Socio-Political Change in Nineteenth Century Orissa and the Rise of Mahima Dharma

FANINDAM DEO
Khariar College
Khariar

Mahima Dharma emerged in central and west Orissa during the 19th century. This *dharma* has so far received very little attention from scholars. The argument in the following pages suggests that through a proper analysis of Mahima Dharma a more elaborate understanding of the evolution of the social milieu of Orissa can be arrived at.

The study of this *dharma* becomes particularly important in view of its links with socio-political unrest in Orissa through the 19th century. Having ousted the Marathas, the British were engaged in consolidating their position during this period. As a part of this process they gave recognition to the local rajas, maharajas and petty chiefs of different estates as feudatory chiefs and *zamindars* of different estates.

On their part these rulers, while claiming independent status, were also trying to consolidate and legitimize their position. Towards achieving this end an important strategy was the propagation of 'Hinduism'—particularly of the Jagannath cult. Besides building Jagannath temples in their capitals, land grants were given for the purpose of building temples and also to Brahmanas and non-tribal services holders. These practices of the local rulers accelerated by the 18th and 19th centuries. Predictably the sufferers were the local tribals and lower sections of *jati* society who were as a result either displaced or exploited.

However, the socio-cultural environment of 19th century Orissa and many of the social and cultural processes emerging therein—such as tribal interaction with non-tribal, intra and inter tribal interaction, changing religious milieu, the emerging patterns of social stratification etc.—all encompass substantial trends rooted in pre-colonial times. Accordingly, any comprehensive analysis of the historical processes behind this movement has to extend to a period preceding colonialism.

I

With the disintegration of the Gupta empire, there arose numerous kingships at the local, sub-regional and regional levels throughout

northern and central India.[1] In Orissa this period saw the emergence
of a rural convergence of political power, led by autochthonous chiefs
and in some cases by chiefs of obscure origin.[2] Local chiefs formed
small kingdoms in the riverine basins and became champions of
'Hinduism'.[3] To gain spiritual authority and thus to strengthen their
claim to be rulers, the local rulers welcomed Brahmanas to their courts.
On their part the Brahmanas prepared myths and genealogies
purporting to legitimise the authority of the new chieftains.[4]

However while seeking such legitimacy, most among such chieftains
who originated from one or the other local aboriginal group,
simultaneously sought to maintain their links with the autochthons
and integrate them into their kingdoms. To sustain their rule they
needed at least the co-operation, if not loyalty, of the aboriginals who
constituted the bulk of the population. Clearly the rulers could not
displace the pastoral hunting society as perhaps happened in South
India.[5] This, incidentally, is a special feature of the formation of
kingdoms in this area. Rather than 'sustained displacement' the local
formation was 'marked by the local acculturation of tribes' which were
increasingly brought into the Brahmanic society and transformed
mostly into peasants and other occupational castes.[6]

In many ways the history of the area is conspicuous in terms of its
synthesis of aboriginal and Brahmanic elements which culminated in
the Jagannath culture of Orissa. As part of establishing their hegemony,
local rulers assimilated aboriginal deities into their beliefs. The
aboriginal stone objects could be easily identified with the Shiva linga.
A good example of this process is available in the Lingaraja temple at
Bhubaneshwar where even today both Badus (aboriginals) as well as
Brahmans are priests.[7]

Furthermore, royal patronage of aboriginal deities served to
consolidate the legitimisation of the rulers and the political power
they exercised over the newly acquired territories. In this process,
Vaisnavism was important: illustrated again by Lord Jagannath of Puri,
an aboriginal deity Hinduised as an incarnation (*avatar*) of Vishnu.[8]

The political development of Orissa in the post-Gupta period was
marked by the emergence of small kingdoms and the gradual
integration of these small kingdoms, first into sub-regional and later
regional kingdoms. For instance, in the upper Mahanadi Valley—
present western Orissa and eastern Madhya Pradesh—a chief of
obscure origin could establish a small kingdom called Sarabhapuria
kingdom around 6th century AD.[9] The upper Mahanadi valley
provided him with fertile land in which to establish a kingdom. There
was an attempt to improve the irrigation facilities also.[10] Subsequently

Brahmanas were invited and deliberately settled in the interior. Perhaps this was in order to initiate a process of acculturation and thereby sedenterise the hunting, gathering and shifting cultivation communities as settled agriculturists.[11] Fortuitously, after the decline of the Gupta empire, the Brahmanas of North India were in search of patrons[12] and the newly emerging chiefs, on the other hand, wanted these Brahmanas' services for legitimising their claims.[13] The political articulation of Orissa was marked by local, sub-regional and regional, lateral integration from below. This process extended over centuries, ending when the regional entity broke up, particularly with the advent of the sultan of Bengal.

