The fluidity and contradiction in the meanings of Sanskritization are evident from the fact that it could be treated as a functional (a-historical) concept and a historical meta-concept at the same time.   Staal's reference to Sanskritization as a meta-concept is also not clear as meta-concepts are generally at a higher level of abstraction over the primary or primitive concepts.   Sanskritization on the contrary is a primary concept which describes a particular set of substantive processes of cultural changes in India.   The emphasis in this concept is on the particular or specific and not on the general or universal.   This is borne out from the following defence of this term by Srinivas: "There was (another) suggestion made that we should discard a local term like Sanskritization, and use a universal term like acculturation.   I think this should be rejected for the reason that acculturation takes a particular form in Hindu society, and we want to characterize this particular form of acculturation."[51]   This contradicts the thesis of Staal.

Contextually, Sanskritization and Westernization are founded upon empirical observations and offer objective insight into some aspects of cultural change.   Difficulties, however, arise from the complexity of the contextual frame of reference.   As we have said, these concepts do not have the same meaning or theoretical implications when used in 'historical specific' and 'contextual specific' terms. Probably, the controversy whether Sanskritization is a functional or historical concept is linked with these two levels of usages.   In historical specific sense Sanskritization is a concept loaded with historical connotations closer to the view-point of Staal; but in contextual specific usage it tends to show many attributes of a functional concept implied by E.B. Harper.

However, Sanskritization fails to account for many aspects of cultural changes in past and contemporary India as it neglects the non-Sanskritic traditions.   It may be noted that often a non-Sanskritic element of culture may be a localized form of the Sanskritic tradition.   McKim Marriott finds such phenomenon in his study of a village community in India.   He observes no clear process of 'Sanskritization' at the expense of 'the non-Sanskritic traditions'.   Instead of borrowing, he finds "evidence of accretion and of transmutation in cultural form without apparent replacement and without rationalization of the accumulated and transformed elements. . . . Sanskritic rites are often added on to non-Sanskritic rites without replacing them."[52]

Moreover, Sanskritic influence has not been universal to all parts of the country.   In most of northern India, especially in Punjab, it was the Islamic tradition which provided a basis for cultural imitation.   Sikhism emerged here as a synthesis of the Hindu tradition with the Islamic movements of sufism and mysticism.   In Punjab, writes Chanana, "culturally Sanskritic influence has been but one of the trends and at times it could not have become the main trend.   For a few centuries until the third quarter of the 19th century Persian influence had been the dominating

one in this area."[53]

Chanana also does not find Westernization to be a simple process. He says, "as regards the present (situation in Punjab), it would be better to say that Indianization is at work; by this we mean Westernization to a large extent in externals and the reassertion of largely Indian values, mingled with the humanitarian values of the West in matters of spirit."[54] This cultural synthesis or Indianization has also been recognized by other historians.[55]

There are, however, aspects of Indianization which do not conform to Sanskritization-Westernization approach. The increasing tendency among the new elite and some castes and religious groups to emphasize their own ingroup identity through isolationism and nativistic revivalism[56] is a case in point. Some of these movements, such as for Dravidian identity in the south, for tribal identity in the eastern border of India and for Muslim national identity in Kashmir are not even related to the process of Indianization. The forces working in such movements, as often also in Sanskritization, are not merely cultural; they emerge from latent structural tensions in the social system rooted in the intergroup and interclass conflict and rivalry for economic resources and power.

As suggested by Harold A. Gould, often the motive-force behind Sanskritization is not of cultural imitation *per se* but an expression of challenge and revolt against the socio-economic deprivations.[57] Sanskritization is thus a cultural camouflage for latent interclass and intercaste competition for economic and social power, typical of a tradition-bound society where the traditionally privileged upper castes hold monopoly to power and social status. When the impact of the external forces like political democratization, land reforms and other social reforms break this monopoly of the upper castes, the cultural camouflage of Sanskritization is thrown away in favour of an open conflict with the privileged classes based on nativistic solidarity.

The term Westernization, too, is not without complications. Srinivas equates Westernization with the British impact on India, but this is too narrow since after independence the impact of the Russian and American versions of modernization in India has been considerable. This form of modernization has also not been entirely free from the influence of implicit ideologies; take for instance, the policy with regard to industrialization. In this field the persistent controversy over the public *versus* private management and ownership of factories offers an ideological case in modernization. These value conflicts which today form an integral aspect of change and modernization in India cannot be adequately accounted for by a term like Westernization. Moreover, for many new elite in India as also in the new states of Asia, the term Westernization has a pejorative connotation because of its association with former colonial domination of these countries by the West. It is, therefore, more value-loaded than the term modernization,[58] which to us appears as a better substitute.

