

# AN ESSAY ON: RELIGION AND SOCIETY

Dr. Tingneichong Gangte

## Introduction:-

In this paper, we are going to look at how religion and society influence each other through the various writings of sociologists. Religion in sociology have become important because it helps in understanding the role of religion in society, to analyze its significance in and impact upon human history, and to understand its diversity and the social forces and influences that shape it (Hamilton 1995:2).

## Definition-

There is no absolute definition of religion each author's definition will differ from another. Here are a few definitions of religion.

'Beliefs, symbols and rituals are major components of all religions, and many social scientists have suggested that they are the primary "building block" of religious institutions. Beliefs are strongly held ideas; symbols are ideas and images; rituals are more or less fixed sequences of behaviour that assume special importance when performed within a religious context. Social scientists contend that beliefs, symbols and rituals are necessary for the creation and maintenance of religious institutions the world over' (Magill 1995: 1094).

'A religion is a set of meaning and behaviours having reference to individuals who are or were or could be religious. Again, religion is a generic term referring to all conceivable religions, formal or informal (in Ferm 1987:647).

'A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden- beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a church, all those who adhere to them' (Durkheim 1957:47).

Ronald L. Johnstone defines, "Religion is a system of beliefs and practices by which a group of people interpret and respond to what they feel is super-natural or sacred".

So, we can see from the above definitions that religion is a body of beliefs and practices that directs an individual and a body that holds the community together.

## Characteristics:

**I.Religion is a group phenomenon:** - Religion though can be an individual affair, is usually a group affair. Individuality in religion can take the forms of hermits or monks. Religion is a community phenomenon which involves a whole group of people. Religion, at the largest, is the society. It generally involves a congregation or a ceremonial gathering which involves a large group of people. For example, a church, a temple or a mosque.

**II.Religion is concerned with the sacred and supernatural:** - Almost all religions in the world involve the sacred or supernatural. Buddhism is the only religion that does not involves either one. Every other religion talks of the sacred or supernatural as its key feature.

**III.Religion involves a body of practices:** - Beliefs are derived from experiences in life. A member is told to believe and then commune to God. Thus, it leads to a belief in God. The body of belief has to be experienced in most religions.

Religion also involves a body of facts which are found in sacred books like the Bible, Quran, Torah, Gita, etc. These books are a body of facts – ultimate truth.

**IV.Religion involves a body of practices:** - First comes the belief of the existence of a supernatural power, then in order to reflect this, practices are followed. Religion involves practices of love, peace, charity etc. But most of all, it involves the practices of rites and rituals. Religion involves a lot of practices which often reflects the belief that is being followed. Believing follows practices in any religion.

Thus, these are some of the characteristics of religion which reflects that religion is social and involves a lot of rites and rituals to be followed by the believers of any particular faith.

## Theories of religion:-

Before we begin, there has to be a discussion on the two terms “religion” and “theory”. Most people have some idea of what “religion” is. They are most likely to think of belief in a God, supernatural spirits, or an after- life or to name one of the great world religions, such as Hinduism, Christianity, or Islam. Most people have a general idea of what a “theory” is. Having heard it often in the context of science, they think of it as a kind of explanation- an attempt to “account for” something that is not at first understood, usually by offering an answer to the common question “why?” (Pals 1996:11).

As we go on with the theories, we will be able to see the connection between these two terms. The theories are placed in a sequence, both chronological and conceptual, that is meant to show a pattern (Ibid: 14).

**I. Animism and magic: E.B. Taylor and J.G. Frazer** – the writing of these two theorists are related and their ideas closely resemble each other. The first is Edward Burnett Tylor (1832 – 1917), a self – educated Englishman who never attended a university but, through his travels and independent study, arrived at the theory of animism, which in his view held the key to the origin of religion. (Ibid: 16).

His book *Primitive Culture* (1871) presents his theory of animism in definitive form, it is the natural centrepiece for our examination of Tylor’s views. The work which has been appreciated within its historical and religious context was published in Victorian Britain at a time when thoughtfully religious people were wrestling with more than a few disturbing challenges to their faith with the coming of Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* and at a time when people were questioning some of the most basic elements of Christian religious beliefs. Thus, *Primitive Culture* sends another tremor of doubt through an already unsettled populace. (Ibid: 17, 18).

For Tylor, the connection between basic rational thinking and social evolution in all aspects of culture is apparent. For example, the use of magic which is the association of ideas, a tendency which ties lies at the very foundation of human reason. Primitive people believed that they could hurt or heal others just by acting on fingernail, a lock of hair etc. In relation to this, Tylor also talks about myths which have originated in the logical association of ideas. They arise from the natural tendency to clothe every idea in a concrete shape.

Tylor’s comments on myths are important because they mark the path of enquiry that must be followed in searching for the origin of religion. He said that religion is not simply a belief in God. He defined religion as “belief in spiritual beings”. Tylor feels that one characteristic shared by all religions, great or small, ancient or modern, is the belief in spirits who think, act, and feel like human persons. The essence of religion, like mythology, seems to be animism (from the latin anima, meaning spirit) the belief in living, personal powers behind all things. Animism is a very old form of thought, which is found throughout the entire history of the human. So, Tylor suggest, if we truly wish to explain religion, the question we must answer is this: How and why did the human race first come to believe that such things as spiritual beings actually exist? (Ibid: 24).

From their encounters with death and dreams, early people reasoned first to a simple theory of their own lives: every human is animated by a soul, or spiritual principle. For them, this soul was a thin, unsubstantial human image, in its nature a sort of vapour, film, or shadow; the cause of life and thought in the individual it animates. They further reasoned that, if souls explain movement activities and changes of human person, why not trees, stars, rivers and the rest of the natural world not be moved by souls. They also reasoned that there could be demons and angels if there not be certain supreme spirits like Gods (Ibid: 25).

Tylor argues that the value of this animistic theory to primitive peoples is apparent from the great variety of early beliefs and customs it can readily explain. In oriental cultural there is widespread belief in reincarnation, which in religions of the Western World, like Christianity and Islam, there are the doctrines of resurrection and immortality of the soul. All these can be understood in Animistic terms, as ways of extending the life of the soul beyond the time of death. Animism also explains why sacred objects and thinkers things called ‘fetishes’ – are important to primitives. They are not idol worshippers but they adore the “anima” within the spirit which gives its life and power.

