

A. Anasimov, 'The cult of the bear among the Evenks and the problem of the evolution of totemistic beliefs', *Problems of the History of Religion and Atheism*, Moscow, 1950, and other works by the same author (all in Russian).

25 V. Chicherov, *The Winter Period of the Russian Folk Agricultural Calendar in the 16th-19th Centuries*, Moscow, 1957. V. Propp, *Russian Agricultural Feasts*, Leningrad, 1963 (both in Russian).

26 N. Matorin, *The Christian Orthodox Cult and Production*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931. O. Sukhareva, 'On the problem of Islamic saint worshiping in Central Asia', *Transactions of the Institute of History and Archaeology: Data on the Archaeology and Ethnography of Uzbekistan*, Tashkent, 1950, vol. 2. O. Sukhareva, 'On the genesis of craftsmen cults among the Tadzhiks and Uzbeks', *In Memory of M. S. Andreyev, Transactions of the Academy of Sciences of the Tadzhik SSR*, Stalinabad, 1960, vol. 120 (all in Russian).

27 V. Bogoraz, 'The myth of the dying and reviving animal', *Artistic Folklore*, 1926, vol. 1 (in Russian).

28 N. Matorin, *The Female Deity in the Christian Orthodox Cult: Essay on Comparative Mythology*, Moscow, 1931 (in Russian).

29 N. Matorin and A. Nevsky, *Programme for the Study of Everyday Orthodoxy: East European Religious Syncretism*, Leningrad, 1930. N. Nikolsky, *The History of the Russian Church*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931. S. Tokarev, *Religious Beliefs of the East Slavic Peoples in the 19th and Early 20th Centuries*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1957. G. Nosova, *Survivals of Paganism in Orthodox Christianity*, Moscow 1975 (all in Russian).

30 L. Lavrov, 'The pre-Islamic beliefs of the Adyghe and Karbardians', *Transactions of the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR* 45, 1959, vol. 51. O. Sukhareva, *Islam in Uzbekistan*, Tashkent. G. Snesarev, *The Rites of Pre-Islamic Beliefs and Rites among the Uzbeks of Khorezm*, Moscow, 1969. V. Basilov, *Saint Worshipping in Islam*, Moscow, 1970. T. Bayalileva, *Pre-Islamic Beliefs and Rites in Central Asia*, Moscow, 1975. T. Bayalileva, *Pre-Islamic Beliefs and their Survivals among the Kirghiz*, Frunse, 1972 (all in Russian).

31 G. Snesarev, 'Some reasons why religious survivals are still preserved in everyday life among the Uzbeks of Korezm', *Sovetskaya Ethnografia*, 1957, no. 2 (in Russian).

32 All the necessary information can be found in the series *Problems of Scientific Atheism*, published by the Institute of Scientific Atheism at the Academy of Social Sciences, founded in 1964 (in Russian).

33 For more details see *Concrete Studies of Contemporary Religious Beliefs*, Moscow, 1967 (in Russian).

34 For more details see I. Kryvelev, 'The contents of the concept of religion', *Proceedings of the 7th ICAES*, Moscow, 1970, p. 713 (in Russian).

JOHN W. COOPER

ed. by Ernest Gellner

1980 New York: Columbia U. Press

C. HUMPHREY

Theories of North Asian shamanism

The ancient religious activity of the Mongols and their neighbours, known to us Europeans as shamanism, has no particular name amongst its own followers. The Mongols, even before they were reconverted to Lamaism in the seventeenth century, simply used the term *xara šasin* (black faith), as it were in verbal opposition to *šira šasin* (yellow faith), a popular term for the reformist sect of Tibetan Buddhism which spread into Mongolia.¹ After the seventeenth century, when shamanism was outlawed in many of the Mongol principalities, the lamas and their faithful, although they had names for the great world religions and even for Bon-po and Taoism, called shamanism merely *xagūcin ba burugu üzel* (the old and wrong way of seeing things).² At the same time, these very lamas used thinly disguised 'shamanist' rituals in their own religious activities. Even among purely shamanist groups such as the north-western Buryat or the Reindeer Tungus it is easy to discover Lamaist deities and cosmological ideas which spread all through Eastern and Central Asia down to India. All this raises the question of whether 'shamanism', which had not even got a name, should be seen as differentiated from Lamaism at all in the Mongolian context. Can we say, in fact, that shamanism is a religion in its own right?

