Govind Sadashiv Ghurye is a towering figure in intellectual and academic life in India. For his unique contribution in the field of Indian Sociology, he has often been acclaimed as the 'father of Indian Sociology'. Analysis of his life and works is very interesting as it gives a perspective of the development of sociology in India. When Ghurye began his academic career, sociology was almost non-existent as an academic discipline. It grew, slowly but steadily, through the efforts of individuals as well as at the behest of governmental administration. In fact, governmental enquiries into Indian social condition came much earlier than the endeavours of academics to instal sociology in India. It was rather opportune for Ghurye to have been in Bombay University where Sociology got its start in 1919 through the efforts of Patrick Geddes. Since then, Ghurye had been at it and he did single-handed what was possible for him to do in Sociology in this country. By his persistent research endeavour, his wide-ranging interest and his upholding of the best of academic tradition, Ghurye became the centre of sociological creativity and research for several generations of Indian sociologists. His own works, which are as diverse as the research output of his students, have been highly esteemed in academic quarters.
Because of this unique role played by Ghurye in the development of Sociology in India, high tributes and panegyrics have been offered to him both in India and abroad. B.S. Guha has written, there are very few people who have done so much for the cause of Indian Anthropology both in teaching as well as in research as Prof. Ghurye has done. D.P. Mukherjee commented, while there are many sociologists in India, Ghurye, by his deep mooring in Indian tradition, provides the only example of an 'Indian Sociologist'. Similar tributes have been paid to him by M. N. Srinivas, Y.B. Damle, D. Marain, M.S.A. Rao and others. Among the foreigners, Merton described Ghurye as the "symbol of sociological creativeness", whereas Mandelbaum, in a personal letter to Ghurye, wrote, "All of us who are interested in India and in Anthropology, are your debtors". In recognition of his services to the cause of Sociology, the University of Bombay instituted an award in his name in 1969. Two felicitation volumes have been published in his name on the occasion of his 60th and 80th Birthdays. All these are in recognition of the unique contribution of Ghurye in the field of Indian Sociology.

Ghurye was born in December, 1893; he is now about eighty-eight years old. Yet he is still active from the academic standpoint. His latest book, The Burning Caldron of North-East India was published in 1980. And as he wrote to the present author in March, 1981, he is planning to write a few more books. From 1968, when he completed his 75th birthday to 1980, he published as many as 10 new books. This
speaks eloquently of the undiminished energy and vigour of Prof. Ghurye. In spite of his deteriorating health and a development of cataract in his eyes, he still regularly visits the old University Library once or twice a week and works on his desk for several hours during a day. This is quite remarkable in an Indian environment. S.D. Pillai wrote in 1976, "An eighty plus Prof. G.S. Ghurye's credits are astounding and still growing. At an age when most others would have retired and talked only about past glories, Ghurye continues to make his presence felt as a social thinker, highly innovative and equally at ease with Vedic India and contemporary India."¹

As it has been already mentioned, sociology was not a school or college subject when Ghurye had been a student. From the very early years, Ghurye showed a flair for Sanskrit. In the Matriculation Examination, he offered Sanskrit as his second language and his love for Sanskrit grew as a result of his contact with Prof. Joshi, an eminent teacher in Sanskrit.² Ghurye stood 17th in the Matriculation Examination. He got himself admitted into the Elphinstone College with Honours in Sanskrit, "the college that was so well-known for its Sanskrit professors, library and its prestige with the government." He stood first class second at the B.A. Examination and was awarded the Bhaudasi Prize, 'the blue ribbon of Sanskrit competence in the University' in the same examination. At the M.A. level,

² G.S. Ghurye - I and Other Explorations (1973), p. 20.
Ghurye offered Sanskrit and English, with Pali and Paleography as alternative papers. He stood First Class First at the M.A. Examination and was awarded the Chancellor’s Gold Medal. Ghurye says, “My success was unique in the annals of the University. None before that time had obtained a First Class at the M.A. with Sanskrit”. With this type of background in Sanskrit, Ghurye finally came to Sociology. This, as we shall see later on, profoundly influenced Ghurye’s own writings and the course of research made in the field of sociology under Ghurye’s leadership.