Tylor said that once these spiritual ideas gripped the minds of ancient people, they did not remain in a fixed form. Animism also follows a pattern of growth and development. At first people think of individual spirits as small and specific and associated them with tree, river or animal they happen to see. Later on their power beings to widen and the spirit of one tree grows in power to become the spirit of the forest or of trees in general. Overtime the same spirit acquires its own identity and character separated from the object.

Tylor also talks about how the Greeks belong to an age of cultural progress rather than decline and this is also related to religion. In ancient Greece, a new era of civilization which Tylor calls “the barbaric” stage takes over from the earlier savage stage. In the savage era, people hunted, gathered and lived in simple villages, and never got beyond their simple ideas of spirit. The barbaric age brought agriculture, cities and literacy. Here we find the spirits of local trees and rivers on one level while above them stand the much greater spirits of the wind, rain and sun. These poly theistic systems are quite typical of the barbaric age. They reach their highest form when they are organised in a way

that one God, one Supreme Being, stands at the top of the divine society. Most civilisations do move to this last highest stage of animism – belief in one supreme divinity, Christianity and Judaism are the leading examples of this last stage.

Taylor's theory practices a mixed portrait of religion and its development. He declares that the story of animism is an encouraging one. Religion can be seen to have gradually evolved upward from the first primitive belief in the spirits of the trees and rocks to the later high plain of monotheism and ethics exhibited in the Judaism and Christianity of the present day. Religion is now a survival because like other odd customs and superstitions people are unwilling to part with it. In the final analysis, Taylor says animist ideas belong properly to the childhood of the human race, not to its maturity. And having eternal things (Ibid: 28, 29).

Now, we will be discussing about Frazer's views on religion. Early in his career, while still a promising young student in classics at Cambridge University, James George Frazer became a "convert" to Taylor's ideas and methods. The centrepiece of Frazer's many labours was the *Golden Bough* (1890-1915), a monumental study of primitive customs and beliefs. The subjects of magic and religion became a central theme of the book. Whenever natural circumstances did not accommodate their needs like suitable rain for crops, primitive people, being capable of thought, made every effort they could to understand the world and change it. The first of these efforts took the form of magic. Frazer's full name for it is "sympathies, or influences. He explained that "savages" always suppose that when two things can in some way be mutually associated – when to the mind they appear "sympathetic" – they must also be physically associated in the outside world. Mental connections mirror physical ones. He points out that the two main connections made by the sympathetic magician are basically of two types – imitative, the magic that connects things on the principle of similarity; and contagious, the magic of contact, which connects on the principle of attachment. In one case, we might say "like affects like," in the other, "part affects part." When Russian peasants pour water through a screen in time of drought, they imagine that because the filtered falling water looks like a thundershower, sprinkling of this sort will actually force rain to fall from the sky. When a voodoo priest pushes a pin through the heart of a doll decorated enemy, he imagines that merely by contact by contagious transmission – he can bring death to his victim (Ibid: 35).

Magic is also faced with a fundamental problem. It may look like science but it is a false science. The laws of imitation and contact also not apply in the real world. So Frazer said that as magic declines, religion comes to fill its place (Ibid: 36).

Religion is quite different from magic. Frazer agreed with Taylor's definition of religion but is more concerned in the contrast than the similarities it shows with magic. For him, the interesting thing about religion is precisely its rejection of the principles of magic. Instead of laws of contact and imitation, religious people claim that the real powers behind the natural world are not the principles at all; they are personalities – the supernatural beings we call the Gods. So when religious people want to control or change the course of nature, they do not use magic spells but pray to their favourite God or Goddess. For Frazer, whenever there is a belief in supernatural beings and human efforts are used to win their help by prayers or ritual, human thought has moved out of the realm of magic and into that of religion. Religion marks an intellectual advance for the human race.

With the coming of religion, Frazer also said that changes have appeared in society like old magician – king giving away to new priest – king whose power lies in the new religious type of thought meaning his ability to communicate with the Gods.

Frazer also talks about how magic and religion play a combining role as well. For example – many tribal societies think of their king, in religious terms, as God, conceive of his powers and his relation to the tribe as magical. In the *Golden Bough*, Frazer talks about how primitive people consider the king as god and how measures should be taken to preserve his divine energy so when the king grows old, they are ritually put to death so that their divine spirit can be conveyed in full strength to a new ruler. These are considered as sacred acts of magical necessity.

Thus, Frazer concluded that it should be clear that the earliest humans lived their lives in a system of ideas that were rational enough for them but fearfully distant from our own. In his view, worship of the Gods have risen in the earliest human attempts to explain the world and it was driven by the human desire to control the power of nature. Magic was the first attempt but it failed. As it declined, religion filled its place. Religion put hopes in prayers and holdings. So Frazer said, just as the age of magic was replaced by that of religion, so too the present era of belief in the gods, one or many, must yield to the third and next era of human thought – the age of science, which is now upon us (Ibid: 43).

**II. Religion and Personality: Sigmund Freud** – Few thinker in modern times have stirred more fierce debate than Sigmund Freud (1856 – 1939), the psychologist from Vienna, Austria, who at the turn of our century shocked not only field of medicine but society at large with his starting new analysis of the human personality. In the last two decades of his life, Freud added to his more specifically psycho-analytical studies several controversial works on general subjects related to society, science and religion. The future of Illusion (1972) and Moses and Monotheism (1938) were the two main books in which he expressed his ideas on religion.

Freud's approach to religion is quite different from that taken by people who are themselves religious. Freud said that religious ideas do not come from a god or gods, for gods do not exist. He further said that religious beliefs are erroneous and that they are superstitions which raise important questions about human nature (Ibid: 65).

In his book "The Future of Illusion," he considered religion in the present and looks ahead. This book talks about how human life has evolved out of the natural world and how nature constantly threatens to destroy us through predators, disasters, diseases, or physical decline. For protection, we join into clans and communities thereby creating civilizations. Freud discussed about how we all crave for childhood security and how in reality we can no longer have it. Here, Freud brings in religions which project onto the external world gods, who through his power dispels the face of death, and reward us for accepting the moral restrictions imposed by civilization. In the eye of such faith, even death loses its sting. These beliefs have been described by Freud as "illusions". An illusion is a belief whose main characteristic is that we very much want it to be true.

