

PROBING THE ECONOMIC DIMENSION OF TEMPLES IN GOA: A CASE STUDY

Dr. Padmaja Vijay Kamat

Associate Professor in History Ponda Education Society's
Shri Ravi Sitaram Naik College of Arts and Science
Farmagudi – Goa, India

Abstract

The Gramsamsthas, or the village communities founded most of the Hindu temples in the State of Goa, India, in the ancient times. These institutions also provided for the maintenance of the temples by dedicating best of the paddy fields and orchards to the Patron God or Goddess of the village and also to the temple servants. A sea change came in the traditional governance of the temples, when they were brought under control of the colonial masters, the Portuguese, through a specially designed regulation in 1886, which acknowledged the proprietary rights of the Mahajans, the hereditary temple managers, who became instantly, the legal owners of the temple properties and incomes accruing from them. These temples still continue to be under the tutelage of the Administrator of Temples, though nominally. Virtually, they are autonomous units with their private statutes and funding agencies.

This paper is an effort to delve into the economic dimension of the Mangesh Temple situated in village Priol in the Taluka of Ponda, as a case study. The narrative is based upon the archival sources, the official temple documents that include the private statutes and annual budget of the temple (2010-11), and the oral sources consulted are the temple authorities and the servants.

Key Words: Hindu, temple economics, *gramasamstha*, *Mahajans*, private statutes.

1. Introduction

Located at 15° 48' – 14° 53' North and 74° 20' 13" – 73° 40' 33" East, Goa is one of the youngest state of the Indian Union. Having an area of only 3700 sq. km., it is the smallest state in the country. Situated on the west coast of India and in the proximity of the Western Ghats, Goa shares common physical features with its neighbouring states of Maharashtra and Karnataka. The centrally located Ponda taluka which was known as the *Antruz Mahal*¹ in the olden days, offers a contrasting cultural image as compared to the 'Old Conquest' areas of Ilhas, Bardez and Salcete, which project the latinized landscape. Ponda could maintain its Hindu cultural identity because it came under the Portuguese sphere of influence much later, i. e. in the 18th century. As such this taluka can be used to study the pattern of growth and development of the Goan society and culture.

Goa's idyllic natural beauty is amplified manifold by the serene sacred space that centers around the local temples. Though these temples were created and maintained by the village communities originally, their sustenance was offered royal patronage by the different Kings and Queens that controlled Goa's destiny from time to time. The Shilahara Kings followed the traditional system of temple management, which was initially designed by the *Gramasamstha* and gave regular employment to the temple servants. The Goa Kadambas took it as a mission to enrich the religious institutions by bestowing honours and wealthy gifts on them. The Savai-Vere Plate of Guhalladeva II of A. D. 1038 and Priol Plate of Guhalladeva III Tribhuvanmalla of A. D. 1099 stand as testimony to these observations. The latter inscription of Kadamba King Guhalladeva III Tribhuvanmalla Vijayarka records the grant of 10 *Nishkas*² to the Nageshwara temple. King Shivachitta Permadideva was a devotee of Shiva. His wife Kamaladevi created *Agraharas*³ for the learned *Brahmins* (Fleet, 1898). Coins of Shivachitta were inscribed with the name of his deity Saptakoteshwara, while those of Jayakeshi I, with Malege Bhairava (Moraes, 1990). The *Nagaji Mandir Shilalekha*⁴ of 1413 A.D. records the land grants made to the temples of Nagesh and Mahalaxmi at Bandora, by Mai Sheno, an official of Vijayanagara King Sangam Devrai I, whose royal writ was then running over Goa. This endowment was for the maintenance of such things as daily worship, *naivedya* (offering of cooked food) and lighting of *nandadeep* (perpetual lamp in the sanctuary) on behalf of the donor (Wagle, 1913; Mitragotri, 1999).

The taluka of Ponda could evade the ferocity of the proselytization as it was a late entrant into the Portuguese ambit in the second half of the 18th century. Ponda taluka too, was following the traditional pattern of village administration with some variations owing to the Muslim rule, which sought to limit the autonomy of the villages through its political representatives known as the Desais and Sardesais. But they did not tamper with the traditional outlook of the village community towards the temple and its management (Desai, 2010), since they too were Hindus. The *gramasamstha* not only donated the most fertile lands to the temple for its maintenance and that of its servants, but also made contributions for the performance of certain religious ceremonies and observances.