Incidentally, a few words about the Elphinstone College, of which Ghurye was a student, will not be irrelevant here. In fact, it shaped largely the prevailing intellectual climate and academic ambience in Western India. Unless one has a thorough knowledge of this background, one is less likely to make a proper assessment of the direction of Ghurye’s aptitudes and interests. Love for Sanskrit and a thorough acquaintance with the classical religious texts are so much characteristic of Ghurye that sometimes it even clouded the sociologist in him. Ghurye carried in this respect a legacy which was a dominant feature of intellectual tradition in Bombay in the 19th century. The Elphinstone College, founded in Bombay in 1834, was at the forefront of the educational world not only in Bombay but also in the whole of Western India. The College, which soon acquired a wide reputation in the area, was not merely a centre for English language.

3 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 35.
but, from the very beginning, it opened to its students the cornucopia of European arts and sciences. Training in Western liberalism was a conspicuous part of its programme. Knowledge of Western literature, political ideals and history and also deep love and admiration for Western liberal tradition - these were very much the characteristic features of the Elphinstonians. Ghurye also acquired this intellectual legacy. Though a nationalist at heart, there is an unmistakable impression of the influence of the West - the British, in particular - in his writings. Many of his works are concerned with the analysis of the cultural tradition of the West. Academically also, he recognizes the works of the British authors overwhelmingly. If one scans the reference pattern of his scholarly works, it becomes apparent how thoroughly he imbued himself into this Western intellectual tradition.

But admiration for Western social and political institutions was only one aspect of Ghurye's academic life. There was a second element, the nationalist in Ghurye, which also owed its origin to the new educational system imparted to the students at Elphinstone College. C.E. Dobbin has given a vivid account of the intellectual, political and social climate of Bombay in the 19th Century. She says that knowledge of European history and tradition led the students to search for their own past and tradition. "The emphasis on the European classical past at Elphinstone College was bound in time to encourage students to examine their own past and seek for parallel institutions and customs ..... much greater interest came to be taken in India's
ancient heritage. Again, "the rediscovery of the Indian past, and in particular, the renewed interest in Sanskrit religious texts by those also possessing knowledge of Western religious and philosophic systems, led to an increased stress on religious reform as the precursor of a renewed Hindu society. Early Elphinstonians, such as Bhau Dazi, had interested themselves in Sanskrit lore as the key to Indian Antiquities. Thus the emergent intellectual community in Bombay and also in Pune subsequently - endeavoured to know India's social history and also contemporary customs, practices and institutions of the Hindus. Bombay and Pune became the centres for Oriental research and the scholars working there made original and invaluable contributions in this respect. One has to take into consideration this prevailing intellectual climate at the time of Ghurye in order to assess him properly. It was with this type of heritage and with this type of interest in contemporary social questions that Ghurye entered into the field of sociology. No doubt, Ghurye's conception of the task of sociology and of his mission as a sociologist, were tremendously influenced by this outlook. And Ghurye was not the lone figure in this respect. The 'Bombay School's' decisive contribution to Indian sociology consist in this phenomenon. Ghurye, Kapadia, Karve, the giants in the field of Indian sociology, all of them endeavoured to explore Hindu social institutions and practices, either with reference to religious texts or through the analysis of contemporary practices. The outstanding research works of these

sociologists have tremendously enriched the field of Indian sociology and helped it to stand on a firm footing.  

While speaking of Ghurye's student days, another influence working on Ghurye should be noted here. Very early in his life, Ghurye developed the habit of maintaining documents and records of his activities and achievements in a fairly regular manner. This has not been in vain. But for this, we would never have seen his autobiographical work *I and Other Explorations* (1973). The book is so much full of facts and details that it gives one not only a glimpse of Ghurye's life and intellectual activities but also a dependable account of the sociological world in Ghurye's time.

After Ghurye got his M.A. Degree, he applied for University foreign scholarship for studying Sociology in 1919. His knowledge of sociology, according to Ghurye's own admission, was almost nil at that time and the first treatise which he read in this connection was Westermarck's *History of Marriage*. Ghurye eventually got the scholarship on the recommendation of Prof. Geddes who was at that time the Head of the Department of Sociology in Bombay University. Geddes wanted him to do some course on town-planning etc. on Geddesian lines which did not at all appeal to Ghurye and which he did not pursue.

