

Nabagunjara

SMITADAS

Sārāla Dāsa is the first major poet, designated as 'Ādikavi' in Oriya literature. *Mahābhārata*, written by him in 15th century, is considered as the encyclopaedia of Oriya culture and language. It is not a faithful translation of Vyasa's Sanskrit *Mahābhārata*; rather it is a new creation containing the 15th century history and religious and ritualistic identities of the then Orissa.

Sārāla's *Mahābhārata* signifies three forms of religious expressions of primitive life, which are: (i) the sacred speech, which is a myth or a narrative; (ii) the sacred place/object or symbols; and (iii) the sacred act or cult ritual. These three forms are combined through intellectual or artistic conceptual rituals practices as Durkheim opines 'that' every religion is made up of intellectual conception and ritual practices. (Durkheim 1995-99) Sārāla's conscious effort has been utilised aesthetically as well as intellectually to give full image to Kṛṣṇa character by means of these three religious characteristics. The systematisation of these three depicts Kṛṣṇa within a cluster of symbols in connection with a sacred act, experienced by primitives, specifically Muṇḍās and Drāvidas, and their identification in the ritualistic cult of Jagannatha over the sacred place Puri.

One of the most beautiful original creations of the poet is the narrative *Nabagunjara*. The word consists of two parts, like *naba*: nine and *gunjara*: people with magical power. (Hoffman 1932:1525) The form and content of the narrative or the meaning of *Nabagunjara* speaks about the sacred linkage between the mythic persona and two primitive groups to show the inner flow of Muṇḍā culture and their ritual relation with the Drāvidians which resulted in Jagannātha-Kṛṣṇa assimilation and construction of a multicultural heritage.

In *Madhya Parva*, Kṛṣṇa has been described to have taken the form of 'Vichitra Murti' or a strange and unheard of animal called *Nabagunjara* to find out if Arjuna can recognise him in this form or

not. Though the description of this animal is given in four couplets only, there is hardly any Oriya who does not know this image. The narrative goes like this:

In order to introduce *Nabagunjara*, the poet has made use of the well known episode of sharing of Draupadī by the five Pāṇḍava brothers which runs as follows: The Pāṇḍavas take a vow before the fire-god that if any one of them by chance sees the other sharing an intimate moment with Draupadī, then the former must go to exile for twelve years. One day when Yudhisthira was with Draupadī; the fire-god comes in a Brāhmin's disguise and asks Arjuna to bring the former on the pretext that he has to say something confidential and important to him. He also warns Arjuna that if the latter does not obey his order immediately, then Hastināpura will be burnt. So to avoid the calamity on Hastināpura Arjuna goes to Yudhiṣṭhira to tell him about the Brāhmin's visit and finds him in an intimate position with Draupadī. Then as per the promise he goes to exile. Kṛṣṇa comes to know it when he visits Hastināpura after Arjuna has spent 4 years 6 months and 13 days in forest. He finds out from Sahadeva that Arjuna is on the Manibhadra mountain and asks Garuḍa to take him there. Having reached this mountain he wants to test Arjuna's bhakti for him and transforms himself into a *nabagunjara*. He is *Nabagunjara* because different parts of his body are taken from nine different animals including man, like head from a rooster, neck from a peacock, hunch from a bull, waist from a lion, tail from a snake, three legs from an elephant, a tiger and a horse, and the fourth leg is a man's hand with a lotus. As Arjuna is busy making his bow he does not pay attention to this strange animal. So the latter begins to dance on dry leaves and creepers, jumps from one place to another, rolls on the ground in order to draw Arjuna's attention. At last, Arjuna looks at him and gets surprised to see such an animal for the first time in his life. But he immediately realises that it cannot be anybody else except Kṛṣṇa himself. So he prays to him, and the latter appears in his original form.

In the theory of sociology, Durkheim opines that religion is a vital mechanism of integration of human beings and as a realm of unifying symbols which signifies an unbreakable relation between religion and the origin of human language and thought. (Nisbet 1975: 66) This could be a study of the form and content of a given text and can be a study of culture through an artistic expression.