Religions teachings, therefore, are not truths revealed by God, nor are they logical conclusions based on scientifically confirmed evidence. They are ideas whose main feature is that we dearly want them to be true. They are "fulfillments of the oldest, strongest and most urgent wishes of mankind. The secret of their strength lies in the strength of those wishes." (Ibid: 72).

In *Moses and Monotheism*, his writing was based on Judaism, his religious tradition. The book talks about the bible in which we find Moses who was the great Hebrew Prophet who inspired the people of Israel by giving them the law of God and who was devoted to only one deity – the Sun God Aten. However his monotheistic religion was overlaid by a new cult which had rituals, superstitions and bloody animal sacrifice. The book examined the psychoanalysis of both Jewish and Christian monotheism which few theologians and historians would dare to attempt.

Thus, Freud claimed that all of religion is just a psychological device by which we attach our own hopes, virtues, and ideals to an imaginary supernatural being we call "God" and in the process only diminish ourselves. Religion arises from emotions and conflicts that originate early in childhood and lie deep beneath the rational normal surface of the personality. It is best seen as an obsession neurosis (Ibid: 78).

Freud has been heavily criticized for his works. He was called as a shrewd promoter of his own interest, ignored valid criticism and even misused people when their actions served the purpose of his programs. In *Moses and Monotheism*, scholars have found in the biblical and archaeological evidence little support for Freud's highly imaginative reconstruction of an early history of the Jews. In *The Future of an Illusion*, he talks about religion being similar to neurosis but in reality we have to be reasonable and appropriate in our approach. So, despite being criticized, Freud remains as an important contributor to the study of religion and society.

**III. Society a sacred: Emile Durkheim** – The elementary Form of the Religious life is probably Durkheim's greatest work. The Elementary Form is an enquiry into the manner in which religion acts both as a source of moral authority and, via its practices and rituals, social solidarity. In the Elementary Forms Durkheim also argues that our basic categories of thought are social in origin. In this book, Durkheim displays his tendency towards evolutionary thinking as he uses an in-depth case-study of a "simple" clan – based society (Australian Aborigines) with a totemic religion to provide one understanding of the relations between religion and society in more complex societies (in McIntosh 1997: 232). His underlying interest was to understand the basic forms of religion life for all societies. Durkheim argued that religions were an expression of social cohesion or social solidarity.

Religion is eminently social. Religious representations are collective representations which express collective realities; the rites are a manner of acting which take rise in the midst of assembled groups and which are destined to excite, maintain or recreate certain mental states in these groups (Durkheim 1957: 10).

Religion cannot be defined except by the characteristics which are found whenever religion itself is found. One important idea which generally passes as characteristic of all that is religious, in that of the supernatural which is the world of the mysterious, of the unknowable, of the un-understandable (Ibid: 25).

Another idea by which the attempt to define religions is often made is that of divinity (Ibid: 29). Religion is the belief in Spiritual Beings that are to be understood as conscious subjects gifted with powers which are superior to common men. But there are also great religions from which the idea of Gods and spirits is absent or play only a minor role.

There are rites without gods and rites from which gods are derived. "All religious powers do not emanate from divine personalities, and their relations of cult which have other objects than uniting man to a deity. Religion is more than the idea of gods or spirits, and consequently cannot be defined exclusively in relation to these latter (Ibid: 35).

All known religious beliefs, whether single or complex, present one common characteristic: they presuppose a classification of all the things, real and ideal, of which men think, into two classes or opposed groups, generally designated by two distinct terms which are translated well enough by the words profane and sacred. (Ibid: 37).

Sacred things are always set apart as superior, powerful, forbidden to normal contact and deserving of great respect. Profane things are the opposite; they belong to the ordinary, uneventful, and practical routine of everyday life. Sacred things always involve large concerns: the interest and welfare of an entire group of people. Profane things on

the other hand, are little matters; they reflect the day – to – day business of each individual (Pals 1996: 99). So, sacred things involve collective society while profane involves only the individual or a family.

With religion, we also have to talk about magic. Magic is made up of beliefs and rites. It is myths and dogmas and does not waste time in pure speculation. It has its ceremonies, sacrifices, lustrations, prayers, chants and dances as well. The beings and objects used in magic and religion are often identical. So, often the souls of the dead are religious objects but also play a role in magic. For example – in Australia as well as in Melanesia, Greece and among Christians, the soul of the dead, their bones and their hairs are often used by the magician (Durkheim 1957: 43).

Many people associated magic with religion and many adhere to it as the real religion but these adherents are not bonded or united into a group leading a common life. There is no Church of magic. The magician and his client have no lasting bond unlike in religion and is more of a sick man with his physician. A church is a moral community formed by believers in a single faith, laymen and priests. But magic lacks any such community.

With all the above characteristics and views about religion, Durkheim have defined it as – A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden – beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them (Ibid: 47). Religion, thus, should be an eminently collective thing. It cannot be separated from society.

With regards to religion, we have to discuss about totemism. A totem is a symbol which is a material expression of something else which symbolizes two things. First, it is the outward and visible form of what is called the totemic principle or god. It is also the symbol of the determined society called the clan. It is the flag and distinguishes it from other clans. In them, people have also found a source of religious nature (in McIntosh 1997: 239).

Totemism is not a sort of animal worship. The attitude of man towards the animals or plants whose name he bears is not at all that of a believer towards his god, for he belongs to the sacred world himself. Their relations are rather those of two beings who are on the same level and equal value (Durkheim 1957: 139).

Durkheim also talked about the soul in his book. There is hardly any society which does not believe in the existence of souls. All the Australian societies admit that every human body shelters interior beings, the principle of the life which animates it: this is the soul (Ibid: 241).

The notion of the soul is a particular application of the beliefs relative to sacred beings. The soul has always been considered a sacred thing and thus, opposed to the body which is, in itself, profane. It inspires those sentiments which are everywhere reserved for that which is divine. The soul is a sacred thing. A soul is not a spirit. A spirit often tied by the closest bonds to some particular object like a rock, a tree etc., may go away at will and lead an independent existence in free space.

Durkheim also talked about the conflict between science and religion. It is said that science denies religion in principle. But religion exists because it is the system of given faults.