The Portuguese government attempted to regulate the administration of the temples by passing a law on October 30, 1886. This was the *Regulamento*⁵ of 1886. It was superseded by another *Regulamento* of March 30, 1933. The constitution and management of the Hindu temples is conducted under the provisions of the Act of 1933 which consisted of 437 articles. The assets of the *mazania* like treasures, funds, immovable properties and their administration, income of the temple, budget, debts, long term leases, distribution of landed properties, sale of mortgaged articles, survey and registration of the temple properties, usurpation and misappropriation of landed properties, etc. were brought under the purview of this Act. The *mazania*, the General Body of *Mahajans* or the hereditary temple managers, is subject to the provisions of this Act and the *Compromisso* or Bye-laws, which are specific to each temple. The Administrator or the *Mamlatdar* of the taluka, could propose the dissolution of the Managing Committee, if it had disregarded the *Regulamento* in any way (Devasthan Regulation, 2010).

2. Research Method

The case study research design is chosen for the present investigation since it has been suggested as most useful for the Social Sciences by a host of scholars (Weirisma, 2000; Thies, 2002, Hennick, Hutter and Baily, 2011) as in-depth knowledge is gained about the topic being probed through such an endeavor. The suitability of the case study method is also recommended (Yin, 2003) because it answers exploratory research questions, where the investigator has no control over context of the investigation and the focus of the study is contemporary. The Mangesh Temple is chosen for investigation since it has huge economic resources, a large stake in the village economy at micro level and to some extent in the state economy on macro level (Kamat, 2011). Its domination on tourist circuit is significant (Goa Samachar, 2011).

3. Literature Survey

Many Western scholars have chosen the Temple Economy in South India as the centre of their attention. Temple has been seen as a prime agent for redistribution of economic resources (Stein, 1960; Stein, 1978; Spencer, 1968). Indian scholars have teamed up with their Western counterparts to allude to the fact that the donations and endowments made to the temple permit incorporation of corporate units like families, castes, sects etc. (Appadurai, 1981; Appadurai and Breckenridge, 1976) into temple circuit. Temple donations have been noticed as the key tools of socio-political empowerment (Breckenridge, 1986; Talbot, 1991). The role played by the temple in bringing about political and economic integration of a region has been probed systematically by some scholars (Dirks, 1976; Ludden, 1979; Heitzman, 1987; Hietzman, 1987; Hietzman, 1991; Branfoot, 2008); while the cultural dynamics of a Hindu temple have been probed by other scholars (Fuller, 1988; Inden, 1985).

With respect to Goa, temple has been acclaimed as a key symbol of local resistance to the Portuguese hegemony (Axelrod and Fuerch, 1996; Iffeka, 1985). An American anthropologist has made forays into temple festivals and the Hindu-Christian crossovers (Newman, 2001). Temple has been distinguished as the master symbol of cultural resurgence (Kamat, 2012). However economic aspect of the Goan temple had hitherto remained a mystery owing to the apathy shown by the hereditary temple managers to research and systematic investigation (Kamat, 2013a). It was only in the recent times that the Temple Economy could be taken up as the focal point of a serious study and that too by invoking the Right to Information and appealing to the Mamlatdar of Ponda, who is also designated as the Administrator of the Temples of the taluka of Ponda, which are very much under the purview of the *Regulamento* of 1933.

The present paper is an effort to probe the economic profile of the Temple of Mangesh at village Priol. A host of oral sources like the members of the Managing Committees, legal experts who represent the temples in law courts, temple servants, and the village elders were interviewed to gain a deeper insight into the administrative traditions that are followed at this temple.

Economics of this temple is traced in three time frames namely, at the time when it was directly under the *Gramasamstha* of Cortalim, when it came under the purview of the *Regulamento* of 1886 that necessitated registering its *Compromisso* or the private statutes and in the recent times. *Foral de Salcete* of 1568 and *Foral de Salcete* of 1622 (the Revenue Registers written in Portuguese and housed in the Historical Archives of Goa) are used for tracing the economics of the temple when it was in its original site at Cortalim in Salcete taluka. The relevant section of the *Compromisso* of the temple is used for probing the economics of the temple when it got relocated in village Priol and the Budget Statement of the said temple for the year 2010-2011 is used for the last timeframe.