Roland Barthes' application of semiological theory to the analysis of popular culture defines that language is already bound up within

particular social forms and creates a reality. So, the signs are not only linguistic signs, but also carriers of meaning including photographs and other visual images. A particular image (or signifier) is fused with a value system (which is at mythological level, is what signified). (Edgar and Sedgwick 2002: 17-18)

Nabagunjara is a sign consisting of a signifier/particular image, shows the form of the word and image; and a signified/concept or a value system of a painted picture or a mask dance at its mythological level. Thus, the structure of an overall painting or use of mask in a popular dance in its surface layer serves as the product of literature and also helps us understand the literary work of art as well as artistic form of popular dance. In this way *Nabagunjara* is:

(1) An artistic imagination, where a painted image and a mask constitute a combination of symbols in a surface structure and signify a form of magic or sacred ritual etc.

(2) A mythical content where Kṛṣṇa's sacred act as eight totemic animals takes place within the Muṇḍa and Drāviḍa religion, their ritual relations, structure, solidarity and legitimacy.

These characteristics could be studied in connection to the semiological researches like 'dream of scientificity' of Roland Barths, 'magical realism' of Garcia Marquez to explore the ritual relation of Muṇḍa and Drāviḍa clan and their belief in the ancestor cult and its special form of totemism where the religious aspect is inspired by the totemic principle or the ancestor. Then as a special power and as a totemic principle, it transmits into the individual or his clan for socio-political progress and legitimacy.

The Image or Form

All the cultural objects are artistic creations. Accordingly, *Nabagunjara* is an art and bears the salient feature of creation, exclusiveness and uniqueness of poets' creative and productive mind as well as primitive popular mind.

The form of *Nabagunjara* is based on artistic expression. *Nabagunjara* is a symbolic representation, sometimes through mask dance, or a painting on rocks that retains the sacredness or on a piece of patta/silk cloth, a granite stone, or a wooden log. The painted, engraved, or sculpted images attempt to reproduce the outward appearance of animals in a strange and united form and the techniques used by the painters and culturists. We hardly see the outer walls of the houses of Puri and on the premises of the Jagannātha temple without a

Nabagunjara painting. It still attracts people in its artistic form.

Nabagunjara symbolises a popular aesthetic form of mask and mask dance: The aesthetic value of *Nabagunjara* also lies in the concept of mask-dance which is of ritualistic importance. Mask dance as a medium of entertainment still has a significant role in the ritualistic ceremonies and festivals of Puri. It is observed and inherited by the *Akhārā* (gymnasium) members who are also the 'sevāyats' of Jagannātha. Throughout the year, many ceremonies and festivals are held in Puri among which 'Sāhi Yātrā' or street festival is the most significant one. Mask dance is one special form of this festival where the *Akhārā* boys perform putting the mask of snake, peacock, tiger, lion, horse, etc. It also has interconnection with the ritualistic practice where Jagannātha puts the mask of elephant, Nāga etc. in some special days and is worshipped in these forms.

The Surface Structure of the Muṇḍā word Gunjara

Gunjara is a non-Aryan word, most probably Muṇḍā. It might have been derived from gun+haḍa. *Gun* has a following meaning: (i) inborn energy; (ii) capable of fulfilling the desire/wish; and (iii) associated with superstition, magical and supernatural quality. [Hoffman 1950 (Vol. VI): 1524]

Then *Haḍa* or *Horo* means a man. If the noun 'haḍa' or 'horo' is connected with gun, the meaning would be a man with magical powers. [*Ibid.* (Vol. V): 1525] So, the word *gun* with *haḍa/horo* might have turned into a combined word *gunhara* or *gunjara* in Oriya. *Jar* is also a verbal objective which means: (i) to attract, to satisfy by offering; (ii) to give pleasure, entertain, with the mind; and (iii) to win. [Hoffman 1950 (Vol. VIII): 2008]

The words *gun* and *jara* refer to two qualities of Kṛṣṇa. First, he is miraculous, energetic, a magician. Second, endowed with these qualities he entertains, to give pleasure, he attracts Arjuna's attention. He succeeds in diverting Arjuna's mind from his own work.

