

RelBib

Bibliography of the Study of Religion

<https://relbib.de>

Dear reader,

This is a self-archived version of the following article:

Author: Rüpke, Jörg
Title: “Controllers and Professionals: Analyzing Religious Specialists”

Published in: Numen: International Association for the History of Religions
 Leiden: Brill

Volume: 43 (3)
Year: 1996
Pages: 241 - 262
ISSN: 0029-5973

The article is used with permission of *Brill*.

Thank you for supporting Green Open Access.

Your RelBib team

EBERHARD KARLS
UNIVERSITÄT
TÜBINGEN



UNIVERSITÄTSBIBLIOTHEK

CONTROLLERS AND PROFESSIONALS: ANALYZING RELIGIOUS SPECIALISTS¹

JÖRG RÜPKE

Summary

Based on a critique of Joachim Wach's typology of religious authority, the article attempts to describe religious specialists as agents of control within their religion's symbolic universe. Special attention is given to processes of professionalization.

0. Introduction

Whereas the external perception of religions is very much determined by their functionaries, religious specialists have received only limited scientific scrutiny. In describing these specialists, historians of religion frequently use a typology comprising terms like "priest," "prophet," "shaman," "healer," "magician"—terms that mostly derive from specific cultural contexts but are used transculturally. Thus, these types are defined by certain functions and performances that sometimes are embarrassingly missing from the culture just analyzed. Furthermore, as will be shown in analyzing the typology of Joachim Wach, a coherent scale or principle in constructing the different types is missing. The Christian concept of "mediation" cannot fulfil this role. A new approach in analyzing and describing religious specialists is badly needed.

An attempt is presented below. The point of departure is the rather general question of religions' interest in an internal division of labour. The controversies about the priestly character of early kings demonstrates the difficulties in finding a historical answer to the question. Instead, a working hypothesis is advanced: For rather diffused social systems such as religions, the stabilization of its identity by the exertion of control is an important instigation for the division of labour. This hypothesis cannot be tested directly, but many features of the

phenomenology of religious specialists can be shown to conform to developments predictable on the basis of that hypothesis. In two short historical case studies, rather unusual systems of religious specializations will appear more understandable. Finally, the specific momentum of specialization is analyzed by looking closer at processes of professionalization and their consequences for the religious systems involved.

1. Religion as individual experience

In his famous dictum, Friedrich Schleiermacher defined religion as the feeling of total dependency (“Gefühl schlechthinniger Abhängigkeit”). This individualistic and existentialistic point of departure has informed not only liberal protestant theology but religious studies as well. Man as individual and his theistic counterpart, divine message and belief, the call of the transcendental onto the whole human being and his reaction—these relationships inform research perspectives in one way or the other. Division of labour, the development of the roles of specialists and their professionalization appear to be anachronistic survivals of cultic religions long gone.

This consequence can be detected in the “sociology of religion” of Joachim Wach (1898-1955). His typology of religious specialists, formed in a critical analysis of Max Weber’s work, bears the title “types of religious authority” (1944: 331-374). After an overview of the many forms of religious authority and the many different (and unpredictable) reactions towards it (331-337), Wach starts his systematic thinking by reflecting on personal charisma and charisma of office (*Amtscharisma*) (337 f.). However, the analysis is not directed towards relationships of power—the subject of Max Weber’s thinking. For Wach the reactions of the “audience” (his term for the mass of a religious group) are not the most important topic. According to him, it is necessary to pay attention to the religious leaders’ own conception of their authority: the “self-consciousness and self-designation of the ‘holy man’ ” (338). This results in a typology of ten classes (341-374, cf. Flasche 1978: 219-228):

- 1) founder of religion
- 2) reformer
- 3) prophet
- 4) seer
- 5) magician
- 6) diviner
- 7) saint
- 8) priest
- 9) *religiosus*
- 10) audience

The criteria of this classification have already been named, foremost personal charisma, the defining element of religious authority. Yet for *religious* authority (on Wach's concept of religion) the bearer's *sensus numinis*, his "nose" for the divine, his "communion" with it, is decisive. Externally, the existence and extent of these characteristics are hard to determine. Thus, the concept of charisma tends to become a matter of the subject's own claims, the typology is bound to the assertions of religious traditions. Anything else, division of labour, special tasks or characteristic activities, are called upon in describing the single classes, but none of it gives rise to a systematization that comprises more than two classes.

The structuring function of the subjectively defined charisma, of the communion with the divine, is shown by the sequence of the classes of the typology. Personal charisma is diminishing from class to class. Basically, founder, reformer, and prophet are distinguished by the external criterion of success. While the seer stands close to the prophet, he remains, however, rather passive in comparison to the types above him.