Scholars have put forward many different views on this matter, and it is clear that one of the main reasons for this is the undoubted complexity of religious history in Central Asia. The prevalence of nomadic pastoralism in the area, the long-distance trade routes, and early steppe empires all facilitated communication between peoples, and the presence in central Asia at one time or another of all the main world religions (Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Christianity) is only one manifestation of this. I have no wish to suggest that there is a single clear answer to the question of the general nature of shamanism in the Mongol area, and therefore I shall first explain the various directions in which existing theories have pointed, before attempting to put forward some specific conclusions.

Eliade, who has written one of the largest ethnographic compilations

on North Asian shamanism, concludes that it is essentially a technique for ecstasy by which men can communicate with the spirits. Although he describes shamanism as 'archaic', by which he means that it predated, in his opinion, the first great expansion of Buddhism through Asia, he does not see it as an autonomous system, nor as a related group of such systems.³ In his view, the shaman does not create a cosmology but simply uses one – and, as far as one can tell, almost any one.

To Eliade the shaman is essentially a person who is able to put himself into a controlled ecstasy for religious purposes. The original 'archaic' shamanism was centred on a belief in a celestial supreme being and in the possibility of concrete communication (in the person of the shaman) between sky and earth. The present existence of shamans in a great number of societies which do not have such a belief is ascribed by Eliade to the survival of shamanist techniques where the original cosmology has disappeared. Certain basic symbols came to be associated with shamanism through the passage of history – the world tree, the world mountain, the ladder, the bridge, etc., each of these being different manifestations of the single primitive belief in a 'centre of the world', a communication path used by the shaman in his ascent to the sky. The present emphasis in many Siberian shamanist cultures on spirits and spirit-possession are later accretions, perhaps resulting from the spread of Buddhism in Central and North Asia.

Eliade presupposes that 'shamanism' as a phenomenon of ecstatic technique has existed throughout the ages in North Asia; and yet he can give no psychological or physiological description of this technique such as to establish that he is talking about the same thing through history. As we have noted above, the content of the shaman's performance and of 'shamanist' beliefs varies from epoch to epoch and from culture to culture.

Eliade's method, the isolation of elements of belief which are then compared as they occur in different cultures, and the search for 'assimilations', 'borrowings', 'survivals' and 'influences', while fascinating in its permutations of information, has two disadvantages. First, it does not make it possible to study shamanism as it occurs within any one system of thought; it is not apparent whether there are other religious manifestations in which the shaman does not play a part, and the specific contribution of shamanism within this totality is not illuminated. Secondly, although Eliade has a concern with the passage of time, he does not really attempt to give a historical analysis of the development of shamanism. There is no analysis of the social or ideological basis of shamanism, and indeed Eliade's whole enterprise suggests that such a basis would be more or less irrelevant, since in his view shamanism is a single phenomenon which has survived through many and great social changes.

On both of these points, Shirokogoroff's work is an advance on Eliade's (although it was written considerably earlier). Shirokogoroff

gives an immensely detailed and comprehensive account of the religious system of the Tungus through history and places shamanism clearly in relation to other beliefs and rituals; an attempt is also made to locate shamanism as a psychological phenomenon within the general 'psycho-mental complex' of the Tungus.⁴