4. Findings

The *Gramasamstha* in every village not only donated the most fertile lands to the temple for its maintenance and that of its servants, but also made contributions for the performance of certain religious ceremonies and observances (Xavier 1950; Furtado 1954; De Souza 1979; De Souza 1994). Certain contributions were of a fixed nature, while others were variable (Pereira 1981). Examples of variable contributions were those made with respect to the feasts like *Jagar*⁶ of Betoda, *Jagar samaradhana* (a community lunch hosted by the temple) at Nirankal, the festivals in the temples of Vetaleshwar at Veling, Shantadurga at Khandepar, Mandodari at Betki and Madananta at Vere. Most of the *Gramasamsthas* contributed for the expenses of the *nandadeep*⁷ and the general illumination of the temple. This too varied from year to year.

Some of the contributions of a fixed nature were: *Dharmadaya*, which was a contribution towards remuneration of the priest in Betoda and Nirankal; *Gramadalap*, a contribution made by the community of Bhoma; *Hakka*, a contribution made by a multitude of communities in favour of temples, *maths* (monasteries), *vyotishis* (astrologers), *ghadis* (witch doctors) and others and also as a reward to the bearers of the *rayas patras*⁵ of the Pontiffs of the Monasteries of Partagal and the Kavle. *Vatan* was another contribution made by the village communities in favour of the temples, their servants as well as the monasteries. *Vatan* was also known as *Inam*, which was a fixed pension. In village Bori, while the priest, washer-man and the barber got only *namashi* (a property given to a temple servant in lieu of salary), the blacksmith enjoyed a fixed *vatan* besides the *namashi*. The *gramasamstha* of Bandoda instituted an annual pension for the temple musicians and *Katkar*⁸. Almost all *gramasamsthas* of Ponda contributed towards the annual pension for the *Bhavins*⁹. Similarity between the *namashi* and the *vatan* was that, both could be enjoyed as long as the grantee rendered service to the temple. Interestingly, Pereira also points out, that these *Gramasamstha* not only bore the expenses of the temple, but also contributed for the upkeep of some of the mosques and the religious functionaries attached to them.

4.1 The Politico-Religious Situation in Salcete

The Portuguese had set their foot in Goa by capturing the *Ilhas* taluka under the leadership of Alfonso de Albuquerque. Salcete and Bardez talukas of Goa were presented to them much later by Bijapur Sultan Ibrahim Adil Shaha i. e. in 1543. The Vicar General Fr. Minguel Vaz having masterminded the destruction of Hindu temples in *Ilhas*, desired that temples of the newly acquired areas too, should be destroyed. Therefore, the Viceroy Antão de Noronha promulgated a new Order applicable to all territories under the Portuguese on August 29, 1566 forbidding erection of new Hindu temples or carrying out repairs to old ones. It was hoped that these temples would in due course of time, fall into ruins. The Hindus of Salcete appealed to the Viceroy against this order but their plea was turned down. This was the reason why people decided to shift along with the idols of their deities to the other side of the river Zuari and hence out of bounds of the Portuguese territories. The aim of the Portuguese was to uproot the Hindu religion and its influence. They looked upon the shifting of idols with disfavour. Diego Fernandes, the Captain of the Fort of Rachol managed to obtain an order from the Viceroy allowing the destruction of as many temples in Salcete as possible. It was around this time in 1566, that Mangesh was shifted from Cortalim to Priol (de Sousa, 1710; Priolkar, 2008). However, the process of shifting the deities seems to have begun much before 1566 as the Jesuits who visited the temple of Mangesh on May 1, 1560, had found it without the cult object (Dhume, 1971).

4.2 Management of the Temple of Mangesh of village Priol

Before the arrival of Mangesh from Cortalim to this place, this ward of Priol was called *Ganapatiwada*. With the migration of Mangesh to this place the ward came to be renamed as Mangeshi. Initially all the expenditure of the temple was born by the *Mahajans* of the temple to the best of their ability, as it was their prime duty. Subsequently, one of the followers of the cult of Mangesh, Mr. Ramachandra Malhar Sukhthankar, who had risen to the status of eminent statesman in the court of the *Peshwa*¹¹ of the Marathas at Poona, got secured the *Mokasa*¹⁰ of the Mangeshi ward and cash *Inam* (pension) of Rs. 250/ from the feudatory of the *Peshwa*, Sawai Imadi Sadashiva Rajendra, former King of Sonda.