---

6 The trend reversed since the first publication of *Social Background of Indian Nationalism* by A.R. Desai in 1948. Since then, a strong contingent of Western Indian sociologists have arisen pursuing research in diverse fields of Sociology. Some of them are I P Desai, M.S. Gore, Y.B. Damle, D. Narain, J.V. Ferreira, B.V. Shah, A.M. Shah etc. But the significant fact is that most of them initiated research in their respective fields under the guidance of Ghurye. K.M. Kapadia and I. Karve were also direct students of Ghurye.

7 Prof. Neera Desai commented to the present author that the book gives one the impression that as if Ghurye knew from very early in his life that he would be writing in autobiography and preserved his documents accordingly.

While in London, Ghurye first joined the Diploma course in Social Welfare and Sociology headed by Prof. Urwick. Then Ghurye met Prof. Hothouse who appeared to him as a "stiff person, not likely to be a good and inspiring guide or even teacher." Hothouse asked him to write a preliminary essay on caste and class to judge his ability. However, the atmosphere at the LSE did not appeal to him very much and though Hothouse agreed to accept him as his Ph.D. student, 'I thanked him and left him, quite determined to flee from him and the school' (LSE).

Ghurye then came to Cambridge where he met Prof. Havers, then at the height of his fame. This was a very important event in Ghurye's academic life. It was under the influence of Havers that Ghurye came to the conclusion that "the anthropological approach to Sociology was the most appropriate one". Ghurye's approach to Sociology as also his range of interest in Sociology were influenced by his contact with Rivers. Writes Srinivas, "In Cambridge, he came under the twin influence of Haddon and Rivers. Ghurye developed an enormous admiration for Rivers and his premature death in 1922 Ghurye regarded not only as a tragedy for anthropology but also as a personal misfortune." 9

It was under Rivers' exhortation that Ghurye fixed up his range of interest. In view of his Sanskritic and Indological knowledge and his familiarity of Indian institutions, Rivers asked him to undertake

a study of the institution of caste on broad historical-evolutionary lines. The theory of culture-contact and the diffusionist approach of Rivers, Elliot-Smith and Perry influenced him at this stage. As Ghurye says, "Rivers' contribution on culture contact and his friend Elliot Smith's theory of diffusion with the help of rudestone monuments had so caught on me, that I had by then material enough to formulate three separate papers." Ghurye wrote his Papers 'The Funerary Monuments of India', 'The Egyptian Affinities of Indian Funerary Practices and Megalithic Monuments', 'Dual Organization of Society in India' and 'Ethnic Theory of Caste' for his Ph.D. Kapadia says that these papers "bear the stamp of Rivers' influence - in his leanings to Anthropology, the significance he attached to kinship in the study of social organisation and his conversion as a diffusionist". All through his life, Ghurye never lost this theoretical track. Even if the extreme diffusionist stance followed by Perry and Elliot-Smith was not his cup of tea, Ghurye, nevertheless, was of the opinion that Sociology was nothing but the past history of mankind. In particular, Rivers' influence on Ghurye was so overwhelming, that he, unfortunately, failed to appreciate the significance of later developments in the field of sociological theory in the West. This, to the present author, had both positive and negative sides for Ghurye's sociology. This issue will be taken up in the concluding chapter.

10 Ghurye - I and Other Explorations (1973), pp. 49-50.
12 S.D. Pillai - op.cit., p. 27.
After his return to India, Ghurye was appointed Reader and Head of the Department of Sociology in Bombay University in 1924. The Department was in great disarray then as Prof. Geddes, his predecessor, could not do much justice to the Department with his diverse interests and somewhat confused framework. When Ghurye began, "there were only three students, of whom one left after a few days". From this time upto 1959 when Ghurye retired, the story is that of singular devotion to academic cause, research dedication and persistent effort to promote the cause of sociology in India. When Ghurye retired, the Department was in the forefront of Sociology in India. Its students were spread far and wide in India as well as abroad to accept the challenge of the growing discipline.