The disintegration of the Gupta empire helped the indigenous chiefs of the locality to extend their political authority in their respective areas. Over a period of time this resulted in the emergence of powerful kingdoms led by Amaryakula of Saravapura, Panduvansis of Mekela, Sailodbhavas of Kongada Mandala, Bhaumakaras of Tosali, Somavansis of Kosala and Gangavansis of Kalinga. Between the 5th and the 14th century the impulses of political fragmentation and decentralisation were caused from below and not from above. Aboriginal chiefs and those of obscure origin, taking advantage of a weak central authority rose to power and formed separate small kingdoms. Here we come across the interesting conjunction of an emerging ruler and immigrant Brahamanas: the ambitious chiefs laying claim to political authority had the patron-searching Brahmanas serving them for justifying their claims.

In Orissa during the 15th and 16th centuries, a process can be observed similar to what has been observed elsewhere in north India.[14] The disintegration of Ganga and Somavansi kingdoms resulted in decentralisation and political fragmentation. This resulted partly from partitions in the ruling family and partly from the widespread practice of granting big and small territories to vassals who entrenched themselves territorially and finally became independent potentates.

Another important aspect of political development of Orissa was the tendency of rulers of sub-regional kingdoms to shift their capital towards coastal Orissa. Besides other factors the prime motive seems to have been a desire to control the fertile coastal plains and thereby sustain a larger regional kingdom which needed elaborate administration. The hinterlands of Orissa with its hills, forests, preponderant presence of hunter-gatherers and a few pockets of settled agriculture could sustain the demands of small kingdoms only. So when the small kingdoms expanded into regional kingdoms they shifted to the more fertile plains which could generate the necessary

surplus. Accordingly we find that the geographical boundaries of these kingdoms were never fixed. The rulers of regional kingdoms also had to adopt different strategies and incorporate different ideologies to bring small kingdoms under their hegemony while simultaneously legitimising their claims to new constantly changing boundaries.

II

The sixteenth century history of Orissa is marked by the growth of Brahmanic dominance, discontent amongst the masses, disintegration of the regional empire, rise of Samanta rajas and their bid for power and independent states, attack by the sultan of Bengal, and finally in the last decade, capture by the Mughals.

Between the 12th and 16th centuries, Jagannath had been mono-polised by the Brahmanas and the regional emperor. Jagannath temples were confined to Cuttack and Puri until the 16th century. But after the 16th century the rajas of Sambalpur, Keonjhar, and Mayurbhanj constructed Jagannath temples in their respective capitals. According to Kulke, Jagannath had grown into a symbol of Hindu kingship and royal authority. He considers the construction of Jagannath temples as a symbolic declaration of independence.[15]

By the 16th century, we also notice a range of intermediaries between the ruler and the peasant; the emergence of younger branches of the ruling family controlling separately the territories inherited by them throughout Orissa. The practice of granting small territories to the younger branches of the ruling family, along with fiscal and administrative rights over them, and also fresh conquests by younger branches for their own consolidation, resulted in political fragmentation. These younger branches of older ruling families entrenched themselves territorially and ultimately emerged as independent rajas.

These rajas, emulating the elder branch, tried to augment their own resources and estate. First they needed an agricultural surplus for maintaining the state machinery. They accelerated the clearing of forests, inviting the non-tribal peasants to settle in their respective rajyas. Digging of ponds and the construction of embankments by the peasants followed thereafter. In many places in the hinterland though the forests were cleared, the local deities of the forest people were now worshipped even by the new settlers. In many places the tribal priests (jhankar) were retained. The rulers patronised the local deities and elevated them to the position of their Esta Devi or tutelary deity: Sambaleswari at Sambalpur, Pataneswari at Patnagath, Raktambari at

Khariar, Bhatarika at Baramba, Maninageswari at Ranpur, Manikeswari at Bhuwanipatna. Consequently, in Orissa we find tribal priests performing *pooja* in temples. In the Devi and Siva temples of Orissa, besides the tribal priests, it is from the unusual *jatis* like *mali, thanapatis, paiks* that villages inhabited by both tribals and non-tribals get their priests. Till the 16th century Jagannath ideology was not used by the chiefs of hinterland of Orissa for their legitimisation in their respective area rather the *thakurani* or devi of the aboriginals was utilised.

