

CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH ON THE BALKAN FAMILY, ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL APPROACHES*

Изnose се прелиминарни резултати рада на пројекту „Историја балканске породице“, Института за југоисточну Европу у Грацу. Разматрају се два кључна питања везана за модел балканске породице: њено порекло и еволуција и функција њене патријархалне структуре.

Кључне речи: патријархат, породица, сточарска привреда, социјални процеси, адаптација.

I Introduction

It seems appropriate to stress at the outset that while we continue to adhere to our scholarly objectives, focusing on social structure, we also cannot avoid being concerned with the ways in which contemporary values are formed. Thus is especially so in societies where so much concern, both overt and covert, is concerned with the importance of „traditions“, including those in which patriarchal values play a significant role.

Patriarchy can be defined as a value embedded in a social structure system which emphasizes both gender and age as the formation factors. This structuring is linked to defining a system of values which guide both family life and broader social units. Patriarchy in the Balkans is given form through patrilineality, patrilocaly and a masculine oriented common law.¹ Patriarchy has many manifestations but certainly two outstanding ones have to do the supremacy and related enhancement of male moral authority through these law codes. A

* This article is a preliminary result of the Balkan Family Project at the Southeast European Institute at Karl-Franzens-University at Graz and funded by the Austrian Research Foundation.

¹ An important set of common laws characterizing the region is the North Albanian "Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit" (Codex of Lekë Dukagjini) whose rules still influence present-day behavior, *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit. Mbledhur dhe kodifikuar nga Shtjefen K. Gjeçovi*, ed. by Akademia e Shkencave, Tirana 1989. See also Margaret Hasluck: *The Unwritten Law in Albania*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1954 and Ian Whitaker: "Familial roles in the extended patrilineal kingroup in Northern Albania", *Mediterranean Family Structures*, ed. by J.G. Peristiany, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976: 195-203, also I. Whitaker: "A Sack for Carrying Things: The Traditional Role of Women in Northern Albanian Society" *Anthropological Quarterly* 54/1981, 3.

corrolery to this defined structure is the formal subordination of women within the context of an overtly protective family and household environment.

The primary concern of this paper is to describe the work of the Balkan Family History Project at the University of Graz and report some preliminary results.² The Balkan Family History project began in early 1993 and is initially based on data collected by Halpern in ex-Yugoslavia from 1953–1986.³ While the data collected by Halpern included both ethnographic, archival and sociological materials the Balkan Family History Project has been concerned, to date, primarily with computerized data bases of census, vital statistical, and related economic information such as land and tax holding records for villages and small towns in what are now the independent countries of Macedonia, current Yugoslavia (Montenegro and Serbia), Bosnia-Hercegovina, Croatia and Slovenia.⁴

II Two key questions of the Balkan family pattern: origins and patriarchal structures.

Origin

On this question Maria Todorova recently presented a definitive view⁵ to a certain degree in opposition to Kaser's opinion. Todorova stresses the demographic aspect of the complex pattern. Her reaction to the suggestion that the Balkan family can be viewed as an archaic survival is to restrict the existence of this pattern. She sees the pattern as a response to changing economic and political processes in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. Instead of using primarily a demographical approach Kaser stresses a cultural one. There are many indications that the Balkan family pattern is indeed of archaic origin and that its existence is connected with pastoral economy.⁶

The idea of a relationship between pastoralism and the existence of the joint family household is not new. Todorova describes the highest concentration of joint family house-

² For a description of the project see Karl Kaser: "Forschungsprojekt 'Balkanfamilie'", *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 5/1994, 1:107 - 109.

³ Over the period 1960-1990 support was received from the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Academy of Sciences, the Department of State and the University of Massachusetts Graduate School. They are all appreciatively acknowledged.