Soon after Ghurye took charge of the Department, a full-fledged course for the M.A. Degree was introduced. In the Department, one could do his M.A. through regular Papers or through Research. This enhanced considerably the research potential of the Department and, from the very beginning, research guidance was a prominent feature of the Department. The first Ph.D. programme in Sociology was instituted in 1936 and it was Ghurye's student who secured it first in 1936. About his research guidance, Ghurye has said, "I find that at my retirement from the Department, I had successfully guided 25 M.A. theses and 39 theses for the Ph.D. Degree which was introduced in 1936, i.e., 12 years after I entered on my career." What is most amazing is

that when Ghurye guided all these researches, the institutional support for research was next to nil. There was no such bodies as University Grants Commission, Indian Council of Social Science Research, Indian Council of Historical Research, Indian Council of Scientific Research and others. The general academic atmosphere was not favourable for research either. In such an arid ambience, it was really extraordinary for Ghurye to have developed the culture of research, instil in his students the urge to go to the field and get first hand information. As Srinivas said to the present author, it was a single man affair - Ghurye constituted a one-man institution stimulating research in the field of sociology.\textsuperscript{15} Ghurye's greatest contribution is that he continuously 'sensitized' others about the almost unlimited dimension of sociological research. This laid the groundwork for subsequent diversification of sociological research. Ghurye provided a living example of how a scholar should be motivated by the best of academic tradition. Rightly has Mandelbaum said, "Men and societies, as we know from our social researches, need example to help sustain their own productive activities. Professor Ghurye's example has filled this function for more than a few scholars, particularly among his students."\textsuperscript{16}

A great exemplar as he was, Ghurye's 'creativity curve' is somewhat peculiar. It has been on the ascendant despite his advancing age. Upto 1980, he authored 30 books; only 5 of them were written

\textsuperscript{15} Interview with Srinivas on 7.1.79.
before 1950 and 13 up to 1959 when he retired from University service. The rest he wrote after his retirement from the University. This proves that he became academically more active when he left the academic world. Even after retirement, he used to visit the Department regularly up to 1960-64. But it became more and more infrequent after his relation with Kapadia began to be strained. Still, he continued to guide the Ph. D. students. As late as in 1971, Mrs. Devangana Desai submitted her thesis 'Erotic Sculpture of India' under his guidance, which gained wide recognition and which, according to Ghurye, brought him highest satisfaction of his career as a research guide. Ghurye's state of creativity, mental alertness and academic orientation even at his advanced age is a rare phenomenon in the Indian situation. But he does not get any material reward for this — rather it costs him quite a pretty penny out of his already meagre financial resources. Though he is an Emeritus Professor of Bombay University, he does not get any research assistance from the University.\(^{17}\) Ghurye's alacrity of mind is all the more remarkable in such a situation.

In spite of this prodigious academic output, Ghurye is a loner in the world of sociology today. He has not attended a single conference, seminar or symposium since 1967. He does not send any article to any academic journal today. For the last 12 years or more

\(^{17}\) Prof. Ferreira, the present Head of the Department of Sociology, told the present author that at the beginning of his Emeritus Professorship, Ghurye was given a sum of money. But this arrangement was stopped subsequently as there was no clear regulation in this respect in the University Statute. Also, according to Ferreira, Ghurye "did not make any formal request", so the University did not consider the proposal of providing any assistance to him.
he has not maintained any contact with his University, his Alma Mater, for which he has done so much throughout his life. Rarely does he grant any interview to those who want to meet him. And rarely does the academic community today take any cognizance of Ghurye. In spite of the fact that many of his students are stalwarts in the field of sociology today, there is an uneasy relation between many of them and Ghurye. Though surprising, but true, many in the field of sociology do not even know whether Ghurye is living or not.

Much of this present state of estrangement between Ghurye and the academic community is due to the self-assertive, highly emotional, sensitive and somewhat egoistical nature of Ghurye. He has never been a 'popular' man throughout his life. He is highly irritated by any slightest provocation. Academically he is outright - no consideration stands in the way of expressing what he thinks to be right. And Ghurye is very much aware of this nature of his. He has characterised it as his 'fighting ego' or 'militant ego'. He possesses, according to his own admission, "a built-in temperament of social aloofness". In describing a colleague, Prof. Ghurye writes that "he was, like me, a brusque person who could and did cut people with his tongue". Nowhere is this nature of Ghurye more evident than in his autobiographical work. The Andhra Jyoti, while commenting on the book, very rightly said,

18 In fact, many prominent sociologists were surprised by the fact that Ghurye granted interview to the present author and talked for more than 15 hours in seven days. It must be recorded here that the present author was overwhelmed by Ghurye's cooperation in his research endeavour.