Little and Great Traditions

The approach to analyse social change with the help of the concepts of Little and Great traditions was used by Robert Redfield in his studies of the Mexican communities. Influenced by this model, Milton Singer and McKim Marriott have conducted some studies on social changes in India utilizing this conceptual framework. The basic ideas in this approach are 'civilization' and 'social organization of tradition'.[59] It is based on the evolutionary view that civilization or the structure of tradition (which consists of both cultural and social structures) grows in two stages: first, through orthogenetic or indigenous evolution, and second, through heterogenetic encounters or contacts with other cultures or civilizations. The social structure of these civilizations operates at two levels, first that of the folks or unlettered peasants, and second, that of the elite or the 'reflective few'. The cultural processes in the former comprise the Little tradition and those in the latter constitute the Great tradition. There is, however, a constant interaction between the two levels of traditions.

Unity of a civilization is maintained by its cultural structure which perpetuates a unity of world-view through cultural performances and their products. These cultural performances are institutionalized around the social structure of both Little and Great traditions. "Those persisting and important arrangements of roles and statuses appearing in such corporate groups as castes, sects, or in teachers, reciters, ritual leaders of one kind or another, which are concerned with the cultivation and inculcation of the Great tradition"[60] form the social structure of this tradition. The social structure of the Little tradition consists of its own role-incumbents such as the folk artists, medicinemen, tellers of riddles, proverbs and stories, poets and dancers, etc. Changes in the cultural system follow through the interaction between the two traditions in the orthogenetic or heterogenetic process of individual growth. The pattern of change, however, is generally from orthogenetic to heterogenetic forms of differentiation or change in the cultural structure of traditions.

In this approach it is assumed that all civilizations start from a primary or orthogenetic level of cultural organization and, in course of time, are diversified not only through internal growth, but more important, through contact with other civilizations—a heterogenetic process. The direction of this change presumably is from folk or peasant to urban cultural structure and social organization. In the final stages, however, this results into a global, universalized pattern of culture, especially through increased cross-contacts among civilizations.[61]

With these assumptions, Milton Singer formulates a series of statements about cultural changes in India:

53093

(1) That because India had a 'primary' or 'indigenous' civilization which had been fashioned out of pre-existing folk and regional cultures, its 'Great tradition' was continuous with the 'Little tradition' to be

found in its diverse regions, villages, castes and tribes. (2) That this cultural continuity was a product and cause of a common cultural consciousness shared by most Indians and expressed in essential similarities of mental outlook and ethos. (3) That this common cultural consciousness has been formed in India with the help of certain processes and factors.... i.e. sacred books and sacred objects .... a special class of (Brahmins) and other agents of cultural transmission.... (4) That in a primary civilization like India's, cultural continuity with the past is so great that even the acceptance of 'modernizing' and 'progress' ideologies does not result in linear form of social and cultural change but may result in the 'traditionalizing' of apparently 'modern' innovations.[62]

Subsequent studies have revealed that Little and Great traditions not only interact but are also interdependent in India,[63] and modernizing forces are not only accepted but also absorbed by the traditional way of life. Milton Singer concludes:

> The weight of present evidence seems to me to show that, while modernizing influences are undoubtedly changing many aspects of Indian society and culture, they have not destroyed its basic structure and pattern. They have given Indians new alternatives and some new choices of life style but the structure is so flexible and rich that many Indians have accepted many modern innovations without loss of their Indianness. They have, in other words, been able to combine choices which affirm some aspects of their cultural tradition with innovative choices.[64]

Another noteworthy study based on this approach has been conducted by McKim Marriott in a village named Kishan Garhi in northern India. Marriott believes that "concept of a primary civilization type of process is one of the most inviting of available models for conceptualizing Kishan Garhi's relations with its universe."[65] He too finds that in the structure of the village culture and its social organization, which consist both of the Little and Great traditional elements, there is a constant interaction of cultural forms. Elements of the Little tradition, indigenous customs, deities and rites circulate upward to the level of the Great tradition and are 'identified' with its legitimate forms. This process Marriott calls 'universalization'. Likewise, some elements of the Great tradition also circulate downward to become organic part of the Little tradition, and lose much of their original form in the process. He used the term 'parochialization' to denote this kind of transaction between the two traditions. Parochialization is defined as the "process of limitation upon the scope of intelligibility, of deprivation of literary form, of reduction to less systematic and less reflective dimensions"[66] of the elements of the Great tradition.