⁴ The material covers communities from all six former republics. Villages were chosen both near industrial centers and in isolated regions. A broad ethnic and religious spectrum is represented (Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Montenegrins, Albanians, Macedonians, Orthodox, Catholics and Muslims). Most of the villages then had approximately 2.000 inhabitants. For Slovenia Halpern designated Šenčur (near the industrial center of Kranj) and Gradec (southeast of Ljubljana near Žumberk). For Croatia Lekenek (near Zagreb), Bobovac (near Sisak, former Military border commune) and the two Dalmatian villages of Slano and Majkovci (both near Dubrovnik) were selected. The Serbian set is a group of six villages around the town of Arandelovac (Šumadija, southeast of Belgrade) including Orašac, site of the original study in 1953-54. In Vojvodina the ethnically mixed settlement of Indija was chosen. Montenegro is represented by Bukovica (near Žabljak, Durmitor), Macedonia by the Albanian village of Velešte and the Muslim-Orthodox village Labunište (both near Struga and Lake Ohrid). For Bosnia the villages of Župča (north of Sarajevo near Visoko) and the Muslim-Orthodox-Catholic area of Maglaj was selected.

⁵ Todorova, *Balkan Family Structure*, 133 - 158.

⁶ K. Kaser: The Balkan joint family: seeking its origins.

holds in Western Bulgaria in regions with a large area of meadows and a developed pastoral economy.⁷ Mosely states that, in general, the joint family had shown a greater viability in the mountainous regions of the Balkans than in the plains.⁸ For Filipović the appearance and persistence of the *zadruga* as an institution originated in connection with livestock herding.⁹ Where patriarchal society survives until recently, for example in Eastern Herzegovina, the inhabitants were engaged primarily in pastoral activities.¹⁰ Mitterauer states that the distribution of the joint family households is confined to mountainous, remote regions, where a money economy and forms of wage work played a lesser role. He suggests that a pastoral economy might have promoted the emergence of complex family structures.¹¹

Despite these strong indications of an existing connection between joint family and household organization and pastoralism, one has to make these arguments more precise. What is the nature of the connection? It seems that that agnatic lineage structure and their patriarchal ideology are associated with pastoral societies. One of the most striking ideological features within the distribution area of the joint family was ancestor worship. In ritual annual religious feasts (in several South Slavic languages called *slava*, in Albanian *feshta*) a patron saint was venerated. In previous decades of our century this was the most important religious feast of the year. The core of this event was the pre-Christian worship of ancestors, for whom after subsequent Christianization a Christian patron saint was substituted.¹² The link to pastoralism is consistent with the observation that one of the general characteristics of nomadic or seminomadic pastoralist societies in ancestor worship.¹³

Another argument is contributed by Murphy. As mentioned, the Balkan joint family was patrilineally and patrilocally structured. Murphy considers both these attributes as characteristics of most of the pastoral societies of the Old World. The negative consequence for the female side is a considerably formal lower social status.¹⁴ Although it has been widely noted that women in pastoral societies are more free than those in formal settled groups because of the nature of everyday economic activities making more difficult their isolation and close control.

Complex family structures in the Balkans can be traced to tribal lineage systems or more generally to large kinship agglomerations in the mountainous regions of the Dinaric. Again, one of basic structures of pastoral societies in general is a agnatic kinship ideology centred upon the idea of an existing common named male ancestor. His sons were regarded as founders of subgroups, and their sons of rather small groups or segmentary lineages. Thus in most cases a segmentary lineage system, male-orientated was established.

⁷ Todorova, *Myth - Making*, 18 - 19.

⁸ Philip E. Mosely, "Adaption for Survival", 31.

⁹ Milenko S. Filipović, "Zadruga (Kućna Zadruga)", 273.

¹⁰ Wayne Vucinich, "A Zadruga in Bileća Rudine", 162 - 163 and *A Study in Social Survival: Katun in the Bileća Rudine*, Denver: University of Denver, 1975.

¹¹ Michael Mitterauer, "Komplexe Familienformen in sozialhistorischer Sicht", *Ethnologia Europaea*, 12/1980: 67-69.

¹² K. Kaser, "Ahnenkult und Patriarchalismus auf dem Balkan", *Historische Anthropologie*, 1/1993: 93-122.