The magician following marks a borderline. On the one hand, his powerful personal charisma puts him in one line with the types above him. On the other hand, sorcery is so institutionalized, professionalized and surrounded by outward symbols, that charisma drawn from the office tends to become more important than personal charisma—characteristic of the types below the magician. This is already clear

for the diviner, who is part of an institutionalized system and manipulates traditional symbols. There follows the priest, entirely characterized by his professionalization (360):

The authority of the priest depends on the charisma of his office. The calling [Wach's association is "job"], not the call [divine calling], characterizes the priest . . .

Yet, why does the saint come between diviner and priest, a type totally dissociated from any institution? It is his position that, again, demonstrates the determining role of the criterion of personal charisma. It is only the diminishing appellative character and authority of diminishing personal charisma that defines the sequence. Authority, the objective side of the subjective quality, is the only reason, why the priest supersedes the purely *religiosus*. The latter's religious qualification by an intensified relationship with the divine is entirely private, without any attempt at social authority.

In the end, Weber's dichotomy of charisma drawn from an office and charisma inherent to a person evaporates due to Wach's concept of religion. If all religious activity is determined by previous religious experiences and all personal charisma is determined by the intensity of these experiences, even the authority of the priest (conceptually due to his office) must somehow participate in personal charisma. Thus, at least for the "authentic" priest, Wach could formulate (360):

Although less original, spontaneous, and intense than that of the founder and prophet, the priest's personal experience guarantees the qualification for his mission. The priest "mediates" between God and man.

Even if each class of Wach's typology sounds familiar, they are too ill defined to provide a structure for any analysis of individual historical situations or developments. Eventually, Wach was not interested in different types of religious specialization and their consequences for an historical religion. His interest was a continuous scale of intensification of the fundamental religious experience, or better: of its weakening and institutionalization—down to the level where ordinary man, the "auditor," needs a mediator who (due to his own more

intensive religious experience) could provide the former at least with a secondary experience.

Excursus: "Mediator"

The concept of "mediator" demands a small digression. Mediation is a central feature of the Christian concept of priest and is employed as a basic concept for the (few) monographs on priests by historians of religion. Hence, it is worthwhile to pay a moment's attention to the Christian controversy on the term.

The point of departure for the intra-Christian, especially Reformation controversy is given by the late New Testament concept of a general and kingly priesthood of all Christians (1 Petr 2.5, 9). All believers directly participate in the salvatory events centered on Christ as the real and only high priest. However, the concept developed only a small critical potential against an ecclesiastical hierarchy that started to evolve for practical as well as disciplinary reasons. More and more, the "general priesthood" was restricted to the obligation to lead a really priestly life. Thus, in contrast to the original intention, a professional ethic, intended to legitimate the cleric's authority, was declared a general norm.

The critical impetus was taken up by Martin Luther. Starting from the justification of the individual, the concept of general priesthood was integrated into the fight against the catholic hierarchy and catholic authorities on the level of the parishes. The word of God is in no need of a mediator, it directly addresses every Christian. Again, however, the critical impetus could not be transformed into a positive, structuring principle. The general priesthood was so general and evenly distributed that it could not legitimate the new and—even for reformation churches—necessary specializations (see Voss 1990).

Basically, for scientific use, the conceptual problem is identical to that of Wach's typology. An individual relationship between God (gods) and man is presupposed. The priest, as "mediator," enters the relationship in order to improve or even open the channel of

communication. Negatively judged, he impedes or monopolizes the—originally direct—line of communication. Everybody should be his own mediator.

As in the case of Christianity, the historian might identify such a conception as a conceptualization of the religion that he is scrutinizing. Yet the concept is not suitable to form the basis of an analytical term. As an empirical and historical science, *Religionswissenschaft* can analyze its objects, religions, only as systems of social actions or, paying more attention to the cognitive dimension, as systems of symbols. Thus, the suitable parameter in describing religious specialists cannot be the intensity of the relationship between the “mediator” and a transcendental deity: Even according to Wach, this value can only be determined on the basis of the claims of the *homo religiosus*. For the historical discipline, the important variable is the position of the specialist within the social system of his religion.²