Sārāla has shown his capability of understanding Kṛṣṇa's standard image and his effort in replacing the standard image by new creative imagination which converts the old idea into a new meaning. The standard name Kṛṣṇais replaced by a new creative word *Nabagunjara* in relation to mask dance and mask ritual. This creative process supplies valuable social, literary, historical and religious materials for the study of the deep structure of an integrated community.

Concept or Deep Structure

Beyond the confines of language and art it could be a study of a ritual act of the Muṇḍā and Drāvidian totemic groups. *Nabagunjara* as a symbol of meaningful contents represents the primitive totemic religious significance of Muṇḍā and Drāvidians.

Scholars have studied primitive religion as sociology of knowledge and integrative factors. Durkheim claims, 'The basic concepts and categories of thought, such as those of place, time, number, and cause are born in religion and of religion.' (Humilton 1995: 97).

Kṛṣṇa in Sārāla Dāsa's *Mahābhārata* is the medium of primitive religion and remains the means of understanding religion. He symbolises the form and concept of primitive religion among which totemic cult is one of the oldest forms. In the interior of the Muṇḍā and Drāviḍa belief in totems, is a primitive religion practice. *Nabagunjara* is a symbolic representation of eight totemic animals in a combined form.

Durkheim's highly explanatory theory of symbolism explains man's relation to nature and society. God is the figurative expression of the society and totem is a visible symbol of the organic unity of society. (Nisbet 1975: 178) *Nabagunjara* is a combination of symbolic contents. So, it is needed to go beneath the symbolism to study what these totems are really expressing.

The anthropological and sociological discourse based on the structural and functional approaches used in the study of the religion of the Muṇḍā and Drāviḍas shows a link between Kṛṣṇa's socio-religious characteristics and patterned socio-religious systems and functions of the Muṇḍā and Drāviḍas.

Krishna's Totemistic Characteristics

The nine parts of *Nabagunjara* can be taken as the natural forces incorporated in a totemic principle. Rooster symbolises virility, neck of a peacock symbolises beauty, the hunch of a bull symbolises strength and bravery, tiger symbolises beauty, the hunch of a bull symbolises strength and bravery, tiger symbolises strength and beauty, elephant is associated with wisdom, horse with speed and energy, snake with creativity. Lastly, the lotus is connected with a human form as well as with beauty, purity, strength, wealth, creativity, and from the philosophical point of view, it refers to self knowledge. Hand of a man is the holistic representation of the supreme control and intellect.

Nabagunjara as a Symbol of Totemic Clan, its Emblem and Organisation

Kṛṣṇa is the symbol of a composite mask of eight totemic emblems of Muṇḍā and Drāviḍa clans where every clan adopts an animal or a bird as their crest and sign and is allied with some totemic emblem and thus forms an organisation of collectiveness. It should be noted here that these eight animals are worshipped as totems by various Muṇḍā and Drāviḍas tribes of India. For example, rooster is worshipped by the Drāvidian Devāṅga tribe; peacock by Drāvidian Bhil and Gond tribe; lion by the Drāvidian Khāngrā tribe; snake by the Drāvidian Bhil, Orāon, Kondh and also by Muṇḍā Śavara, Muṇḍāri, Śānthāl, Khariā, Bhunj, Korwa tribes; elephant by the Drāvidian Arakh and Muṇḍā Muṇḍāri, Khariā, Juāṅg tribes; tiger by the Drāvidian Bhil, Orion, Goṇḍ, and Muṇḍā Khariā, Muṇḍāri, Jnāṅg, and Korwā tribes; and horse by the Drāvidian Chenchu, Khāngrā and Arakh tribes. (Frazer 1986:219-235, 292-316) The objects that serve as a totem are either plants or animals. Sometimes though rarely, groups of ancestors or a single ancestor is used as a totem and named after purely a mythical being. (Durkheim 1995: 102-3) Durkheim opines, 'Every clan has a totem that belongs to it alone; two different clans of the same tribe cannot have the same one. Indeed, one is part of a clan only by virtue of having a certain name. So, all who bear this name are members of it in the same right, however scattered across the tribal territory they may be, they all have the same relation with one another.' (1995:100) In *Mahābhārata*, Kṛṣṇa takes a combined figure of two groups, who joined by a bond of kinship to form a singular family. Their collectivity is incorporated in 'Nabagunjara' image. The species like wood/tree/animal designate the Śavara clan and the species like animals designate the Drāvidian clan and both regard one another as one family while residing over the 'gaḍjāt mahals' or the tribal territories comprising dense forests and hills. It is because in the opinion of Durkheim (1995: 100), 'acknowledge reciprocal obligations which are identical and have been incumbent on kin in all ages'. Sārāla has described four lineages of Śavara clan and the propagation of their ancestor cult-ritual. In every age the totemic species sandalwood, as the ancestor deity of Muṇḍās, has remained linked with Kṛṣṇa's dead body, which is described by Sārāla as Drāvidians ancestor soul. Thus, the theory of totemism discovers

