CHAPTER - IV

KINSHIP, FAMILY AND MARRIAGE

Section - 1

KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Since the social edifice of Indian society rests on village community, caste and the joint family, it is but natural that Ghurye should try to take up these different strands, one after another, in his analysis of Indian society. Indeed, Ghurye makes substantive and original contribution in the field of Kinship, family and marriage. Ghurye recognized that this area constitutes the most important part of sociological investigation. Also, it is in this field that Ghurye found it most convenient to combine his intellectual borrowing from the West with his legacy from the East, i.e., his vast knowledge in the field of Indology and classical literature. The manner in which he has combined the data from classical literature, ethnological details and his knowledge on the Kinship systems in other civilizations in his discussion on Family and Kinship is something without parallel. In The Social Process, Ghurye clearly indicated that the suitable environment for the smooth and harmonious relation between individual and society can be created only by the family. Against the backdrop of his deliberations and cogitations on the family, the discussions on the Indo-European family organization are being expatiated here.

Ghurye's interest in the field of Kinship dates back to the early days of his acquaintance with Rivers and Haddon and their near classic studies on Kinship. The influence of Rivers was, however, more pronounced than that of Haddon. True, Ghurye did not publish any book in this field till 1955. But he kept up his interest in Kinship. This is discernible from his article on 'Dual Organization' published early in his academic career. His class lectures, too, kept his interest on Kinship alive. Kapadia wrote that Kinship systems dominated his lectures on social institutions to M.A. students right from the very beginning of his career.2 Ghurye himself admitted, "My interest in Kinship systems and terminologies has been rather old and I have been following it up from time to time."3

Thanks to the endeavour of sociologists and social anthropologists today, there is now a surfeit of literature on Kinship systems.4 Yet there are plenty of gaps in this area of research. Ghurye pointed out this lacuna while inaugurating a conference of Sociologists held in Bombay in 1967 and suggested that an authentic survey of Kinship terminologies in different parts of India should be made. This, according to him, would facilitate comparative and analytical studies of Kinship.5 K. Gough's and I. Karve's works on South Indian Kinship terminologies were the first ever attempts in this direction.6 The need of doing intensive research on Kinship system in India has been emphasized by Lila Dube also. She observed that there is a 'pressing need of

4 Lila Dube - Sociology of Kinship (Popular 1974) gives an excellent bibliographical report on this.
intensive studies on Kinship systems, giving clear pictures of well-defined and localized groups .... building up a sound body of generalizations about Indian Kinship". 7

In order to locate Ghurye's position in the sphere of Kinship literature, it is necessary to get an idea of the whole debate on Kinship studies in anthropological literature. This debate has been very aptly described by Singer as that regarding Cultural Vs Structural explanations of Kinship systems. 8 The systematic study of Kinship in Anthropology began with Morgan. Kinship terminologies, according to him, reveal stages of human evolution and they are indicators of social structure. By a scientific analysis of these terminologies, 'social reconstruction', i.e., getting an idea of the previous state of society, is possible. Morgan grouped Kinship terminologies into two major systems; classificatory and descriptive. Whereas the Classificatory System, merged lineal with collateral relatives, in the Descriptive System, lineal relatives are isolated in the terminology. W.H.R. Rivers noted that no discovery in the whole range of science can more certainly be credited to one man than the discovery of the classificatory system of relationship to Morgan. 9

But Kroeber, in his 'Classificatory Systems of Relationship' regarded the distinction between the descriptive and classificatory systems as misleading. 10 He suggested that Kinship terminology should be studied in terms of psychological principles, because "terms of relationship reflect

---

7 Lila Dube - op.cit., p. 44.
psychology not sociology. Hence reconstruction of social institutions and forms of marriage from Kinship terms may be risky. The correspondence between the two is determined by specific cultural patterns and hence they vary from culture to culture. That is why Kroeber's approach may be regarded as the cultural one towards Kinship.

Rivers did not accept Kroeber's position and he substantiated Morgan's basic premises in this respect. He was of the opinion that Kinship terminology is rigorously determined by social conditions and particularly by forms of marriage. As such they can be used for historical reconstruction. Rivers, in his study of the 'Toda Kinship System' (1906) and of Dravidian Kinship terms, tried to correlate Kinship terminology with features of social organization and forms of marriage.

Radcliffe-Brown agreed with Rivers that social practices including forms of marriage are regularly connected with Kinship terminologies. However, as Singer says, "He did not accept Rivers' causal analysis of the connections or their use for historical reconstructions; Kin-terms and social institutions are, for him, related not as cause and effect but as component and interdependent parts of a structural system." This approach may therefore be termed as structural approach.