Durkheim contends that all religious theories claim that religion is simply a natural instinct of the human race and desired for logical responses to the world they encounter it. He considered them as ambitious and said in order to be scientific about religion we cannot make guesses about how people thought at the dawn of history but we must look at present day. For him, a religion linked to the simplest social system may be regarded as “the most elementary religion we can possibly know” (Pals 1996: 101).

Thus there is something eternal in religion which is destined to survive all the particular symbols in which religious thoughts has successfully enveloped itself. There can be no society which does not feel the need of upholding and reaffirming at regular intervals the collective sentiments and the collective ideas which make its unity and its personality. Now this moral remaking cannot be achieved except by the means of reunions, assemblies and meetings where the individuals, being closely united to one another, reaffirm in common their common sentiments; hence come ceremonies which do not differ from regular religious ceremonies, either in their object, the result which they produce, or the process employed to attain these results (Durkheim 1957: 427).

So, for Durkheim religion is a mystification of collectivity. Religion is nothing but collective strength of society which proves that collectivity is stronger than the individual.

Needless to say, Durkheim's view and religion have faced criticisms. Durkheim's writings have been said that they are based on “the most unsound group of ethnographical facts” by Arnold Van Gennep, the famed Dutch anthropologist. He has also described religion as a hallmark of social health while most theorists have seen it a disease.

**IV. Religion as Alienation: Karl Marx** – Marx to begin with was known as a social atheist. He was never an “anti – theist”. He was not a religious man but always spoke in favour of religion especially Christianity and Judaism. He never spoke about the existence of God but said that it would be wrong to go against religion.

Religion for Marx was essentially the product of a class society. His ideas on religion are part of his general theory of alienation in class – divided societies. Religion is seen as both a product of alienation and an expression of class interests. It is at one and the same time a tool for the manipulation and oppression of the subordinate class in

society, an expression of protest against oppression and a form of resignation and consolation in the face of oppression (Hamilton 1995: 91).

For him, belief in God and in some heavenly salvation is not just an illusion; it is an illusion that paralyzes and imprisons. It paralyzes workers by drawing off into fantasy the very motives of anger and frustration they need to organized a revolt. Desire for heaven makes them connect with earth. At the same time religion also imprisons; it promotes oppression by presenting a system of belief which declares that poverty and misery are facts of life which ordinary people must simply accept and embrace (Pals 1996: 143).

Religion is pure illusion with most definitely evil consequences. It is so fully determined by economics that it is pointless to consider any of its doctrines or beliefs on their own merits. Marx said that belief in a God or Gods is an unhappy by – product of the class – struggle (Ibid: 138, 139).

The alienation evident in religion is the expression of our more basic unhappiness, which is always economic. Religion has a powerful and lasting appeal. It addresses the emotional needs of an alienated unhappy humanity.

“Religion is the opium of the people” is one of the most frequently paraphrased statements of Karl Marx. It was translated from the Germany original “Die Religion...ist das opium des Volkes” and is often referred to as “religion is the opium of the masses”. For Marx, opium eased pain as it created fantasies. This is precisely the role of religion in the life of the poor. Through it, the pain people suffer in a world of cruel exploitations is eased by the fantasy of a supernatural world where all sorrows cease, all oppression disappears (Ibid: 141). Religion is the sigh of the oppressed culture, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.

Central to Marx’s theories was the oppressive economic situation in which he dwelt. With the rise of European industrialism, Marx and his colleague Friedrich Engels witnessed and responded to the growth of what he called “surplus value”. Marx’s view of capitalism saw rich capitalists getting richer and their workers getting poorer (the gap, the exploitation, was the surplus value). Workers were exploited and alienated from everything. Here, religion enters. Capitalism utilizes our tendency towards religion as a tool or ideological state apparatus to justify this alienation. Christianity teaches that those who gather up riches and power in this life will certainly not be rewarded in the next while those who suffer oppression and poverty in this life, while cultivating their spiritual wealth, will be rewarded in the kingdom of God. Thus, Marx’s famous line – “religion is the opium of the people”, as it soothes them and dulls their senses to the pain of oppression is correctly said.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe, these were the attitudes carried in all sections of the society.

Marx made two ramifications –

**I. Religion is a social narcotic:** Because of the working class and their attitude towards their poor position, they were treating religion like opium (narcotic, drug). Marx saw that religion killed all the mental stresses of the poor people. It is the opium of the people. They developed an attitude that their condition was natural and “God given”. They accepted their sufferings because they believed that they will be blessed later on. So, instead of protesting and revolting, religion made them docile, passive and accepting.

**II. Religion as a capitalist ideology:** The capitalists assumed a belief that they were rich because of the blessings of God. Marx said that they felt that God wanted them to be rich by exploitation. They used religion as a tool to become richer and keep the working class quite.

Thus, these are a few views of Marx on religion. He said that religion was the opium of the people. Marx said that religion must be abolished as the illusory happiness of the people before they can achieve real happiness. However, since religion is the product of social conditions, it cannot be abolished except by abolishing those social conditions (Hamilton 1995: 94). Marx said that religion is good but religion in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe was abused and Marx was bitterly against it.

Marx has been criticized because what Marx presents is not an account of religion in general but an analysis of Christianity and of similar faiths that stress belief in God and afterlife. Marx has also been criticized for reducing religion to economics. Though, he has been criticized, his views are generally taken and have influenced the masses.

Thus, these are some of the major theories of religion. They were, and still remain, impressive exhibits of the way in which theoretical enquiry, even in error, serves as a powerful incentive to further exploration and deeper understanding (Pals 1996: 283).

It is Essential to include the views and ideas of Max Weber in this paper because he gave tremendous contribution to the study of religion and society. In the Protestant Ethic he sought to illustrate the power of ideas as a catalyst for historical and social change and to give the realm of ideas some autonomy from the economic or natural world. Weber wanted to explain why modern capitalism emerged first in the West – particularly England. For modern rational capitalism in the West to develop there had to be not only the correct ‘external’ conditions – example wage labour, market, etc.- but also the creation of the correct mental attitude and personality. For Weber the widespread influence of Protestantism after the Reformation helped explain why full blown rational capitalism developed where

and when it did. Protestantism, in its various guises, overcome internal psychological obstacles – such as mysticism, ceremony and magic central to some religions like Catholicism – and helped foster an approach to life very useful for the development and expansion of capitalism, though Weber did not believe that Protestantism and reformation ‘caused capitalism’ (McIntosh 1997: 115).