Plate 1
Temple of Mangesh, Priol



Plate 2
Cult Object of Mangesh in the Sanctuary

The arrangement for the temple in earlier times was that, the Dhume family of Kumbharjuva would bear the expenses of the temple for six months, the family of Naik Karande would bear it for three months, the Kabadi family, for one and half month and the expenses for the remaining one and half month would be borne by the remaining *Mahajans*. The treasures of the temple of Mangesh were kept in the Dhume family house in Kumbharjuva (Dhume, 1966). The *Kamavisdar* or the Secretary of the Managing Committee was appointed after the acquisition of the *Mokasa* and *Inam*. He used to maintain the accounts of the temple, which were to be presented to the body of the *Mahajans* at the time of the annual feast of the temple.

The *Compromisso* of the temple of Mangesh was passed and announced vide *Portaria* No. 146, dated June 15, 1909 and was published in the government Gazette. The *Mahajans* of the Mangesh are the *Gaud Saraswat Brahmins*, better known as the *Kushasthale Brahmins*, organised into 24 *Vangads*¹² of the *Comunidade* of Cortalim (*Compromisso*, 1909).

Subsequently the Article No. 24 and Article No. 25 in the *Compromisso* were amended and declared as approved vide *Portaria* No. 3530 dated November 14, 1940. These amendments made it possible that a small part of the fees charged for performance of the rituals in the temple could accrue to the temple coffers. Until then all the money so collected was distributed among the temple servants.

4.3 Economics of the Temple of Mangesh at Cortalim

Gaspar Moreira, the clerk of the Court of Salcete, and the clerk of measurement of *Namshi* or *Namoxins* has certified a report in the *Foral de Salcete* of 1622, which says that on the orders of the *Licenciado* Francisco Travasso, issued on October 25, 1622, the *Gãonkari*¹³ of Cortalim was summoned to select experts for measuring the *namoxins* of Cortalim. These experts were the elderly people of the village who knew the boundaries of the properties of the village and were trustworthy to give their testimony and do the job of demarcation of the *namoxins* truly. The said *Gãonkari* selected Francisco Viera (originally Malnato Dalvi), Antonio Fernandez, Luis de Menezes and Juao Lobo to do the job and they were to be assisted by the Father, Attorney of the Company of Jesus in the said task of measurement. All the members of this panel were given an oath on the book of the holy Gospel and on the heads of their children so that they perform the duty without passion or affection and demarcate and fix the boundaries of the paddy fields and other properties of temples and to point out those which were misappropriated. The *Ovidor*, other members of the panel and the interpreter had signed the report (*Foral de Salcete 1622-1692, fl. 250*).

4.3.1 List of properties owned by the temple of Mangesh

Sr. No.	Paddy Fields	Palm groves and Areca groves
1	<i>Vaddeacho Zao</i>	Bhatanche, <i>Dhualliache Bhatt</i> and <i>Malarache</i>
2	<i>Mairiaqui Abhixekacho Zao</i>	<i>Abhxequiachi</i>
3	<i>Kesvache Panch</i> and <i>Maluche Addiache</i>	<i>Deussua Vadd</i>
4	<i>Boiniaqui Zao</i>	<i>Manguanatache, Harjagrachem</i> and <i>Jotichem,</i>
5	<i>Kultariaquim Devache Oddaracho Zao</i>	<i>Marguiriachi Namoxin</i>
6	<i>Talle Zao</i>	Sateriche
7	<i>Thavai Zao</i>	<i>Santerichem</i>
8	<i>Tellaraxi Cet</i>	<i>Virache Deulachem</i>
9	<i>Bamna Sanqueri</i>	<i>Virache Deulachem</i>
10	<i>Bana Ghasassalem Panch</i>	<i>Satrache Bhatta</i>
11	<i>Harbhatalem Vikhandichem Panch</i>	Another piece of <i>Satrache Bhatta</i>
12	<i>Panni Zao</i>	<i>Sonabhattale</i>
13	<i>Boridi Satericho Panch</i>	<i>Gopinatachem</i>
14	<i>Cultanti Sateriche Panch</i>	<i>Guroualem</i>
15	<i>Phonddu Zao</i>	<i>Tallay</i>
16	<i>Amboqueri Viracho Panch</i>	<i>Azepallachem</i>
17	<i>Dhaculo Venno</i>	<i>Canaghasassalem,</i>
18	<i>Vaddlo Venno</i>	
19	<i>Pattechari</i>	
20	<i>Magachari</i>	
21	<i>Angureanto Tallay</i>	
22	<i>Gurucetantuli Curungui</i>	
23	<i>Camrache Panch</i>	

