The Great Titration: Science and Society in East and West*, London, 1979, pp. 168-69 has also been cited. In the context of the Harappans, it has been put forward earlier by Kosambi (*An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, pp. 63-64) and S.C. Malik (*Indian Civilization: The Formative Period*, pp. 99-105).
  183. We have argued elsewhere about the limitations of the use of 'Aryan' and the changing frontier of 'Aryan' and 'non-Aryan', cf. our *History of Panchala*, vol. I, 1983, pp. 23-29. See also A. Ghosh, *The City in Early Historical India*, Simla, 1973, p. 4 and Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-115.
  184. R.N. Nandi, *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan*, Delhi, 1973; from the two maps at the end it appears that the data for Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh have not been harnessed fully. See also Ram Bhushan Prasad Singh, *Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka*, Delhi, 1975, map at the end.
  185. Cf. S. Settar, 'From Vaishnavism to Shrivaisnavism: A Study of Shrivaisnava Settlements of Pre-Ramanuja Era', in Ratan Parimoo, (ed.), *Vaishnavism in Indian Arts and Culture*, New Delhi, 1987.
  186. Friedhelm Hardy, *Viraha-Bhakti: The Early History of Krishna Devotion in South India*, Oxford, 1983, pp. 256-61 and six maps between pp. 256 and 257.

187. *Ibid.*, see particularly pp. 274–75 where the poetic dedication of temples is discussed.
188. Cf. Kesavan Veluthat, 'The Temple Base of the Bhakti Movement in South India', in Krishna Mohan Shrivasthi, (ed.), *Essay in Indian Art, Religion and Society*, Delhi, 1987, pp. 151–59; M.G.S. Narayanan and Veluthat Kesavan, 'Bhakti Movement in South India', in D.N. Jha, (ed.), *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, Delhi, 1987, pp. 348–75; Y. Subbarayaluy, *Political Geography of the Chola Country*, Madras, 1973; George W. Spencer, 'The Sacred Geography of the Tamil Shaivite Hymns,' *Numen*, vol. 17, December 1970, pp. 232–44. See also Kamil Zvevbeil, *The Smile of Murugan*, Leiden, 1973, pp. 198–99 for the importance of the cult of places sacred to both Shaiva and Vaishnava saints.
189. For an excellent exposition of the cult, see S. Settar, *Inviting Death*, Dharwad. 1986; *Idem*, *Pursuing Death*, Dharwad, 1988.
190. Cf. S. Settar and Gunther D. Sontheimer, (eds.), *Memorial Stones: A Study of their Origin, Significance and Variety*, Dharwad and Heidelberg, 1982.
191. Cf. D.D. Kosambi, *Myth and Reality*, Bombay, 1962, pp. 3–32.
192. Romila Thapar, 'Death and the Hero, in S.C. Humphreys and Helen King', (eds.), *Mortality and Immortality—The Anthropology and Archaeology of Death*, London, 1981, pp. 294, 310–11.
193. Cf. *supra*, paragraph 3.18 dealing with the rise of tantricism. Yet another example of cultural integration is noticeable in the transformation of a herostone into a deity, viz, the cult of Vithoba at Pandharpur (Maharashtra). Cf. S.G. Tulpule, 'The Origin of Vithala: A New Interpretation', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vols. 58–59, 1977–78, pp. 1009–1015.
194. *Supra*, paragraph 4.10.
195. Manfred Buttner in Lauri Honko, (ed.), *Science of Religion*, The Hague, 1979, p. 254.
196. Alphonse Dupr nt, 'Religion and Religious Anthropology,' in Jacques Le Goffe and Pierre Nora, (eds.), *Constructing the Past*, pp. 123–50.
197. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
198. Some important writings on this aspect are: Makhan Jha, *Dimensions of Pilgrimage: an Anthropological Appraisal*, New Delhi, 1985; L.P. Vidyarthi, 'Thinking About Sacred City,' *Eastern Anthropologist*, vol. XIII, no. 4; L.P. Vidyarthi and Makhan Jha, *Symposium on the Sacred Complexes of India*, Ranchi, 1974; S.M. Bhardwaj, *Hindu Places of Pilgrimage in India: A Study in Cultural Geography*, Berkeley, 1973; E. Alan Morris, *Pilgrimage in the Hindu Tradition: A Case Study of West Bengal*, Delhi, 1984; B.B. Goswami and S.G. Morab, 'Comparative Study of Sacred Complexes India, A Working Paper', *Journal of Social Research*, vol. XIII, no. 2, 1970, pp. 95f.; L.P. Vidyarthi, *The Sacred Complex in Hindu Gaya*, Bombay 1961; Milton Singer, 'The Cultural Pattern of Indian Civilisation—A Preliminary Report of the Methodological Field study,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 1, 1955.
199. P.V. Kane, *History of Dharamashastra*, vol. IV, Poona, 1973, pp. 581–82, 730–825.
200. R.S. Sharma, *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India*, New Delhi, 1983, pp. 236–37.
201. e.g. V.N. Hari Rao, *The Srirangam Temple*, Tirupati, 1967; J.M. Somasundaram Pillai, *The Great Temple at Tanjore*, Tanjore, 2nd rev. ed., 1958; Douglas Barrett and Moreshwar G. Dikshit, *Mukhalingam, Sirpur and Rajim Temples*, Bombay, 1960; K.K. Pillay, *The Suchindrale Temple*, Madras, 1953, T.V. Mahalingam, *The South Indian Temple Complex*, Dharwar, 1970.
