CHAPTER - III

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF ETHNOGRAPHY:

Earlier studies of anthropology faced with the problem of taking ‘Armchair’ approach. These anthropologists were also termed as ‘Armchair Anthropologist’ as their study did not involve any fieldwork. On the contrary they drew from ancient books and other Ethnographic accounts. These approaches were mainly:

I. CLASSICAL EVOLUTIONISM

EDWARD TYLOR - Tylor is often called the ‘Father of Anthropology’ because it was in his hands that anthropology became ‘the science of culture’ In his book entitled ‘Primitive Culture’ published in 1871, he defined ‘culture’ as follows: “Culture of civilization, ...... is that complex which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society”. Tylor was convinced that cultural progress had taken place and that the savage man had developed into the civilized man. He was also convinced that all cultures were capable of progress because he believed in the “psychic unity of mankind”. He felt that contemporary differences in cultures indicated differences in the rates of cultural evolution only and that all cultures were on the road to civilization. Tylor suggested that inferences about the past of ‘civilized’ societies could be drawn on the basis of evidence from contemporary ‘savage’ societies. In other words, he was explaining
'The' comparative method. It was Tylor again who explicitly defined the concept of 'survivals' which he employed for 'Historical Reconstruction'. According to him, 'survivals' are "processes, customs, opinions and so forth, which have been carried on by force of habit into a new state of society different from that in which they had their original home, and they thus remain proofs and examples of an older condition of culture out of which a newer one has been evolved". Tylor found such survivals in myths, riddles, games, nursery rhymes, rituals and artifacts.

One of the outstanding contributions of Tylor was in tracing the evolution of Religion. At the outset he gave a minimum definition of religion. According to him, Religion is the 'Belief in Spiritual Beings' which he termed as Animism (anima = spirit or soul). Tylor considered that the belief in spiritual being had arisen in response to an intellectual need – the desire to explain the phenomenon of sleep and life that lead to two crucial experiences that of dream and death. There experiences would have inevitably produced the conception of duality – image and reality: vital principle and body. Man must have then named the 'double' as 'spirit' or 'soul'. Having thus established the notion of primitive religion, Tylor went on to trace the evolution of religion. Animism and the consequent belief in life after death in the form of soul must have laid the foundation for the first form of worship viz., Ancestral Worship. In due course, these ancestral spirits might have been deified. As a result of deification, there would have
existed several such ancestral deities. Polytheism or the belief in several gods would have thus resulted. Later on the conception of one supreme being above all these minor deities would have eventually evolved. In other words, Monotheism would have been established ultimately.

LEWIS HENRY MORGAN:

Morgan in his 'Ancient Society' published in 1977, gave a detailed exposition of Cultural Evolutionist position of the 19th century. He not only contemplated on the evolution of specific social instructions like marriage, family and kinship, but constructed a general sequence of human history. He further presented an overall scheme of instituted progress by correlating the stages of human evolution with developments in technology, political organization, family structure and kinship.

Morgan's scheme of human evolution can be understood as presented in Table below.
## AN OVERVIEW OF BIO-CULTURAL EVOLUTION OF MAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERIODS</th>
<th>FOSSIL TYPE OF BIOLOGICAL FORMS</th>
<th>CULTURAL EVENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOMO HABICIS</td>
<td>First stone tools, old man tools, hunting/scavenging, seasonal composites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Paleolithic</td>
<td>HOMO ERECTUS</td>
<td>Probable division of labour of sex, Abbevilean and Acheulean tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Paleolithic</td>
<td>HOMO SAPIENS</td>
<td>Monoterian tools, Burials probable religious beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEANDERTHALNE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Paleolithic</td>
<td>HOMO SAPIENS</td>
<td>Blade tools, cave painting, female figurines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microlithic</td>
<td>HOMO</td>
<td>Microliths; Broad of food collecting, Increasingly sedentary communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>SAPIENS</td>
<td>Polished tools, framing, permanent villages, Domestication of plant and animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>SAPIENS</td>
<td>Full time craft specialists, cities and states, civilization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table – II

MORGAN’S SCHEME OF HUMAN EVOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVOLUTIONARY STAGES</th>
<th>TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Savagery</td>
<td>Invention of speech, subsistence in Fruits and nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Savagery</td>
<td>Fishing and the use of Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Savagery</td>
<td>Bow and Arrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Barbarism</td>
<td>Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Barbarism</td>
<td>Domestication of animals in the Old World; cultivation of maize by irrigation, Adobe and stone brick buildings in the New world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Barbarism</td>
<td>Iron smelting, use of iron tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilization</td>
<td>Phonetic Alphabet and writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table – III