Unlike Eliade, Shirokogoroff sees shamanism as a fairly late phenomenon which was 'stimulated' by the spread of Buddhism. Shamanism was pre-dated by sacrificial cults of offering to the High God or Sky God, and this cult was served by priests with different functions from shamans. The twentieth century shamanism of the Tungus is not concerned with honouring the celestial god, nor with the ancient cult of the dead, but on the other hand it 'has its very profound roots in the social system and psychology of animistic philosophy characteristic of the Tungus and other shamanists. But it is also true that shamanism in its present form is one of the consequences of the intrusion of Buddhism among the North-Asiatic ethnical groups.'⁵ Shirokogoroff notes that the word for shaman in Tungus (*saman*) appears to be of foreign origin, and furthermore the phenomenon of shamanism itself has southern elements. It is in the shamanistic cult of spirits rather than the ecstatic ascent to heaven, that we see Lamaist influence on shamanism, and the shaman's spirit-vessels, costume and drum can all be seen as having a southern origin. Ecstatic experience, he held, was basic to the human condition; what changed through history was the interpretation and valuation of it. Among the Tungus the ecstatic ascent to the supreme being in heaven gradually disappeared under the influence of the idea of spirits which came down to possess the shaman. Thus, while religious specialists had existed all along, the shaman's role, according to Shirokogoroff, is specific to the belief in spirits and the experience of possession. He attempted to show with historical material on migrations, etc., how and when shamanism arose among the Tungus. According to him it was quite possible for shamanism to exist alongside continuing celestial cults and also alongside Lamaism. There might even be some intermixture: shamans might be requested to take part in the celestial cults, and lamas might advise people to become shamans, or even take up shamanising for themselves.

Shirokogoroff's description of the psychological and social aspects of shamanism as it functions within the culture of the Tungus is unparalleled in Siberian ethnography, but most scholars find that there is not enough evidence to support his theory that shamanism was 'stimulated by Buddhism'. Apart from anything else, this theory would find difficulty in accounting for the similarities between Tungus shamanism and the shamanism of the peoples of far Northern and Western Siberia where Buddhism can hardly have penetrated as such. Furthermore, Shirokogoroff, like Eliade, gives logical, rather than historical or sociological, reasons for the disappearance of celestial cults and the growing influence of 'active, lower elements', and in this way divorces his theory from social, economic or political realities.

bal-like
just like
Lauri-
shans

Will has no
corner on
the market
of concern
for ethnology.

Apart from the early theories such as those of Sternberg⁶ and Czaplicka,⁷ it is only recently in social anthropology that an attempt has been made to give a general sociological explanation of shamanism, and this appears in Lewis's book *Ecstatic Religion*.⁸ In most complex societies, Lewis argues, the form that shamanism, possession, or trances take, is determined by pressure internal to that society. He suggests that people subject to these pressures, very often the politically disadvantaged or people whose social role is not highly valued, will be the people who create ecstatic cults, and in this case the cults will be 'peripheral' and will express the anti-authoritarian views of the members. On the other hand, in a society such as the Tungus, the most serious pressures are external to society, for example, severe climatic conditions, lack of food, or prevalence of epidemic diseases. In this case, shamanism becomes the 'central morality cult' and embodies the main ideas and values, including political ones, of the society. Shamanism becomes a means by which the morality of society is activated in relation to individuals and groups.

This is a useful series of generalisations about human society as a whole, but in relation to this particular culture area it is not very enlightening. In North Asia almost every example of a shamanistic cult seems to embody features of both 'central morality cults' and 'peripheral cults'. Among the small-scale Tungus, for example, shamanist spirits concern a far wider range of ideas and values than a 'central morality', if such can be distinguished, and the same is true of the Western Buryat, as will be shown later. In both of these societies women and other disadvantaged people can become shamans, and to take the other case, that of the complex society, the Manchus with their empire maintained a court shaman, surely concerned with 'central morality', until their downfall in 1911.

It is Soviet scholars who have done the most work and produced the most interesting ideas about North Asian shamanism. Gumilev⁹ criticises Banzarov for seeing shamanism as an original religion emerging naturally from the worship of the sky, plants, animals and man himself. The number and qualitative differentiation of the deities found in shamanism leads Gumilev to suppose that it is not an example of polytheism, but syncretism. Why is it, he asks, that the shamans ignore the sky gods? And how is it that, despite his previous declaration of the autochthonous character of shamanism, Banzarov ascribes the cult of fire to Persian Zoroastrianism?