2. *Division of labour and social control*

Probably all religions contain religious specialists, usually *different* religious specialists. This is but a phenomenon of the division of labour. Its genesis cannot be reconstructed,³ but some of its general functions can be named. The division of labour is a common feature of growing differentiation within the social evolution. Complexity and adaptiveness of the system grow. Religious actions are not as controlled by external factors as e.g. economic behaviour. Stability and hence identity are especially problems of the cultural sector of a society. By intensifying the structure of the religious systems, religious specialists come in as controlling agents, if we do not restrict “control” to the dealing with specific forms of deviant behaviour (cf. Janowitz 1973 and Cohen 1968). Control, here, is to be understood on the model of “social control,” the sum of institutions, processes and actions serving the maintenance of the structure and border lines of a social system (cf. Gladigow 1987 for the censorship on myths). Obviously, not all specializations within religious systems involve control. Buildings or sacrificial animals have to be maintained. At

some point in time the latter will be butchered and cooked. Such activities give rise to many, even permanent, specializations. Nevertheless, control remains an important function of the large range of religious specialists often addressed as priests, teachers, theologians.⁴ As will be seen, many phenomenological characteristics of these specialists can be integrated within a model that hypothesizes functional and structural developments of religious specialists within complex societies—a model that could serve as an instrument in identifying and describing processes and structures of religious specialization.

Control within systems of symbols

How can control be organized to stabilize symbolic universes? One point to be considered first is literacy: Writing might preserve verbal conceptualizations of symbol systems nearly without limits, thereby creating the possibility of revitalizations at any place or time. Any control must keep up with the flexibility of the media. Censorship, the banning from libraries, schools, and public reading, and, finally, physical destruction of texts demands a thorough-going bureaucratic documentation. This illustrates the basic concept of every control, which—according to Bühler's model of communication—must pay attention to the transmitter (producer), to the medium of transmission, and to the receiver (addressee).

Yet, for many religions not writing, but the maintenance of the symbol system by permanent repetition and reactualization forms the normal procedure. Ritual is of foremost importance, theological reflection separated from the face-to-face situation of cult is of secondary importance, only. Three basic forms of ritual control can be named:

- 1) The monopolization of ritual activities offers a large field of possible forms of control. Ritual competence might be stressed and—in different degrees—restricted to specialists. The right to perform and hence the possibility to modify could be denied to non-specialists.
- 2) A much weaker form of control would be the replacement of the specialists' monopoly by their exemplary behaviour. The same ritual

(or type of ritual) that might be performed by e.g. all grown-ups or all males is performed by the specialists as well, yet—and this is the important feature for authority and control—much more exactly and lavishly.

3) Efficient bureaucratic structures would be necessary, if the juridical validation (or rather de-validation) of a ritual is assigned to specialists. The ritual might be performed by everybody, but its validity is permanently precarious by being subject to the specialists' potential veto.

Most of the rituals contain verbal elements up to explicit interpretations of the ritual itself. Pure associations, spontaneous interpretations of the participants normally remain unsaid, i.e. implicit and restricted to the very situation. Therefore interest in control is minimal (but cf. Paul 1990). Elaborated religious thinking separated from this situation, however, has a large potential for doctrinal development and social effect. The identity of the symbol system might be seriously affected. Therefore, interest in control of such "theological" products is large. Measuring rods could be installed in the form of abstract dogmas. The production of dogmas as well as the legitimate respecification of these dogmas for concrete situations will be monopolized by specialists (who might be identical with the ritual specialist or not). The definition of a canon of "holy scripture(s)" is another mechanism. The denunciation or even destruction of the partisans of the illegitimate theology might follow in a second step, mostly no longer performed by religious specialists but by political authorities. The necessary condition for this is the quasi monopolistic stance of the religious system within the society.

The topic of exclusion leads, after ritual and religious thinking (theology), to the question of membership. Control might be exerted in the form of an initial filter, i.e. rituals of initiation. Their performance or—in particular, if the local area is transgressed—their documentation might be monopolized by religious specialists. Such a demand in documentation could lead to the building up of archives, even the monopolizing of systems of documentation (writing systems). In this

context, a secondary religious socialization, a formal religious education, could be institutionalized. Such an activity could supplement or supplant the primary religious socialization by participating in local cult (cf. Gladigow 1995: 21 f.). Therefore, the organizers, "teachers," need not to be identical with the ritual specialists.

Religions that demand a comparatively high commitment (and correspondingly offer higher rewards) must protect their resources and their members' motivation by excluding free-riders (Stark, McCann 1993). An administration is necessary that could register e.g. payments or individual participation. An institution like confession, presupposing the internalization of a large range of norms, could complete a supervision naturally full of gaps, especially for the inaccessible realm of motivation and mental sinning (Hahn 1982).

Control of the controllers

Institutionalized, not only diffused, controls (see Cohen 1966: 39) are a form of power and need legitimation. This problem is delineated by the term *Amtscharisma* ("charisma of office"), but not solved. It is more fruitful to reformulate the problem in terms of a process. Who does control the controllers? Obviously, there must be a connection between the kind and amount of control *by* the controllers and the kind and amount of control *of* the controllers; both could be related to the religious system as a whole and to society.