19 Ghurye - I and Other Explorations (1973), p. 35, 63. Also p. 144.
"Like everything else which Prof. G.S. Ghurye writes, his autobiography bears the unmistakable stamp of his unusual personality ... Had it not been the autobiography of Professor Ghurye, I and Other Explorations should have been held as highly egoistical ... Indeed none but Professor Ghurye could be moved so deeply by even the smallest of courtesies shown to him or so violently outraged by the least signs of ingratitude or boorishness."  

It is far from truth that the academic community in India is totally indifferent to Ghurye. The fact is, on the other hand, that Ghurye has shown a stiff disinclination to accept any offers made to him if he thinks that he has to compromise his sense of dignity in order to accept them. In evidence, we may cite the following incidents. In 1969, the Ministry of Education requested him to give his bio-data. Ghurye began to write it. Then came a telegram requesting him to give five copies of them. "The first thing which I did then was to tear off those two pages which I had written and throw them into waste paper basket." In 1970, Dr. H.S. Gore came to him with a proposal of the government to award him the honorific 'Padmabhushan'. Ghurye turned that down because, 'I think that it was beneath my dignity to receive that award'. In 1971, the University Grants Commission offered him the post of National Lecturer. Ghurye considered the proposal ridiculous because thereby he would have "to move from place to place whereas the students would remain tight in their places." In 1974, the Indian Council of Social Science Research wrote to him to send his bio-data.

Ghurye considered it humiliating and "those who do not know about my writings do not deserve to get replies from me". A month or so after the publication of Ghurye's *India Recreates Democracy* in 1978, a letter from the then Prime Minister came to Ghurye congratulating him on the thesis. But Ghurye did not reply because he thought that the format of the letter was not proper.

So we get a picture of the man through these episodes. In spite of considerable financial difficulty, he has not been moved by lucrative proposals or offers. He is not ready to compromise on those principles which he considers to be right. He has got a very high notion of himself and he strongly feels that failure to show proper respect to him is an affront to academic tradition itself and so he feels bitter. These are some of the reasons why Ghurye has become more and more alienated from the academic community.

Let us now come to an analysis of Ghurye's substantive writings with which the present work is concerned. What immediately strikes one in this respect is the enormous diversity of Ghurye's

---

21 All these incidents and many others, including the reasons for his boycott of the Silver Jubilee Celebration of the Department of Sociology in Bombay University in 1969, have been narrated by Ghurye himself to the present author in substantiation of what he says, his 'fighting ego' or 'militant ego'.

22 In 1971, the Human Rights Division of the UN invited him to submit a background paper of an International Seminar. This implied, besides considerable honor, a sum of Rs. 3600 for writing down about 30 pages. But as a protest against - what he says - the 'callous and indifferent role of the UN' over Bangladesh at that time, Ghurye declined to accept the invitation. See, his *I and Other Explorations* (1973), pp. 218-20.
writings. Ghurye's broad area of interest is the general process of evolution of culture in different civilizations, in general, and in Indian (Hindu) Civilization, in particular. The origin and subsequent proliferation of the different varieties of Indo-European Civilizations constitute the range of Ghurye's study. The range is very wide, indeed. As the two principal branches of the Indo-European people subsequently prospered in India (the Indo-Aryans) and Europe (the Anglo-Saxons, for example), he shows wide similarities between these two peoples as regards the two principal institutions, viz., the family and the caste. Not only this, a host of other things also come within Ghurye's range of interest. Rajput Architecture and Funerary Monuments, Sadhus in India and sex in America, Shakespeare and Kalidasa, castes, tribes, and races, metropolitan cities and small villages, Mesopotamian Civilization and Occidental Civilization—everything is grist to his sociological mill.23 Ghurye's felicity in spanning the