THE COMPARISONS BETWEEN LIVING REPRESENTATIVES AND THE STAGE OF HUMAN EVOLUTION – MORGAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVOLUTIONARY STAGES</th>
<th>LIVING REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Savagery</td>
<td>Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Savagery</td>
<td>Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Savagery</td>
<td>Polynesians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Barbarism</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Barbarism</td>
<td>Zuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Barbarism</td>
<td>Homeric Greeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilization</td>
<td>Euro – Americans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morgan was a precursor to Anthropological fieldwork tradition, as he had conducted fieldwork amongst the Iroquois
Indians of North America. This field experience initiated a deep interest in Kinship terminologies for him. Morgan is often called the 'Father of Kinship studies'. He was the first to typify the kinship terminologies of the world into descriptive and classificatory. He published his works on kinship in the 'Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity'. Morgan believed in the 'Psychic unity of mankind' and hence stated that the "history of the human races is one in source, one in experience, and one in progress".

**JAMES GEORGE FRAZER:**

Frazer is best known for his monumental work 'The Golden Bough' published in twelve volumes by 1914. Although his work was published in the early 20th Century he is included among the 19th century classical Evolutionists for having employed 'The' Comparative Method and Concepts like 'Progress' in a big way. Frazer never did any fieldwork, but developed his theories based on other peoples' ethnographic researches. For this reason, he has been labeled as the 'Armchair Anthropologist'.

According to Frazer, all primitive peoples were mentally irrational and hence superstition pervaded primitive thought. This expressed itself in the notion of magic. On the other hand modern man is rational in his thinking and hence seeks empirical knowledge which is available through science. Frazer postulated a three-state evolutionary development as follows:

- Magic
- Religion
- Science
According to Frazer, in the first stage of human society, magic prevailed. But magic based on false assumption regarding cause and effect, could not have always succeeded in producing the desired result. Man must have then realized that there could be some superior power above him that controls him and his activities. He must have then submitted himself to this superior power. Further, he must have worshipped and propitiated it in order to beg for. It is here then that magic gets replaced by religion. Frazer thus distinguished between magic and religion by pointing out that while the former is manipulative, the latter is supplicative.

Later on, the antithesis of magic, nearly science, which is based on factual correlations between cause and effect, would have evolved as man also evolved mentally. Once man had learnt to establish causal relations, he had also learnt to control nature.

II. HISTORICAL PARTICULARISM AND DIFFUSIONISM

HISTORICAL PARTICULARISM:

FRANZ BOAS was a physical geographer, who turned to Anthropology; when he did field work amongst the Eskimos of the Baffin Islands. He found that the influence of culture on people was far greater than that of the environment. It was culture that enabled man to adapt suitably to any environment. He thus formulated the dogma of Cultural Determinism.

Boas vehemently attacked the comparative method employed by the Evolutionists. He refuted the evolutionist typology, which classified some people as 'savages' and some other as 'civilized'
Boas said that no culture should be classified in so subjective manner. He postulated the concept of Cultural Relativity according to which each culture is to be judged by its own standards and values. Boas further criticized the evolutionist theorization which was based on scanty data. He said that only on the strong foundation provided by empirical data should theories be formulated. Boas thus gave the impetus to the rise of Empiricism in the discipline of Anthropology. He further criticized the evolutionists assumption that cultural similarities were due to similar causes particularly, "The psychic unity of mankind". Boas stated that cultural similarities were only due to Diffusion of traits, and any primary cause must be empirically established. Boas felt that each culture is intelligible only with reference to its past history. The idea came to be known as HISTORICAL PARTICULARISM according to which the intensive field study of both the present and the past of each culture must be done. Boas thus put forth the Historical Method by which the history of a peoples' culture can be unraveled instead of the evolutionists advocated 'The' Comparative Method.

ALFRED KROEBER:

Rather than formulating laws of diffusion, Kroeber attempted to seek the causes for diffusion. He tried to enlist culture tracts to the maximum in order to obtain comprehensiveness and completeness in defining each culture area. Although the process of enlisting culture traits was abandoned the efforts to classify
culture areas continued. Kroeber added new dimension to the Culture Area concept by correlating environmental conditions with native American cultures. In a detailed study, ‘Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America’, he mapped vegetational, physiographic, climatological and culture areas. Kroeber eventually mapped: 7 ‘Grand Areas’, 21 ‘Areas’ and 63 ‘sub Areas’ for North and Central America.