Source: *Foral de Salcete 1622-1692, folios 250 v-256 v*

The traditional tributes paid cash and kind by the *Gāonkars* of Cortalim to the temple for daily and seasonal ritual service are listed in the Panchanama Report that was compiled in 1568, a year after the demolition of the temple. It speaks of a provision store situated in the vicinity of the temple, a part of whose incomes were dedicated for the maintenance of the ritual services of the temple of Mangesh (*Foral de Salcete* of 1568, *fls* 456-464).

4.4 Economics of the Temple as reflected in the *Compromisso* of 1909

Article 12 enumerates the sources of income as revenue from the Temple estates, interest on loans granted, tributes from Government Treasury, tributes from Velge *Comunidade* in Sanqueli *mahal*, revenue accruing from the lands given as *kutumban*, annual contribution called *Kalepatti* and *Rathapatti*¹⁴ from Ponda, Sanguem and Quepem *mahal*, contributions paid by the Government Treasury on the behalf of Hemadbarshe *mahal*, material and monetary offerings and donations made by the *Mahajans* and other devotees, fees charged for the performance of cults in the temple and all other such gains.

Article 19 specifies the heads of expenditure of the temple namely, maintenance of the temples, *agrashalas*, *math*, etc., expenses made on rituals and festivals, maintenance of temple lands, management and administration of the temple, salaries of temple servants etc.

4.5 Economics of the temple of Mangesh the Recent Time

The details about the projected Income and Expenditure of the Temple in Indian Rupees for the Financial Years 2007 – 2011 can be gauged from the following table:

Particulars	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Income	41,16,316	52,47,816	55,53,816	98,98,316
Expenditure	41,09,624	47,60,350	49,01,602	75,86,764
Balance	6,692	4,87,466	6,52,214	23,11,552

Source: Budget Statement of Temple of Mangesh for 2010-11, p. 2.

4.5.1 Total *foros* and rents of properties due to the temple:

Description	INR
Lease rent of properties in <i>Mocasa</i> of Mangeshi	163.50
<i>Foros</i> of properties declared by government as <i>Aforramentos</i>	81.74
Lease rents of <i>rustoxa</i> and urban properties with assessments situated in the property <i>Palmar Cumharjua</i>	107.00
Lease rent of plots comprised within Plot No. 1 of Paroda village	67.98
Rents of <i>Kiriste</i> of properties situated in Mangeshi	55.98
Rents of 7 properties granted on the perpetual lease (1 at Mangeshi, 3 at Priol, 1 at Khandola, 1 at Cuncolim and 1 at Velguem)	602.34
The rents of 7 plots of <i>Palmar Cumbarjua</i> leased on public auction	5,720.00
Rent of <i>Valado de Almerias</i> situated at Mardol	131.00
Rents of areca gardens leased on public auction	45,000.00
Rents of paddy fields of Paroda	7,548.00
Rents of plots of paddy fields of <i>Chuman Cantor</i> 1/6 of gross product	5,543.52
Rents of 11 plots of paddy fields <i>Rainguinim</i> , Bandora, 1/6 of gross product	252.60
Rents of paddy fields situated at Mardol (1), Surla in Bicholi (1), Neura de Grande (1), Cuncolim (1) and Mangeshi (4), a 1/6 of the gross product	1,344.90
Rents of <i>rustica</i> and urban properties <i>Le Avenca</i> (Nos. 1 to 4)	25,675.00
Taxes collected from hawkers in <i>Devasthan</i> properties, Mangeshi	225.00
Rent of plot occupied by a residential house at Mangeshi	14.50
Rent of plot occupied by a residential house at Carambolim	13.50
Rent of plot occupied by a residential house at Cumbarjua	610.70
Total	95,157.20

Source: Budget Statement of Temple of Mangesh for 2010-11, p. 4.