Gumilev himself proposes the following scheme. The early Mongols did not have shamanism but believed in a single celestial god, and this is attested by all of the important early writers, Rubruck, Plano Carpini, Marco Polo and Rashid-ad-din. The blue sky of physical nature was differentiated by the Mongols from the eternal sky, the latter being a powerful god who demanded action on the part of his followers. At the same time, an earth deity called Etügen was worshipped by means of setting up cairns (*oboga*) on mountain tops, and thus early Mongol re-

ligion was characterised by dualism. The great sky deity Khormusta did not originate in Zoroastrianism, as Banzarov maintained, but in Manichaeism, from the Uighurs. Such creative and providential gods are not compatible with shamanism. Shamanism existed in the context of a cosmology consisting of three 'worlds', the upper, middle, and lower, peopled by human beings in the middle world and their souls (i.e. spirits) in the upper and lower worlds. The shamans were able to effect communication between these worlds, but this was a practice, not a dogma. What had this in common with the ancient Mongol religion?

The ancient Mongol religion died out because the Eastern Tatars took up Mohammedanism and the Mongols took up Buddhism. When these fell into decline there was a flow of shamanist practice which took varied syncretic forms. Gumilev sees the Tungus as the archetypal shamanists, and he holds that the West Siberian Ugrian religions are not really shamanism, but closer in fact to the early Mongol beliefs in an all-powerful sky god.

Gumilev has an extremely wide knowledge of the sources for the ancient Mongol period and earlier, and his article undoubtedly clears some of the confusions stemming from an uncritical acceptance of Banzarov. It is interesting also that he gives an even later date than Shirkogoroff for the origin of shamanism. However, it is worthwhile noting that while it is possible to deny the presence of shamans in the early Mongol period by claiming that the religious specialists mentioned in the sources were other kinds of priests or magicians, it is not possible to ignore the repeated mention of things very like *ongons*, the representations of spirits; this implies that, according to Gumilev, shamanism and *ongons* could exist independently, and this as we shall see is doubtful.

Gumilev is an orientalist rather than an ethnographer, and the Soviet scholars who have been interested in the development of shamanism in society have taken a different approach, although most of their conclusions do not differ substantially from his. Potapov, who has worked extensively on the peoples of the Altai, also maintains that shamanism was not an original, autochthonous religion.¹⁰ According to him, it was preceded at least in the Altai region by a cult of the mountains (which recalls Gumilev's explanation of the worship of Etügen). However, Potapov adds that the cult of mountains was not simply an abstract idea but it was closely linked with the economy and society of a particular historical time: each sacred mountain was situated in the centre of clan territory, whether this was used for hunting or herding, and was the site for the worship of the clan ancestor from whom each living member traced his descent. The existence of a sacred mountain in a particular territory was evidence that this land was in economic use by a particular group. The cult of mountains was generally carried out by elders of the lineage, but in complicated rituals by the shaman since he was the ritual specialist representing the lineage. Potapov claims this cult was essentially pre-shamanist since no

representations were made of mountain spirits, while models were made of all other spirits. Here Potapov is saying, unlike Gumilev, that representations (*ongons*) exist together with shamanism, and that one cannot exist without the other.

According to Potapov shamanism arose only with the dissolution of clan-based society in North Asia. Previously the functions of the shaman had been carried out by every member of the clan and it was only when the strict tribal system began to disintegrate that these functions were transferred to a single person. This view is supported by Vainstein who attempts to show in an interesting article entitled 'The Tuvan shaman's drum and the ceremony of its enlivening'¹¹ that the evolution of shamanism is manifest in the ritual of the consecration of the shaman's drum: in the first section of the rite the shaman-owner-to-be was not allowed to be present, but all of the clansmen acted as though in a trance and struck the drum, handing it from man to man until they passed it to the weakest shaman present; it ended up in the hands of the most powerful shaman among the relatives. The second phase of the rite was conducted by the shaman-owner, alone in a tent, and subsequently no-one apart from him could handle the drum.

Vainstein maintains that this view of the evolution of shamanism is supported by the fact that there are Siberian peoples where the disintegration of the clan system has happened more slowly and where there were no professional shamans until recently, the functions of the shaman being performed by many people.¹² Shamanism, he maintains, always existed in a secondary role, but without specialised ministers it went unnoticed by early observers. Only with the development of class society were the old clan cults pushed into oblivion, and single individuals came to take on and elaborate the shaman's role. It is noticeable that the most complex shaman's costume occurs in Southern Siberia, where the influence of class-dominated empires was strong, while moving north-west and north-east, it becomes more and more simplified and finally vanishes.