Sanskritization, Marriott finds, does not proceed in the village as an

independent process; it is superposed on non-Sanskritic cultural forms through accretion rather than simple replacement. Marriot writes:

> For understanding why Sanskritization has gone so short a way in so long a time in the festivals of Kishan Garhi, and for understanding why Sanskritic rites are often added on to non-Sanskritic rites without replacing them, the concept of primary or indigenous process of civilization again offers useful guidance. By definition, an indigenous civilization is one whose Great tradition originates by a 'universalization', or carrying forward of materials which are already present in the Little tradition which it encompasses (Redfield and Singer 1954: 68). Such an indigenous Great tradition has authority in so far as it constitutes a more articulate and refined restatement or systematization of what is already there. . . . Without subsequent secondary transformation of its contents and without heterogenetic criticism of the Little tradition the indigenous Great tradition lacks authority to supplant the hoary prototype that are the sources of its own sacredness. . . . If the indigenous origins and connections of the Great tradition limit its authority to uproot any Little tradition, the essentially unlearned and nonliterate nature of the Little tradition also obstructs the direct transmission or spread of elements downward from Great to Little. Downward spread, like universalization, is likely to be characterized by transformation.[67]

Comparatively speaking, the concepts of universalization and parochialization also describe the processes of cultural change implied by Sanskritization; especially universalization comes very close to this concept. Parochialization, however, refers to an inverted form of Sanskritization or de-Sanskritization, a connotation which escaped the formulation of Srinivas. Despite this, the contribution of Marriott is very limited in scope specially because he focuses merely upon the orthogenetic process of cultural change.

On evaluation we find the approach of the Little and Great traditions offers possibility of comparative studies in cultural change which is not possible through Sanskritization-Westernization model as the latter is culturally bound in scope. Moreover, this approach is broader in coverage in that its concepts of heterogenetic and orthogenetic sources of change take into account what Srinivas calls Westernization and Sanskritization, respectively, and yet has a tight logical structure of concepts. Despite this relative advantage, this approach too suffers from the culurological bias, and neglects the structural aspects of social change.

Multiple Traditions

The dominant feeling of some social scientists is that Indian society or culture could not be described fully either through the dichotomy of the Sanskritic and Western traditions or that of the Little and Great traditions. Indian tradition is far too complex, and consists of a hierarchy of traditions

each of which needs to be analysed in order to unravel all the ramifications of change. S.C. Dube advocates this view:

> In broad outlines the 'Sanskritic Model' appears to be attractive, but careful analysis shows that it is extremely deceptive. Sanskritic sources provide not one model but many models, some of them involving even fundamentally opposed ideals. What we call Hindu philosophy is not just one school of thought, it is a compendium of many systems of thought, recognizing and advocating many divergent images of society and many different schemes of values. ... The Sanskritization hypothesis is unidirectional and has a single focus. It concentrates on the ritual theme.... The importance of the ritual theme in Hindu life is undeniable, but at the same time the impact of the secular trends 'is not too insignificant to be ignored. As far as Little and Great traditions are concerned, there is apparently no precise definition.... Where there are more than one Great or near-Great traditions, each with its canonical texts and ethical codes, the situation becomes all the more confusing. ...It may also be added that the Great tradition-Little tradition frame of reference does not allow proper scope for the consideration of the role and significance of regional, Western and emergent national traditions, each of which is powerful in its own way.68

As an alternative, Dube offers a six-fold classification of traditions in India each of which is to be studied in rural as well as urban contexts to evaluate change. These are: the classical tradition, the emergent national tradition, the regional tradition, the local tradition, the Western tradition and the local subcultural traditions of social groups.69 These various levels of traditions no doubt offer a wide scope for the study of change but the principle on which they have been classified is again *ad hoc* and nominalistic. In substantive realm the emphasis here too is more on culture than on social structure. Needless to point out that a few other attempts toward multiple classification of traditions or cultural patterns in India,70 which have been made recently, also suffer from similar limitations.

Theories of Structural Changes

A structural analysis of change differs from the cultural one which is in terms of particularities of customs, values and ideational phenomena, their integration, interaction and change. Structural analysis is focused on the network of social relationships, which though culturally distinct share common and comparable attributes at a higher level of abstraction called social structure. Thus, caste, kinship, class, occupational groups, factory and administrative structures which comprise distinctive fields of social interaction constitute structural realities. They emerge from human needs and existential conditions of man, and are comparable intra-culturally as

well as cross-culturally.   At the substratum of these structural realities are numberless particularities of values, customs and cultures.