The Samanta rajas, their relatives and service-holders might have encroached upon lands which the aborigines had held communally during this phase of expansion. The lands and villages were granted, to such relatives of the rulers family as the *pattayats* (the second son), *lalu* (the third son), *baboo* (the sons of a concubine/mistress); to the *rani*, the queen, as *khorak-posak* (maintenance estate); to the Brahman as *brahmottar* and *sasana*, and to the *dalabehera* and *nayak* (military chiefs both tribal and non-tribals). Custom required this upper stratum of society not to wield the plough. Therefore these people, in turn, rented land to cultivators. Immediately below the privileged class were the economically superior aboriginals who aspired to Kshatriya status. Their superiority was recognised by the local rulers who gave them a higher position in the kingdom. This recognition by the ruler combined with their economic superiority secured for them a higher social status. This left the vast majority of the aboriginal community and low ranking service *jatis* at the bottom of the social structure.

The sultan of Bengal attacked Orissa in AD 1568.[16] His deputy Kalapahad destroyed images of the Jagannath temple of Puri and the Sun temple of Konark. Taking advantage of the internal dissension of the Samanta rajas—perhaps some of the rajas even invited the sultan of Bengal—the latter captured Orissa easily. Then came the Mughals in 1580s who captured Orissa from the sultan. Man Singh was appointed as the governor and a new *bandobast* or settlement was introduced in Orissa in 1582.[17] According to this settlement the fertile coastal region was taken under direct management, Puri was declared as crown land and the hinterland of Orissa was given to twenty four local ruler according to a their respective zones of influence. They were recognised as Garhjat chiefs or semi-autonomous chief in return for an annual payment. The raja of Khurdha was recognised as the Gajapati but he was given Puri-Khurdha and thirty one small *zamindars* only.[18]

In the changed circumstances the Gajapati of Puri lost political power, his resource base and was confined to a limited area. There were bitter contests between local rajas, the sultan of Bengal and the

Mughal governor of Orissa for control over the temple city. Obviously the wealth and pilgrim tax of the Puri temple were the main attractions. For nearly 150 years uncertainty prevailed. Between 1600 and 1750 A.D. the Jagannath temple was attacked not less than 12 times by Hindu chiefs, Muslim sultans and Mughal governors. The Mughals recognised the intermediaries who had appeared during the earlier period; some of whom came to be called *zamindars*. The small local raja's territory was called Garhjat, and the raja Garhjatraja. Though the above terms were used, in reality none of them actually owned land in the sense of having private property rights. The land in the fertile coastal plain of Orissa was divided by the Mughals into two; the best lands they kept under their direct management while the rest were given to the service holders for their maintenance but not with property rights.

The Marathas got coastal Orissa in 1751 and western Orissa in 1755. They captured Puri in 1751 and reduced the Khurdha raja to being a mere *zamindar* of a few estates. They, furthermore, divided Orissa into two major political divisions: Mughalbandi and Garhjats. Twenty four Garhjat chiefs of the hilly and forest tracts in the interior of Orissa were recognised and required to pay a fixed annual tribute. There was, however, no definite rule for fixing this tribute and they were, therefore, almost autonomous. The Mughalbandi area was divided into four *chaklas* or divisions and was under the direct management of the Marathas.[19] They further divided *chaklas* to into *parganas* which were managed by thirty two *amils*. At the lowest level the *mukaddams* and *talukadars* were appointed to collect revenue. The Marathas granted rent free lands to temples, Brahmanas and *maths*.