He said that Protestantism was an important factor that led to the growth of capitalism in Europe. The European form of capitalism was a specific type of religious outlook. There was a close affinity, Weber argues, between the spirit of modern capitalism and the Protestant Ethic (Hamilton 1995: 166). The spirit of capitalism stimulated and promoted a distinctively European type of economic development. Capitalism was the social counterpart of Calvinist theology (Weber 1956: 2).

The central idea to which Weber appeals in confirmation of his theory is expressed in the characteristic phrase “a calling”. To the Calvinist, Weber argues, the calling is not a condition in which the individual is born, but a strenuous and exacting enterprise chosen by himself, and to be pursued with a sense of religious responsibility. Labour is not merely an economic means: it is a spiritual end. Covetousness, if a danger to the soul, is a less formidable menace than sloth. So far from poverty being meritorious, it is a duty to choose the more profitable occupation (Ibid: 2, 3).

Richard Baxter, a Presbyterian, in his works *Saints’ Everlasting Rest* or *Christian Directory* or similar works of others emphasized on wealth and its acquisition, on the ebionitic elements of the New Testament. Wealth is a great danger, its temptations never end and its pursuit is not only senseless when compared to the importance of the kingdom of God, but it is morally suspect. The saints’ everlasting rest is in the world and on earth man must be certain of his state of grace and the works of him who sent him along as it is yet day. Not leisure and enjoyment, but only activity will increase the glory of God (in McIntosh 1997: 122, 123). This means that it is important to do hard work and do all that you can for the glory of God. The view was an important source of motivation to earn more through hard labour which accelerated capitalism.

Waste of time is thus the first and in principle the deadliest of sins. The span of human life is infinitely short and precious to make sure of one’s own election. Loss of time through sociability, idle talk, luxury even more sleep than is necessary for health, six to almost eight hours, is worthy of absolute normal condemnation (Weber 1956: 157, 158). In a spiritual sense, time is money because every hour lost is lost to the labour for the glory of God. Thus, we can say that the motion of calling and how a man’s work on earth determines his afterlife have all made a big increase in capitalism.

The ethics of Protestantism like the notion of calling, value of hard work, value of time and so on are all essential for the expansion of the kingdom of God. These ethics have become the driving forces that have led to the universe growth of capitalism.

Thus, Weber gave a very religious outlook to what caused the rise of capitalism. The treatment of labour as a calling became as characteristic of the modern workers as the corresponding attitude towards acquisition of the business man (McIntosh 1997: 128). So, Weber considered religion as an important source of development.

## Summary:

Thus, we can see that religion is a group phenomenon and is eminently social. It is a group affair involving beliefs and practices. Religion and society are inseparable.

The theories of religion have profound impacts on later writings and thoughts as well. E.B. Taylor described religion as a belief in spiritual beings. He also talked about the belief in souls as well. Frazer tried to explain religion in term of magic. There are two types of magic which are sympathetic magic which is based on the law of similarity and the other is based on the law of contact called contagious magic. Frazer said that magic was replaced by religion. Freud said that religion is a psychological device by which we attach our hopes, virtues etc., to a supernatural being called God. For Freud, God does not exist and is merely an illusion. Emile Durkheim talked about religion being social and that it was an expression of social cohesion. Karl Marx viewed religion as the opium of the people because it eased the suffering of the masses and was also used by the capitalists to become richer.

Max Weber talked about how the Protestant ethic became the driving force for the growth of capitalism. Work becomes treated as calling prompting the masses to work hard for the glory of God.

To conclude, religion and society are inseparable and – to each other – virtually indispensable (Pals 1996: 89). Religion is social involving a group of people. Religion though is individualistic, tends to be more of a social institution. It brings social solidarity and also acts like a drug for the masses.

**References:**

- Durkheim, Emile, 1957. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Ferm, Vergilius. (ed). 1987. The Encyclopedia of Religion. New Jersey: Popular Books.
- Hamilton, Malcolm. 1995. The Sociology of Religion: Theoretical and Comparative Perspective (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) London: Routledge.
- Magill, Frank N. 1995. International Encyclopedia of Sociology. Volume II. London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- McIntosh, Ian. (ed.). 1997. Classical Sociological Theory: A Reader. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pals, Daniel L. 1996. Seven Theories of Religion. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Marx..1956. The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism. London: Unwin university Books.
- [www.karl](http://www.karlmarx.com) Marx.com

**NOTES ON: FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD*****By, Dr. Tingneichong Gangte*****Introduction:**

Sociology of the family is the study of how human sexual reproduction is institutionalised and of how children which are the product of sexual union are assigned places within a kinship system. Many sociologists have regarded the family as the cornerstone of society. It forms the basic unit of social organisation and it is difficult to imagine how human society could function without it. In general, the family has been seen as universal social institution, as an inevitable part of human society. In most tribal societies, kinship patterns form the major part of the whole social structure. By contrast, the family is only a small part of social structure of modern industrial societies. It is nevertheless a key element in them, specifically linking individuals with other institutions such as the Church, the states or the economy. The class system, too, including its restriction on education and opportunity, its high or low mobility rates, and its initial social placement by birth, is founded on the family (Goode 1989: 3). The earliest moral and ethical writings of many cultures assert the significance of the family. Within those commentaries, the view is often expressed that a society loses its strength if people do not fulfil family obligations. The wide range of commentaries, analysis and political actions, over a period of hundreds of years suggest that throughout history we have been at least implicitly aware of the importance of family pattern as a central element in human societies.

The household is not a discrete unit in an absolute sense, however, it is intimately related to the family and other structures of kinship and marriage. The very attempt to distinguish between family and household goes hand in hand with establishing a relationship between the two (Shah: 1988). The family and the household or economic group were often considered to be identical for practical purposes (Cheal: 2002). In common English parlance, the word family is used in several senses such as household, body of persons who live in one house or under one head including parents, children, servants etc., group consisting of parents and children whether living together or not; in a wider sense, or those who are nearly connected by blood or affinity and finally those descended or claiming descent from a common ancestor; a house, kindred, lineage etc. these four social units by the four meanings are usually related to each other but should be clearly distinguished from each other for sociological analysis (Shah:1973). The household is one of the several dimensions of the family and should be viewed in relation to the other dimensions or social groups having specific activities and functions.