23 We quote here a poem composed by Prof. M.G. Kulkarni, a student of Ghurye and now Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology, Marathawada University, presented to Ghurye on the occasion of his 77th birthday:

"Himalayas stand as Nature's pride
The Taj or the Ellora as that of Mankind,
Have the Muses wrought thee
and Chiselled and Refined
With rigour and rupture: all these to deride?
From caste to Costume and Kinship to Kinsey
From Family to Friendship and Tribes to Tensions
Religion, Rurbanization to Rajput Architecture
Race too: Rural Life and Cities to Shakespeare
Sadhus and Vidyas, Aristotle and Comte
These are verily the milestones monumental
that Satisfy the Muses I say
These are indeed the temples soaring
sky high with rising spires" etc.
Vedic India and modern India is wonderful. And he says nothing
ex-cathedra. Each and every bit of his writings is fortified with
facts so that the reader can make his own conclusions.24 And the
facts have been gathered from all sources possible: literary, his-
torical, archaeological, sculptural, painting, iconography; nor is
his talent for empirical and behavioral researches any mean. And
this gives an extra-dimension to his research. Thus, 'intellectual
integrity is his watchword. He will never rest content and will not
allow his students to be satisfied, until he has ransacked the whole
available material and analysed it objectively."25 But it must be
pointed out here that Ghurye's penchant for thoroughness often recoils
on him; often he fails to strike a proper balance between facts and
logic, leaving the reader in utter confusion about Ghurye's own
stand.

Also, it is very difficult to analyse systematically
Ghurye's thought in view of the enormous diversity of subjects and
themes in his writings. The style of his writing too makes it baffling
for the reader to sift his own opinion and arguments from those of
others. The present writer is, however, of the opinion that there is
a central theme underlying all the diverse writings of Ghurye. The
theme is a very broad one; it is the theme of acculturation that
goes on and on since the time of the arrival of the Vedic Aryans in

24 Very significantly, he quotes Lord Bryce at the
beginning of his Whither India? (1974):
'It is facts that are needed: Facts, Facts, Facts.
When facts have been supplied each of us can try
to reason from them.'

25 K.M. Kapadia - 'Prof. G.S. Ghurye: An Introduction'
India. Indian society, through its long historical process of growth, presents a picture of a vast mosaic of culture held together by religion, the values and norms of Hinduism. As a sociologist, Ghurye feels the imperative of exploring this unifying and synthesizing process. In spite of very many diversions (to be discussed later on), exploration and analysis of the process of cultural unity in India through ages constitute the major thrust of Ghurye's writings. And to establish his thesis he moves, with perfect ease, back and forth, from the Vedic to the present day India.

In deciphering Ghurye, two approaches may be approximated. First, one may divide the entire range of Ghurye's writings into a number of broad themes and analyse each of these items showing how Ghurye discussed the institutions and processes. As the following chapters will reveal, a thematic analysis of Ghurye's writings is an imperative necessity to assess him properly. In fact, in spite of some interesting diversions, Ghurye's major writings have been arranged thematically. Thus castes, tribes, family and kinship, culture and civilization, Religious institutions, social tensions etc have been separately analysed in the body of the dissertation. It has also been attempted to show not only the thought and writings of Ghurye but also to make a critical assessment of them vis-a-vis contemporary sociological thinking and researches. Obviously, the present author tried to be as much as analytic as possible in accepting or confuting Ghurye's contributions. Thus, while analysing Ghurye's thought, care has been devoted not only to Ghurye's works but also to works by other writers on allied subjects. In the field of Family, Kinship and Marriage,
for example, one can hardly do justice to Ghurye, if one is not acquainted with the writings of Morgan, Westermarck, Briffault, Bachofen, Rivers, Murdock, Tylor and others. Though stupendous, the task has been a rewarding one for the present author. This has led to appreciation as well as criticism of Ghurye. It has transpired that some of his writings are full of sociological insights, some are rather trifle while still others are biased and subjective. To prove this, separate and detailed analysis of individual sociological themes has been followed by an over-all assessment of Ghurye's writings and his general contributions in the field of Indian sociology.

