Journal of Intangible Cultural Heritage

JICH (2025), Volume 4 (I)

Cultural Symbolism and Ritual Purity: A Review of Mary Douglas' Contributions to Anthropological Thought

K. A. D. P. Kaluarachchi

Divisional Secretariat Office, Balangoda, Sri Lanka
*dinithiprathibha5@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the concept of holiness from both theoretical and practical perspectives, focusing on its relevance in Indian society and beyond. Drawing from Mary Douglas' Purity and Danger. It examines the anthropological discussions on holiness and its association with purity, wholeness, and ritual practices. Douglas' interpretation of holiness in The Abominations of Leviticus highlights its connection to completeness, both in a physical and spiritual sense. The study delves into how holiness is deeply embedded in Hinduism and Christianity, emphasizing its role in maintaining ritual purity and overcoming uncleanness. The contributions of Saint Vincent de Paul and Saint Louise de Marillac are also analyzed, demonstrating holiness through service and devotion to the marginalized. Furthermore, the paper discusses the intricate relationship between holiness and purity within social and religious contexts, highlighting various rituals that sustain these concepts. The impact of socio-economic changes in post-independent India on the practice and perception of holiness is also examined, illustrating how modernization and societal transformations influence traditional understandings of purity. By analyzing these shifts, the paper provides insights into how holiness continues to shape religious and cultural practices. This study contributes to a broader understanding of how holiness is maintained and redefined in contemporary society, particularly in response to evolving socio-cultural dynamics.

***Key words**: Holiness, Indian society, Purity, Hinduism, Christianity*

1. Introduction

Holiness, purity, and pollution have long intrigued scholars because they reveal how societies construct meaning, maintain social boundaries, and regulate behaviour. Mary Douglas's influential study "Purity and Danger" (1966) argues that rules about "purity are not merely about hygiene or superstition; rather, they form part of a broader symbolic system that helps communities interpret their world and preserve social order. Douglas famously observes that "dirt is matter out of place" (Douglas, 1966, p. 36), highlighting how classification systems underpin cultural stability. These ideas are particularly relevant in India, where Hindu and Christian traditions

continue to navigate notions of purity and ritual practice, even amid social and economic transformations. For instance, figures such as Saint Vincent de Paul and Saint Louise de Marillac exemplify how holiness is enacted and negotiated in everyday life. Moreover, contemporary scholarship such as the work of Olyan (2000), Milgrom (1991), and Kristeva (1982) demonstrates the continuing relevance of Douglas's insights, emphasizing the value of examining diverse cultural contexts, including Indian religious life, when exploring concepts of purity, pollution, and the sacred.

1.2 Objectives

This study explores how Mary Douglas's ideas of purity and pollution shed light on how people understand and practice holiness in Indian religious traditions and Christianity. It examines how communities use concepts of cleanliness, sacredness, and ritual to make sense of their world, maintain social order, and respond to social and cultural changes over time.

2. Materials and Methods

Mary Douglas was a well-known British anthropologist who specialized in cultural symbols research. Purity and Danger are right in her wheelhouse in this way. It's well-written and unexpectedly approachable to even people who are well-versed in the primary areas (anthropology and comparative religion). It also includes instances from a wide range of civilizations and religions. And further this explores the changes happening with socio-economic changes occurred/occurring in post-independent India. And it will be discussed how holiness maintains by the people for the sake of purity in Indian Society.

The book delves into the universal topics of filth and hygiene. It focuses on how dirt plays a role in every society as part of a larger cultural belief system. She shows that a fragmented approach to analysing pollution in cultures is completely ineffective for providing comprehensive explanations. When I approached Leviticus, I found a lot of attempts to explain each purity commandment as if it were a separate issue of purity. Douglas exemplifies the weakness of this strategy.