## THE FAMILY

The family is one of society's main and arguably most important social institutions as it serves to socialize individuals to be productive members of society. We all look to our family for guidance, support and a sense of belonging. Some believe that the family is the most important social institution as it is our first encounter with socialization processes. From a sociological perspective, the Family is not only viewed as an institution, but also as a social system and a social group (Eshleman: 2000). As with all institutions, the family has within its boundaries a set of norms, values, statuses and roles which are organized to meet specific goals for the overall society. The institutionalized norms, values, statuses and roles within the family are designated to guide sexual activity and social relations within a sexual union of individuals. As a social system, the family is viewed as an entity which consists of various interrelated parts (or statuses) that perform particular functions (roles). Further, the family as a system is part of a larger system (society) and contributes to the functioning of society. Within the family system, the statuses and roles interact with one another to form a system of relations amongst the members who hold a specific status and perform a specified role. The operation of the family system is dependent upon the effectiveness of these status role interactions. As a social group, the focus is on the individual members (the people) of the family in question. What each person brings to the family and how each person contributes to the relationships with other individuals in the family determines the reality within each family.

## Definitions

The typical family that sociologists describe may appear to be a small group or a large group according to the way in which it is defined. If we use a narrow definition of the family, families always appear as small groups but if we use a broad definition, it will be seen that families are sometimes small groups and sometimes very large groups. Different sociologists and anthropologists have defined family in various ways best suited to their understanding with regard to function and importance in society.

George Peter Murdock defines family as a social group characterised by common residence, economic co-operation and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes, atleast two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship and one or more children own or adopted, of the sexually cohabiting adults.

The Bureau of the Census defines a family as a group of two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption and residing together; all such persons are considered members of one family (in Winch and McGinnis: 1953).

The Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sociology describes family as referring to a basic kinship unit, in its minimal form consisting of a husband, wife and children. In its wildest sense, it refers to all relatives living together or recognized as a social unit including adopted persons.

Mac Iver defines family as a sex relationship sufficiently precise and enduring to provide for the procreation and upbringing of children. It is the primary social group and its importance is immense.

A.M. Shah in his 'The Household Dimension of the family in India', describe the use or the word family in English language well as in sociology as referring to the sense of a household as well as of a wider kinship unit whose members may be living in more than one household.

William J. Goode is of the opinion that family cannot be concretely defined due to the different relationships that individuals create with each other and therefore cannot be captured by a neat verbal formula, however he places a series of characteristics found in relationships between individuals that may help define what a family is composed of. These are –

- At least two adult persons of opposite sex residing together. They engage in some kind of division of labour i.e. they do not both perform exactly the same tasks.
- They engage in many types of economic and social exchanges i.e. they do things for one another.
- They share many things in common such as food, sex, residence and both goods and social activities.
- The adults have parental relations with their children as their children have filial relations with them, the parents have some authority over their children while also assuming some obligation for protection, co-operation and nurturance.
- There are sibling relations among the children themselves, with once more, a range of obligations to share, protect and help one another.

When all these conditions are fulfilled, according to Goode, few people would deny that the unit is a family.

An outline of the various definitions given above suggest that individuals who share a relationship by blood or marriage, co-reside, have off-springs, fulfil certain obligations and services to one another constitutes a family. In

some cases however, where procreation is not possible, adoption may be alternative and still be socially recognized as fulfilling the criterion of a family.

### Essential Features

The family is not a mere institution but also an institutional complex or system of institutions. The family, especially the nuclear or individual family, is the most basic social group and of primary importance in the socialization of the young. The family in which one is born is called the family of orientation and that in which one marries is called the family of procreation. If the leadership of the family is in the hands of the husband it is called father-right family or patriarchal. When the authority of the family is in the hand of the mother, it is called mother-right family. One of the most important features of the family, which now is losing its significance, is that it functions as economic unit both for production and consumption especially when the rearing and maintenance of children make heavy demands on the economic resources of the parents. But the family is not only confined to provide for the material needs of the off-springs but also to inculcate in their minds the ideas, ways and customs of the social groups, it is the most effective agency for the transmission of the cultural heritage from generation to generation (Gisbert: 1973).

One striking feature of the individual family is its instability. Normally it never covers the whole life of a person. It usually begins when the partners are adult, it changes when the sons become emancipated, it ends with the death of one of the parties if not before. Moreover, the relations between its members vary considerably especially those arising out of the birth and growth of the off-spring. When the children are completely dependent upon parental care, the family presents the characteristics of a compact human group but when the children grow in age, this compactness begins gradually to relax. All this tends to show that although the family is one of the most limited groups of society, its institutional value and its influence as a socialising agency are equalled by any other group or institution.

### TYPES OF FAMILY STRUCTURE

The structure of the family varies from society to society. The smallest or basic unit of kinship structure i.e. the nuclear or elementary family consist of husband, wife and children young or old. The nuclear family usually provides the basis for formation of domestic groups of persons living together in intimate daily life (Radcliff-Brown: 1950). One common type of domestic group is the parental family in which the household consists of the parents and their young or unmarried children. We must also recognise compound families which result when a widower or widow with children by first marriage enters into a second marriage into which children are born. This gives relationship as those of half-sibling and of step-parent and step-child.

Unit larger than the nuclear family are usually known as extended or joined family. An extended family is a large family group containing more than one couple or more than one parent-child and whose members are linked by a discourse of family ties and exchange of practical support. The principle family ties in extended families are descent ties. Extended families are therefore usually inter-generational families, typically involving three generations of family members (Cheal: 2002). The family is called patrilineal joint family when based on the principle of patrilineal descent and matrilineal joint family when based on the principle of matrilineal descent (Shah: 1973).

Either on its own or as the basic unit within an extended family, Murdock (1949) found that the nuclear family was present in every society and led him to conclude that it is a universal human social grouping. The basic structure of the nuclear family depends upon incest taboos, from these it follows that the nuclear family is discontinuous over time and confined to two generations. A third generation can only result from the formation of new families by an exchange of males and females between existing nuclear families. The universality of the nuclear family does not mean that family structure is everywhere the same. On the contrary it is extremely variable and seen in marital relations, in parent-child relation and in sibling relations. It is independent and characteristic of modern industrial societies.