Lowie has also made some original contributions in the sphere of Kinship analysis. Lowie has acknowledged the influence both of Rivers and Kroeber upon him. He admits that there exists 'a high correlation between a clan organization and a bifurcated merging type of kin terminology.'

12 Kroeber - op. cit., p. 84.
13 Singer - op. cit., p. 535.
But Ghurye shows that Lowie's scheme is logically and sequentially defective. About Malinowski's and Radcliffe-Brown's schemes, Ghurye does not make any detailed discussion. About them he curtly remarks, "the departure (from Morgan's and River's scheme) made by Malinowski modified and correlated by Radcliffe-Brown to some extent, has proved sterile."  

Ghurye undertakes a detailed discussion of Murdock's scheme. Murdock's scheme, Ghurye says, has the appearance of definiteness and finality but his conclusions are, as he shows, theoretically unsound and statistically wrong. Murdock has made a cross-cultural study of family and Kinship in about 250 societies in his 'Social Structure' (1949). Alfred Eggan says, "Utilising the postulational method and statistical analysis, he found that Kinship terminologies are primarily determined by such sociological factors as descent and residence, with marriage rules of lesser importance." But Ghurye thinks that Murdock has not put sufficient emphasis on the sociological factors of Kinship.

By the use of statistical method, Murdock has also tried to establish a correlation between social organization and Kinship terminology. But Ghurye makes a detailed discussion of the methods and findings of Murdock and asserts that his generalizations are based on unsound statistical principles. As he says, 'I have come across a number of discrepancies in Murdock's final conclusions.' Murdock himself later revised his statistical techniques and made a revised classification of five major

---

19 Ghurye - op. cit., p. 40.
types of social organization based on descent and residence. About this classification Ghurye has still reserved his opinions.

Ghurye thinks that kinship terms help us to identify the social obligations and duties of an individual towards others in society. He says, "Since Rivers wrote on kinship, whatever the classification of kin-nomenclature, there has been an attempt to discover connection between a particular type of kin-nomenclature and facts of social structure and life." Kinship structure may fundamentally be divided into two categories: consanguineal and affinal. The fundamental elements of a social structure are derived from these principles. The three important groups which are derived from kinship are, family, kindred and clan. Lowiès and Murdock's chief defects, according to Ghurye, are that they have not sufficiently recognized the primacy of the family. "The principal members of this primary group are the nucleus from which an individual's relationships emanate. How they are treated in kinship nomenclature is, therefore, the most significant." The concept of kindred is also essentially a social one and as such it is to be distinguished from such biological grouping as descent. Descent is a particular aspect of biological relation and social duties and responsibilities cannot be understood in terms of descent.

The term kindred is more appropriate from this standpoint as it implies both kin-connections and social obligations.

21 Ghurye - op.cit., p. 33. It may be noted here that K.P. Chattopadhyay, another student of Rivers, was also profoundly influenced by Rivers' approach. See Chattopadhyay - 'On Terms of Kinship and Social Relationship' in T.N. Madan and G. Sarana - Indian Anthropology (1962), pp. 339-50.
We have already seen that in the famous debate on Kinship, Ghurye has sided with Morgan and Rivers. He makes slight modifications in Morgan's scheme, e.g., Morgan's descriptive system may more appropriately be called 'individualizing' system and that Rivers' 'denotative' system would only be a part of the broader 'individualizing' system. But apart from this variation, Ghurye agrees with the broad tenets of Rivers' theory and, in fact, his *Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture* has proved to be a major substantiation of the theory that Kinship study is the principal method of social reconstruction. As Ghurye says, "In *Family & Kin* I have attempted to use both the terminological and behavioural data about Kin among many of the peoples of Indo-European Speech in order to focus them on the elucidation of the history of the institution of family".

It is impossible to give even a broad idea of the depth of erudition and the extent of cross-cultural linguistic knowledge that Ghurye has shown in the above-mentioned work. Prof. G.G. Homans, in his review of Ghurye's book in *The American Journal of Sociology* (1958) says "the effective study of Indo-European Kinship requires a thorough command not only of the linguistics and history of a variety of peoples but also of comparative Kinship in non-Indo-European Cultures..... Prof. Ghurye's is a heroic attempt to resolve the dilemma." In India, there was hardly, if ever, any sociologist who would undertake a cross-cultural study of this dimension. The theoretical purpose of the book is very clear and this is to study the family structure of the people belonging to

Indo-European culture based on linguistic usages. These people had a common past and a common language. Subsequently they dispersed for various reasons. Ghurye studies the linguistic usages for Kinship terms of these people to study whether some uniformity in family structure can be deduced from such common cultural past.