The stability of social structure is contingent on culture.   Yet, as abstraction, structure forms a higher level than culture.   A structural analysis of change consists of demonstrating the qualitative nature of new adaptations in the patterned relationships, as when a joint family breaks and becomes nuclear, a caste group is transformed into a class group or when traditional charismatic leadership is replaced by leaders of popular choice, etc.   From a functional view-point such "explanation consists essentially of pointing out how the different types of activity fit on top of one another, and are consistent with one another, and how conflicts are contained and prevented from changing the structure."

In India, for historical reasons, the cultural approaches to the analysis of change have been quite frequent but rarely structural.   Still, structural studies have not been altogether neglected.   Quite a few such studies exist on the sociology of village communities, family structure, urban areas, leadership and political structure, etc.   No attempt has, however, been made to compare the findings in these various fields for inter-structural compatibility tests, and for some broad generalizations about social change. In its absence discussion regarding change remains confined to raw particularities of social data without abstract generalizations.   As Bailey says, in structural analysis "we ought not to confine ourselves to the raw material provided by the principles that people themselves give", our only task is not to make sense of the "flagrant contradictions in popular thought" by abstracting out consistent elements which a culturological study attempts. Given certain problems, a valid sociological understanding can be achieved by making abstractions immediately from behaviour or from other non-verbal information, and by using our own concepts and evading the ideas of the people.[71]

Thus, a structural analysis presupposes formulation of abstract concepts over the ethnographic details through which the facts of social life are not only described but also explained.[72]   This requires a hierarchy of propositions in structural terms.   For instance, the distinction between the culturological and structural connotations of a term like modernization would depend upon the way its implications are formulated through abstract structural statements.   As an example we have the following formulation of modernization, mainly from a structural frame of reference by Richard D. Lambert in his study of factories in Poona.

Throughout this literature, however, a relatively simple polarity occurs— a set of ideal types whose component parts appear again and again in discussions about changes from peasant to industrialized societies.   For our purpose, we will select five changes which are presumed to accompany that process of social change called modernization: status is superseded by contract as the predominant basis of interpersonal economic

relations; primary group organizea production processes are supplanted by a more complex division of labour, finer job specifications, and the interdependence of separate economic roles; ascribed status gives way to achieved status as the legitimizer of social gradation; status immobility surrenders to rapid vertical and horizontal mobility; and belief in the durability, inevitability, and propriety of one's status is replaced by aspirations for improving one's lot.... It is assumed that the introduction of the factory system has certain institutional imperatives that flow from this form of work organization, imperatives which are instrumental in moving a society from one end of the polarity to another, from a static, acquired-status-ridden, tradition-bound, primary-goup oriented, particularistic, fatalistic society into one that is rapidly changing, achieved-status-dominated, progressive secondary-group oriented, universalistic and aspiring.[73]

In most structural studies in India, the ideal-typical formulations and statements are not clearly indicated, although an implicit recognition of these is present. The differentiation of roles and shifting nuclei of authority in family,[74] the changing positions of caste and tribe in the power structure,[75] emergence of new factions[76] and dominant castes[77] in villages, the spread of bureaucratic administration, the emergence of youth organizations,[78] new labour movements,[79] urban growth and industrial-demographic changes and changes[80] in leadership,[81] etc., are some structural studies which offer valuable clues to social change in India. In these studies, however, methodological orientation does not remain uniform which merits brief discussion. We shall discuss below a few salient orientations in the structural approaches for the analysis of social change in India.

Dialectical Approach

From its early Marxist form, the dialectical approach in sociology has undergone further refinements in concepts and propositions; its speculative-philosophical elements have been replaced by genuine sociological formulations of categories.[82] In India, Marxist theory did influence some scholars but as a whole failed to develop a scientific tradition of thinking and research.[83] Among the early studies based on this model we may mention studies of caste based on economic interpretation,[84] interpretation of Indian history from a class view-point in the "chronological order of successive developments in the means and relations of production,"[85] and evolutionary formulation of the stages of social development in India, guided by economic institutions.[86]

Marxist sensibility, however, remains diffused in the thought patterns of modern Indian intellectuals. It dominates the minds of the leaders in the Communist Party, and a large membership of the Congress and other liberal parties is also influenced by its ideology. Generally, attachment to Marxism is less specific, and it often projects a spirit of militant anticoloni-

alism rather than function as an integrated world-view or system of thought. Intellectuals like M. N. Roy, Jawaharlal Nehru and Jayaprakash Narayan, who started as proponents of this philosophy, later controverted it. In sociology the influence of this approach was never strong in India probably because of the dominant influence that British sociology and social anthropology with its functional orientation exercised on its methodology and scope. Despite this a few sociologists were influenced by the methodology of the dialectical or Marxist sociology.