3. Results and Discussion

Mary Douglas' Purity and Danger: an investigation of ideas of pollution and taboo, first published in 1966, is one of few anthropological publications to have had such a significant impact outside of that discipline, and on the discipline of architecture in particular. Douglas' writing - a study of social and cultural systems through the evidence of commonplace, the excluded, and the prohibited was deemed peripheral within the discipline of anthropology until the late 1970s, and she later disclosed that she was dissatisfied with the instant response. Purity and Danger, on the other hand, went on to become a model of theory's ability to cut across disciplines, methodological approaches, and intellectual stances, assisting us in comprehending dirt in various material and symbolic forms.

Since the publication of Mary Douglas' Purity and Danger in 1966. Many other scholars' descriptions of purity have been impacted by this book. Introducing a new

way of thinking about this problem. There have been no new theories of purity established in the field of religious studies that surpass Douglas' insights. Douglas has continued to change and develop her theory of purity in a number of books and essays since that time. Her Purity and Danger theories continue to dominate the profession.

Purity and Danger, first published in 1966, rightfully deserves to be considered a classic, and the publication of a new version, complete with a new self-critical prologue, confirms this. The book is accessible to non-specialists while also serving as a source of inspiration and information for anthropologists and sociologists. The book, which engages critically with anthropology, sociology, and psychoanalysis, rejects the denigration of "primitive worlds" and the reduction of the purity problem to either hygiene or psychological requirements. Powers of Horror (1980/1982), a book by the psychoanalytic theorist Julia Kristeva, presented Douglas' work to a new generation of social theorists.

The connection between the idea of hygiene and respect for convention is presented in the first chapter, Ritual Uncleanness. Furthermore, the idea that uncleanness and holiness, as well as clean and unclean, are all relative concepts.

Mary Douglas' meditation on purity and risk breaks through the epistemic stalemate of both Durkheim's effort of defining religion and Maussian attention on plainly religious behaviours such as sacrifice, bringing us into the fluid realm of the daily. Purity and danger are two characteristics that can be found in any culture or community. Purity and danger are two themes that everyone, from the spectacular to the mundane, confronts on a daily basis. Nonetheless, each culture has its own set of taboos, rituals, and definitions of what is pure and what is hazardous. "Purity and danger, as a result, takes us out of the rigid metaphysical framework of what is and isn't, instead shedding light on the relationship between "order to chaos, being to non-being, shape to formlessness, life to death (Douglas, 1966, p. 7)." Douglas thus forges a new path in anthropology that incorporates both explanation and understanding modes of inquiry.

The idea of holiness has fascinated anthropologists since the very beginning of the discipline (Douglas, 1966). Douglas starts by exploring the origins of the word “holy,” pointing out that it’s rooted in the idea of being set apart. Because the Hebrew word k-d-sh doesn’t translate neatly into English, Ronald Knox’s Old Testament uses the phrase “put apart” to capture its meaning.

Douglas then looks at how holiness is understood in Hinduism. In Hindu thought, the idea that the sacred and the impure could belong to the same category seems impossible. Yet ideas about pollution show that holiness and unholiness aren’t always strict opposites. Something considered clean in one situation might be seen as unclean in another. This flexible system creates a kind of “algebra of pollution,” where context matters more than absolute rules. Women and sadhus in India play active roles in preserving holiness through their everyday practices, showing how the sacred is woven into daily life.