Later on, however, Kroeber turned increasingly to impressionistic interpretation of culture center which, he called “Culture Climax”. Kroeber was a Configurationist. He found the concept of culture too unwieldy and inclusive. Hence, he sought a means of ordering data or classifying or characterizing societies by their patterns. The idea behind configuration is that each society has a cluster of characteristics that mark it as different from all others. Kroeber suggested that such configurations could be seen in terms of style or in the dominance and persistence of other cultural aspects. He thus made an attempt to create a typology in order to define or identify a culture.

DIFFUSION AND DIFFUSIONISM:

The concept of Evolution and the dogma of Evolution were attached by a number of anthropologists from different parts of the world. In defiance, they put forth the concept of Diffusion which state that all cultures originated in only one or more specific areas from which they spread or diffused throughout the world. Diffusion may take place in three ways:-
1. By the imitation of cultural traits;
2. By the migration of cultural carriers;
3. By both imitation and migration.

**Diffusionism** refers to the theoretical construct that postulates the diffusion or transmission of cultural characteristics of traits from one common society to all other societies.

The Diffusionists attacked the evolutionists on several grounds:

1. The Diffusionists criticized the Evolutionist premise of the "Psychic Unity of Mankind". The Diffusionists said that man is basically uninventive and important inventions are made only once in one place. As man is easily capable of imitation, these inventions then diffuse to other places.

2. The Diffusionists did not accept the Evolutionist contention that cultures originated in different parts of the world independently. They stated that all cultures originated at one point and then spread throughout the world. This is because they did not believe that mankind was capable of multiple independent inventions.

3. The Diffusionists opposed the notion of 'progress' from simple to complex forms held by the Evolutionists. According to the Diffusionists, the label of simplicity or
complexity attributed to any culture form is a relative matter. One form that may appear to be simple to one people may appear to be complex to another and vice versa. The notion of progress is then irrelevant here.

4. The Diffusionists attacked 'The' Comparative Method of evolutionists which used present primitive person as exemplars of pre-historic peoples or as representatives of the early stage of man's cultural development. The Diffusionists firmly held that 'primitive' or 'modern' is also relative matter and hence 'The' Comparative Method should not be employed at all.

5. The Diffusionists did not look for mere 'parallels' as did the Evolutionists and also did not explain away 'variations' as mere differences in rates of evolution. The Diffusionists looked specifically for variations that gradually occurred while diffusions took place. In the process of diffusion, exact imitation is not possible and hence, some differences are bound to occur resulting in variation.

6. The Diffusionists further criticized the 'Armchair' remarks of the Evolutionists for the speculative reconstructions, based on unreliable and incomplete documentary sources. The Diffusionists said that since the dogmas of the Evolutionists were not founded on
empirical observation, cultural evolutionism as such does not stand the test of validity.

III. FUNCTIONALISM:

As against the Evolutionists and Diffusionists, there arose a dynamic school of thought founded by BRONISLAW MALINOWSKI, called FUNCTIONALISM. This school of thought postulates that each and every cultural trait exists in order to serve the needs of the individuals in society. In other words, the function of culture is to fulfill man's needs.

Functionalism is not concerned with origin or the reconstruction of the past. Further, the functionalists opposed the concept of 'survival' because, to the other. Functionalism thus looks for utilitarian causes. That is, functionalism aims at finding out which needs of man produce what cultural responses and correlating the two dynamically. As functionalism conceptualized cultures as working units, it emphasized the study of the operation or functioning of contemporary cultures.

Functionalism in Anthropology was a off shoot of the functional ideas put forth by the eminent sociologist EMILE DURKHEIM. He stated that in order to explain a social phenomena, one must seek both the cause that produced it and the function that it fulfilled. The explanation of social phenomena also entailed the asking of how the phenomena that together constitute social life combine to produce harmony within the society and
consequently maintain social solidarity through a satisfactory adoption to the environment. Drawing inspirations from Durkheim, Malinowski developed the concept of functionalism to its greatest elaboration pinpointing the various needs of man as the causes of all social phenomena and the institutions which function in order to fulfill those needs.

**MALINOWSKI’S CONTRIBUTION TO FUNCTIONALISM IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY:**

In his ‘A Scientific Theory of Culture’, the contribution of culture to the biological survival and the psychological welfare of man was the prime functionalist tenet put forth by Malinowski. To him, culture was the vehicle through which man satisfied his needs. Each human desire or need impels the formation of a culture institution which provides the channel through which man fulfills his desires. Malinowski comprehended culture in its totality and declared that all the institutions are interrelated and integrated into the system of culture. Thus, culture is an integrated whole which can be analyzed in two ways:

1. Institutionally;
2. Functionally.

Malinowski actively sought bio-physical explanations in trying to understand institutions in relations to individuals. He tried to analyse how institutions responded or functioned in order to satisfy individual needs. It was individuals survivals that was
crucial to Malinowski. How culture helped an individual to survive was the prime question to which Malinowski sought an answer.