4.5.2 Income to be collected in the form of dividends and profits:

Particulars	Indian Rupees
Dividends on shares, profits etc from <i>Comunidades</i> of Margao, Kundai, Curtorim, Cortalim, Sancoale, Veling and Madkai	24,500.00
<i>Formassa</i> from the <i>Comunidades</i> of Veling	14.45
<i>Consignação</i> from Cortalim, instituted by Dhumes of Cumbarjua	50.00
<i>Hakka</i> and Pension from the government (<i>Fazenda Nacional</i>) and <i>Comunidades</i>	14.65
From <i>Comunidades</i>	388.65
Total	24,967.75

Source: Budget Statement of Temple of Mangesh for 2010-11, p. 10.

4.5.3 The Economics of the temple for the Present Times in INR can be gauged from the following table:

INCOME	AMOUNT	TOTAL	%
Lease Rents, <i>Foros</i>		95,157.20	1%
Dividends, Profits, etc.		24,967.75	0%
Interest			
On Loans against mortgage of Immovable Properties	1,930.00		
On Loans granted against Cloths and Ornaments	108.01		
On Shares of <i>Comunidade</i>	1,283.95		
From Banks	7,60,000.00		
On other Deposits	2,500.00	7,65,821.96	8%
Other Income			
Pension from Servants	212.25		
Pension from <i>Swamiji</i> of <i>Kavle Math</i>	50.00		
Donations	14,60,000.00		
Amount collected under Section 24 of Bye-laws for <i>Devakrityas</i>	75,00,000.00		
Miscellaneous	52,107.00	90,12,369.25	91%
Grand Total		98,98,316.16	100%
EXPENDITURE			
Festivals celebrated by <i>Devasthan</i>		14,34,350.00	19%
Festivals by <i>Mahajans</i> and devotees		3,13,494.26	4%
Salaries			
<i>Sevekaris</i>	4,65,570.00		
Office Staff	6,53,400.00	11,18,970.00	15%
<i>Derram</i> and Audit Fees		85,000.00	1%
Statutory Expenditure		46,34,950.00	61%
Grand Total		75,86,764.26	100%
Balance		23,11,551.96	23.35%

Source: Budget Statement of Temple of Mangesh for 2010-11, pp. 1- 49.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

When the Portuguese colonial masters, hand in glove with the Church authorities, began to make concerted efforts to decimate the Hindu population of Goa and devastate their temples, the erstwhile *Antruz Mahal* was chosen to be the safe heaven for the cults that had to be shifted under duress. But very soon they were consecrated in their new abodes with commensurate honour. The temple of Mangesh was given a solid financial grounding when it was awarded the grant of *Mokasa* in 1746, which accorded to the temple, the right to collect taxes from the people of the locality. The paddy fields, coco and areca groves, and buildings owned by the temple are found in many places of Goa. This temple had a prominent economic profile. It had ownership of *Comunidade* shares from multiple villages. It was the recipient of traditional contributions of *Hakkas* and Pensions from so many *Comunidades* and owing to liquidation of some *Comunidades*, their obligation to this temple had to be dispensed with by the central revenue office, the *Fazenda Nacional* at Panaji. It received nominal pensions from the Pontiff of the Kavale Monastery and also its servants. It lent capitals to private persons, businesses and even *comunidades* in the past. But today it is making safe investments in banks. Mangesh temple is perhaps the most visited temple by the domestic and foreign tourists and as such it is a mega-profit earner. But, the management of the said temple has not explored its full capacity to be a key player in the state economy. The temple has massive archival resources about its administration and economic operations, but has been showing complete repugnance to any serious research. Fifty years ago, it had donated a piece of land to facilitate building of a high school in its proximity. In the present context this temple can play the leadership role by redesigning its operations emulating the example of the Tirupati Venkateshwara temple, one of the wealthiest temples of South India to become a driving force in restructuring Goa's socio-economic profile.