One of them is D. P. Mukerji. In his writings we find some systematic concern with the analysis of Indian social processes from a dialectical frame of reference. He mainly focuses upon the encounter of the Indian tradition with that of the West which, on the one hand, unleashed many forces of cultural contradiction and, on the other, gave rise to a new middle class. The rise of these forces, according to him, generates a dialectical process of conflict and synthesis which must be given a push by bringing into play the conserved energies of the class structure of Indian society. This, however, could be done through planning. He writes:

> The value of Indian tradition lies in the ability of their conserving forces to put a brake on hasty passage. Adjustment is the end-produ‛ t of the dialectical connection between the two. Meanwhile is tension. And tension is not merely interesting as a subject of research, if it leads up to a higher stage, it is also desirable. That higher stage is where personality is integrated through a planned, a socially directed, collective endeavour for historically understood end, which means, as the author understands it, a socialist order. Tensions will not cease there. It is not the peace of the grave. Only alienation from nature, work, and man will stop in the arduous course of such high and strenuous endeavour.[36]

Evidently, Mukerji's views come closest to the dialectical approach to social change which he identifies as a process of synthesis emerging from the interplay and conflict of contradictory systems of values and class interests. This process according to him started with the impact of Islam on India and continues up to this date; the British rule created a new historical contingency in India by creating a middle class with its roots neither in tradition nor modernity. Thus, Indian society ceased to be closed without being open.[37]

The dialectical approach has been applied to the study of the emergence of nationalism in India by A.R. Desai. He contends that nationalism in India is a product of the material conditions created by the British colonialism, and it did not exist in pre-British India. The British rule simultaneously led to economic disintegration as well as economic reforms which released new social consciousness and class structure from which nationalism followed. Desai writes:

(During the British rule) different classes had their specific grievances against Britain. The industrialists desired freedom for unobstructed industrialization of India and protection for the native industries. The educated classes demanded the Indianization of Services, since the higher posts were mainly the preserve of the British. The agriculturists demanded the reduction of the land tax. The workers demanded better conditions of work and living wage. The nation as a whole demanded the freedom of association and press, assembly, elected legislature....and finally complete independence.[88]

The economic relationship is predominantly a stabilizing factor in the continuity of traditional institutions in India, which, according to Desai, would undergo changes as these relationships change. This is especially true about caste which will eventually disintegrate with the creation of new social material conditions, such as industries, economic freedom, education, etc. The role of education in the rise of Indian nationalism has been over-drawn according to Desai, who says: "Indian nationalism was in fact the outcome of the new social material conditions created in India and the new social forces which emerged within Indian society, as a result of the British conquest. It was the outcome of the objective conflict of interest.... While recognizing the progressive role played by the introduction of modern education in India, it would be incorrect to conclude that Indian nationalism was the child of this education."[89]

An important limitation of the dialectical approach for studies of social change in India is the lack of substantial empirical data in support of its major assertions which are often historiographic and can easily be challenged. In theoretical terms, however, this approach can be most viable for analysis of the various processes of change and conflict in India provided it is founded upon a sound tradition of scientific research. Despite this limitation, some studies conducted on this model offer useful hypotheses which can be further tested in course of the studies on social change.

Cognitive Historical Approach

Analysis of social change from a cognitive historical view-point has been postulated by Louis Dumont. He conceives of Indian society not in terms of systems of relationship but as systems of ideational or value patterns or cognitive structures. Sociology itself is considered a vocation, attempting to place each simple fact of social life in the complex texture of society's collective representations. Dumont says:

The difficulty is that the thing is true at the same time at a multitude of levels. Each field of thought, each point of view itself rests upon a simplification, but thought is discursive and it cannot only explore one field, but make one point of view succeed another and, by combining in this way different simplifications, reconstruct the complexity of the datum.... If common thought simplifies itself in this way at each instant,

the vocation of the sociologist is, in this sense, inverse. His understanding consists in replacing the simple in the complex, the small in the great, in lighting up a restricted area by bringing back to it its environment, which common thought (and often, following it, thought in general) suppresses. The sociologist has to construct a view in which the representation is preserved as it presents itself and at the same time is seen in its relation to its non-conscious counterpart.[90]