Malinowski found that man primarily had several fundamental or BASIC NEEDS which are, in other words, BIOLOGICAL IMPERATIVES.

**THE CORRELATION MADE BY MALINOWSKI:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.NO</th>
<th>BASIC NEEDS OR IMPERATIVE</th>
<th>CULTURAL RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metabolism</td>
<td>Commissariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Kinship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bodily Comfort</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Movements</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Malinowski, culture was adoptive, and without the satisfaction of basic biological needs, neither man nor culture itself could survive. Although Malinowski did not speculate how culture arose, he had no doubts as to why it came into being; it was a means to human survival. Culture, to him, is then a functioning whole, to be understood in relation to man's biology and his environment.

Having understood man's Basic Needs and their cultural responses, Malinowski felt that a theory could be developed in which the basic needs and their cultural satisfaction can be linked up with the deprivation of new cultural needs which he called...
Derived Needs. He found two types of Derived Needs or Imperatives: (1) Instrumental Imperatives – arising out of such types of activity as economic, educational and political i.e. necessary for organized activity. (2) Integrative Imperatives – such as knowledge, religion and magic, i.e. necessary for mental and moral integration.

The following figure reveals the scheme outlined by Malinowski in order to show the various needs of human beings:

THE VARIOUS NEEDS AS CONCEPTUALIZED BY MALINOWSKI:

Malinowski states that the analysis in which we attempt to define the relation between a cultural performance and a human need, basic or derived, may be termed functional. He further says that function cannot be defined in any other way than the satisfaction of a need by an activity in which human beings cooperate, use artifacts and consume goods. This very definition implies the essential concept of Organization. In order to achieve
any purpose, human beings have to organize. Organization implies a very definite scheme or structure. A unit of human organization implies a very definite scheme or structure. A unit of human organization may be called institution. Each institution implies a system of organized activity. Malinowski considers an institution as the legitimate isolate of culture analysis. Functionalism thus, is the analysis of social customs, rules and regulations and institutions in terms of their contribution to the maintenance of social system.

**INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF CULTURE:**

Malinowski puts forth explicitly on institutional analysis of culture. At the outset, he gives a diagrammatic definition of the concept of institution. He then proceeds to explain in detail the various concepts employed in the definition.

**THE STRUCTURE OF AN INSTITUTION AS OUTLINED BY MALINOWSKI:**

![Diagram of institutional structure]

- **Charter**
  - Personnel
    - Material
  - Norms
    - Apparatus
- **Activities**
- **Function**
Malinowski describes what he calls an organized system of purposeful activities. He defines as the Charter of an institution, the system of values for the pursuit of which human beings organize, or enter organizations already existing. The Personnel of an institution, Malinowski defines as the group organized in definite principles of authority, division of functions and distribution of privileges and duties. The rules or norms of an institution are the technically acquired skills, habits, legal norms, and ethical commands which are accepted by the members or imposed upon them. It is clear that both the organization of the personnel and the nature of the rules followed are definitely related to the charter. In a way both the personnel and the rules are derived from and contingent upon the Charter.

According to Malinowski, an organization is invariably based up on and intimately associated with the material environmental setting. Organized on the charter, acting through their social and organized cooperation, following the rules of their specific occupation, using the material apparatus at their disposal, the group engages in the activities for which they have organized.

For Malinowski, the distinction between activities and rules is clear and precise. The activities depend on the ability, power, honesty and good will of the members. They deviate invariably from the rules, which represent the ideal of performance, not necessarily its reality. The activities over, are embodies in actual behaviour, the rules may often in precepts, texts and regulations. Finally,
Malinowski introduces the concept of FUNCTION, that is the integral result of organized activities as distinguished from charter, that is the purpose, the traditional or new end to be obtained.

Malinowski ultimately stated that every type of effective activity had to be organized in one way and only, through which it becomes culturally stabilized, that is, incorporated into the culture heritage of a group. Malinowski states that the figure representing the institutional structure stands for the following propositions. Each institution, that is, organized type of activity, has a definite structure. In order to observe theoretically upon an institution, it is necessary to analyse it in the manner here indicated, and in this manner only. No element, trait, custom, or idea is defined or can be defined except by placing it within its relevant and real institutional setting. Malinowski is thus insisting that such institutional analysis is not only possible but also indispensable. It is maintained here that the institution is the real isolate of culture analysis. It is also maintained that any other type of discussion or demonstration in terms of isolated traits or trait complexes, other than those which would follow the institutional integration, must be incorrect. Malinowski thus establishes that the institutional structure is universal though out all cultures.