By making a comprehensive study of the Kinship-terms of the people belonging to Indo-European, Greek and Latin Cultures, Ghurye concludes that "the family organization is primitive Indo-European culture was of an extended type in structure and bi-lineal in kin-affiliation. ... The Indo-European family was, in all probability, a unit comprising four generations." Ghurye also contests Morgan's theory that matrilineal and mother-right type of family was the pristine form of social organization. As he says, "the position of the husband and the father suggested by the widely current terms for these relatives is not compatible with a matrilineal organization. We conclude, therefore, that the primitive Indo-European Organization was patrilineal." While all the successive branches of this Indo-European culture maintained this type of family organization, in the case of the Anglo-Saxons it proved to be somewhat different. They had no specific term beyond the father from which it can be inferred that the family in Anglo-Saxon Society was the nuclear one where the father formed the archetype for the nomenclature of further ascendants. On this point, Prof. Edmundson remarks, this view "deserves

circulation among sociologists inclined to attribute the nuclearity of the American family to the industrial revolution."

Ghurye is also critical about Engels' view on the primacy of the economic factor in the origin and development of the family. The economic factor cannot be the sole or even the principal factor in the determination of Kinship structure. It cannot explain, for example, why self-acquired property was looked upon as the property of the earner by the Greeks whereas it was thought to belong to the coparcenary among the Indo-Aryans. Familial Organization are attuned more to "ideas and beliefs of a non-economic nature."

Kinship terms are not only the indicators of an earlier type of social organization, the evolution of the same can also be understood with reference to change in Kin-terminology. Ghurye attempts to make a cultural history by an analysis of the evolution of these terms. For example, the two words 'Patni' and 'Bahu' indicate that from the mistress of the house the wife was later converted into a mere bride having no authority. Ghurye also strongly denies any suggestion that Indo-Aryan Kinship languages have any Dravidian ancestry - they have originated from Indo-European source.

Analysing the Kinship terminologies Ghurye shows the evolution of family organization in ancient and medieval India. He shows how the four-generation family, was, later on, converted into three generation family. He shows how the rules of inheritance framed by Jimutvahana on the

31 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 214.
32 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 20.
one hand and Vijnaneshwara on the other supported respectively joint and nuclear types of family. By making such an analysis Ghurye shows the tremendous importance of Kinship terminologies in the understanding of social structure. Naturally, he declares "History of Kinship functions and of familial organization is in harmony with the deductions about them which are derivable from the terminologies". It would be interesting to note here that D.P. Mukherjee highly appreciated this work of Ghurye and commented that this work reflected a genuine approach. "Yours is genuine Social Anthropology without the errors of an exaggerated Functionalism." We now turn to another significant aspect of Kinship study, viz., the theory of Dual Organization. The theory was first formulated in its full-fledged form by Rivers and the debate which he thereby raised in the field of anthropological theory, still continues. In a highly original and well documented essay, viz., "Do Dual Organizations Exist?", Levi-Strauss has recently examined the question again. He concludes ".... we should be well-advised to reject the theory and to treat the apparent manifestations of dualism as superficial distortions of structure whose real nature is quite different and vastly more complex." Yet, he holds, the anomalies and contradictions in the realm of dual organization did not escape Rivers' attention. Rivers saw these anomalies as the historical result of the fusion of two populations differing in race, in culture or simply in power. About Rivers, Levi-Strauss says, "Actually, Rivers, whose genius is largely ignored today, employed both types of interpretation

Ghurye was profoundly influenced by this aspect of Rivers' writings, Srinivas writes, "Ghurye's approach to anthropological problems as well as his interests were influenced by Rivers". It was due largely to the influence of Rivers that Ghurye published an article in 1923 in the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, entitled 'Dual Organization in India'. The purpose was not only to provide additional evidences in support of Rivers but also to show that kinship structure in the Aryan north and in the non-aryan south was vastly different from each other.

Ghurye discusses the matter from three aspects. First, he examines the present usages and kinship terminologies of south Indian people to have an idea of their past organization. Second, he examines the practices with regard to cross-cousin marriage to show the connection between the two. And, third, he asks the question whether their present organization proves the hypothesis of the past prevalence of dual organization among them.

With regard to the first point, Rivers was of the opinion that the classificatory system is a clear remnant of a dual organization of society. The question is why one's mother's sister's children and father's brother's children are equated with one's own brothers and sisters. In a matrilineal community like that of South India, Ghurye thinks, the hypothesis of dual organization only explains this phenomenon.