These are plausible arguments, but unfortunately there is, as yet, little concrete historical material to back them up. It is not clear what, in sociological terms, Vainstein means by 'the disintegration of the clan', since clans in some form or other have been present in the Altai-Tuva-Buryat area virtually until today. If he is implying that clans were previously more communalised and egalitarian in this region, then this remains to be demonstrated, although there is no reason why this should not be so. Vainstein's early historical materials concretely referring to Tuva and the Altai only show that shamanism was not mentioned. In the absence of more data, he tries to show the existence of a series of different existing types of shamanism in Siberia that some of these are 'earlier' in kind than others; the disadvantages of this kind of argument are well known.

All recent Soviet research emphasises the close intertwining of shamanism, Buddhist, and pre-shamanist elements in the current religious

life of North Asian peoples. Zhukovskaya makes the point that Buddhism itself had undergone a transformation since its early days; the modest cells of ascetic lamas under the guidance of a guru, which at least in legend formed the beginning stages of Buddhism, developed in Tibet into a complex hierarchy of ranks and offices, headed by the Panchen-Lama and the Dalai-Lama.¹³ A complex and hierarchical cosmology was elaborated which included large numbers of deities, some of them human beings who had attained holy status. At the same time, the idea emerged that deities could spiritually embody themselves in human vessels, and Tibetan monasteries were frequently headed by such 'gods in disguise'. All of this meant that hierarchical Tibetan society, which had taken the form of a kingdom since at least the seventh century, assimilated and developed a cosmology which itself closely represented the hierarchical principle.

Zhukovskaya does not mention the fact that the Mongolian region may first have been exposed to Buddhism at a very early period, before the development of the wealthy monasteries and the great teaching sects, when wandering missionaries took the belief along the trade routes to the north of Tibet.¹⁴ She does not even touch upon the taking up of Buddhism by the Mongols during the Yuan Dynasty but confines her study to the later period of the re-penetration of Lamaism into Mongolia in the seventeenth century.

The standard picture of this process is of a distinct, Tibetan form of Lamaism rapidly gaining ground in Mongolia, encouraged by the aristocracy and later by the Manchus; this was opposed by native Mongol shamanism, the religion of the ordinary people, which although it soon gave way to Lamaism was in the end to influence the latter strongly.

But the shamanist elements in Lamaism cannot be attributed entirely to the influence of the Mongol 'black faith', since Tibetan Lamaism already been in contact for many centuries with Bon-po. This Tibetan religious system seems to have been closely similar to shamanism. There was intense rivalry with Lamaism but by the seventeenth century both systems had acquired some of the typical attributes of the other: Bon-po had acquired monks, monasteries, and holy books, on the model of the Ganjur and Tanjur, while Lamaism had specialists in magic, exorcism, possession, trance and sorcery.

So the Buddhism which reached Mongolia in the seventeenth century and Buryatia a century later was already to some extent a syncretic religion. Furthermore, all scholars agree that the shamanism which it found in Mongolia cannot have been a 'pure' form, since, quite apart from all the arguments brought forward by Gumilev, etc. it had been preceded only shortly before by the period of Buddhism of the Mongol Empire.

Zhukovskaya observes quite rightly that the key to all of these changes of religion in Mongolia is the development of different forms of society over the period in question. Her view is that shamanism arose

with the transmission from a society based on kinship (*rodovoy stroy*) to feudalism. The concentration of religious functions into the hands of one individual, the shaman, was the beginning of this process. But once feudalism had in fact established itself and a class society had developed, shamanism was no longer appropriate. The class of 'exploiters' needed a religion which justified the present state of affairs on earth, and which encouraged the less fortunate to bear their fate patiently in the expectation of a better life hereafter. This function was fulfilled by Buddhism.¹⁵

This argument is not explained in detail by Zhukovskaya and for it to be fully acceptable we should need to know what exactly were the changes in the society based on clans which turned it into a feudal society and why these should result in the emergence of individual shamans; we should want to know what 'feudalism' means in the context of nomadic pastoralism – it might, for instance, be more enlightening to explore the use of the Marxist types 'military democracy'¹⁶ and the 'asiatic mode of production'¹⁷ for certain periods in central Asian history. This is not the place to explore these questions in full, and I shall simply take it that Zhukovskaya's theory, which tallies in its outlines with that of other Soviet scholars, gives us an adequate explanation in general, if not in particular.