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF CULTURE:

For Malinowski, Function means always the satisfaction of a need. The functional isolate is the institution that carries out the work required to achieve the goal. At the same time Malinowski
also indicate that culture, as the handwork of man and as the medium through which he achieves his ends is a medium which allows him to live, to establish a standard of safety, comfort and prosperity, a medium which gives him power and allows him to create goods and values beyond his organic endowment that culture is all this and through all this, must be understood as a means to an end, that is, instrumentally or functionally.

Malinowski then outlines the general axioms of Functionalism, as Functionalism, according to him, is concerned with the clear understanding of the nature of culture phenomena.

IV. STRUCTURAL – FUNCTIONALISM:

RADCLIFFE – BROWN:

Radcliffe – Brown’s approach is called Structural – Functionalism as against Malinowski’s mere Functionalism. Radcliffe Brown tried to relate structure in order to understand society and culture synchronically.

To, Radcliffe – Brown, culture was an abstraction. Therefore, a science of culture as envisaged by Malinowski, was not possible. Radcliffe – Brown preferred to analyse social structure instead. To him, social structure is ‘the network of actually existing relation’. According to Radcliffe – Brown social facts required explanation in terms of social laws. As against Malinowski, he emphasized group survival, and did not search for explanations in terms of the psychology of individuals. Radcliffe-Browns aim then was to study
social structures and formulate laws governing social behaviour cross culturally. He stated that the task governing social behaviour cross culturally. He stated that the task of Anthropology was to classify societies and compare them so that generalization ought be made. It is because of the force of Radcliffe Brown's orientation that British Anthropology is often called as 'Social Anthropology' in contrast to the American 'Cultural Anthropology'.

In order to illustrate the relationship between structure and function, Brown turned to biology. Drawing in Spencer, Brown elaborated the analogy between biological systems and social organisms. The function of a recurrent physiological process, is a correspondence between it and necessary conditions of existence of the organism. Thus, the concept of structural – functionalism as applied to human societies is based on the analogy between social life and organic life. An organism is an agglomeration of cells and interstitial fluids arranged in relation to one another not as an aggregate but as an integrated living whole. In other words, it is a complexly integrated system molecules. The system of relations by which these units are related is the organic structure. The structure is thus to be defined as a set of relations between entities. As long as it lives, the organism preserves the complete identity of its constituent parts. It loses some of its constituent molecules by respiration or excretion; it takes in others by respiration and alimentary absorption. Over a period its constituent cells do not remain the same. But the structural
arrangement of the constituent units does remain similar. The process by which this structural continuity of the activities and interactions of the constituent units of the organism, the cells, and the organ into which the cells are united. Thus, the life an organism is conceived as the functioning of its structure. It is through and by the continuity of the functioning that the continuity of the structure is preserved.

Turning from organic life to social life, Brown establishes his structural functionalism as given herein: when we examine any community, we can recognize the existence of a social structure. Individual human beings, the essential units in this instance, are connected by a definite set of social relations into an integrated whole. The continuity of the social structure, like that of an organic structure is not destroyed by changes in the units. Individuals may leave the society, by death or otherwise, other may enter it. The continuity of structure is maintained by the process of social life, which consists of the activities and interaction of the individual human beings and of the organized groups into which they are united. The social life of the community is here defined as the functioning of the social structure. The function of any recurrent activity is the part it plays in the social life as a whole and therefore, the contribution it makes to the maintenance of the structural continuity.

The concept of function as here defined thus involves the notion of a structure consisting of a set of relations amongst unit
entitles, the continuity of the structure being maintained by a life process made of the activities of the constituent units.

Radcliffe-Brown, however, reminds us that, two important points are there where the analogy between organism and society breaks down. The first is that, in an organism it is possible to observe the organic structure, to some extent, independently of its functioning. But in a human society the social structure as a whole can only be observed in it's functioning. The second point is that an organism does, not in the course of its life, change its structural type. On the other hand, a society in the course of its history can and does change its structural type without any breach of continuity.

Radcliffe-Brown says that by the definition there offered, function is the contribution which a partial activity makes to the total activity of which it is a part. The function of a particular social usage is the contribution it makes to the total social life as the functioning of the total social system. Such a view implies that a social system has a certain kind of unity, which we may speak of as a functional unity. Brown defines it as a condition in which all parts of the social system work together with a sufficient degree of harmony or internal consistency.