On the contrary, in the areas where aryan languages are used, the corresponding terms are descriptive. This is very natural as, Ghurye says, these are patriarchal regions where there was no system of dual organization.

Secondly, according to Rivers, cross-cousin marriage has for a long time been explained as due to dual organization, inspite of some anomalies between the two. And Ghurye shows that cross-cousin marriage has a fairly wide distribution in South India and also crops up here and there in northern India. This is a strong testimony of the earlier existence of dual organization.

Thirdly, even in modern time, we find the existence of the remnants of dual organization among many people. For example, among the Tottiyan, the Koravas, the Maria Gonds, the Gollas etc, we find its prevalence. Ghurye concludes "the foregoing discussion will have made it clear that we have good reason to believe that in Southern India, there was a wide prevalence of dual organization with matrilineal descent." 41

In another article written in 1936, Ghurye noted the wide prevalence of cross-cousin marriage among different castes and tribes living in North and North-East India. He notes that this preferential mating is to be found among some Maharashtrian Brahmins Castes. 42 In a field study made among the Kathis in 1935, he found the existence among them of two exogamous groups, and of cross-cousin marriage. Of course,

41 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 18.
Ghurye does not explicitly say whether the existence of cross-cousin marriage is indicative of the existence of dual organization. He only notes that this phenomenon is important and needs further investigation.45

Section - 2

KINSHIP IN HINDU SOCIETY

Ghurye's deep interest in Kinship in Hindu society enabled him to make some highly original contributions on the structure and evolution of Hindu Kinship and its relation with other aspects of society. In the analysis of Kinship, Ghurye has successfully combined Indology and Sociology. His heavily documented and highly original 'Two Brahmanic Institutions: Gotra and Charana' is a classic instance of it. But this is not the solitary work where Ghurye has discussed this phenomenon. Evolution of various other aspects of Hindu Kinship has been discussed by him in other books, viz., Caste & Race in India (1969), Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture (1955), Vidya (1957), Agastya & Skanda (1975) etc. Broadly speaking, Ghurye is concerned with Kinship as an institution regulating marriage in Hindu society. That leads him to discuss (1) the relation between Kinship and Caste; (2) the origin, development, and social implications of 'Gotra', 'Charana' and 'Pravara' in Brahmanic literature and society and 3) the operation of Scpinda exogamy.

CASTE AND KINSHIP

The relationship between caste and kinship is very close because 1) exogamy in our society is largely based on kinship, either real or imaginary; and 2) the effective unit of caste, the sub-caste,
is largely constituted of Kinsmen. Ghurye observed that Risley and Senart opened the question of relation between caste and kinship but they did not go very deep into the matter. It was Adrian Mayer who for the first time undertook a detailed study of the relation between the two. His broad conclusions in this respect are that: 1) every Hindu is a member of three bodies: the kindred, the sub-caste and the caste; 2) the local sub-caste group is primarily a Kin-group; and 3) Kinship provides the key to introduction within a caste or sub-caste and an unknown person is recognized as a caste-fellow only through the Kinsmen of the locality. 44

To Ghurye, there are three types of marriage restrictions in our society which shape the relationship between caste and kinship. These are endogamy, exogamy and hypergamy. Hypergamy was widespread when our society was not crystallized into caste groups and when the Varnas were just broad status groups. 45 As distinguished from it, hypergamous practices operate now within the caste system. It is true that hypergamous practices go against the fundamental principle of caste, viz., endogamy. But the significance of hypergamy is not very much in Hindu society. On the whole, hypergamous marriage is on the decline now. Ghurye agrees with what Pocock says on this point, "we can say that while hypergamy is a factor disruptive to large Kin-Groups, the factors making for their permanence are today impotent or destroyed." 46

EXOGAMY IN HINDU SOCIETY:

But this can not be said with regard to exogamy. It has a valuable role to play in maintaining social integrity. There are two types of exogamy in Hindu society: 1) Sept or Gotra exogamy and 2) prohibited degrees of kin or Sapinda exogamy. The Gotra exogamy may be of the Brahmanic type and of the non-Brahmanic type. That which is followed by most castes is largely a mixture of the two. Sept exogamy of the non-Brahmanic variety has been divided by Karandikar into six types based on territorial divisions, family sections, nickname groups, division based on sects, totemic groups and eponymous divisions. Of these, the first two and the last are most widespread.