Hierarchization offers a fairly common solution. Within the controllers, dependencies are defined and behavioural options of the individuals are reduced. Outwards, the apparatus and the system as a whole are stabilized. You must not judge the system by its lowest (and mostly the only directly known) representatives. The burden of legitimation is (at least partly) taken off from the positions with continuous contact with the subjects and transferred to the inner, to the higher positions of the hierarchy.

The functioning of hierarchy might be strengthened by the motif of decadence: former priests, shamans, augurs, apostles were mightier, they were able to perform miracles. This, obviously, is a rather critical

motif. Why, then, would it be handed down so often within the circle of specialists? It seems to stabilize collegiate and hierarchical structures, i.e. self-subordination, despite the high authority claimed and represented towards the subjects. By proliferating the motif, every contemporary specialist is reminded that his power is entirely dependent on the conferral by the organization.

Coherence of the apparatus could be promoted by a restricted admission. Specialists often practice cooptation. Social strata might be reproduced, only a nobleman could be created bishop, only a patrician *rex sacrorum*. However, the opposite option is feasible, too, and might accelerate the differentiation from the political system. It is possible to restrict candidates to certain “natural” groups—enlisted families, *gentes*—sometimes positions are hereditary. Thus, the restriction (and the ensuing difference in competence and authority) is “naturally” legitimated. The resulting problem is that supply (or descendants) and demand could easily fall out of balance.

The specialists’ superiority in competence is safeguarded by extensive training and the monopolies of certain kinds of knowledge. It does not matter whether such a knowledge would have any practical usage; what does matter is the solidarity of the knowing and the prestige assigned by those excluded (see Bremmer 1995, Burkert 1995). Special garments and special codes of behaviour enlarge the distance between specialists and non-specialists and further the establishment of the former as a special status group. Such a strategy might culminate in very complex scripts of roles (see Landtman 1905: 86-164).

3. *Case studies*

The model, which due to its hypothetical character cannot be proved directly, must demonstrate its usefulness in historical analyses. Here, two rather sketchy examples have to suffice. Both deal with religious specialists whose traditional classification appears to be unsatisfactory.

Shamans

The open-ended debate on the definition of shamans versus priest unsatisfactorily tries to draw on a definition of the shaman as individually evoked ecstatic (cf. Quack 1985; Sasaki 1990). This phenomenological approach does not conform with the ethnographical data. In shamanistic societies, other criteria apart from the uncheckable claim of the ecstatic exist. For every new shaman the teaching received from established shamans is of utter importance and is a decisive source of legitimation. Furthermore, in the recognition of a young man as shaman, the local group is as much involved as the shaman-to-be himself. It is the local group that decides whether the "candidate" is to be revered as a new ecstatic or to be treated as a lunatic. Naturally, the stance of a "self-made shaman" is much weaker than that of an hereditary shaman. It is important that his deviant behaviour conforms to cultural patterns set by earlier shamans, but the recognition of that classification has to be made explicit by the local group (the data are presented by Eliade 1951: 22 f.). Given the structures of these societies, the anthropologist normally would recognise no shamans but those approved by the local group.

Hence, even in the case of ecstasies, *controlled* tradition, the control of the symbol system, forms a central element of the shamanistic "vocation." Empirical data do not support the hypothesis that generally ecstasies are a factor of insecurity. Put into context, they tend to be as conservative and stabilizing as technicians of hepatoscopy, interpreters of dreams or exegetics of holy scriptures. Contrary to Turner (1968: 439), there is no general dichotomy of religious specialists between "institutional functionaries," manipulating visible, ritual symbols (priests), and "inspirational functionaries," manipulating psychogenic, "internal," and putatively innovative symbols.

Roman priests

Roman “priests” do not conform to our Christianly informed concept of priest (see Beard, North 1990; Bendlin *et al.* 1993). These *sacerdotes publici* do not have any training, their temporal involvement could be characterized as “leisure activity,” they do not perform any pastoral carework, their way of life does not show any elements of a special holiness. Even most of the state sacrifices are performed by magistrates, who are as competent as any *paterfamilias* to do such a ritual. Despite a differentiation into several colleges (*collegia, sodalitates*), there are only traces of hierarchy. Permanent organization and professionalization are but initial (Kehrer 1982: 46-50). These *sacerdotes* are hard to be understood as priests, but as controllers they do offer a coherent picture.

Control of the symbol system is indicated by the phrase *disciplina tenere*, keeping disciplinary order on the cognitive level. The colleges decided upon the applicability of the political-religious rules to specific courses of action. Whenever temples were dedicated or expiatory rituals for prodigies had to be performed, the *sacerdotes* had to offer advice and assistance to the performing magistrates. Thus, the most important innovative mechanisms in the expansion of the range of gods and rituals were controlled. A similarly restrained control was exerted in the realm of sacrifices. The central sacrifices of the state priesthoods were exemplary. Protocols were produced and sometimes even published in the form of inscriptions; these monumental copies are, at least partly, preserved for the Arval Brethren and the secular games. Together with other material, the original *acta* formed the archive of a certain priesthood, formed their *libri sacerdotum* (see Scheid 1994). Descriptions rather than norms were preserved in writing.