Notes

1. *Antruz Mahal* – centrally located administrative division of Goa in the olden times
2. *Nishkas* - coins current in Goa in the 11th century
3. *Agrahar* - a pool of villages set aside for the maintenance of Brahmin Scholars
4. *Shilalekha* – stone tablet registering a land grant
5. *Regulamento* – a regulation
6. *Jagar* - a night long musical performance narrating the heroic exploits of the deity
7. *Nandadeep* – perpetual lamps in the sanctuary
8. *Katkar* – a temple servant decorated with a badge and a silver staff
9. *Bhavin* – a female temple servant belonging to the *Devadasi* caste
10. *Mokasa* – a grant which enables the grantee to collect revenues from the people of the locality
11. *Peshwa* – prime minister of the Maratha Kings
12. *Vangad* – clans
13. *Gāonkari* – village community
14. *Kalepatti* and *Rathapatti* – contributions from the *Comunidade* for temple feasts

References

1. Appadurai, A. (1981) *Worship and Conflict under Colonial Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Appadurai, A. and Breckenridge, C. (1976) *The South Indian Temple: Authority, Honour and Redistribution*. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*. Available at <http://cis.sagepub.content/10/2/187>. Accessed on April 1, 2013.
3. Axelrod P. and Fuerch. "Flight of Deities: Hindu Resistance in Portuguese Goa" in *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. XXX, Part II., 1996.
4. Branfoot, Crispin. (2008) "Imperial Frontiers: Building Sacred Space in the Sixteenth Century South India" In *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 90 (2).
5. Breckenridge, C. (1986) "Food, Politics and Pilgrimage in South India" In, R. S. Khare and M. S. A. Rao ed., *Food, Society and Culture*. Durham N. C.: Carolina Academic Press.

6. Budget Statement of Temple of Mangesh, Priol, for 2010-11.
7. Compromisso of the Mangesh Temple of 1909.
8. Desai, Yeshwant. (2010) The descendent of Desai of Priol who was the political agent of Antruz Mahal under Adil Shaha of Bijapur, was interviewed by the Author at Priol, Goa, on June 29, 2010.
9. De Sousa, F. *Oriente Conquistado a Jesú Christo pelos Padres de Companhia de Jesú de Provincia de Goa*. Lisboa, 1710.
10. De Souza, T. R. (1979) *Medieval Goa*. New Delhi: Concept Publication.
11. De Souza, T. R. (1994) *Goa to Me*. New Delhi: Concept Publication.
12. Devasthan Regulation. (2010) Panaji: Government Printing Press.
13. Dirks, N. (1976) "Political Authority and Change in South Indian History." In *Economic and Social History Review*, 13.
14. Dhume, A. R. (1966) "Shri Mangesh Devasthanachi Sankshipta Mahiti" in *Shri Shantadurga Chatuhshatabdi Grantha*, ed. P. S. Pissurlekar, Mumbai: Shantadurga Seva Samiti.
15. Dhume, V. N. S. (1971) *Shri Mangesh Devasthan Samagra Itihas*. Margao: Timoji Shenvi Kakodkar.
16. Fleet, J. F. (1898) *Pali and Old Canarese Inscriptions from the Bombay Presidency and Madras Presidency*. London: J. F. Fleet.
17. *Foral de Salcete of 1568*. Housed at the Historical Archives of Goa, Panaji.
18. *Foral de Salcete 1622-1692*. Housed at the Historical Archives of Goa, Panaji.
19. Fuller, C. J. (1988) "The Hindu Temple and Indian Society." In Michael V. Fox ed., *Temple in Society*. Winon Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.
20. Furtado, A. (1954) "Gomantakatil Gramasamstha." In Silver Jubilee Committee ed., *Ajacha va Kalcha Gomantak*. Mumbai: The Goa Hindu Association.
- Henrick,
21. Goa Samachar (2011) Available at <http://www.goasamachar.com/print.php?alias=temples-in-go>
22. Hennink, M. Hutter, I. and Baily, A. (2011) *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
23. Hietzman, J. (1987) "Temple Urbanism in Medieval South India." In *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 46 (4). Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2057102>. Accessed on May12, 2013.
24. Hietzman, J. (1987) "State Formation in South India, 850-1280." In *Economic and Social History Review*, Vol. 24 (1).
25. Hietzman, J. (1991) "Ritual Polity and Economy: The Transactional Network of an Imperial Temple in Medieval South India." In *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*. Vol. 34 (1/2). Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3632277>. Accessed on May 12, 2013.
26. Iffeka, C. (1985) "The Image of Goa." In T. R. De Souza ed., *Old Issues, New Questions*. New Delhi: Concept Publication.
27. Inden, R. (1985) "The Temple and the Hindu Chain of Being." In *Purusartha* 8.
28. Kamat, P. V. (2011) *Ponda: A History of Temples*. Ph. D. Thesis submitted to Goa University, Taleigao, Panaji.
29. Kamat, P. V. (2012) "Goan Temples: Symbols of Cultural Annihilation and Resurgence." In *Asian Conference on Cultural Studies Official Conference Proceedings*. Available at <http://iafor.org/accs.proceedings.html>.
30. Kamat, P. V. (2013a) "Temple Economy in Goa" in *Official Conference Proceedings of European Conference on Social Sciences 2013* available at <http://iafor.org/category/research/conference-proceedings/ecss-official-conference-proceedings/>
31. Kamat, P. V. (2013b) "Temple Economy in Goa: A Case Study." In Damir Tokic ed. *The Macrotheme Review* 2 (5), Fall 2013. Austin (Texas): Macrotheme Capital Management, LLC.
32. Ludden, D. (1979) "Patronage and Irrigation in Tamil Nadu: A Long-term View" In *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 16.
33. Mitragotri, V. R. (1999) *Socio Cultural History of Goa From Bhojas to Vijaynagar*. Panaji: Institute Menezes Braganza.