But the Brahmanic Gotra organization is more important and even the non-Brahmanic system cannot be understood without reference to it. The Brahmanical pattern of Gotra organization was gradually dovetailed into the Hindu social system because of the immense social and political power of the Brahmins. That is why, Ghurye says, "their social organization, that of Gotra and Pravara, the former of which has been for the last 2500 years at least the basis of exogamy, deserves to be scanned, however briefly, to complete the discussion of the connection of caste with kinship."

47 See - Ghurye - Ibid., p. 229.
49 Ghurye - Caste & Race in India, p. 248.
Ghurye undertakes this task in details and on a gigantic scale in his "Two Brahmanical Institutions: Gotra and Charana" (1972). There are three underlying ideas which prompted Ghurye to take up this work. Firstly, sociological categories like Gotra, Charana and Pravara have been the most important ones regulating the Brahman's social relations for centuries. Secondly, that these Brahmanical institutions have penetrated the social organization and behavioural pattern of the non-Brahmin Hindus. And thirdly, that these rules relating to Gotra and Pravara exogamy still govern substantially the social relations of the Hindus. It is on the basis of these assumptions that it is claimed that Ghurye has combined Indology and Sociology in an efficient way in this book. One can, of course, and perhaps rightly, challenge the validity of each of these assumptions. Thereby, the book will be primarily of an Indological nature and 'disappointing as a sociological book'.

Regarding the origin of this Gotra-exogamy, it may be said that the Vedic Aryans, when they came into India, had neither any gotra organization nor any other tradition of group exogamy among them. The Indo-Aryans came to India with the cultural trait of family exogamy. Brahmanic exogamy in India was the result of a complex pattern of interaction between various elements, e.g., their earlier system of family-exogamy, the cult of the manes, the maintenance of family-genealogy etc. Ghurye strongly refuses any suggestion that gotra-exogamy developed as a result of the Aryans coming into contact with the non-aryan indigenous

52 Ghurye - Two Brahmanical Institutions, pp. 308-9.
people who followed some sort of group-exogamy. Other allied factors have also contributed to the origin of Brahmanic exogamy. The Vedic Aryen's Knowledge of astronomy and cosmography which they gained in their new home in India, also contributed to the development of the beliefs relating to the Gotras or Kin-Units.\footnote{53}

In this connection, Ghurye goes into the interesting question of the linkage between gotra-exogamy in our country and the magico-religious complex of beliefs about menstrual blood - a concept which was developed by Durkheim.\footnote{54} Durkheim was of the opinion that exogamy is based on a religious sentiment grown on certain occult or magical virtues which were attributed to blood, particularly to the menstrual blood of women. Ghurye holds that there is a big difference in the attitude toward menstrual blood between the Aryans and the non-aryen indigenous people. Menstruation was not looked upon with horror in Brahmanic society while it was a dreaded thing among the tribal people and the lower castes. Srinivas has also testified to this phenomenon and says "the severity of the restrictions imposed on the girl decline as we go up the caste ladder."\footnote{55} To the Brahmans and other higher caste people, menstruation appeared as a normal phenomenon, but with the passing of days, the Brahmanic society also began to develop menstruation complex. Ghurye thinks that this was due to the influence

\begin{footnotes}
\item[54] Ghurye - Two Brahmanical Institution, pp. 250-292.
\item[56] For Tribal ideas on menstruation, V.Ellingson-Primitve Ideas of Menstruation and the Climacteric in the East Central Provinces of India' in J.P. Mills et al - Essays in Anthropology (1948), pp. 141-57.
\item[56] Ghurye - op.cit., p. 262.
\end{footnotes}
of early South Indian practices in this respect. But this is far from saying that Brahmānic exogamous practices were also derived from them. Considering all the facts, Ghurye concludes that "we cannot directly connect the institution of 'gotra exogamy' to the complex of beliefs and practices about menstruation current in Brahmānic society."  

Historically, Gotra as a kin-unit was fully recognized by 800 B.C. Around 500 B.C., sexual relation with a woman of one's own gotra began to be considered as heinous. Rules relating to 'Pravara' exogamy began to crystallize in this period and thereby the most complex type of exogamy in Hindu society based on Gotra - Pravara began to take shape. Ghurye says that at about 400 B.C. there developed about nine hundred exogamous gotras and these were ultimately grouped into eight super-gotras which were all exogamous. And added to it were the restrictions based on Pravara identification and Sapinda rules.