Both the Mughals and the Marathas did not bring the Garhjats under their direct administration. They were satisfied with collecting an annual tribute so long as the loyalty to the rajas was assured. Rather than dealing with people at large, they preferred to pressurise the chiefs. In other words, the Mughals and Marathas did not have any significant direct impact on the manner in which the social milieu was evolving in the Garhjats. But in the coastal plains the reduction of the position of the Gajapati of Orissa and the appointment of *zamindars*, *jagirdars* had its impact in entire Orissa. The *zamindars*, *jagirdars* and the Garhjat chiefs exercised control over the cultivators but they were not given hereditary rights over land. During the time of Mughal and Maratha rule the Garhjat rajas consolidated their position in a slow and long process. The rajas recognised the tribal chiefs as *gahatia*, *dalabehera*, *muthahid* and *gartia* etc. The latter also obtained areas over which they exercised power on the basis of a military tenure. For this they were obliged to perform military service upon demand. Some

powerful tribal chiefs who did not submit to such a tenure were won over by matrimonial alliances. The rajas also depended upon the tribals, who were in a majority, for recruiting his *paiks* (soldiery).

The recognition of the *gahatia, muthahid, gartia* helped to establish a range of intermediaries between the Garhjat raja and the peasant. These rajas also invited non-tribals with their experience of developed agriculture to generate more surplus. Possibly, these non-tribals were invited from outside not to introduce intensive agriculture on the lands of tribals but to clear forests for extending cultivation or perhaps to settle in the land vacated in the process of shifting cultivation. These rulers seldom transgressed limits that were acceptable to tribals or rather they dared not do so. The availability of considerable fallow land and forest might have enabled them to expand agriculture without encroaching upon tribal land and villages. Nonetheless, during this phase the tribal chiefs faced various pressures from the rajas, their relatives, Brahmanas, service holders, the Mughals, and Marathas. Yet they remained dominant in their own area. Moreover, this kind of pressure was exerted mainly on the tribal chiefs but there was little pressure on the general tribal population.

At this stage perhaps the Garhjat chiefs felt the need to authenticate their status and the exercise of political authority over their territory. They had to legitimise not only their superior position but also the rapid growth of social differentiation. There was also a need to account for the increasing power of the ruler. Therefore, in support of their position, they sponsored the composition of myths of their origin and *rajapuranas*.[20] With the end of the regional empire of Orissa, furthermore, there was a shortage of patrons for Brahmanas in coastal Orissa. Perhaps during this period the Brahmanas of Utkala migrated to the Garhjat estates in search of patrons, as had happened in northern India after the disintegration of the Gupta empire (supra). These myths and *rajapuranas* placed the rajas as superior beings, *Raja-Mahapuru* or God sent person, sent to preserve the *rajya*. It was contended that his absence would lead to anarchy. This helped both horizontal and vertical legitimisation of the Garhjat chiefs. These *rajapuranas* were utilized at the Puri darbar when the Jagannath temple was reopened in 18th century.[21] It also legitimised the raja as being a *Raja-Mahapuru* amongst the tribals and ethnic groups.

So we see by the 18th century the rulers had absorbed some territories for themselves (*bhogra*), their relatives (*khorak-posak*), their God and goddesses (*debottar*), for Brahmanas (*brahmottar*) and for service holders. The rajas demanded the nominal allegiance of the tribal chiefs but, beyond that, the vast majority of the tribals were left

more or less undisturbed. However, the very recognition of these tribal chiefs led to an elevation in their status. This intensified the process of social stratification which had quite early beginnings. Various levels of intermediaries appeared and the ssocio-political system became increasingly complex. The rajas recognised these intermediaries by receiving even a nominal allegiance or tribute, in which, the hierarchical arrangement was acted out.

III

The British occupied south Orissa in 1768, north and coastal Orissa in 1808 and western Orissa in 1818. The above areas were placed under the Madras, Bengal, and Central provinces respectively. British colonial rulers realised the special importance that these Garhjat rulers had for administrative purposes in the relatively unproductive and inaccessible hill and forest regions of Orissa. These rulers were retained under the all India colonial policy of 'protection of ancient families and continuation of their dignity and representation.'[22] This policy was a political necessity, for the colonial state, and it later proved helpful e.g., during the *paik* revolt of Khurda, in 1817, tribal movements of Chumsar and Sambalpur, in the 1830's and during the revolt of 1857, these feudatory chiefs and *zamindars* co-operated with the British and helped them in capturing some of the leaders of these rebellions and protest movement.[23]

This policy of colonial rulers also had other far reaching consequences. In the 19th century the British defeated the Marathas in Orissa. In the changed circumstances the local rajas realised that the colonial rulers were powerful enough to protect them against both internal and external dangers. The British on their part wanted an alliance with the local rajas for their own reasons. So the alliance was struck between colonial rulers and local rajas. The rajas agreed to pay a certain annual tribute, and the former agreed to provide assistance as and when required so long as the rajas' loyalty to British crown was assured.