34. Moraes, G. M. (1990) *The Kadamba Kula – A History of Ancient and Medieval Karnataka*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.
35. Newman Robert S. (2001) *Of Umbrellas, Goddesses and Dreams: Essays on Goan Culture and Society*. Mapusa: Other India Press.
36. Pereira, Rui Gomes. (1981) *Goa: Gaumkari*. Panaji: A. Gomes Pereira.
37. Priolkar, A. K. (2008) *The Goa Inquisition*. Second Edition. Panaji: RajhamsaVitaran.
38. *Regulamento das Mazanias das Devalayas do Estado da India*. (1933) Nova Goa: Imprensa Nacional.
39. Spencer, G. W. (1968) "Temple Money Lending and Livestock Distribution in Early Tanjore." In *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 5.
40. Stein, B. (1960) "The Economic Function of a Medieval South Indian Temple." In *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 19 (2). Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2943547>. Accessed on April 1, 2013.
41. Stein, B. (1978) ed., *South Indian Temples: An Analytical Reconsideration*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
42. Talbot, C. (1991) "Temples, Donors and Gifts: Patterns of Patronage in Thirteenth Century South India" In *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 50 (2). Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2057210>. Accessed on April 1, 2013.
43. Thies, C. G. (2002) "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations" in *International Studies Perspectives* (November 2002) 3 (4). Available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1528-3577.t01-1-00099/pdf>. Accessed on May 10, 2015.
44. Wagle, S. V. (1913) *Gomantakatil Devasthanancha Sankshipt Itihas*. Mapusa: S. V. Wagle.
45. Wiersma, W. (2000) *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction*. 7th Edition. Boston: Allyn Bacon.
46. Yin, R. (2003) *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 5. 3rd Edition. California: Sage Publications.
47. Xavier, Fillipe Nery. *Bosquejo Historico das Comunidades das Aldeas dos Concelhos Ilhas, Salcete e Bardez, 4 parts*. Nova Goa: Imprensa Nacional, 1950.

Biography of the Author

Dr. Padmaja V. Kamat is the Associate Professor in History and currently officiating as the Head, Dept. of History, in P. E. S.' Shri Ravi S. Naik College of Arts & Science, Farmagudi, Goa. She was the first Teacher Fellow under U. G. C. Scheme of Faculty Development Program to complete her Ph. D. on the topic, 'Ponda: A History of Temples' in 2011. She is deeply involved in researching the aspects of cultic evolution of the Hindu deities and the economic profiles of Goan temples. She has presented research papers in the National and 8 International conferences so far.