It is true that this general rule of association of Gotra exogamy with Pravara and Sapinda exogamy is not prevalent in all the parts of India. The Kashmiri Brahmans do not apply the Pravara principle. But by and large the gotra restrictions continue even today inspite of the enforcement of the Hindu Marriage Act of 1955, legalizing marriage within the gotra. "The sentiment against marrying within one's Gotra has remained almost as strong as it was a thousand years ago .... such is the power of sacrosanct rules in this non-rational and sentimental Brahmānic society."  

58 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 292.
61 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 310.
Ghurye is of the opinion that from eugenic standpoint, such artificial restrictions are totally unscientific and the sooner it is done away with, the better. But, from another standpoint, its persistence must have resulted in random distribution of genetic factors instead of concentrating them into a small circle. Its effect on caste is that otherwise caste-based endogamy would have further resulted in the creation of extremely local and narrow units - which would have helped in the process of progressive disintegration of our society. This, according to Ghurye, is the societal function of exogamy based kinship. With the increase in communication facilities in modern times, the horizon from which spouses are chosen has further widened. Ghurye has shown that it has occurred also in the Lonikand village.

Recent sociological findings also testify to this phenomenon - an individual is forced to go out of his limited horizon in search of a partner. Mayer says, "The affinal links of a village sub-caste group stretch out for an average of twenty to thirty miles." In A.R. Beals' survey of Kamhalli village, also, it was found that villagers are being forced to stretch out of a small geographical area in search of a marriage partner. Mandelbaum has shown that in some parts of North India, village exogamy is prevalent. Village exogamy has also been reported to have existed by Irawati Karve. According to T.N. Madan, the assimilation

---

63 Ghurye - op. cit., p. 22.
64 Ghurye - Caste and Race in India, p. 265.
65 Ghurye - After a Century and a Quarter: Lonikand then and Now (1960), pp. 77-78.
67 Mandelbaum - Society in India (1972), p. 231.
of a bride to her husband’s family is impeded if her natal family is in the same village. Thus an individual strengthens the bond of social unity when he is constrained to go out of a particular circle for the purpose of marriage. Kinship regulations relating to hypergamy, exogamy and prohibited circle - all have a combined effect of intensifying the regional and territorial integration of casts or sub-caste and ultimately of Hindu society. This is how, according to Ghurye, rules relating to exogamy strengthen the bond of unity in Hindu society. The Brahmanical contribution in the process is most profound as the Brahmanical practices relating to exogamy were ultimately accepted by other sections. Family and Kinship structures are the most important aspects of social structure. And in these two aspects, Brahmanical institutions and practices have been followed by others. The Brahmans have thus played a leading and indispensable role in maintaining social unity among the Hindus.

---

Section - 3

SEX AND MARRIAGE

The problem of sex and its relation to the larger society is a question to which Ghurye turns his attention again and again. Undoubtedly, sex is basically an individual, biological phenomenon. But considering its vital importance for society, every society creates some norms for regulating sex so that sex does not become an unregulated act of pleasure and the individual necessity and social need correspond with each other. Ghurye thinks that it is from this perspective that a sociologist should become interested in the question of sex and marriage and this is the approach which he himself has taken.

While analysing Indian social and literary history, he proudly mentions that Vatsayana judged the question of sex only as a part of an integrated scheme of values presented by Hindu religion, viz., Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha. So Kama or sex is not be viewed in an isolated manner. The whole aim of Vatsayana was "to fulfil Kama in part at least as an aspect of Dharma or duty." But this spirit was degenerated subsequently. This became evident not only in the writings of Bhavabhuti but also from various architectural works and temple carvings of medieval India. Rightly or wrongly, Ghurye regards it as due to the sinister influence of Islamic culture on Indian society.

72 On this aspect, see Ghurye - Social Tensions in India (Popular : 1968), pp. 222-56.
which is relevant here is that Ghurye has always seen sex in the context of
society and culture. And his interest in sex had been continued and
consistent. Even in 1970, we find him engaged in supervising Mrs. D.J.
Desai's thesis entitled 'Social Background of Sexual Representation on
Medieval Hindu Temples', which, he says, 'brought me the highest satis-
faction of my career as a research guide.'

It is in this background that Ghurye's work 'Sexual Behaviour of
the American Female' is to be understood. S.D. Pillai says that while
reading this book, 'one is struck by his knowledge of classical and modern
sciences on the subject.' The assumptions and conclusions of Dr. Kinsey's
monumental work 'Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female profoundly disturbed
Ghurye. He says that Kinsey belongs to those who are "the protagonists
of the bankruptcy view of monogamous marriage". He quotes a passage from
Darlington's The Facts of Life, "If the sexual act were not delightful
it could not be the basis of reproduction. And if it were not capable of
becoming sacred, it would not be the basis of the family and hence of the
development of society and culture." Even from Kinsey's own data,
no may be shown that in America, marriage is still the basic institution
providing sexual gratification.