In the emerging situation, a four-tier stratification followed: (1) the elder branches of Raj families as feudatory chiefs (2) the younger branches and a few tribal chiefs as rajas and *zamindars*, (3) *umrao, majhi, gahatia, muthahid* as *gaotia/thekedar* of the villages, and (4) the general mass, both tribal and non-tribal as peasants and landless labourers. Secondly, the rajas and *zamindars* enjoyed police and magisterial powers under the protection of the colonial regime.[24] This upset the earlier social and political balance with the tribals. Previously

the rajas had not dared to antagonise the tribals; they had avoided the displacement of tribals and had never transgressed the limit to acceptability. With the rajas now no more dependent on the support of the tribals skilled cultivators from outside were invited and settled in tribal villages. The regular collection of revenue from each village was started and for this purpose villages were given on *thika* (auctioned). Feeling more secure and protected, these rajas even took repressive measures wherever the tribals opposed them. Not only the *zamindars* but even their officials exploited them.

The gradual transformation of what had been gift (given by tribals to the raja) into dues (as revenue demand) by the Garhjat chiefs under British protection, and the establishment of a *zamindar* and *raiyat* relationship, alienated the tribal headman from his fellow tribesmen. In the 19th century the *thekedari* system further eroded tribal agrarian relations. Under the new system the tribal headmen were forced to collect more revenue from their territory to compete with the non-tribal *thekedars* who had entered these parts as horse-traders, distillers and moneylenders. Monetisation spread with the introduction of the new system of taxation and commutation of feudal dues and services into cash.[25] The colonial rulers' bureaucratic capabilities had an unprecedented and long reach. The system's administrative fingers spread to the heart of many formerly unadministered areas. All this had its direct impact on the society thereby affecting its social structure, economic and agrarian institutions and political system. Tribal society was losing grip over resources and environment as the encroachment of the land and forest by outsiders increased.

Under this kind of multi-dimensional pressure different groups responded in different ways at different times. Some of them accepted a low position in some places; others aspired for high rank and became part of the Garhjat state. Yet other groups could not cope with the external pressures and withdrew to the inaccessible areas and there were times when they revolted against exploitation.[26] As a result the people came to be divided into four groups (i) the vast majority of small and marginal farmers and landless labourers (ii) a few *zamindars* Garhjat rajas (iii) a groups of *gaotia/thekedars*, protected and unprotected and (iv) those who chose to withdraw themselves to the interior.

In the 19th century there were movements against the system. In some places the tribal aristocracy actively participated with the non-tribal aristocracy, seeking a better political dispensation for themselves but able to use their traditional ties to bring the dissatisfied tribals,

peasants and other groups also to the movement. At other times and places a particular tribal group would revolt under its own leader who may not necessarily have been a chief. Such revolts could be against the emerging social system in which the lowly placed *jatis* actively participated and in which the *paiks* gave tacit support. The alienation of land, the breakdown of mutuality, the imposition of restrictions and cesses affected the community as a whole and prompted it to rise against the *sarkar-raja-thekedar* nexus.

Prior to colonial rule local deities guaranteed and represented 'vertical solidarity' which was the most important condition of legitimacy in tribal society. Under British protection it was discarded and a rigid caste society emerged around the Garhjat which (caste society) itself was the necessity for establishing a 'horizontal solidarity'.[27]

The Garhjat rajas, in order to enhance their status and independent position, started constructing palaces and temples. Each Garhjat chief, *zamindar* and even some *goatias* started building temples and buildings. The people had to bear an additional burden *beth-begar* or forced labour. Upto the 17th century there were only five Jagannath temples in Orissa but by the 19th century hundreds of Jagannath temples were built by the Garhjat rajas. For that they needed Brahmanas. As the Brahmanas of the Garhjats were looked down upon as *halua* (cultivator Brahmanas) and *jhadua* (from the forest), the Utkali Brahmans were invited to western Orissa. Land was granted to the Brahmanas and to temples by the rulers at the expense of tribals.[28]

In the 19th century the Jagannath cult was under the iron grip of Raja-Brahman nexus. The Savara-devatas (Jagannath) had been hijacked by the ruling classes of Orissa from the tribals and used as tool to exercise their authority over the latter. *Dinabandhu* (the friend of the downtrodden)—another name of Jagannath—had been Brahmanised as *Badathakura* (the great God) beyond the reach of the downtrodden. Some of the tribal groups were not even allowed to enter the temple dedicated to their God.