The focus in social change study, according to Dumont, should be on "the reaction of Indian minds to the revelation of Western culture," and on how under the impact of the cognitive elements of Western culture 'such as individualism, freedom, democracy, etc., the cognitive system of Indian tradition is reacting with rejection or acceptance. The contrast in the Indian and Western cognitive systems lies in the holistic character of the former and the individualistic attribute of the latter; this contrast also poses the nature of tension between tradition *versus* modernity in India.

In the traditional social structure of India the principle of holism was maintained by the hierarchical organization of castes based on the conception of a moral order or *dharma* which reinforced the principle of hierarchy. From this followed the ideas of social inequality, pollution-purity and priest-king alliance to enforce social order through charismatic authority. Dumont thinks that the complementary relationship between the priest and the king as formulated in the old Brahmana texts was necessary for the development of 'a language of pure hierarchy' in Indian social system.[91]

Should this mean that Indian tradition is impervious to modernization? Dumont answers this in the negative, for two reasons: first, because the ideas of holism and hierarchy were predominant even in the pre-modern Western tradition,[92] and second, because the traditional Indian social system did recognize the legitimacy of social and cultural innovations through the institutionalized role of the Renouncer or Sanyasi,[93] who was liberated from the norm of social hierarchy or caste through spiritual transcendence and also authorised to re-interpret the meaning of tradition and thereby change it.

From the above it is evident that Dumont's primary focus is on changes in the basic themes of Indian cultural structure and not on the dynamics of social groups or structures as such. In his view sociological study should be concerned with deeper aspects of change in the 'ideo-structures' of a society rather than with expedient issues which are finally trivial. He writes that "study of change answers a strong public demand, and for a part corresponds more to the subjective needs of the student as a member of a modern society, than to properly sociological issues."[94] Moreover, the 'ideo-structural' approach has the added advantage of being fruitful for both synchronic and diachronic types of studies.[95]

The cognitive historical approach has also the advantage of formulating a series of abstractions on cultural themes for comparative study, generally

on the model of ideal-types. This flexibility of abstractions on concepts renders it possible through this approach to study the various historical stages through which cultural changes have followed in India. Like Sanskritization and Westernization, for instance, this model does not foreclose the possibility of studying the impact of Islamic culture on Indian culture and society. Despite this, the approach is mainly culturological and, therefore, limited in scope. Moreover, Dumont's assumption of a kingly model based on the alliance between the Kshatriya and the Brahmin to explicate the nature of traditional social order in India may not be acceptable to all and may not be applicable to every part of the Indian society. [96]

TOWARD AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

As we evaluate the above approaches we find that each one of them has advantages of its own for the study of social change, but these advantages are limited as none of them provides a comprehensive enough perspective on social change in India. Sanskritization is an empirical reality, but it often takes a form which is more nativistic or de-Sanskritizing in orientation than being guided by the norms of the higher Sanskritic tradition. It may also manifest suppressed inter-class hostility. Harold Gould observes: ". . . one of the prime motives behind Sanskritization is this factor of repressed hostility which manifests itself not in the form of rejecting the caste system but in the form of its victims trying to seize control of it and thereby expiate their frustrations on the same battlefield where they acquired them. Only then can there be a sense of satisfaction in something achieved that is tangible, concrete, and relevant to past experience."[97] This subsumption of many meanings by Sanskritization and Westernization is admitted by Srinivas: "Sanskritization . . . subsumes several mutually antagonistic values, perhaps even as Westernization does."[98]

Limitations in other approaches have also been pointed out. Little tradition-Great tradition approach is sounder in respect of the causal explanation of change but remains culturological in scope. It also does not take account of the more specific substructures of traditions. The multiple traditions theory goes deeper into the classification of traditions but lacks in theoretical or explanatory categories to account for change. The dialectical and other structural theories stand on established foundation of logical categories but suffer from the paucity of empirical studies or documentations on change. Each one of them has, however, something to offer toward an integrated approach to social change.

A series of concepts related to social change could be integrated into a logical system on the basis of similarities in theoretical formulations. It is our endeavour to find out the underlying theoretical similarities in the conceptual formulations of various approaches to social change and then string them together on a systematic logical principle to achieve a fair degree of conceptual integration.