By the nineteenth century, when we begin to have reliable information, shamanism and Buddhism in Buryatia had not only many common ideas, but also numerous common practices. It is not possible to think of them as forming two complementary parts of a single religious system. In this, North Asia appears to be different from South-East Asia, where in Thailand, Burma and Ceylon, Buddhism and 'spirit-cults' have been described as existing side-by-side, with different and complementary religious and social functions.¹⁸ In the South-East Asia case, Buddhism represents an ascetic and holy way of life, usually possible only for short periods of the life-span, directed at obtaining religious merit and a better re-birth; matters of health, material prosperity, fertility and luck in this life are the concern of a variety of other specialists more or less outside Buddhism. But in North Asia, in Lamaist areas, up to forty per cent of the entire male population spent a whole lifetime in the monastery or in orders; a rigorous life spent contemplating philosophical truths and the after-life was not even attempted by the majority of lamas, concubines were regarded as a necessary evil, and high Buddhist ranks were even passed on to natural heirs. Lamaism could fulfil all the needs of this life as well as those of the next, and in this sense there was nothing that a Buryat shaman could do that a lama could not also do: there were lama diviners, lama mediums, lama medicine men, and lama exorcists. Some of the ecstatic/magical practices of the lamas were far beyond the resources of shamans: for example, there was the *tsam*, a huge dance representing the exorcism of the elaborate and terrifying masked figures of demons.

There is no need to assume that the elements of shamanism and

Buddhism which seemed similar by the nineteenth century had a common origin, or even that they were necessarily borrowed from one another. Despite numerous similarities the two implied radically different approaches to morality. However, we can perhaps assume that behind what likenesses there were lay similar social forms.

By the late nineteenth century it was clear that in Mongolia, unlike South-East Asia, shamanism and Buddhism did not exist together harmoniously in the same community. On the contrary, there were areas which were definitely 'Buddhist' and others which were clearly 'shamanist'. In Central and East Mongolia few shamans remained by the beginning of the twentieth century,¹⁹ while, on the other hand, the Western Buryats never took up Buddhism, despite the repeated efforts of lama missionaries and the performance of miracles. The 'Chronicle of the Alar Buryats' tells us what happened in one such case.²⁰ A temple was built in Alar in 1840 with thirteen lamas and a head-lama (*shirelei*), all of whom were Khori Buryats. The local population was entirely shamanist and was frankly uninterested in the temple, although some people did point out that the *shirelei* was neglecting his vows by keeping concubines. It was decided to replace the *shirelei* with a local man, Choivan Samsonov. Not only did Samsonov keep a wife and rear a family, he knew nothing about Buddhism and soon built special yurts and outhouses for his large collection of shamanist *ongons*. He was succeeded in his old age by his son, Ganzhur Choivanov, the first of the *shirelais* to have a degree from a Buddhist monastery. Choivanov waged an energetic war against the shamanists, but he had no success; the whole idea of making religious merit by sacrificing property to the lamas passed right over the heads of the local Buryats who saw only unnecessary expense for no purpose. In order to avoid his annoying exhortations many of them even asked to be baptised into the Orthodox Church. By the beginning of the twentieth century, the Alar Temple was still small and poor, with twelve lamas, and it was soon closed down.