In Christianity, Douglas emphasizes a similar link between holiness and wholeness. In The Abominations of Leviticus, she notes that "holiness is exemplified by completeness," where physical wholeness reflects spiritual perfection. Saints like Vincent de Paul and Louise de Marillac illustrate this through lives devoted to God and service to the poor. Across cultures, holiness often carries the idea of purity, protection, and care. People use rituals to maintain it, to protect what is sacred, and to navigate ideas of cleanliness and pollution in their communities. Holiness, in practice, is as much about living and acting in a way that honors the sacred as it is about abstract belief. Purity and danger, as a result, takes us out of the rigid metaphysical framework of what is and isn't, instead shedding light on the relationship between "order to chaos, being to non-being, shape to formlessness, life to death (Douglas, 1966, p. 7)". Douglas therefore paves the way for a new way of practicing anthropology that incorporates both explanation and comprehension modalities. Olyan (1996) had developed this paradigm in a previous work to explain why the altar had to be built of unfinished stones: when a tool, notably an iron tool, was brought to them, they lost their wholeness and hence their purity. Jacob Milgrom used the holiness/wholeness paradigm to sacred time, and Susa applied it to priestly hair after the death of a relative, according to Olyan (Olyan, S. M.,2000). However, Olyan pointed out that the Bible did not make an absolute or unique relationship between wholeness and purity. While imperfect priests did not fully lose their holiness, beauty could be a correlate of wholeness. They were still allowed to enter the sanctuary and eat sacred food. In short, Olyan contended that Douglas's paradigm was effective for some biblical texts but not for all, adding that "while Douglas did not distinguish between biblical sources, it is critical that we do so if we are to assess the value of her paradigm with any insight (Olyan, 2008, p. 8)."

Professor Srinivas and the late Franz Steiner were the first to be concerned in polluting behaviour, according to Mary, because each, as a Brahmin and a Jew, strove to deal with difficulties of ceremonial cleanness in their daily lives. She then went on to perform fieldwork in the Congo with a highly pollution-conscious culture, where she uncovered a predisposition against piecemeal explanations.

In chapter three, the Author also discusses the relationship between animals and holiness. She explains in the chapter that in some communities, some animals are regarded as holy, while others are regarded as filthy. She refers to another author to substantiate this claim. Pigs are seen as dirty animals in Syrian society, but they are regarded as sacred animals in other societies. The well-known discussion of why certain animals in the Pentateuch were considered unclean is found in Purity and Danger. Pigs, for example, are unclean because, while cloven-hoofed like cattle, they do not eat cud and hence do not fit into the pastoral classification system. Separation is thus described as holiness, which requires that "individuals conform to the class to which they belong in the categories given in the account of creation," and food regulations are considered the "physical expression of holiness." Douglas also discusses the significance of borders and the manner in which they articulate human bodies, particularly practices involving excreta. These are examples of how the individual body is the "body politic in miniature" and how "rituals function on the body politic through the symbolic medium of the physical body."

The author then goes on to discuss the key differences between primitive taboo and primitive holiness norms, namely the distinction between friendly and unfriendly deities. The separation of sanctuary and consecrated objects and persons from profane ones, which is a common practice in religious cults, is essentially the same as separations motivated by fear of malevolent spirits.

The author then goes on to explain how Christian holiness rules, on the other hand, neglect material circumstances and judge based on the agent's motives and disposition. She establishes this condition by demonstrating the following:

"The irrationality of laws of uncleanness from the standpoint of spiritual religion or even of the higher heathenism, is so manifest that they must necessarily be looked upon as having survived from an earlier form of faith and of society (Robertson Smith, cited in Douglas, 1966/2002, p. 430)."

Here we have a familiar theme, as Douglas follows Durkheim's line of exposition (Durkheim, 1912/1995), but with her own twist, arguing that culture is always about argument, about a clash of claims, and that the metaphysics can only be understood if it is seen as emerging from the political realities of the time, out of the human interests it serves. This thesis is rewritten in the familiar terms of her cultural theory, as advanced in Natural Symbols, with different types of thought systems sketched in and the attempt - as in previous work - for a sociological context for interpreting cosmological variety. So, where do the priestly redactors fit in? Her careful investigation of the historical record, as shaky as it is, as well as her interpretation of the purity rule, allow her to conjecture about their political views. The temple cult's hierocratic lords are currently perceived as pushing a liberal political stance, an inclusionist ethic, in order to attract new members and counteract any xenophobic tendencies in other political interest groups. Their theology is not what one would anticipate from a simple enclave, where restrictions are in place to keep the people of Judah apart.