¹³ Frank R. Viveo, *Handbuch der Kulturanthropologie*, München, 1988: 131.

¹⁴ F. Murphy, *Cultural and Social Anthropology. An Overture*. Englewood Cliffs, 1989: 146-147.

Thus one can see that the complex family is usually part of a pastoral labor organization and an extended lineage structure. The elements of patrilocality, patrilineality and ancestor worship are thus characteristics of pastoral societies.

Kaser calls the pastoral socio-cultural legacy the „Illyrian heritage“. He stresses the point that patrilineality, one of the cornerstones of Balkan patriarchy and the Balkan family pattern, has to be considered of great historic depth. Kaser suggests that patrilineally structures cannot be suggested to have emerged at the beginning of the 19th century when we have definite proof of a pre-existing Balkan family pattern.¹⁵

The Balkan joint family was a result of both pastoral economy and the Illyrian cultural legacy with its patriarchal influence. In general, the culture of the central Balkans is in part an autochthonous development. These family and household structures not simply go back much earlier to the Indo-European past. After the Roman conquest of the Illyrian lands this feature was preserved by Albanian and Vlach nomads. They were later joined by Slav groups, who followed them into the uplands. What we have here is an adaptive strategy based as much on ecological factors as on simply conforming to a pre-existing tradition. Originality in cultural institutions is almost a relative question. We need here to focus on process not on achieved complexes which given an illusion of permanence.

The Ottoman conquest during the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries was generally accompanied by massive migrations of the Balkan peoples in all directions. Reconstruction of the migration movements is difficult. A main direction was from south to north as the conquest followed this direction. People became destabilized and uprooted; they left their homes and fled. Pastoralists or semipastoralists, recently settled, rediscovered their former survival strategies, while former mountain dwellers, on the way to settling down in the valleys and plains, returned to their former way of life. The mountain regions we are dealing with became repopulated.¹⁶ It is hardly possible to describe the individual motivation for the withdrawal into the mountains, but we can assume that it was a reaction to escape the Ottoman conquest. Generally the Ottoman administration did not absorb the mountain dwellers, and so they independently developed appropriate social structures and survival strategies. All of these strategies and structures were based on the joint family as an underlying basic structure.

The most striking innovation in social organization was the development of tribal systems in Montenegro and northern/central Albania (there where almost 30 named Montenegrin tribes, *pleme*, in the second half of the nineteenth century and more than 60 identified Albanian tribes, *fis*, at the beginning of the twentieth century)¹⁷ based on this inherited traditional sociocultural pattern. Recent historical investigations contend that both the Montenegrin and the Albanian tribes emerged during and after the Ottoman conquest and were not the continuation of older structures.¹⁸ This view accords well with the idea of adaptati-

¹⁵ K. Kaser, "Origins of Balkan Patriarchy", 1-39.

¹⁶ The best study is Cvijić, *Balkansko poluostrvo*, 127-181. Hamme1, "Demography", 5-6 presents a concise summary.

¹⁷ Mary E. Durham, *Some tribal origins, laws and customs of the Balkans*, London, 1928: 13-52.

¹⁸ See Branislav Đurđev on the Montenegrin side and Selami Pulaha on the Albanian. See for instance B. Đurđev, "Iz istorije Crne Gore, brdskih i malisorskih plemena", *Radovi Naučnog društva Bosne i Hercegovine*, 2/1954: 165-220. B. Đurđev, "Postanak brdskih, crnogorskih i hercegovačkih plemena", *Zgodovinski časopis*, 19/20/1965-66: 187-195. Selami Pulaha, "Mbi gjallërimin e lidhjeve faëfësnore dhe krijimin e fiseve në Shqipërinë e verinut në shekujt XV-XVI", *Stu-*

on as a continuing process. Further the notion of tribal can never be viewed as autonomous but has always been conditioned by boundary maintenance with existing state societies, Greek, Roman, Medieval kingdom or Ottoman. Tribes are structured as segmentary organizations or chiefdoms. This segmentary organization is characterized by the leading role of the lineage segment in political, religious and economical activities. This was the case in regions of southern Albania and northern Greece. The Montenegrin and north Albanian tribes were organized as chiefdoms. Political authority resided at the level of the tribe. The position of the chieftain was an official rank, its competences were fixed and his authority was stressed. The status of the chieftain usually was held within a certain family or lineage. Lineages and their households were corporate groups. The member of each shared both economic and noneconomic rights. Therefore it was important to define membership through descent.