The joint family in India has existed since earliest times and was in the past a corporate body with property held in common, common worship and authority exercised by the head of the family. In recent times the importance of the joint family has gradually declined due to economic changes such as diversification of employment from agriculture to industrialization, desire to acquire more and individualism.

## FUNCTIONS OF THE FAMILY

The family is the only social institution other than religion that is formally developed in all societies (Goode: 1989). Although the family thought of as an expressive or emotional social unit, it serves as an institutional agency for the larger social structures. Families are also themselves economic units with respect to production, allocation, social control and an instrument of the larger society.

Kingsley Davis (1981) has distinguished four major social functions of family. These are reproduction, maintenance, placement and socialization.

Mac Iver divides the functions of the family into two categories, essential and non essential. Essential functions include stable satisfaction of sex needs, production and rearing of children and provision of a home. Non-essential functions being religious, educational, economic, health and recreation.

Lundberg has enumerated four basic functions of family that is regulation of sexual behaviour and reproduction, care and training of children, co-operation and division of labour, primary group satisfaction.

Murdock sees family as a firm social constellation frequently drawn to other functions thus often the centre of religious worship with the father as family priest. It may be the primary unit in land holding, vengeance or recreation. Social status may depend more on the family position than upon individual achievement.

Ogburn and Nimkoff have divided family functions into six categories namely affectional, economic, recreational, protective, religious and educational.

Of all these functions given, sociologists accept reproduction, maintenance, socialization and placement being the essential function of the family. Reproduction is the primary aim of the family, marriage is the social sanction for sexual union leading to procreation. Sex morality is generally regarded essential for good marital relations. Family being a structural arrangement, its function is the maintenance of its members especially the young, old and invalid. A child, through family is put in status and role arrangement and introduces him to the larger society.

## THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

From a functional perspective, many questions are raised which involve the functions of the family, the functional relationship between the family and other parts of the social system and the functions performed by an institution or a part of society for the individual.

G.P. Murdock argues that the family performs four basic functions in all societies. He terms these as the sexual, reproductive, economic and educational. They are essential for social life since without the sexual and reproductive functions there would be no members of society, without the economic function for example the preparation and provision of food, life would cease and without education or socialization there would be no culture. Human society without culture could not function. The family's function for society, are inseparable from its function for its individual members. It serves both at one and the same time and in much the same way (Haralambos: 1980).

Talcott Parsons concentrates his analysis on the family in modern American society. The American family according to him retains two basic and irreducible functions which are common in all societies.

- i. The primary socialization of children: Socialization during the early years of childhood which takes place mainly within the family which involves internalization of culture and structuring of the personality since without shared norms and values, social life would not be possible.
- ii. Stabilization of adult personalities: Once personality is produced in an individual, it must be stabilized. The emphasis here is on marriage relationship and emotional security that the couple provides for each other. This acts as counter weight to the stress and strains of everyday life which tend to make the personality unstable. The family therefore provides a context in which husband and wife can express their childish whims, give and receive emotional support, recharge their batteries and so stabilise their personalities.

Ezra F. Vogel and Norman W. Bells express their view on the functions and dysfunctions of the family in the American society. They argue that the tension and hostility of unresolved between the parents are projected onto the child. The child is thus use as an emotional scapegoat by the parents to relieve their tension. This is seen as function for the parents, for the good of the family unit and society as a whole. This serves as a personality stabilising process for the parents however it is dysfunctional for the child and he becomes emotionally disturbed. Vogel and Bell argue that the cost to the child is indeed low compared to the gains of family solidarity and effective role performance by the adults.

From a Marxian perspective, Fredrich Engels work “origin of the family, private property of the state” took an evolutionary view of the family attempting to trace its origins and evolution through time. He combined an evolutionary approach with Marxian theory arguing that as the mode of production changed, so did the family. During the earlier stages of human evolution, the forces of production were communally owned and the family and such did not exist. The era of primitive communism was characterized by promiscuity. There were no rules limiting sexual relationships and the society was in effect the family. Engels speculated that from the promiscuous horde, marriage and the family evolved through a series of stages which included polygamy to its present stage, the monogamous nuclear family, in particular the private of ownership of the forces of production and the advent of the State which instituted laws to protect the system of private property and enforce rules of monogamous marriage. This solved the problem of inheritance of private property. Property was owned by males and in order to pass them on to the heirs, they must be certain of the legitimacy of those heirs and hence needed more control over the women. Marxian analysis of the family in capitalist society developed mainly in the late 1960’s and 1970’s when several feminist writers employed Marxian concepts in their criticism of the family. The family is seen as a unit which produces one of the basic commodities of the capitalism i.e. labour. It produces it cheaply from the point of view of the capitalist since they do not have to pay for the production of the children on their upkeep. In particular, the wife is not paid for providing and rearing children.

Margaret Benston states that the amount of unpaid labour performed by women is very large and very profitable to those who own the means of production. To pay women for their work, even in minimum wage scale would involve a massive redistribution of wealth. Frank Ansley translates Parson’s view of the family as personality stabilises into a Marxian framework. She sees the emotional support provided by the wife as a safety value for the frustration produced in the husband by working in a capitalist system. Rather than being turned against the system which produced it, this frustration is absorbed by the comforting wife. In this way the system is not threatened. Kathy McAfee and Myrna Wood make a similar point in the discussion of male dominance in the family. They claim that the petty dictatorship which most men exercise over their wives and families enables to vent their anger and frustration in a way which pose no challenge to the system.

## HOUSEHOLD

The central idea of the household concept is that of co- residence. In demographic usage the concept of household has tended to follow census practice with household defining person occupying a separate housing or dwelling unit or less often the persons who participate in a common domestic economy. Nowadays, we use the term household to denote persons living together rather than family because family would strictly denote a couple and their children and not include other persons or relatives living in the same unit.

A.M. Shah has contributed immensely to the study of households, their structure and their typology in his ‘The Household Dimension of the Family in India’, and also pointed out the major factors affecting the developmental process of households which is explicitly stated norms governing the formation of households, their actual observance, influence, effects and relations which are made up of individuals between whom no kinship ties exists and conversely, members of one family may be distributed over two or more domestic groups.

## DEFINITION

The Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sociology defines a household as all persons who live in the same dwelling unit. The dwelling unit may be a house, an apartment or a group of rooms or room.