the interrelatedness of the Muṇḍās and Drāviḍas and their solidarity which is distinct in Sārāla's epic.

The idea of an affinity between the animals and totemic species and the member of the clan still exists in many primitive groups who still retain a rich ritualistic tradition in the history of little India. The Nāgas, the Moriās, the tigers and lions, etc. are under the kingly tradition fully developed from such totemic beliefs, adopting an animal or plant, and traced their origin from some legendary persona in the form of snake, peacock, tiger, lion, wooden log as their crest and sign. They ruled over many parts of the India. Kṛṣṇa represents a similar kind of tradition in Sārāla's *Mahābhārata* where he is described as a mythic persona, metamorphosed into the clan's eponymous animal, gave the clan its name.

In this way the socio-religious features of totemism are applied to show the association between each clan and a sacred totem with their identity, collective behaviour, structure.

Magico-religious significance of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa

Kṛṣṇa has been depicted as an animal of fantasy. The magical function of Kṛṣṇa symbolises a composite form of magic and reality. Tribal communities possess a close relationship with the nature, the biological world and their uncommon activities. (Hasnain 1991: 59-60) So, the belief in supernatural power—a dead comes alive, a tree becomes an animal, a man becomes a tiger, an animal turns into a piece of wood, even God turns himself into any form of these—are all considered as the religious features. (Goldenweiser 1988: 231) A mendicant/magician/priest, head of the tribal society is believed to be capable of establishing a relationship which a second world/god/ancestor by magic and also can go into Trans whenever he likes. He uses this quality for the benefit of his community. (Frazer 1922: 110-2) In the culture of ancient Greek and Rome, the ruling power was conferred upon the religious priests. Asia Minor was also under the control of religious leaders who were associated with supernatural power. (*Ibid*: 12-13) Among the tribals of Orissa like Śavara Kondh, Gond, Juāng, Bhūyāñ, Bhil and Orāon, the role of a priest or headman is very significant as he has the power to meet and talk to the supreme power in dream and can turn himself into an animal. In Puri, the words for Jagannātha like 'Chaḷanti Thākura' (the moving god), and 'Thākura Rājā' (God-King) are widely used to show the ruling power of the ancestor/supreme being.

Tribals, thus, worship these people bestowed with miraculous powers. Kṛṣṇa's transformational power as animal masks are of such magico-religious significance, where he, as the totemic principle inculcates force into his clan members who are warrior hunting groups, mainly associated with bravery and physical force, and are governed by the fundamental principle of totemism.

Ritual Relation

Totemic object/creatures are also the objects/creatures of rites. Totem worship is a ritualistic act of primitive. The notion of sacred in connection with nature power within a totemic object becomes the centre for power and generative force that each totemic group worships as the totemic principle or god. Kṛṣṇa symbolises these impersonal animal forces in a visible form and denotes the idea of collective force of a united clan. People believe that the store house of power in a totemic principle can be generated in them. Such universality of beliefs and feelings are expressed in festivals, gatherings, family functions in a collective way where all of them participate. This way a ritual relation and inheritance of ritual act among groups developed between the totemic species and the people of the clans.