The more isolated and independent pastoral societies are, the greater the tendency to construct segmentary lineage systems. The Albanian mountain dwellers in southern Albania and northern Greece, through intensive segmentation, obviously lost their tribal organization before or after Ottoman occupation (15th century). The lineage segments became the decisive political, economic and religious units. These patrilineages had cycles of fission, parallel to the cyclical division of households and like household fissioning were conditioned by outside influences.¹⁹

All these kinds of social organization had as their main aims to ensure protection in a hostile political environment and ensure effective ecological adaption. The Ottoman empire was based on an Islamic foundation. Christian family households, tribes (at least a big number), and their lineage groups, were tolerated. But, while enjoying a degree of autonomy, they were subordinate citizens and subject to arbitrary acts of the provincial Ottoman administrators. The lives of these mountain dwellers thus depended on their flocks and their ability to find methods of protecting themselves and their flocks. The migrations from winter pastures to summer pastures could be particularly dangerous. The need for protection and safety was one reason for the intensifying of the construction of joint family households. A secondary effect was that under the circumstances of permanent danger a man with his weapons became the dominant symbol of these mountainous societies. This behavior was related to the very strongly developed patriarchy.

The joint family household was the basic element of these large units. But the joint family, like the lineage of which it was a part, underwent fissioning. The tribal lineages constructed of joint families focused on shared sentiment but residential units in their linkages enabled the larger lineage units to function. This functioning was reinforced by the fact that they all shared a common territory, an extension of the household as a residential unit.

The Balkan joint family became the basic unit for the patrilineal tribal lineages that developed from the fourteenth century onward. It was flexible enough to adapt to the bilineally based kindreds of Vlachs and Sarakatsans. At the same time this plasticity enabled the individual household to create cyclical alternations of nuclear and joint family households

dimë Historike, 1975: 121-145. S. Pulaha, "Formation des régions de selfgovernment dans les Malessies du sandjak de Shkodër aux XV-XVIIe siècles", *Studia Albanica*, 1976: 173-179.

¹⁹ Scupin/DeCorse, *Anthropology*, 292.

depending on fertility, fission and fusion.²⁰ In this these units functioned like settled agriculturalists. What characterized Balkan social structure as the pioneering works of Cvijić illustrated was the constant interrelationship between becoming settled farmers and pastoralism. Until the 19th century this was a reversible process. This ended with the spread of industrialization and the modern state. In contemporary times there is nowhere for groups to hide witness the Holocaust and the current fighting in ex-Yugoslavia. There are now no mountains which provide refuge. The modern state, even in splintered form, is all.

According to our arguments it is much more logical to assign the origin of the Balkan joint family to the goat and sheep keeping families of the mountains than to see it as a result of conditions in the plains. But the fact is that many joint families resided in the valleys and plains. How did the joint family emerge in the plains?

For centuries pastoral families of the mountainous regions migrated into the plains where they settled. There is strong evidence that the regions of settlement were the two outside belts mentioned by Mosely. In the generally chaotic situation caused by the Ottoman conquest not only did Slavic families flee to the mountains, as noted, but families, especially those of the Vlachs, also left their mountainous homelands. We do not know anything about the immediate individual reasons of migration and can only conjecture. But they left the mountains and many of them settled in territories recently occupied by the Ottomans. The valleys of Serbia, Bosnia, and Dalmatia and, especially along the borders between the Ottoman and the Habsburg empires, were favored sites. They were attracted by open land and by the privileges held out to them by the Ottoman administrators who wished to have the land resettled to provide better defense.²¹ Another reason for leaving the mountainous regions were the tensions that arose due population increases and the limited resources of a pastoral society.