To these Buryats, Buddhism and Orthodoxy were seen as equivalents, and the decision to join one or other had more to do with politics than religion. Under Russian rule there were definite advantages in being Orthodox.²¹ But the conversion was only superficial; many Orthodox Buryats almost never went to church, but had frequent contact with shamans. Side by side with an icon hung rows of shamanist *ongons* in their yurts. St Nicholas himself became the *ogon* of the harvest, bringing luck and prosperity in the crop-agriculture which Buryats associated primarily with the Russian peasant economy.²²

The two important religion systems for the Buryat were shamanism and Buddhism, and the vital question is – why did the Western Buryat remain shamanist, while the Eastern Buryat took up Buddhism? The answer, I think, can only be given in terms of differences in society. The Western Buryats had a relatively stagnant economy as a result of pressure on land: the growth of the Buryat population, the surrounding forest terrain which made an expansion of herding im-

THIS
IS
EXACT

possible, and finally the coming of Russian settlers, meant that crop agriculture was greatly increased in the fertile valleys with a consequent lessening in nomadism.²³ The fact that the Western Buryats became attached to particular bits of land whose usufruct was regulated by patrilineal and other kinship links may have encouraged an ancestor-based view of society. An individual's rights to field and pastures were validated by the link he could trace with the commonality of 'original' Buryat users, in other words a link via named and relatively recent ancestors, women as well as men. The different kinds of links employed established a differentiation of rank among land-users. This kind of system was easily represented by shamanism with its multitude of ranked deities,²⁴ its great emphasis on ancestors as the arbitrary regulators of luck and success, and its professional practitioners tied to clans.

The Eastern Buryats, on the other hand, formed an expanding society based on nomadic herding. Great tracts of pastureland were available to the South and East of the Trans-Baikal steppes, and an expansion in the productivity of herders could result immediately in territorial expansion into North Mongolia, the Aga Steppes, and so on. Crop agriculture was barely practised at all and the use of land was not rigidly prescribed, as among the Western Buryat, by links with previously established ancestors. Eastern Buryats nomadised virtually irrespective of whether neighbours were kin,²⁵ but nevertheless they had a much more unified and monolithic idea of their society.²⁶ The eleven Khori lineages of the Eastern Buryat were descended from a common ancestor who belonged to the mythic configuration of people related to Chengis Khan. Other 'Eastern Buryats' were people of Mongol origin, people who had belonged to some army, guard, or tribe in the Mongol orbit, but who often had forgotten their precise genealogical links with the past. In these circumstances, in which links with recent ancestors were relatively unimportant, it is possible that Lamaism with its universal, non-kin based, professional practitioners and its monolithic hierarchy did correspond more closely than shamanism to the needs and contradictions of Eastern Buryat society. Besides which, it is doubtful whether the Western Buryat economy could have supported a large number of non-productive men living in monasteries, even if such a move towards Lamaism had developed there. As for Zhukovskaya's argument that the Buddhist doctrine of the *karma*, by which individuals can only expect to better their lives in another re-birth, attracted the Mongol and Buryat aristocrats since it justified their privileged position, it is difficult to support this without reservation. Certainly, it was the Mongol feudal lords who encouraged the return of Buddhism in the seventeenth century, and Mongol society was hierarchically divided into classes of state serfs, personal serfs, monastery serfs, free-men, aristocrats and officials. However, the position was not entirely the same among the Eastern Buryats, who still retained a clan-based political system, and therefore this whole ques-

tion requires further consideration.

In conclusion, the moral and intellectual differences between shamanism and Buddhism did not result in them becoming complementary religious practices which could be employed within one population. Instead, they became separate and even antagonistic in such a way that shamanism predominated in one area, while Buddhism prevailed in another. This was possible because Lamaism contained all the possibilities for ecstatic trance, possession, and curing which were used by the shamans. It is suggested that the development of Lamaism can be correlated with a hierarchical territorially expansive society, while the retention of shamanism is related to a descent-based society in which there is the need to validate land-claims by reference to ancestors. The position was not static and at the beginning of the twentieth century there were regions where Lamaism was gaining ground at the expense of shamanism (e.g. Tunka, Darkhat) and consequently the two did at that point exist within the same population.