202. Debjani Paul, 'Antiquity of the Vishnupada at Gaya: Tradition and Archaeology', *East and West* (N.S.) vol. 35 nos. 1–3, September 1985, pp. 103–41. I owe this reference to my colleague Dr. Dilip K. Chakrabarti.
203. It is regretted that even such an intensive study as Savitri V. Kumar, *The Puranic Lore of Holy Water-Places*, New Delhi, 1983 does not note of the milieu in which the phenomenon of tirthas seems to have developed.
204. R.N. Nandi, *Social Roots of Religion in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1986, p. 48.
205. R.N. Nandi, 'Agrarian Growth and Social Conflicts in Early Feudal India,' *Social Science Probing*s, vol. II, no. 2, June, 1985, pp. 168–69.
206. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *On Religion*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975.
207. *Ibid.*, p. 38, extract from *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law*.
208. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
209. *Ibid.*
210. *Ibid.*, p. 38. For other statements of Marx and Engels on religion and ideology see extracts from *The German Ideology* (written in 1845–46), ch. 1; *Manifesto of the*

- Communist Party* (1847–48), ch. 2 and 3; *Capital*, vol. I (1867); *Anti-Duhring* (1878) and *Ludwig Feuerbach and End of Classic German Philosophy* (1886). For all these extracts, see *ibid.*, pp. 65–72, pp. 78–79, 117–19, 128–29, and 214–32.
211. Jorge Larrain, *Marxism and Ideology*, London, 1983, p. 42. The work takes considerable pain to show how, with few exceptions, the most important Marxist theoreticians have developed a 'positive and neutral conception' which conceives various ideologies existing in terms of the interests of opposed classes. See particularly ch. 2 where the change in the meaning of ideology from Marx to Gramsci has been delineated.
  212. Cf. Max Weber, *The Sociology of Religion*, trans., by Ephraim Fischhoff, 1963 and A. Gramsci, *Selections from the 'Prison Notebooks'*, London, 1971, p. 376.
  213. Clifford Geertz, 'Ideology of a Cultural System', in D. Apter, (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*, New York, 1964.
  214. Some representative writings grappling with these problems include, Clifford Geertz, 'Religion as a Cultural System', in M. Banton, (ed.), *Anthropological Approaches to Religion*, London, 1966; P. Hirst and P. Woolley, *Social Relations and Human Attributes*, London, 1980, S. Lukes, 'Some Problems about Rationality', in B.R. Wilson, (ed.), *Rationality*, Oxford, 1970 and M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, London, 1970. All the relevant extracts from these writings have been compiled in Robert Boccock and Kenneth Thompson, (eds.), *Religion and Ideology: A Reader*, Manchester, 1985.
  215. A. Gramsci, *op. cit.*, *passim*. For Gramsci's indebtedness to Lukacs, see Jorge Larrain, *op. cit.*, pp. 69–87. See also Perry Anderson, 'The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci', *New Left Review*, no. 100, November 1976-January 1977.
  216. *Supra*, paragraph 2.22.
  217. Cf. Maurice Godelier, 'Infrastructures, Societies, and History', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 19, no. 4, December 1978, pp. 763–71 and 'The Emergence and Development of Marxism in Anthropology in France', in Ernest Gellner, (ed.), *Soviet and Western Anthropology*, London, 1980, pp. 3–18.
  218. Max Adler, 'Ideology and Appearance', in T. Bottomore and P. Godde, (eds.), *Austro-Marxism*, Oxford, 1978, pp. 254–55.
  219. See references under n. 217.
  220. *Ibid.* Cf. also Gregor McLennan, *Marxism and the Methodologies of History*, London, 1981, ch. 3.
  221. Maurice Godelier, 'Infrastructures, Societies, and History', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 19, no. 4, December 1978, p. 765.
  222. Engels himself wrote in 1886, 'Every ideology, however, once it has arisen, develops in connection with the given concept—material, and develops this material further; otherwise it would not be an ideology', in *Ludwig Feurbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, cited in Marx-Engels, *On Religion*, p. 229.
  223. *Supra*, paragraph 3.3–5.
  224. Cf. particularly S.C. Malik, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 72).
  225. *Man Makes Himself*, p. 154.
  226. Romila Thapar, *The Mauryas Revisited*—S.G. Deuskar Lectures on Indian History (1984), Calcutta, 1987, pp. 1–31.
  227. *Supra*, section III.
  228. *History of Panchal*, vol. 1, Delhi, 1983, pp. 173–77.
  229. R.S. Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1959, pp. 103–18.
  230. The idea was put forward by Barton Stein in his *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*, New Delhi, 1980 and exploded by D. N. Jha, 'Validity of "Brahmana-Peasant Alliance" and the "Segmentary State" in Early Medieval South India', *Social Science Probings*, vol. I, no. 2, June 1984, pp. 270–95.
  231. *Supra*, ns. 142 and 144.
  232. For South Indian marketing hierarchy in the Chola age, see Kenneth R. Hall, *Trade and Statecraft in the Age of Cholas*, New Delhi, 1980, *passim*.
  233. Clifford Geertz, 'Ideology as a Cultural System,' reproduced in Robert Boccock and Kenneth Thompson, *Religion and Ideology: A Reader*, Manchester, 1985, p. 83. Cf. this with Antonio Gramsci's recognition 'mass adhesion or non-adhesion to an ideology is the real critical test of the rationality and historicity of modes of thinking', *Prison Notebooks*, London, 1971, p. 341. See also Georges Duby, 'The Diffusion of Cultural Patterns in Feudal Society,' *Past and Present*, April, 1968.