It is striking that the distribution of the Balkan joint family household described by Mosely coincides with the former distribution of the tribal lineages and the migration destinations of the mountain peoples. After they had settled in their new areas they continued to form joint family households. Further development depended then on various circumstances.

The case of Karadorđe the early 19th century founder of the dominant dynasty that ruled Serbia alternating with the Obrenović dynasty and then Yugoslavia to World War II is illustrative of this process. He was from the area of Topola in central Serbia which had been recently settled by pastoralists from the Dinaric area. Up to the time of their rising against the Ottomans in 1804 they continued with modified pastoralism based on acorn fed pigs not sheep, using forests not open mountain pastures. But like their ancestral groups they were organized into lineages and extended households. Excellent units for warfare and predation witness not only revolts against the Turks but the whole *hajduk* tradition of brigandage. The disputes with authority were constant and provide insight into the basic links between a shifting and limited economy, a patriarchal structure, predation and a profound ideology of heroism.

²⁰ See for instance Joel M. Halpern and David Anderson, "The Zadruga, a Century of Change", *Anthropologia*, N.S. 12/1970: 83 - 97.

²¹ Eugene A. Hammel, "The zadruga as process", 345 - 346.

Returning to the theme of the current fighting in Bosnia with its ideal of ethnic cleansing. This can be seen as marauding lineages in modern dress - a pattern shared by not only orthodox Serbs and Montenegrins, but by Hercegovinian Croats and some Moslems. It is also, in part, a war of the countryside against the city. Such behaviors help us, in part, to understand actions like the siege of Sarajevo. But, of course, this is only a part of the story since we leave aside the role of political bureaucratic manipulation.

Were the conditions suitable for the joint family household the system survived; where they clashed with unfavorable conditions the system more or less rapidly disappeared. The system disappeared but not the behavior which the former pastoralists developed. They were herders in nomadic societies and could become warriors, as was Karađorđe (noted above) or the people of the Military Border. The joint family household was large enough to continue functioning. This dual purpose, fighting and/or herding lay at the beginning of the Central Balkan societies. It is not only preserved in the folk poetry, but it is also the key for understanding of present society.

Evolution and function of Balkan patriarchal structures

What follows is an initial attempt of this Project to achieve an understanding of patriarchy through an analysis of the frequency of family household kin terms. We have decided to begin with Serbian census data from 1863²² considering the studied village of Orašac and some of its immediately surrounding villages and towns and compare this data to 1961 census results for diverse villages throughout Yugoslavia. In analyzing this data we have an opportunity to see how representative Orašac is when compared to its neighbors and also to examine how these villages compare with nearby towns. In analyzing kin data for patriarchal patterns, documenting patrilocal residence is crucial. In this connection we need to look for frequency of inmarrying females as in categories of daughters-in-law as well as sisters-in-law in addition to wives. We also present comparable evidence of male bonding, as in the frequency of father-son and brother-brother relationships, especially relationships between fathers and married sons and brothers. It is important to state here that the ideal of a large extended family household was not frequently achieved²³ often due to variations in the economic base.²⁴ We also need to consider at brothers' children as well as grandchildren and to interpret these kin structures in the context of mortality and natality rates. In this approach, however, we ignore questions of size and focusing instead on complexity.

It is necessary at this point to say something about our limitations. It has already been mentioned that comparative materials are not readily available. The one true comparison over time that we do have in these two tables is the data from the village of Orašac for 1863 and 1961. Nevertheless within each table there are also valuable points of comparison as when examining Orašac in relation to neighboring villages and towns for the same period. Further, in the table for 1961 data we have the possibility to compare a series of di-

²² Obtained through the courtesy of the Serbian State Archives.