The social structure is an ordered arrangement of parts or components. It may be seen as an arrangement of persons in institutionally controlled or defined relationships. The first place, Brown regards as a part of the social structure, all the social
relations of person to person. Secondly Brown includes under social structure the differentiation of individuals and of classes by their social role. In the study of social structure, the concrete reality with which we are concerned in the set of actually existing relations, at a given moment of time, which linked together certain human beings. Thus the study of social structure leads immediately to the study of interests or values as the determinants of social relations. A social relation does not result from similarity of interests, but rests either on the mutual interest of persons in one another or on one or more common interests, or on a combination of both of these. When two or more persons have a common interest in an object, that object can be said to have a social value for the persons thus associated. The study of social values in this sense is therefore, a part of the study of social structure.

As institution is an established norms of conduct recognized as such by a distinguished social groups. Social Institutions, in the sense of standardized modes of behavior, constitute the machinery by which a social structure maintains its existence and its continuity. Brown defines the social function of a socially standardized mode of activity, or mode of thought, as its relation to the social structure, to the existence and continuity of which it makes some contribution. Thus, the social structure consists of the ordered arrangement of parts and the function of the parts is to interrelate the components of the structure, and to maintain its
integrity, social function is the interconnection between social structure and social life.

By the function of an institution, Brown means the part it plays in the total system of social integration of which it is a part. By using that phrase 'social integration', Brown assures that the function of culture as a whole is to unite individual human beings into more or less stable structures as to make possible an ordered social life.

In his STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION IN PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES, Brown applied his structural-functional principles mainly to the analysis of kinship system which remain as classic in socio-culture Anthropology.

RAYMOND FIRTH:

Firth was influenced by both Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown. Like Malinowski he is concerned to some extent, with the nature of individuals, and the choices that they make. Following Brown, he focuses on observed activities. Firth sets out his impressions on structural-functionalism thus: “To analyse the repercussions of the acts of individuals, to show how they are integrated into sets of behaviors, each with a guiding theme, and to make clear the relationship of these themes to one another”.

One of the important contributions attributed to Firth is the distinction he made between social structure and social organization. While the arrangement of parts or elements constitutes social structure, how people in the society get things
done constitutes social organization. To give an analogy, the study of social structure is comparable to the study of human anatomy, and that of social organization to that of human physiology. Within the framework of social structure, individuals always keep making choice, between alternatives, which have significant consequences. The manner in which a social structure appears at a given time, as it is being activated by the choice making individuals, is social organization. In other words social organization stands for how social structure works out in time.

MEYER FORTES:

Fortes has often been considered as the true disciple of Radcliffe – Brown for several reasons. Fortes regarded social structure as the foundation of the whole of social life of any continuing society. According to him, social structure is not an aspect of culture, but the entire culture of a given people handled in a special frame of theory.

In his classic article “The social structure of Unilineal Descent Groups”. Fortes has analyzed the African kinship system.

According to Fortes, the social structure should be thought of in terms of levels of organization. He says that we can investigate the total social structure of a given community at the level of local organization, at the level of kinship, at the level of corporate group structure of government, and at that of ritual institutions. Fortes demonstrate how these levels are related to different collective interests which are perhaps connected in some sort of hierarchy.
And one of the problems of analysis and exposition is to perceive and state the fact that all levels of structure are simultaneously involved in every social relationship and activity. This restatement of what is commonly meant by the concept of integration has the advantage of suggesting how the different modes of social relationship distinguished in any society are interlocked with one another. It helps to make clear also how certain basic principles of social organization can be generalized throughout the whole structure of a primitive society.

Fortes believes that the study of unilineal descent groups as a part of a total social system means in fact, studying its function in the widest framework of social structure, and that of the political organization. He ultimately shows that descent is fundamentally a jural concept, as Brown has argued. Fortes see its significance in the connecting link between the external that is, political or legal aspect of unilineal descent groups, and the internal or domestic aspect. The dynamic character of lineage structure can be seen most casually in the balance that is reached between its external relations and its internal structure. Maintaining the stable condition in the social structure is one of the chief functions of lineage systems.

Fortes concludes that this frame of reference thus gives us procedures of investigation and analysis by which a social system can be apprehended as a unity made of part and processes that are
linked to one another by a limited number of principles of wide validity in homogenous and relatively stable societies.

**S. F. NADEL:**

Nadel produced two outstanding theoretical looks that combined philosophical, psychological and mathematical models. *The Foundations of Social Anthropology* and *The Theory of Social Structure* revealed a synthesis of structural – functionalism. Nadels central argument was simply that the structuralist orthodoxy was inadequate by itself – it had to be wedded to a functionalism perspective.