Secondly, the question whether Ghurye's writings can be divided into different phases is also relevant here. The question is important because Ghurye is a prolific writer and he has been writing over the last 60 years. We know that there are writers who have changed their opinions and even approaches in different phases of their life. Harold Laski, for example, possessed an acute, analytical and receptive mind and one is to take into consideration the different phases of his life in order to analyse his thought. Did Ghurye change his stance from time to time? Was he receptive to different types of influences in different phases of his life? To such a categorical question, Ghurye replied to the present author, "there is no difference in phases. The whole scheme was conceived by me during the first eight years, 1921-30."

26 See - H. Deane - The Political Ideas of Harold Laski (1955) for an analysis of Laski's thought from this standpoint.
My contact with Rivers, Haddon, G.E. Smith and others had confirmed me in my belief that both archaeology and Sanskrit literature were useful and necessary for Sociology. And they may have been instrumental in formulating the scheme "...

Ghurye, for example, has been writing on caste since 1923. The last reprint of his book came out in 1978. In every new edition of the book, new chapters have been added, and old chapters have been revised but Ghurye's approach relating to the substantive issues of caste remains basically the same. As he says in the Fifth edition of the book that researches on caste made after the first publication of his book in 1932 have only strengthened his belief that endogamy in the essence of caste. In the case of tribes again, the book published by him in 1980 shows that Ghurye is concerned with Elwin's 'anti-national' approach towards the tribal problem in the same way as it was in the case of the first edition of the book on tribes published in 1943. The fact that Ghurye did not change his opinion substantively, makes it relatively more easy to deal with Ghurye's thought.

We have divided the whole range of Ghurye's writings into a number of broad themes. The classification has not always been a neat one, sometimes a little bit of discretion had to be used but this enabled us to arrange more systematically Ghurye's ideas. Thus six broad areas have been located in Ghurye's writings. These

27 Interview with the present author on 10.1.79.
are 1) Caste, 2) Tribes, 3) Kinship, Family and Marriage; 4) Culture, Civilization and the historical role of cities; 5) Religion and 6) Sociology of Conflict and Integration. Besides these, there are a number of important writings of Ghurye which could not be fitted into the above scheme. These spill-overs have been taken up in the chapter entitled 'Society and Change and other writings'. It is believed that this arrangement of Ghurye's writings enables us to present a coherent and systematic analysis of his ideas.

Of these, caste constitutes an area of foremost importance in Ghurye's writings. Here is a field, as Srinivas told the present author, where Ghurye has shown his awareness of both structure and culture. And here we find Ghurye at his best. When the present author met Ghurye in 1979, he found Ghurye making plans for a substantive alteration of his book on caste for its sixth edition. The canvas which Ghurye has used for his discussion on caste is very broad indeed. It includes a cross-cultural perspective as well as the evolution of the institution in India from the earliest Vedic period to the present day when caste has become 'fissiparous' in nature. The different editions of his book 'Caste and Race in India' are relevant from this standpoint and we have analysed them in details in the next chapter.

Next comes Ghurye's writings on Tribes. Ghurye's discussion on Tribes is important not only because he vehemently opposed V. Elwin's theory of 'isolationism' but also because he presents
here his own thesis of the 'Hinduization' of the tribes with the help of authentic data. Described by others as the process of 'Aryanization', 'Sanskritization' or 'tribe-caste continuum', the process has been widely corroborated by sociological researches and Ghurye makes a serious attempt to establish this thesis. The discussion is to be found in the different editions of his book 'The Aborigines, so called' etc. (1943, 1959, 1963) and 'The Burning Caldron of North-East India' (1980). Impact of Urbanisation on a Hinduized Tribe has also been discussed by him (The Mahadev Kolis (1957, 1963). That constitutes the subject matter of our analysis in the 3rd chapter.

Ghurye's interest in kinship studies dates back from his association with Rivers. Since then he has been engaged in writing continuously in the sphere of kinship, Marriage and Family. The books where Ghurye's ideas in this respect are to found are 1) Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture (1955, 1962), 2) Anthro-Sociological Papers (1963), 3) Sexual Behaviour of the American Female (1956) and 4) Two Brahminical Institutions - Gotra and Charana (1973). A few other articles published in I and Other Explorations (1973) and in some other Journals are also relevant in this connection. We have endeavoured to show in Chapter IV, that Ghurye's contributions in this field are not only extensive but also valuable.