The tribal-peasant saw the orthodox Jagannath cult and the Brahmanas as being responsible for the loss of their traditional cultivable area. This antagonism was hardened by the cultural differences between the tribal-peasant and Brahmanas, which was accentuated by the latter's ideas of purity, pollution, dietary restrictions and rigid caste distinctions. However, it would be wrong to assume that under such an emerging order and social pressure all tribal groups revolted *en masse* against the exploiter. As a matter of fact, we find that the reaction of each group in Orissa arose out of its own historical context. The meaning a people give to an entity or an event are out of a range of

meanings and options available to them at the time of their particular experience of that entity or event.

The lower strata of the society were thus chafing under the emerging unequal system. One of the tribal poets, Bhima Bhoi, came out with his work. He preached that 'the final deliverer' had already appeared in Orissa in the form of Mahima Swamy. God Jagannath of Puri, he said, had left His temple and become a disciple of Mahima Swamy. He saw the inequalities of the system as being responsible for the miseries of the low caste people and Adivasis. The followers of Mahima Dharma were, therefore, forbidden to accept anything from raja-brahman-barber-washerman and prostitutes. The followers of Mahima Dharma were also prohibited from worshipping idols, and from taking part in traditional rituals. They preached the equality of human beings because they believed in the uniform presence of formless God in every human being. Therefore, they rejected caste differences. They saw the raja-brahman combine and their associates as the cause of their miseries, and the Lord Jagannath as their protector. In order to counteract this situation, they turned the weapon of the Brahmanas around: i.e. they declared the raja-brahmana and their associates to be untouchables. To take matters further the followers of Mahima Dharma are forbidden from taking Jagannath *prasada*. Some of the followers even made an attempt to burn the idol of Jagannath in 1881. The *dharma* seems to have adopted a position of open attack on the orthodox tradition of Brahmanical restriction upon the entry of tribals and some other low-caste groups into the Jagannath temple. It appears also to be an attack on idol worship. The beliefs and practices of Mahima Dharma merit separate and more detailed treatment which space here does not permit. For the present it is sufficient to say that the intricate socio-political changes taking place in 19th century Orissa lay at the base of the emerging Mahima Dharma.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Singh, 1984: 317; Kulke, 1982: 245
2. Kulke, 1978, 104-114; Banerjee 1931, Appendix; Wills, 1919, 196-262.
3. Kulke, 1978, 106; Tiwari, 1985, 35
4. Deo, 1990, 86.
5. Stein, 1969, 179-185, talks about 'sustained displacement' of tribal society in the 'nuclear areas' of South India. Contrasted with the South Indian process of 'sustained displacement' of tribals, there are processes of integration and acculturation in Orissa; Kulke, 1978, 104-114.
6. Sahu, 1983, 133-144; 1984, 148-160.

7. Eschamann, 1978, 97.
8. Kulke, 1986, 139-155.
9. Sahu, 1971, 95; Sah, 1976, 125-129; Tiwari, 1985, 35 suggested the tribal origin of this dynasty. *CII*, III, 190ff; I, xi 185ff.
10. *CII*, III, 199, lines 25-26.
11. *IA*, VII, 250 fn. 26; *EI* IX, 284, fn. 10. There was a division in Saravapura kingdom called Sabarabhogika. *EI*, XXXIV, 28ff. Perhaps rulers had special administrative division (*bhoga*) where aboriginals lived. In one source a Brahmana was given a village and allowed to enjoy the *bhoga* but was to contribute *dhanya* and *hiranya* to the ruler i.e. it is liable for dues. *EI*, XXXI, 263 ff.
12. Nandi, 1979, 70-100.
13. Tiwari, 1985, 35.
14. Sharma, 1965, 159.
15. Kulke, 1976, 6.
16. Panigrahi, 1981, 38.
17. Sahu, 1980, 254.
18. *ibid*, 256.
19. Toynbee, 1960, 24.
20. Deo, 1990, 64-65.
21. *ibid*.
22. *Foreign Department Proceedings*, (Political), 13 September, 1833, no. 56-57; July 1881 letter no. 1778/90 dt. 18-5-1880, and 1777/90 dt. 18-5-1881. National Archives of India, New Delhi.
23. *Foreign Department Proceedings*, (Political), 6 February, 1834, no. 102-103, National Archives of India, New Delhi; *Chhattisgarh Divisional Record*, IX, 49, Sl. no. 50, 9th July 1856, Madhya Pradesh Record Room, Nagpur.
24. Aitchesan, 1929, I and V.
25. Officially a new *sikka* or coin was introduced in Orissa in 1819, and the *cowrie* was withdrawn.
26. Deo, *op. cit.*, 155.
27. Kulke, 1976, 11.
28. De, 1971, 55-60.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitchesan, C.V., 1983, *Collection of Treaties, engagements and Sanads*, I. V. Mittal Publication Delhi (First edition, Delhi, 1929).