Nadel feels that when describing structure we abstract relational features from the totality of the perceived data, ignoring all that is not ‘order’ or ‘arrangement’, in brief, we define the positions relative to one another of the component parts. This has an important consequences, namely the structures can be transposed irrespective of the concrete data manifesting it differently expressed the parts composing any structure can vary widely in their concrete character without changing the identity of the structure. Our definition should thus be rephrased as follows: structure indicates an ordered arrangement of parts, which can be treated as transposable, being relatively invariant, while the parts themselves are variable.

Nadel now translates all this into the language appropriate to the analysis of societies. To begin with, societies are made up of people; societies have boundaries, people either belonging to them
or not; and people belong to a society in virtue of rules under which they stand and which impose on them regular determinate ways of acting towards and in regard to one another. Conceivably, in theory, there might be as many such ways of acting as there are situations in which people meet, practically an infinite number. But we are here speaking of ways of acting governed by rules and hence in some measure stereotyped. And of the ways of acting so understood it is time to say that they are finite and always less numerous than the possible combinations of people which means that the same way of acting are repetitive in the population.

Nadel now expands and clarifies for 'determinate ways of acting towards or in regard to one another' we usually say relationships and we indicate that they follow from rules by calling them institutionalized or social relationships. We identify the mutual ways of acting of individuals as 'relationships' only when the former exhibit some consistency and constancy since without these attributes they would merely be single or disjointed acts. Most relationships however, lack this simple constancy or uniformity. Rather, the concrete behavior occurring in them will always be diversified and more or less widely variable, intentionally changing with the circumstance; it will be consistent or constant only in its general character i.e., in its capacity to indicate a certain type of mutuality or linkage. Thus, in identifying any relationship we already abstract from the qualitatively varying modes of behavior, an invariant relational aspect – the linkage between
people they signify. Nadel now concludes that we arrive at the structure of a society through abstracting from the concrete population and its behavior, the pattern or network of relationships obtaining 'between actors in their capacity of playing roles relative to one another'. Considered by itself, it represents an unproblematic and elementary form of structuring. It becomes interesting and important only through its implications of interdependence between persons of sections so numbered that is, when it goes together with some differentiation and interlocking of their respective 'way of acting' and hence with a 'network' of relationships. In other words, it is concerned with the functions of the structure.

V. STRUCTURALISM:

'Structuralism' refers to the search of the deep innate and orderly principles that underlie any system. The basic assumption of structuralism is that, the human mind possesses certain given properties, which are the source of all human achievements and accomplishments. Structural Analysis consists of discovering these fundamental properties that lie behind the creation of any man-made system. In other words, structural analysis attempts to unravel the logic of the human mind. Structural Linguistics and Structural Anthropology endeavor to follow this method in the analysis of language and socio-cultural system respectively. Structuralism, in effect, involves the study of conscious experience
through introspection, and focuses on the atomistic or elementary mental states such as sensations, images and feelings.

**STRUCTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY:**

LEVI - STRAUSS is the founder of structuralism in Anthropology. He developed the ideas of reciprocity as the fundamental principle of social structure, which Malinowski had demonstrated, from his work in the Trobriand Islands. He borrows his ideas from structural linguistics, particularly the Prague Schools of Linguistics, who demonstrated that it is the structure of language is not a mere inventory of its sound, but that is relationships between sounds that provides significance. These relationships are not normally conscious in the minds of speakers, but they form the basis for discovering cross-culturally valid invariant rules. Levi - Strauss develops these ideas further in the following manner. He states that language is a social phenomenon, and, of all social phenomena, it is the one which manifests to the greatest degree two fundamental characteristics which make it susceptible to scientific study. In the first place, much of linguistic behavior lies on the level of unconscious thought. When we speak we are not conscious of the syntactic and morphological laws of our language. Moreover, we are not ordinarily conscious of the phonemes that we employ to convey different meanings; and we are rarely, if ever, conscious of the phonemes that we employ to convey different meanings, and we are rarely, if ever, conscious of the phonological opposition, which reduce each phoneme to a bundle
of distinctive features. This absence of consciousness, moreover still holds when we do become aware of the grammar or the phonemics of our language. For, while this awareness is the privilege of the scholar, language, as a matter of fact, lives and develops only as a collective construct; and even the scholar's linguistic knowledge always remains dissociated from his experience as speaking agent, for his mode of speech is not affected by his ability to interpret his language on a higher level. We may say, then, in so far as language is concerned we need not fear the influence of the observer on the observed phenomena, because the observer cannot modify the phenomenon merely by becoming conscious of it.