As a sociologist following the historical and evolutionary approach, study of the evolution of culture and civilization in different societies in general and in Indian society in particular,

constitutes a point of departure for Ghurye. And this general approach has been hollowed by Ghurye in all his writings. Yet there are some works which are specifically concerned with the analysis of the role of culture, civilization and cities in the evolution of society. These are 1) Culture and Society (1947), 2) Occidental Civilization (1948), 3) Cities and Civilization (1962), 4) Indian Acculturation: Agastya and Skanda (1977) and 5) The Social Process (1938). Some Articles printed in the Anthropological Papers (1963) and in Other Explorations (1973) were also written to provide evidence to the process of acculturation going on in Indian society. Acculturation, naturally constitutes the subject matters of our discussion in Chapter V.

In Chapter VI, we have included Ghurye’s discussion on "Sociology of Religion". Basically Ghurye is a Sociologist of Hindu Religion. And this stems from his wide and extensive knowledge of Sanskrit and Indology. This, at the same time, leaves one pondering if Ghurye’s writings constitute a part of Indology or sociology. The position we have taken is that though there are many things of Indological interest in Ghurye’s writings, his discussion on the process of evolution of Hindu religion has got many sociological insights and should promote further research in this field. The books which are directly relevant in this connection are 1) Indian Sadhues (1953, 1964), 2) Gods and Men (1962), 3) Religious Consciousness (1965), 4) Vedic India (1979) and 5) The Legacy of the Ramayana (1979).
Ghurye never lacked in interest in contemporary Indian situations. As a sociologist, he is extremely concerned with the concept of integration, the process of national unity in India and the contemporary challenges to the situation. This concern became apparent even at the time he wrote his *Caste and Race in India* in 1932 and *The Aborigines - so-called - and their Future* in 1943. However, this concern with the present 'disturbing trends' in Indian society has come back in a big way in the later writings of Ghurye. There are three books of Ghurye, his 'trilogy' in the field, which are relevant in this connection. These are his *Social Tensions in India* (1968), *Whither India?* (1974), and *India Recreates Democracy* (1978). We have discussed these aspects in details primarily for two reasons. First, Ghurye's concept of unity at the social or cultural level is a part of his general theoretical framework and it calls for a detailed analysis of how he developed this framework and applied it in various spheres of society. Second, failure, on the part of Ghurye, to interpret correctly the emerging pattern of unity in Indian society is the result of his biased and one-sided view of Indian history. It is also due to his covert assumption that religion can still provide the base of national unity in India. In Chapter VIII we have analysed the shortcomings and failures of Ghurye in this respect and we have rejected his theory of 'pluralistic society' as a correct presentation of the nature of Indian Unity today.

Besides these areas, there are many other fields which have attracted Ghurye's attention. His analysis, with the help of empirical data and field study, of the process of emergent social change
in rural societies has attracted wide attention. After a Century and a Quarter (1960) and Anatomy of a Bururban Community (1963) are, the outcome of much interest in things 'empirical'. In a few articles and in the last two chapters of his Cities and Civilization (1962), Ghurye has also discussed the changes occurring in an urban and industrial situation. Again, his discussion on the 'sartorial habit' of the Indian people is a pioneering work by an Indian sociologist and 1) The Indian Costume (1952, 1966) and 2) Bharatnatya and its Costume (1958) are of interest from this standpoint. His knowledge in the field of art and architecture is revealed in his Rajput Architecture (1968) and Social Tensions in India (1968). He has also discussed the 'evolution of knowledge-systems' in India in his Vidyas (1957) which he claims to be a part of sociology of knowledge. This small book is a homage paid to Comte on the occasion of his death centenary. D. Narain has rightly commented "That an Indian Sociologists was mindful of this event is in itself remarkable". All these miscellaneous writings of Ghurye have been discussed in Chapter VII and an attempt has been made to analyse them in their proper perspectives.

Against this backdrop of Ghurye's life and works only that one can, hopefully, proceed to more and more detailed analysis of his writings in the diverse fields of sociology. This has been the principal endeavour of the present researcher in the Chapters to follow.