Banerjee, R.D., 1931, *History of Orissa*, II, R. Chatterji, Calcutta.

De. S.C., 1971, 'Study of some Maufi Grants and Interesting Facts Gleaned from them', *New Aspects of History of Orissa*, Sambalpur University, pp. 55-60.

Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum (CII), II, III.

Deo, F., 1990, 'History of Interaction Between Tribal peoples and Their Socio-Cultural Environment in Chhatisgarh Region' Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Ephigraphia Indica, IX, XXXI, XXXIV, XXXVI.

Eschmann, A., 1986, 'Hinduization of Tribal Deities of Orissa: The Formative Phase', in A. Eschmann, H.K. Kulke, G. Tripathi (eds.), *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, Manohar, Delhi, pp. 79-98 (First edition,

South Asia Institute, 1978)

—— 1986, 'Mahima Dharma: An Autochthonous Hindu Reform Movement' in A. Eschmann, H. Kulke and G. Tripathy (eds.), *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, Manohar, Delhi, pp. 375-410.

Indian Antiquary, (IA), VII.

Kulke, H.,1976, 'Kshatriyaisation and Social Change: A Study of Changing India', in S.D. Pillai (ed.), *Aspect of Changing India*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, pp. 398-409.

—— 1978, 'Early State Formation and Royal Legitimisation in Ancient Orissa', in M. Das. (ed.) *Side Lights on History and Culture of Orissa*, Vidyapuri, Cuttack, pp. 104-114.

—— 1982, 'Fragmentation and Segmentation Versus Integration? Reflections on the concept of Indian Feudalism', *Studies in History*, IV, 2, pp. 237-263.

Nandi, R., 1981, 'Client, Ritual and Conflict in Early Brahmanical Order', *Indian Historical Review*, Kitab Mahal, Cuttack.

Sah, A.P., 1976, *Life in Medieval Orissa*, Chaukhamba Orientalia, Varanasi.

Sahu, B.P., 1983, 'Social Morphology and Physiology of Early Medieval Orissa (C.A.D. 400-1000)', *Proceedings of the Indian History* Congress, pp. 133-144.

—— 1984, 'Ancient Orissa: The Dynamics of Internal transformation of the Tribal Society', *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, pp. 148-160.

Sahu, N.K.,1971, 'A Survey of the History of Orissa', *New Aspects of History of Orissa*, Sambalpur University, pp. 9-24.

—— 1980, *History of Orissa*, Nalanda, Cuttack.

Sharma R.S. ,1965, *Indian Feudalism: C. 300-1200*, University of Calcutta, Calcutta.

Singh, K.S., 1984, 'A Study of State Formation Among Tribal Communities' in R.S. Sharma and V. Jha (eds.) *Indian Society: Historical Probings in Memory of D.D. Kosambi*, Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi, 3rd ed., pp. 317-326.

Stein, B., 1969, 'Integration of Agrarian System of South India', in R.E. Frykenberg (ed.) *Land Control and Social Structure in Indian History*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, pp. 176-216.

Tiwari, S.P., 1985, *Comprehensive History of Orissa, Dakisana Kosala under Saravapurias*, Punthi Pustak, Calcutta.

Toynbee, G.,1960, 'A Sketch of the History of Orissa from 1803-1828', *Orissa Historical Research Journal*, (First printed in Calcutta, 1878).

Wills, C.U., 1919, 'Territorial System of Rajput Kingdoms of Medieval Chhatisgarh', *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*, XV, pp. 196-262.