Kinsey's wrong attitude towards sex has led him to the
debunking of the institution of marriage in his writings. Ghurye shows
with the help of the data provided by Kinsey himself and those provided
by other earlier and contemporary works, that this is an unscientific

73 Ghurye - '1 & Other Explorations (1973), p. 217.
75 Ghurye - 'Preface' to 'Sexual Behaviour of the American Female' (1956).
76 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 70.
view of the true nature of marriage and sex in American life.

Firstly, a distorted view about the exclusive importance of sex is provided by the concept of 'female orgasm'. Kinsey has built his own thesis on the basis of this concept of orgasm. But the concept itself is extremely nebulous. Simone De Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex*, has said that there is no certainty 'whether vaginal feeling ever rises to a definite orgasm'. Kinsey depends on such a fluid concept and makes little distinction between marital sex on the one hand and pre-marital and extra-marital sex on the other.

Secondly, it is true that pre-marital and extra-marital sex activity among American females has increased to a great extent recently. But this fact does not warrant the conclusion of Kinsey that pre-marital 'petting' is highly correlated with sexual orgasm in married life. On the other hand, the data provided by Davis (Factors in the Sex Life of 2000 Women (1929) and by Terman (Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness (1938) prove that at least to some extent pre-marital petting is associated with marital unhappiness. Kinsey's conclusions may be regarded as oversimplified in nature.

Thirdly, Ghurye holds that even today among American women, coital experience, and not orgasmic experience, is important for sexual satisfaction within marriage. Thus he declares, "the continuance and stability of the marriage tie in America is not an external unity but is supported by the internal basis of fair sexual satisfaction within it."

---

Fourthly, the data provided by Kinsey do not support the conclusion that the married females get less and less of sexual satisfaction out of their marriage as they grow older. On the contrary it is found that sexual adjustment in marital life goes on increasing till at least the 15th year of marriage and Ghurye shows this in the form of a table.  

In this way, Ghurye shows that even in the United States, family and marriage provide the basic centres for sexual adjustment and gratification.

As we have already seen, Ghurye's interest in sex was not just accidental. Apart from his long period of teaching on the problems of marriage and family in the post-graduate classes - which Ghurye mentions as the immediate cause of the writing of the above book - his interest in questions of sex became evident as early as in 1930. S.D. Pillai says, "Actually, Ghurye's research concern with this aspect of life (sex) dates back to 1938 when he was among the prime movers of the second All-India Population Conference and the first (and the last) Marriage Hygiene Conference. Two papers which he read at that Conference deal respectively with 'Birth Control' and 'Sex Habits of Middle Class People' based on field data. Perhaps this was one of the few attempts in the thirties to study sex habits in an Indian setting in a systematic manner."  

To turn our attention to the second paper mentioned above, it is interesting to note how the state of culture of a society is reflected in the sex-habits of the people. The data which have been collected here

---
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are on: beginning of sex-life in marriage, forceful separation of husband and wife after marriage, frequency of coitus etc. The interesting point is that more than 40% of the female respondents fall in the group whose age at marriage was 15 or below while all of them except 37 (in a sample of 298) fall under the age-group of 20. If one makes a field study in contemporary Bombay, the nature of social change will become apparent by this single variable of age at marriage of women.

Regarding the magnitude of birth control practices, out of 304 persons 201 persons said that they do not, 50 persons definitely practised it and 11 persons were inclined to practice it. Considering that only 30% of the people practised birth control and the fact that even they had no adequate knowledge about birth-control techniques, reveal the immaturity of urbanization at that time. It should be noted here that the conduct of field-investigation on the taboo topic of sex in 1938 speaks eloquently of Ghurye's catholicity of mind as regards the field of investigation - both with regard to methodology and contents.

The question of sex is intimately connected with marriage and Ghurye has shown his keen interest in this institution not merely from a theoretician's point of view. He analyses marriage data on contemporary society and analyses its impact on population problem.
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He suggests that adjustment among marriage partners is key to marital happiness and for this he stresses the need for counselling services in India of the future.\textsuperscript{67} Analyzing a sample of 3400 marriages he makes quite a few interesting conclusions. These are highly significant from sociological point of view. He shows that due to high mortality rate in our country, a very small percentage of our marriages continue that long as to make the entire period of reproduction fruitful. He shows that for an average woman, cessation of reproduction takes place when she is just about 35 years of age, i.e., 10 years earlier than the average physiological limit. He asks whether it is due to early maternity or due to some other biological phenomenon.\textsuperscript{68} In any case, it raises some problems for legislators and social planners. Again, it is found that in cases when males remarry, this has been due to the lack of either any child or any male child. Thus, in a large majority of cases, second marriage has occurred due to inherited social tradition. This is contrary to what many foreigners presume about the psychological nature of the Hindus.