Religious services for individuals (which might be interpreted as forms of control) were hardly existent. The assistance of some priests during marriage was restricted to a special ritual for upper class couples. Otherwise, only the religio-legal character of plots of land

(graves, sanctuaries, groves) was an object of priestly control (especially by the *pontifices*), since private religion and public interest could interfere. The large political interest in the status and activities of private societies, however, was not vested with the religious specialist.

Internal control within the religious specialists was poor. Recruiting by cooptation had already been modified by quora (patricians/plebeians) by the end of the 4th century BC, by elements of public vote by the middle of the 3rd century BC. These modifications were, however, restricted to very few elevated positions. As a permanent object of debate they remained precarious, even if they did not really enlarge the basis of recruitment socially. It was a basic concern of the colleges to assemble as many different families as possible within the single unit, for instance by prohibiting the membership of a second male of the same family. Experience and knowledge was acquired by life time membership—in itself an important mechanism of control (Szeidler 1986: 2326). Even this was frequently interrupted by long periods of foreign military or diplomatic service. Neither a hereditary principle nor practising as youthful *camillus*—such an experience never was a precondition—could prepare candidates for the task. Apart from the *flamines*, a special group of single priests for the service of special deities, priestly garments did not exceed the status symbols of magistrates and the normal clothes of the upper strata of society. Hierarchization was missing; even the influence of the *pontifex maximus* onto other priests was restricted to the right to force them to do their specific service in a given case (Gladigow 1970). Lastly, even the *epulones*, a small college deriving from the pontiffs' (proto-)equestrian servants (*apparitores*), were not subjected to their former masters' authority.

There are two significant exceptions, the already mentioned *flamines* and the *virgines Vestales* (for the data see Vanggaard 1988, Cancik-Lindemaier 1990). Clothing was strictly regulated, covering the time out of service, too. Nearly permanent presence was enforced, strict norms regulated or even forbade marital resp. sexual life. At least in principle, the call into service did not depend on

the consent of the (in the case of the Vestals: very) young priests-to-be; they were seized by the *pontifex maximus* (*captio*), not coopted by their colleagues. Theological concepts, perhaps coordinated with these norms, are not explicitly transmitted. Naturally, the interpretation of such a complex of signs is very dynamic. I cannot exclude the possibility that the idea of the representation of the deity by her or his priest—the favourite idea of modern interpretations (cf. Scheid 1986; for India Minkowski 1992; in general James 1955: 291)—was part of ancient thinking, too. There are, however, no positive indicators that it did dominate ancient interpretations. For contemporaries, the relationship with the other priests, the positional meaning in the terms of V.W. Turner, must have been much more important. They were all members of the same social stratum, they were all regarded as *sacerdotes*. *Flamen Dialis* and Vestals gathered in the same *collegium pontificale* as the “leisure time priests” called *pontifices* (see Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 3, 13, 10 f.). Thus, the standing and the representation done by the few full time priests is part of the prestige of all priests. Seen from outside, *sacerdotes* must have seemed to be much more than they were. Again, the motif of decadence can be traced: many of the restrictions were thought to have applied to all *sacerdotes* in former times. It is, however, significant for the weak internal interest in control that the few attempts at strengthening the norms of ritual correctness for priests in an exposed position (e.g. for the *flamines* and the *rex sacrorum* during the third and second centuries BC) were not successful in the long run (see Rüpke 1996a).

The weak control with respect to the populace points to the low level of organization of Roman religion. In its traditional forms, in Rome religion normally is *diffused religion*. The large and, with regard to the upper class, diffused segment of hardly hierarchized controllers address themselves nearly exclusively to the area of statal, political action. The very priesthoods form an area of action, where—without regard to (the few remaining) differences in status and magistracies just held—coherence within the political elite can grow, being structured by the principle of seniority only.

This coherence is not a static, but a dynamic factor. Political or religious activities are not legitimated by drawing on a dogmatized tradition. Instead, they have to gain consensus through an interplay of a complex system of institutions, checks and balances (Rüpke 1996). This, exactly, is the interest embodied in the controlling function of the religious specialists in Rome, who did not safeguard the products of a holy tradition. Methodically, it is by means of the analytical concept of “control,” by the focusing on interdependencies instead of phenomenological data, that such functions of religious specialists can be detected and integrated within a larger image of religion within society.