Apart from the distinction between Levite priests and others, the purity laws do not seek to distinguish between different classes or races of people but rather promote an egalitarian worldview that encompasses all of creation. Pollution becomes a global problem for which everyone is responsible, even if they are not necessarily guilty. This uniqueness of the Biblical system, with its aniconic monotheism, is raised again in Leviticus as Literature, and she returns to the holiness code and the significance of the temple worship with it. She presents another interpretation of the prohibited animals, this time more focused in its underlying theological underpinnings. Leviticus as Literature raises this uniqueness of the Biblical system, with its aniconic monotheism, and she returns to the holiness code and the significance of temple worship with it. She offers yet another interpretation of the prohibited animals, this time with a greater emphasis on theological foundations. Moses' God is the God of Life, and all living things, as well as blood, which is the essence of life, belong to him. He is opposed to all types of death and corruption. All of the purity laws are now considered part of a coherent vision based on the covenant. She claims that the word "abomination" as a translation for the forbidden animals is too value-laden and derogatory for the context. Avoiding or avoiding would better convey the prohibition's technical meaning. Animals, far from being

awful in the emotional sense, are also part of God's creation and are protected by him. Their life is preserved by the rules that consider them unclean to touch after death and hence forbid them from being eaten.

4. Conclusion

However, the expansions of her theory of contamination as it applies to the Old Testament, as well as her extensive analysis of its various manifestations, are only one facet of the two books' complicated argument. Another is concerned with the question of literary form. Complex kinds of parallelism and chiasmus, in which the text is structured in sequences that reverse at mid-point, are identified here.

The mid-point represents a climax, conveying the overall meaning of the sequence, or ring, as Douglas refers to it. This pattern can be easily visible in short areas, and Old Testament experts have detected it. Is it possible to apply these formats to entire volumes with such ease? She stated in Numbers that the fundamental key is the parallelism between narrative portions and rules, with the text alternating between the two such that the text may be read horizontally as well as lineally in structuralist style. Douglas claims that the text adopts this approach, with its sequences forming a complex ring structure with three decreasing size portions. The first screen demarcates the outer court, which serves as a sacrifice arena, and leads to the first sanctuary, which houses the Ark of the Covenant. The second screen leads to the holiest of holies, which houses the Ark of the Covenant. Far from being a haphazard accumulation of injunctions, Leviticus' laws follow this pattern, with an increasing focus on holiness and isolation, first for the people and then for the priests.

Recommendations

Building on Mary Douglas's ideas, this study suggests that future research should pay closer attention to how people actually live out ideas of purity and holiness in their everyday religious practices, especially in societies undergoing rapid social and cultural change such as post-independent India. Ethnographic and community-based studies could help capture how traditional purity rules are adapted, questioned, or maintained in daily life. Bringing together perspectives from anthropology, sociology, theology, and psychoanalysis may also offer a richer understanding of why these symbolic systems continue to matter. Such approaches can help show how rituals of purity and holiness remain meaningful and relevant within modern, pluralistic societies.

5. References

Douglas, M. (1966). Purity and danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo. Routledge.

Douglas, M. (1999). Leviticus as literature. Oxford University Press.

Durkheim, É. (1912/1995). The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (K. E. Fields, Trans.). Free Press.

Knox, R. (1949). The Old Testament: A new translation. Sheed & Ward.

Kristeva, J. (1982). Powers of horror: An essay on abjection (L. S. Roudiez, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1980)

Milgrom, J. (1991). Leviticus 1–16: A new translation with introduction and commentary. Yale University Press.

Olyan, S. M. (1996). Rites and rank: Hierarchy in biblical representations of cult. Princeton University Press.

Saint Vincent de Paul Society. (n.d.). Life and legacy of Saint Vincent de Paul and Saint Louise de Marillac.