Ghurye recognises that the age of marriage is a vital consideration in any scheme for social planning. He says that the child marriage system of Hindu society is bad both from psychological and physiological points of view. Writing in 1935, he suggests that the age of marriage in our country should be raised to 16 in case of females and 21 in case of males.\textsuperscript{69} Considering the time, the suggestion was quite

\textsuperscript{67} Ghurye - 'Social Work and Sociology' in Anthro-Sociological Papers (1965), pp. 177-78. Also, his 'D and Other Explorations', p. 242.

\textsuperscript{68} Ghurye - 'Marriage and Widowhood in India' in op cit., p. 72. Also, on this point, see Dr. Tulika Sen's thesis on 'Menarche in India' (Ms).

\textsuperscript{69} G.S.Ghurye - 'The Age at Marriage' in Anthro-Sociological Papers, p.67. First published in 'Marriage Hygiene', 1935.
radical. It is really strange that it took more than thirty years for the government to see its way to accepting it! Ghurye also considers the social effects and implications of marriage at a very late age. There should be a law in this respect too. The social responsibility of rearing up the children falls upon the parents and they should not marry at an age when they cannot carry this responsibility. This suggestion should go right into the heads of intellectuals and other middle-class persons of our age who do not think of marrying until they are well into their thirties.

It seems that Ghurye was the first sociologist to analyse systematically 'Fertility Data' with reference to other social and cultural aspects, e.g., Religion, class, occupation etc. The question of fertility is a very complex one and it cannot be solved simply by raising the age at marriage. Analysing the census data of 1931, Ghurye shows that "Women marrying at 15-19 years have the highest average fertility, those marrying at 13-14 coming next and those marrying at 20-29 and after 29 years following in that order." Ghurye thinks that to solve the fertility problem, along with rise in the age of marriage, "there must also be carried on an intensive campaign for control of birth". One could only wish that our statesmen had accepted this timely warning from a veteran sociologist!

Ghurye's work on fertility differentials on social and cultural bases has been a pioneering one by an Indian sociologist. Subsequently, it proved to be a vital area for sociological research. As Mandelbaum has noted, "People of different social categories tend to have different fertility rates" and that analysis of these social and cultural
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differentials are very important for any population planning programme".92 Regarding the relation between class and fertility, Ghurye contests the census interpretation and shows that lower classes have a higher fertility rate.95 The fertility rate is also different in people belonging to different occupations.

Further, Ghurye became aware of the problem of population growth rate in our country at a very early age. He urges that the people should be made conscious of this fact and that birth control techniques should be used. Writing about the year 1925, Ghurye says, "Perchance I, too, had been working at some of the problems of population in general and of India in particular. Rivers' clarion call regarding depopulation of Melanesia, Carr-Saunders's book on population and the literature that I had read on birth control had conspired to send me tracking some of the problems of population."94 In 1925, he published a long article on 'Civilisation and Fecundity' in which he contested the thesis of Saunders that civilized races are more fecund than the non-civilised or barbarians.95 The famous American Sociologist Ross was highly impressed by the contention of the article and he wrote a letter to Ghurye accordingly.96

In another article on population, which was written in the same year, Ghurye criticises the method of calculation of population which was adopted in the previous census. He contests the thesis formulated:
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by the British writers that the situation in the economic front has improved in India. He says, "Any Indian, who is an intelligent observer, sees round him anything but prosperity and feels the existence of such phenomena as scarcity and pestilence." He also shows that the growth rate of population in India as compared to many other European countries has been far less. Very significantly, he declares, 'I venture to think that the phenomenal growth of population of some of the European countries, with England leading them, during the last one hundred and fifty years, has been the principal cause that has disturbed the peace of the world." But this observation Ghurye makes strictly on a comparative basis. Taken by itself, population growth rate in India even at that time, was considered by him as undesirable. So these writings and interests of Ghurye abundantly prove that he set the pattern of sociological enquiry in India both as regards methods and contents. He was not merely an "arm-chair sociologist", as stated by Srinivas and Panini, but a person who lived amidst his society and tried to solve its problems.
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