4. Professionalization

As the Roman example shows, “specialist” is a rather vague term. There are many degrees of specialization. Nevertheless specialization is a useful term. Returning to Rome, it was only the membership within the colleges that defined the religious function: Political position and social prestige of an upper class Roman citizen did not suffice to establish the *special* religious and functional competence. These members were not simply the *patresfamilias* of the state who automatically had the right (and duty) to perform certain types of domestic cult.

Specialization—again the Roman example is instructive—does not equal vocation, is not full time activity. At Rome, only the Vestals could fulfil this criterion, including their economic dependency on their “job” (cf. the criteria of Shils 1968: 245 f.). By any means, full time vocational roles mark an advanced state of social evolution.

Professionalization as a specific concept designates a particular form of vocation, be it full-fledged or only initial (see Ghandi 1982: 9 f.). Professions are defined by

- * a formal training, finished by an institutionalized exam, thereby conferring the publicly recognized qualification for a certain cultural tradition;

- * a certain ability to do things within this cultural tradition including a monopoly to do them; and finally professions are defined by
- * an organization and by institutionalized controls that ensure the public usefulness of the vocational practice (Parsons 1968: 536).

Professionalization, this is implied, is more than an intensification of specialization. Professional ethics are a defining element, an element, that might get lost by growing specialization and thus shrinking societal function and responsibility. De-professionalization is a realistic possibility (Vollmer, Mills 1966, Schach 1987), perhaps even a tendency within contemporary Christian priesthood (Fichter in Vollmer, Mills 1966: 146; Goldner, Ference, Ritti 1973: 135).

The role of professional ethics cannot be overestimated (Schach 1987, espec. 64). It is an internalized conception of one's own duties with regard to larger segments of society, controlled by likewise professionalized colleagues and one's own professional organization only (cf. Zintl 1978: 120). It is professional ethics that allow for the interpretation of professionalization as a form of control: "Professionalism is an alternative form of social control. The professional man is highly controlled by his professional peers by virtue of common values acquired in professional schools, by his constant association through work (and often socially) with other professionals, by his continuing education ('keeping up'), which is based largely on books and journals that only fellow professionals read" (Thompson 1969: 95, cf. 93).

Professional ethics answer the problem that even within densely structured organizations professionals need freedom, since non-specialists are not able to define the precise goals of the hopefully innovative activity of the professional—a critical problem for, e.g. scientific, innovation-oriented institutions.⁵ Control must be realized in the form of self-control or control by professional peers (Schach 1987: 11).

Market pricing is another common mechanism of control which is not fully applicable to professionals. If the activity of the professional

is fragmented into priceable services at all, anonymous tariffs usually apply; otherwise flat rates will be paid or “presents” be given. For the southern Indian temple priest, for instance, only a “present” (*dakṣiṇā*) could be a medium of recompensation adequate to his status, a ticket system avoids the direct monetarization of smaller services (Fuller 1984: 66, 98-101). Like the change of one’s physician, the change of one’s astrologer would normally not be determined by his or her price—a fact to which the economy of religion should pay attention when it employs the model of the market.

As I have already attempted to demonstrate, the concept of professionalization is useful for the study of religion, too. In an historical perspective, the professionalization of religious specialists is prior to other processes of professionalization in medieval and early modern Europe (Parsons 1968: 537). Paying attention to the high importance of professional ethics for the professionalization, it is to be expected that religious systems will take the lead in processes of professionalization. The decisive factor would be the intensive “ideologization” of religious organizations. This would produce professional ethics that do not follow but further other aspects of professionalization. I would even suggest that in comparison with other systems, religion might introduce other forms of specialization, might test the division of labour, too, rather early. The instigating factors could be religions’ high need in controlling and its large possibilities of control with regard to the controllers. To analyze the timing of processes of professionalization within different societal, including the religious, systems might be a fruitful line of research.

Stressing the controlling aspect of professionalization should not obscure the innovative side, the intensified innovation rate of professionals. Within the religious realm, one could think of the genesis of Indian *corpora* of texts as the *Atharvaveda* (Inden 1992; cf. Kaiser 1992 for Ayurveda medicin), of the priestly texts and editorial work in the *Tenakh*, of the early development and differentiation of Roman law by the pontiffs, or of the establishment of many of the early Christian European universities. These examples are by no means new, but they illustrate a point that is usually lost in formulating typologies

of religious specialists. Innovation and control cannot be assigned to prophets and priests respectively, innovation is not restricted to external stimuli. Professionalization clearly indicates the integration of potential innovation *within* the organizational framework. This might be one of the most interesting aspects of the control approach towards religious specialists.