Muṇḍā and Drāviḍa integration is based on this kind of a ritual relation. Radcliff-Brown states, 'There is a ritual relation between the person and the totem.... Every society adopts and imposes upon its members, towards certain objects, this attitude of mind and behaviour which he calls the "ritual attitude". There are different societies and attitudes, but they have something in common.' (1976: 123) *Nabagunjara* suggests the mythic character with totemic objects that are not only the clan emblems of the Muṇḍās and the Drāviḍas but are ceremonial and ritualistic in its features as well. It is used during religious ceremonies and worship. They share their experiences, they share every moment of joy and sadness, and they also share the joy of victory. Before going to battle they worship the totemic object or god's weapon believing that it will generate the supernatural force in them and will bring victory. Victory for them thus becomes a religious phenomenon; so it should be observed religiously. For this reason they make their victory a ritualistic celebration and observe it in form of the god or totemic objects.

The ritual relation of *Nabagunjara* is still at work when different ceremonial functions takes place. The artistic form of mask dance in the 'Sāhi Yātrā' or street festival reminds us of such past ritual relations.

Totemic decorations are not only a symbol of a name or an emblem; but also the part of public worship and used in religious ceremonies. Mask dance of Kṛṣṇa is a symbol of ritual act. These are a means of expressing processes and religious experience of little communities. Sāralā's *Mahābhārata* describes Kṛṣṇa's mask as a clan emblem, its function as public institution; the relation of ancestor and the community; their combined force which they had utilised as a legitimate device over great tradition.

Mast dance held in Puri is of great popularity and significance. Nāga, tiger, lion, peacock, horse masks are used by the performers in the ceremonies. Celebrants who wear these masks on their faces or paint them on their bodies, represent the totem to initiate the ritualistic life of their clan tradition. It manifests natural/animal forces directly related with the group's or individuals' physical prowess and their socio-political empowerment.

The mast can be defined as a ritual mast because the role of the mask is connected with a ritualistic celebration of the several communities of Puri temple and the deity himself. There are many festivals held for the deity Jagannātha where he himself, as a totemic principle, is dressed up with the animal masks of elephant, snake, lion and appears before his devotees on special days. (I have discussed Nāga mask as a Drāviḍian element in Muṇḍā religious system. See "Attendants of King God and God King", *Drāviḍian Studies*, Vol. I, No. 3, 2003, Kuppam: Dravidian University). Here the user of the mast does not only represent a certain figure, i.e. in ancestor but actually becomes this figure. To put a mast on was, therefore, akin to undergoing a real transformation. [Eliade (Vol. 9) 1987: 265] Here, the act of transformation, in *Nabagunjara* developed as a ritual act in Jagannath temple and among Puri residents. The role of mask dance of the *akhārā* members/*sevāyats* and the mask ritual of the deity has been used to show the interrelatedness of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa communities with the totemic principle based on elementary characteristics of ritual.

Relativism of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa Totemic Beliefs and Practices

A parallel pattern of totemic beliefs and practices to similar social units paved the way for the integration constituted by one section of patrilineal Muṇḍā and the other section of matrilineal Drāviḍa named after animals and birds to form a combined organisation.

Special associations of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa groups with natural species

plants or animals exist in common among tribals who reside over the region of ancient Kalinga and Utkala with highly elaborated totemic ritual and mythology. *Nabagunjara* symbolises this commonness of animal worship and totemic beliefs.

The common possession of totem provides each group with an important means of unification. But they are the parts of the total symbol, even if a part of one another, promote the sense of identity and solidarity within the totality. They are related to each other in various ways but multiply such ties in many ways. In theory, 'the greater the number and the closer the ties that unite the members of group, the more effectively the group will be able to achieve its common goals and values'. (Schwartz and Eerald 1968, 394)

The other interrelatedness of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa became possible through the practice of ancestor cult. Ancestor cult is described by Tylor as an earlier religion of which totemism is a special form. In totemism the religious aspects are inspired by the ancestor and transferred to the animal with which it is assimilated. Sāralā has described Kṛṣṇa as the ancestor deity of Drāviḍas and as a war deity or the head of Kondh-Maler group (See, Smita Mohanty "Kondh-Malhāra Śrīkṛṣṇa O Śavara Jagannātha Samanwaya: Eka Tuḷanātmaka Adhyayana, *Jankār* (Oriya), 2006: 4), who has the magical quality of transforming himself into animals and again come back to the human form. Also, he has the magical quality as an ancestor to transform himself from a sacred blue stone (which is the symbol of Drāviḍa ancestor's body's abode) to a sacred sandalwood log (which is the symbol of the ancestor deity of Śavaras). This transformation is an incorporation of Kṛṣṇa in Jagannātha and it also demonstrates the assimilation of Kondhs and Śavaras in a social context.