NOTES

- 1 D. Banzarov, 'The black faith, or shamanism among the Mongols', *Collected Works*, Moscow, 1955, pp. 51-2 (in Russian).
- 2 W. Heissig, 'A Mongolian source to the Lamaist suppression of shamanism in the 17th century: pt 2', *Anthropos*, 1953, 48, 518.
- 3 M. Eliade, *Shamanism, Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, London, 1964, pp. 498-507.
- 4 S.M. Shirokogoroff, *The Psychomental Complex of the Tungus*, London, 1935.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 130, note 52.
- 6 L.Ya. Shernberg, *Religion in the Light of Ethnography*, AN SSSR, Leningrad, 1936 (in Russian).
- 7 M.A. Gzaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia: A Study in Social Anthropology*, Oxford, 1914, pp. 116-291.
- 8 I.M. Lewis, *Ecstatic Religion: An Anthropological Study of Spirit Possession and Shamanism*, London, 1971, pp. 18-36.
- 9 L.N. Gumilev, *The Ancient Mongol Religion*, Dokl. Otdel. i. Komissyi Georgr. ob-ya SSSR, 5, Leningrad, 1968, pp. 31-8 (in Russian).
- 10 L.P. Potapov, 'The mountain cult in the Altai', *Sovetskaya Ethnografya*, 1946, no. 2, pp. 31-8 (in Russian).
- 11 S.I. Vainstein, 'The Tuva (Soyot) shaman's drum and the ceremony of its "enlivening"', in V. Dioszegi (ed.) *Popular Beliefs and Folklore Tradition in Siberia*, The Hague, 1968, pp. 331-8.
- 12 S.I. Vainstein, 'Shamanism of Touvinians', *7th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences*, Moscow, 1964, p. 13.
- 13 N.L. Zhukovskaya, 'The influence of Mongol-Buryat shamanism and pre-shamanist beliefs on Lamaism', in G.G. Stratanovich (ed.) *Problemy Ethnografii i Etnicheskoy Istorii Narodov Vostochnoy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Azii*, AN SSSR, Moscow, 1968, p. 219 (in Russian).
- 14 M. Bussagli, *Painting of Central Asia*, translated L. Small, Geneva, 1963, pp. 20-9, for example, describes the spread of Buddhism eastwards along the silk route by tracing early wall paintings dating to the second half of the third century A.D.
- 15 Zhukovskaya, op. cit., pp. 235-6.
- 16 G.E. Markov, 'Some problems of social organisation of the nomads of Asia', *Sovetskaya Ethnografya*, 1970, no. 6, pp. 74-89 (in Russian).

- 17 K. Marx, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, ed. E. Hobsbawm, London, 1964, pp. 33-4, 67-9.
- 18 E. R. Leach, Pulleyar and the Lord Buddha, an aspect of religious syncretism in Ceylon', *Psychoanalysis and the Psycho-analytical Review*, vol. 49, no. 2, S.J. Tambiah, *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults in North-East Thailand*, Cambridge, 1970.
- 19 V. Dioszegi, 'Problems of Mongolian shamanism: report of an expedition made in 1960 in Mongolia', *Acta Ethnographica* (Budapest), vol. 10, fasc. 1-2, 1961, p. 196.
- 20 G.N. Rumyantsev, *Chronicle of the Altai Buryat*, 1949, Zapiski NIKKE B-M, 9 (in Russian).
- 21 I.M. Manzigeev, *The Tangut Buryat Clan*, Ulan-Ude, 1960, p. 202.
- 22 Ibid., p. 110.
- 23 N.P. Mangutov, 'Social-economic relations in western Buryatia', *Etnograficheskiy Sbornik*, Ulan-Ude, 1965, 4, p. 111.
- 24 L. Krader, 'Buryat religion and society', *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 1954, 10, pp. 322-48.
- 25 I.A. Asalkhanov, 'On Buryat clans in the 19th century', *Etnograficheskiy Sbornik*, Ulan-Ude, 1960, 1, pp. 81-2.
- 26 B. Rinchen, 'About a Khori Buryat genealogy', *Acta Orientalia* (Hungary), 1965, vol. 18, p. 206, makes an interesting distinction between the written genealogies of the Mongols as opposed to the Buryats. The Mongols called their genealogies *udum sudur* 'chronicle of descent', and these were primarily concerned to show who were the descendants of a given ancestor. The Buryats on the other hand called their genealogies *uy-un-bicig* 'writing of the origin', and the aim here was to find out from whom a living person was descended, who were the ancestors. Rinchen concludes that the *uy-un-bicig* were closer to the shamanist cult of ancestors; they were used by Khori as well as Western Buryat.

PART VI

Concepts and methods