Levi Strauss draws attention to the analogy between a social group and a language. The variety of possible attitude in the areas of interpersonal relationships within a social groups is almost unlimited; the same hold time for the variety of sounds which can be articulated by the vocal apparatus – and which are actually produced during the first months of human life. Each language, however, retains only a very small number among all possible sounds, and in this respect linguistics raise two questions: Why are certain sounds selected? What relationships exist between one or several of the sounds chosen and all the others? Like language, the social group has a great wealth the psycho-physiological material at its disposal. Like language, it too retains only certain elements, at least some of which remains the same throughout the most
varied cultures and are combined into structures which are always diversified. Thus we may wonder about the reason for this choice and the laws of combination.

Levi Strauss now discusses the relationships between language and culture:

1. In the first place, language can be said to be a result of culture. The language which is spoken by one population is a reflection of the total culture of the population.

2. In the second place, one can also say that language is a part of culture. It is one of those many things which make up a culture.

3. In the third place, language can be said to be a condition of culture, and this in two different ways: first, it is a condition of culture in a diachronic way, because it is mostly through language that we learn about our own culture – we are taught by our parents, with language. Second, from a much more theoretical point of view, language can be said to be a condition of culture because the material out of which the whole culture is built: logical relations, oppositions, correlations and the like. Language, from this point of view, may appear as laying a kind of foundation for the more complex structures which correspond to the different aspects of culture.
Following structural linguistics, Levi Strauss explains that when a culture system different from one's own is first encountered, it appears to be incoherent, but structural analysis shows that it possesses its own internal logic. He holds that this coherence transcends all utility and function, and it follows that the principles of this logic can be accounted for only in terms of the inherent and unconscious structure of the human mind itself. Levi Strauss is thus interested in discovering the structure of the human mind and human thought processes.

According to Levi Strauss, the basic property of the human mind is "Dualism" or to think in dyads. Each dyad consists of a pair of oppositions which he calls "Binary Oppositions." The dialectic expresses itself in verbal classifications such as these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Profane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is this dichotomizing tendency of the human mind that gives specific shape to the arrangement of social phenomena. The most important activity of the human mind is to organize the raw materials of experience provided by history and environment. Thus the primary distinction between Nature and Culture emerges. The
human mind transposes natural phenomena into cultural phenomena. Let us take the dyad,

Raw X Cooked

While the former is a natural occurrence the latter is a cultural occurrence.

Levi Strauss contends that social behavior is always conducted by reference to a Conceptual Scheme, an ideal model in the action’s mind of how things are or how they ought to be. And the essential characteristic of this ideal scheme is that it is logically ordered. It now becomes apparent that by ‘structure’ Levi Strauss does not refer to an articulation which can be directly observed by a logical ordering, a set of mathematical equations which can be demonstrated as functionally equivalent to the phenomenon under discussion. In other words, the structure can be represented as a model.

While comparing structural linguistics and structural anthropology, Levi Strauss emphasizes the revolutionary role of structural linguistics with respect to the social sciences. He reviews the goals and methods of linguistics and argues that it provides a model of scientific method of anthropology. Its approach is objective and regroups, it has defined constituent units, studied their interrelations and isolated constants; finally language is susceptible of mathematical analysis. Both language and culture one built of oppositions, correlations and logical relations. Language can, therefore, be treated as a conceptual model for other
aspect of culture; these aspects can also be regarded as system of communication.

Just as the scholar of linguistics interprets the language structure, the anthropologist interprets the structure of culture.

Structural Anthropology has focused mainly on three fields:

1. Kinship Analysis
2. Analysis of Myth
3. Semantic Analysis

This Chapter on approach to Ethnography was mainly to focus on the need for multiple methods to understand the ethnic and institutional characteristics of Doms. We see that each approach has its own limitations. Earlier studies also known as 'Armchair' studies like those of BRIGGS and CROOKE suffered from the limitations of fieldwork analysis. Unlike, BRIGGS and CROOKE study, my study was based on intensive observational fieldwork, where I narrate stories regarding their own origin or legends of their own origin.

According to my study regarding the Doms of Gorakhpur, the stories of origin that they told about themselves was their link to Kshatriyas, that once upon a time they were rich and mighty as Kshatriyas and that their ancestors belonged to this caste. But I found that they had very vague notions of how from the status of Kshatriyas they became the deprived and marginalised community.

These Doms also trace their origin to DOMINGARH FORT in DOMARIAGANG which is in close proximity to Gorakhpur. But in
my study I did not find any remnants of this fort. Though 'Imperial Gazetteer' of Gorakhpur district mention about their presence. In my study, the place where Domingarh Fort was to be I found there was a mound of earth and several locals occupied this area.