According to the census definition, a household include not only family members but also persons who are not related to each other, if they share the same dwelling unit. A person living alone is also considered a household.

According to David Cheal, a household is a group of people who live together for the purpose of meeting their daily needs, particularly food and shelter. Household members almost always share some food, typically by eating meals together.

According to A.M. Shah, on account of the close association of the household with the house and the hearth, almost all over India, the household is an easily identifiable unit. This does not however mean that it is merely a physical unit indicated by the house and the hearth. House is distinguishable from a building. The household is also not merely a consumption units many economists tend to think. It actually represents a variety of things, ideas and images and is a focus of social relationships with some of the deepest sentiments and emotions in human life.

To sum up the definitions given, we form a general idea that the household unit can range from a low to a high number of individuals residing in a single dwelling and may or may not be related to each other by a system of

affinity or consanguinity. The household can also be composed of a number of generations of individuals as in the case of the Indian joint family or Chinese extended family.

## TYPOLGY OF HOUSEHOLD

A.M. Shah studied 283 households in one village in Gujarat during 1955 – 1958. On the basis of this study he found 68% simple households and 32% complex households. He identified three types of households found in India while conducting his study. These are the Emigrant Household, the Complex Household and the Simple Household.

The Emigrant Household consists of those families who migrate from rural areas to towns, cities, to engage in some form of work and better opportunities and thereby dwell together as a large unit of related persons. They can further categorize as:

- “Independent” emigrant households
  - i. Emigrant parents separated from a married son residing in the village
  - ii. Emigrant men separated from parents and married brothers
  - iii. Emigrant men separated from married brothers
  - iv. Emigrant households having no near kinsman in the village
- “Linked” emigrant households
  - i. Emigrant husbands each having wife and children in the village
  - ii. Emigrant unmarried men each having parents and unmarried siblings in the village
  - iii. Emigrant households each forming part of a joint unit of parents and one married son
  - iv. Emigrant households each forming part of a joint unit of parents and more than one married son.
  - v. Emigrant households of a married man linked with parents but separated from a married brother

The Complex Household reveals the maximum extent to which a household may grow. In other words, they represent the limit within which the developmental process of most of the household is confined. The composition is as follows:

- i. Eldest brother and his wife, younger brother and his wife, youngest unmarried brother
- ii. Man his wife and unmarried children and his father widower brother
- iii. Man, his wife and unmarried children, his widowed mother and father's widower brother
- iv. Man, his wife, his two bachelor brothers, widowed mother, and father's brother's widow
- v. Man, his wife and father's widowed mother
- vi. Man, his wife, his one married son and other unmarried children, and his widowed mother

A Simple Household may be composed of the whole or a part of a parental family. There are six major possible compositions:

- i. Husband, wife, and unmarried children
- ii. Husband and wife
- iii. Father and unmarried children
- iv. Mother and unmarried children
- v. Unmarried brothers and sisters
- vi. A single man or woman

It is clear that the term “simple household” covers a considerable number of socially distinct types of kinship compositions. It is necessary to distinguish the simple household composed of the complete parental family from those composed of the various types of the incomplete parental family.

In general, the majority of the households found in any given society are relatively small, consisting of groups such as a couple and their children, a small group of students sharing an apartment or an individual living alone. Such households often are referred to as private households in contrast to institutional households such as boarding schools, prisons, hospitals, mental institutions, convents or seminaries. There is no inherent limit to the size of private household but their average size exceeds six and in urban-industrial societies, is closer to three.

## SUMMARY OF FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD

Whether we examine the family as an institution, system, or group, the interest of sociologists who study the family begins with a fascination of the family entity and the relationships within its boundaries. One of the big issues or challenges within the family studies lies in its definition. Contemporary society is changing rapidly and we have seen many family forms increase in numbers and some relatively new forms emerge. The “ideal image” of two biological parents and children living in harmony, as with most ideal types, does not present a very realistic framework for contemporary society. There are growing numbers of so called “variant family forms” in American society and throughout the world. If we are to arrive at a more accurate analysis of the family, from a purely SOCIOLOGICAL standpoint, we must be willing to accept that the family has many forms, ranging from the two-parent family, singled-parent, blended families, same sex family, adoptive families and the list goes on.

Whereas the household is defined in terms of co-residence, the family is defined in terms of kinship, which in turn is based on marriage, descent from a common ancestor, or social fiction (adoption or other forms of ‘fictive kinship’). The distinction is not always made in ‘everyday’ language, however, and the concepts and reality overlap: a household seldom contains all of an individual’s close kin, the so called ‘extended family’. Modern census of related persons living together (more properly called a census family), a usage encouraged by and reinforcing a western cultural tendency to view the small nuclear family group as ‘the family’ – other kin are relatives.

## REFERENCES

- Bottomore, T.B.  
Bombay      Sociology: A Guide to Problems and Literature (1962). Blackie and Son Ltd.
- Cheal, David.      Sociology of Family Life (2002). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Davis, Kingsley.      Human Society (1981). Surjeet Publications, New Delhi
- Gisbert, P.      Fundamentals of Sociology (1973). Orient Longman Pvt. Ltd. Kolkata
- Goode, William J.      The Family (1989). Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Graburn, Nelson.  
Publishers, new York      Readings in Kinship and Social Structure (1971). Harper and Row
- Haralambos, Michael.      Sociology: Themes and Perspectives (1980). Oxford University Press, Delhi
- Johnson, Harry, M.  
Delhi      Sociology: A Systematic Introduction (1960). Allied Publishers Ltd., New
- Kapadia, K.M.      Marriage and Family in India (1955). Oxford University Press, Kolkata

Mann, Michael(ed). The Macmillan student Encyclopaedia or Sociology (1983). Macmillan Press Ltd. London

Radcliff-Brown, A.R. “Introduction”, in A.A.R. Radcliff-Brown and Daryll Fordes (ed), African system of Kinship and Marriage (1950), Oxford University Press, London

Shah, A.M. The Phase of Dispersal in the Indian Kinship Process (1988), Sociological Bulletin, 37 (1 and 2) March – September

New Delhi The Household Dimension of the Family in India (1973), Orient Longman,

Uberoi, Patricia (ed). Family, Kinship and Marriage in India (1993), Oxford University Press, New Delhi