Universität Potsdam
 Institut für Klassische Philologie
 Postfach 601553
 D-14415 Potsdam

JÖRG RÜPKE

¹ A German version of this paper has been given as inaugural lecture at the University of Tübingen on 11th May, 1995, an outline of the argument at the annual meeting of the *Deutsche Vereinigung für Religionsgeschichte* at Bonn. For discussion of the argument I should like to thank Christoph Auffarth, Burkhard Gladigow, Günter Kehrer, Hans G. Kippenberg, and Heinrich von Stietencron—and Thomas Lawson for the improvement of the English text.

² For a critique of the concept of “mediator” from the part of Indology see the publications of Heesterman (1971; 1985: 3-9, 141-157; cf. 1991): He reconstructs a development of Vedic ritual, which turns an originally contingent and legitimizing sacrificial competition between king and priest into a self-contained, stable ritual complex: Now, the relationship between political leader (king), who initiates the sacrifice, and brahmin, the ritual specialist, is only negatively defined by negating certain interdependencies. Any positive definition (like “mediator”) is not suitable.

³ See the detailed account of Landtman 1905; cf. Turner 1968: 441-443 for the differentiation of religious specialists. Both of them stress that the development out of political functions (king, headman) seems to be a particular case.

⁴ Named as an important function by Simmel 1923: 235. Cf. Turner 1968: 439, who, however, did not develop his idea: “What the priest is and does keeps cultural change and individual deviation within narrow limits.”

⁵ Cf. Thompson’s list of professional values (1969: 69): “(1) autonomy in work, both as to means and ends, (2) a belief in professional growth as the measure of success, (3) an acceptance of peer evaluation, rather than the opinion of a ‘superior,’ as the standard of personal worth, (4) an assignment of the highest value to activities that develop new knowledge (pure research over applied research, etc.)”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beard, Mary; North, John
 1990 "Introduction." Idem (eds), *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*. London: Duckworth. 1-14.
- Bendlin, Andreas et al.
 1993 "Priesthoods in Mediterranean Religions: Review article Mary Beard, John North (eds), *Pagan Priests ... 1990 ...*" *Numen* 40. 82-94.
- Bremmer, Jan N.
 1995 "Religious secrets and secrecy in classical Greece." Kippenberg, Stroumsa 1995. 61-78.
- Burkert, Walter
 1995 "Der geheime Reiz des Verborgenen: Antike Mysterienkulte." Kippenberg, Stroumsa 1995. 79-100.
- Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard
 1990 "Kultische Privilegierung und gesellschaftliche Realität: Ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte der virgines Vestae." *Saeculum* 41. 1-16.
- Cohen, Albert K[ircidel]
 1966 *Deviance and Control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eliade, Mircea
 1951 *Schamanismus und archaische Ekstasetechnik*. [Le chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l'extase, 1951.] Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- Flasche, Rainer
 1978 *Die Religionswissenschaft Joachim Wachs*. Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 35. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Fuller, C.J.
 1984 *Servants of the Goddess: The Priests of a South Indian Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ghandi, J.S.
 1982 *Lawyers and Touts: A Study of the Sociology of Legal Profession*. Delhi: Hindustan Publishing Company.
- Gladigow, Burkhard
 1970 "Condictio und inauguratio: Ein Beitrag zur römischen Sakralverfassung." *Hermes* 98. 369-379.
 1987 "Mythenzensur und Symbolkontrolle." Aleida und Jan Assmann (eds), *Kanon und Zensur*. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation 2. München: Fink. 158-168.
 1995 "Struktur der Öffentlichkeit und Bekenntnis in polytheistischen Religionen." Kippenberg, Stroumsa 1995. 17-35.

- Goldner, Fred. H.; Ference, Thomas P.; Ritti, R. Richard
 1973 "Priests and Laity: A Profession in Transition." Paul Halmos (ed.), *Professionalisation and Social Change*. Sociological Review Monograph 20. Keele: University of Keele. 119-137.
- Hahn, Alois
 1982 "Zur Soziologie der Beichte und anderer Formen institutionalisierter Bekenntnisse: Selbstthematization und Zivilisationsprozeß." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 34. 407-434.
- Heesterman, Jan C.
 1971 "Priesthood and the Brahmin." *Contributions to Indian Sociology NS* 5. 43-47.
 1985 *The Inner Conflict of Tradition: Essays in Indian Ritual, Kingship, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 1991 "'I am who I am:' Truth and Identity in Vedic Ritual." Gerhard R.F. Oberhammer (ed.), *Beiträge zur Hermeneutik indischer und abendländischer Religionstraditionen*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. 147-177.
- Inden, Ronald
 1992 "Changes in the Vedic Priesthood." A.W. van den Hoek, D.H.A. Kolff, M.S. Oort (eds), *Ritual, State and History in South Asia: Essays in Honour of J.C. Heesterman*. Memoirs of the Kern Institute 3. Leiden: Brill. 556-577.
- James, E.O.
 1955 *The Nature and Function of Priesthood: A Comparative and Anthropological Study*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Janowitz, Morris
 1973 "Wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Überblick zur Entwicklung des Grundbegriffs 'Soziale Kontrolle'." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 25. 499-514.
- Kaiser, Ronald
 1992 *Die Professionalisierung der ayurvedischen Medizin und deren Rolle im indischen Medizinpluralismus*. Kölner Ethnologische Arbeitspapiere 3. Bonn: Holos.
- Kehrer, Günter
 1982 *Organisierte Religion*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Kippenberg, Hans G.; Stroumsa, Guy G. (eds)
 1995 *Secrecy and Concealment: Studies in the History of Mediterranean & Near Eastern Religions*. Studies in the History of Religions 65. Leiden: Brill.
- Landtman, Gunnar
 1905 *The Origin of Priesthood*. Diss. Ekenaes, Finland.