Again the collectivity of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa has been demonstrated by a bond of kinship relation through marriage. Kṛṣṇa has been described here as Śabarī Nārāyaṇa by marrying Mālati Śabarī, a Śavara maiden to form a single family.

Muṇḍā and Drāviḍa Legitimacy as a Unitary

All primitive beliefs and practices have an aim, i.e. the power to legitimise. It may be magic, may be a totemic object, and may be nature, anything that possesses power. Kṛṣṇa's totemistic characteristics and magical force have been utilised to draw Arjuna's attention from the latter's work. Arjuna was attracted towards the wonderful and strange animal's dance and realised that only Krishna,

the supreme being, can take this strange form. Then, he worshipped Kṛṣṇa as the supreme divine power, which is of Muṇḍā and Drāviḍa significance. It can be taken as the legitimacy of a tribal magical/totemic power to whom an Ārya surrendered.

In addition to giving utmost importance to Lord Jagannātha as a Śavara ancestor—god throughout *Mahābhārata*, Sāralā has portrayed Kṛṣṇa and Jagannātha as a combination of sacred sandalwood tree and a stone. This way Niḷamādhava or the blue stone image stayed amidst the Śavaras in the form of Śavari Nārāyaṇa. The socio-religious devices started utilising power from 12th century onwards during the Gaṅga rule over Kalinga and Soma Vaṁśīs of Utkala that resulted in the unification of both the areas under Jagannātha where Kṛṣṇa was assimilated.

In this context, it is important here to quote Garcia Marquez's Nobel address, 'The solitude of Latin America', commented upon the monstrous poverty and the continuous political oppression of much of Latin America and who interpreted these horrors from a European perspective. His address opens with reference to one of the many accounts of voyages to the new world of post colonialism which is even now a combination of fantasy and science. The data given in the book is like this:

Antonio Pignafetta, the Florentine navigator who accompanied Magellan on his first circumnavigation of the world, kept a meticulous log on his journey through the our Southern American continent which, nevertheless, also seems to be an adventure into the imagination. He related that he had seen pigs with their umbilicus on their backs, and birds without feet, the females of the species of which would breed their eggs on the back of the males, as well as others like gannets without tongues whose beaks looked like a spoon. The navigator wrote that he had seen a monstrosity of an animal with the head and ears of a male, the body of a camel, the hooves of a deer and the neigh of a horse. He related that they put a mirror in front of the first native they met in Patagonia and how that over existed giants lost the use of the his reason out of fear of his own image (Marquezs Noble Address 1982, in Bernard McGuirk and Richard Coldwell).

(Gabriel Garcia Marquez, *New Reading*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press in Bassnett 1993: 87).

Here, the early travelers' new imagination of fantasy came to life and combined with the desire and believed in the existence of Utopia, an European perception of Latin America.

It is a fine example to show the relationship between the imaginary world of the poet to describe the new and the cultural conventions

which explore man's two belongings stated by Tylor, a life for feeling, thinking, functioning and a phantom as being its image or second self (Tylor 1958 (part II): XII). It is also turned by Garcia Marquez as 'Magical Realism'. (Bassnett 1993: 88) It still exists in the fantastic perception towards the supreme being and as a culture identity in its real form. A desire for believing in the existence of a totemic principle or natural force, newly imagined by Sārālā Dāsa, exemplified in the experience, desires of tribal Orissa legitimacy over Brāhmanic Orissa. Even today, the narrative exists in the form of painting, sculpture, mask dance, still seem in the venerable combined ritualistic practice relation between the *Sevāyats*' and Jagannātha in the temple and the sacred town. Interestingly the performers are not only tribals but also brāhmaṇas. This reminds us of the primitive religious ritual reality beyond caste and creed.