Minkowski, Christopher Z.

1992 *Priesthood in Ancient India: A Study of the Maitrāvaruna Priest*. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 18. Wien: De Nobili.

Motzki, Harald

1977 *Schamanismus als Problem religionswissenschaftlicher Terminologie*. Arbeitsmaterialien zur Religionsgeschichte 2. Köln: Brill.

Parsons, Talcott

1968 "Professions." David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 12. [New York]: Macmillan. 536-547.

Paul, Ingwer

1990 *Rituelle Kommunikation: Sprachliche Verfahren zur Konstitution ritueller Bedeutung und zur Organisation des Rituals*. Kommunikation und Institution 18. Tübingen: Narr.

Quack, Anton

1985 *Priesterinnen, Heilerinnen, Schamaninnen? Die pofingao der Puryuma von Katipol (Taiwan)*. Dargestellt und analysiert nach Aufzeichnungen aus dem Nachlaß von D. Schröder. Collectanea Instituti Anthropolos 32. Berlin: Reimer.

Rüpke, Jörg

1996 "Religion und Krieg: Zur Verhältnisbestimmung religiöser und politischer Systeme einer Gesellschaft." Richard Faber (ed.), *Politische Religion—religiöse Politik*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann (forthcoming).

1996a "Innovationsmechanismen kultischer Religionen: Sakralrecht im Rom der Republik." Hubert Cancik (ed.), *Geschichte - Tradition - Reflexion* 2. Tübingen: Mohr (forthcoming).

Sasaki, Kōkan

1990 "Priest, shaman, king." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 17. 105-128.

Schach, Bernhard

1987 *Professionalisierung und Berufsethos: Eine Untersuchung zur Entwicklung des beruflichen Selbstverständnisses, dargestellt am Beispiel des Volksschullehrers*. Soziologische Schriften 47. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

Scheid, John

1986 "Le flamme de Jupiter, les Vestales et le général triomphant: Variations romaines sur le thème de la figuration des dieux." *Le Temps de la Réflexion* 7. 213-230.

1994 "Les archives de la piété: Réflexions sur les livres sacerdotaux." *La mémoire perdue: A la recherche des archives oubliées, publiques et privées, de la Rome antique*. Série Histoire Ancienne et Médiévale 30. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne. 173-185.

Shils, Edward

1968 "Occupation and Career." David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 11*. [New York]: Macmillan. 245-254.

Simmel, Georg

1923 *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. 5 Aufl. (3¹⁹²³). Gesammelte Werke 2. Berlin: Dunker & Humblot, 1968.

Stark, Rodney; McCann, James C.

1993 "Market Forces and Catholic Commitment: Exploring the New Paradigm." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32. 111-124.

Szemler, G[eorge] J.

1986 "Priesthoods and Priestly Careers in Ancient Rome." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.16*, 3. Berlin: de Gruyter. 2314-2331.

Thompson, Victor A.

1969 *Bureaucracy and Innovation*. University of Alabama Press.

Turner, Victor W.

1968 "Religious Specialists. I. Anthropological Study." David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 13*. [New York]: Macmillan. 437-444.

Vanggaard, Jens H.

1988 *The Flamen: A Study in the History and Sociology of Roman Religion*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.

Vollmer, Howard M.; Mills, Donald L. (eds)

1966 *Professionalization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Voss, Klaus Peter

1990 *Der Gedanke des allgemeinen Priester- und Prophetentums: Seine gemeinde-theologische Aktualisierung in der Reformationszeit*. Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Wach, Joachim

1944 *Sociology of Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zintl, Reinhart

1978 "Organisation und Innovation." Karlheinz Wöhler (ed.), *Organisationsanalyse*. Stuttgart: Enke. 110-125.