Sārālā described the stages of Kṛṣṇa's magical transformation in the assimilation of Munda group with its divine head Jagannātha and Dravida group with its culture hero Kṛṣṇa. In the first stage the Muṇḍā and Drāviḍa totemic groups were associated. The second developed stage is a total ritual process where Kṛṣṇa transforms himself into a sandalwood log and became Jagannātha. The magical transformational power is a means of expressing emotions, family attachments, and conscious desires of little communities. It shows the relationship of the supreme being and the clan and their group dynamics, socio-political progress and supremacy, desire for victory over Brāhmanas and Kṣatriyas. Their conflict and battle with Arjuna/arya, Gālamādhava, Indradyumna/Kṣatriya with their Brāhmaṇa minister and priests resulted in acquiring the status and identity of brahmanic importance and establishing their own traditional values. During the reign of Indradyumna there is an evidence of Jarā Śavara who had placed a condition in front of the King Indradyumna for worshipping the deity jointly with Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas and take part as a joint member in the cult by retaining his ancestral right. The upward mobility of Śavara communities in collaboration with Drāviḍa groups resulted in establishing Jagannātha at the centre as the state deity with all ritualistic practices, the most distinct tribal socio-cultural feature of medieval Orissa.

Sārālā has described the Oriya culture as a symbiosis of non-Aryan cultures of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍas where Kṣatriyas/Brāhmaṇas were a later attachment. Sārālā has given evidence of legendary King Gālamādhava, from Harihaya lineage with his Brāhmin priest and Kṣatriya king Indradyumna from Ikshvaku lineage with his Brāhmin

minister-priest who had come to Orissa with a desire of worshipping Kṛṣṇa's body made up of stone and wood deity, Jagannātha. In dream Kṛṣṇa tells Gālamādhava to make friendship with Śavara if he wants to worship the Śavara deity and tells Indradyumna to worship the wooden deity together.

Nabagunjara (where Kṛṣṇa transforms himself into animals) and *Nabakalevara* (which means new body, where Kṛṣṇa transform himself from stone to wood) are the finest examples of such symbiosis of Muṇḍā-Drāviḍa and brahmanas and show their identity and significance in Jagannātha.

REFERENCE

- Bassnett, Susan (1993), *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*.
 Dāsā, Sārālā (1965-72), *Mahābhārata*, (ed.), A.B. Mohanty, Bhubaneswar:
 Department of Cultural Affairs, Govt. of Orissa.
 Durkheim, Emile (1995), *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, (tr.), Karen
 E. Fields, New York: The Free Press.
 Edgar, Andrew and Peter Sedgwick (2002), *Cultural Theory: The Key Thinkers*,
 London and New York: Routledge.
 Eliade Mircea (1987), *The Encyclopaedia of Religion*, vol. 4.9, New York:
 MacMillan.
 Frazer, J.G. (1986), *Marriage and Worship in Early Societies*, vol. II, Delhi:
 Mittal Publications (Reprint).
 Goldenweiser, A. Alexander (1988), *Introduction of Anthropology*, New Delhi:
 Deep and Deep Publications.
 Hamilton, Malcom B. (1995), *The Sociology of Religion*, London and New
 York: Routledge.
 Hasnain, Nadeem (1991), *Tribal India Today*, Delhi: Harnam Publications.
 Hoffman, S.J. (ed), (In collaboration with Arthur Van Emelen) (1950-52),
Encyclopaedia Mundrarica, vol. V, VI, VII, Patna: Superintendent, Govt. of
 Printing, Bihar and Orissa.
 Nisbet, A. (1975), *Sociology of Emile Durkheim*, London: Neinemann.
 Raddcliff-Brown, A.R. (1976), *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*,
 London: Routledge (Reprint).
 Schwartz, Barton M. and Robert H. Ewald (1968), *Culture and Society*, New
 York: The Ronald Press Company.
 Tylor, Edward Burnett (1958), *Religion in Primitive Culture*, vol. II, New York:
 Hurper & Row.