²³ Joel M. Halpern: "Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth century, social and household structure as reflected in the census of 1863" in Peter Laslett and Richard Wall ed. *Household and Family in Past Time*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972: 401 - 427.

²⁴ J. M. Halpern, *A Serbian Village in Historical Perspective*.

verse communities for the same period. Finally, as we shall see subsequently, there are some instructive more general comparisons between the two tables. We should also note that there is a difference in the size of the samples, 1.363 households in 1863 as compared to 5.560 households in 1961. There is here a disproportion of more than 4 to 1. However, if we consider total population sizes we here need to take account of the fact that the household sizes were on the average higher in 1863 than 1961 so that the relative figures are 8.051 for 1863 and 21.748 or roughly 2.5 to 1.

Focusing, for a moment, on Orašac we have this same disparity but one reflected specifically in a four fold increase in the number of households (131 as compared to 450), however, the population size had less than doubled in this period from 1.083 to 2.015. But it is qualitative aspects of structure which are our focus here. Most significant is the increased importance of the spouse unit. In 1863 these individuals made up some 22% of the population while in 1961 they were 40%. (In these tables the first number in each cell lists the number of individuals in the category, the first percentage figures refers to the number of individuals in this community as a percentage of the total kin category for the overall sample including all villages and towns of all household heads in the sample. The relative figures for the total sample size are on the right e. g. in 1863 there is total of 1.363 household heads in all the villages, and if the total 1863 population is considered 16.9% are household heads). At the same time 12.1% of the Orašac population are household heads.

Considering first the matter of the representativeness of Orašac in our overall sample we see that in some respects Orašac has of a more conservative social structure but it is within range of the other villages, while Arandelovac clearly is a deviant case. The explanation being that Arandelovac was then a recently created town which had some agricultural base but was mostly a village of craftsmen and traders with many incomplete families. By contrast, Topola was a more established community with a developed agricultural base and with a population of 1.611 was the largest unit in our sample. Here we see that it approaches the nearby villages in most elements of its social structure. While it had been briefly the capital of Serbia at the time of Karađorđe at the beginning of the 19th century, by the middle of the century it had reverted to the status of a local community resembling, in many ways, a village.

A very significant point connecting the two tables and emphasizing a certain continuity in overall patriarchal structure is that the percentage of sons both in the communities of rural Serbia in 1863 and in villages throughout much of Yugoslavia in 1961 they are virtually the same being. In chronological order, 21.5% and 21.3% respectively. If we compare the percentage of wives in the total population we can see that there is an approximately 50% increase when the respective populations are considered as a whole (12.3 in 1863 and 18.7 in 1961) but that the percentages are still less than those for sons although the gap narrows considerably over a century. In the case of Orašac, where data for 1966 and 1975 are available the percentages came to be subsequently reversed so that the percentage of wives overtook that for sons. Here it is the worth emphasizing that 1961 was essentially a midpoint in economic growth and modernization. Thus urbanization and industrialization had begun but their full impact were yet to be felt so that over the next three decades, prior to the dissolution of Yugoslavia, there were great socioeconomic transformations still to come.

While the data from the 1863 table confirms the comparability of the communities so that it is possible, always with the exception of Arandelovac, to treat this data as a unit, on

the other hand, the 1961 communities are marked by diversity. Before proceed to examine the diversity in the 1961 communities some additional overall comparisons between the two sets of data are useful. We have already noted the continued prevalence of the father-son tie over that of husband wife, although the dominance is less marked in 1961. We should note here that the 1863 table represents some 96.8% of the total population and in 1961 95.8% so in both cases some small kin groupings are omitted. Importantly, the fraternal extension of households more or less disappears after a century. Thus the category brother declines more than six fold and is only 1% in 1961 as opposed to 6.7% in 1863.

Extension over the generations, in part promoted by increased longevity is very marked. Thus 5.1% are grandchildren in 1863 as compared to 6.8% in 1961. This can be seen as compensating for the disappearance of categories of lateral extension such as brother's wife, brother's son and brother's daughter in 1961 so that an overall complexity is maintained. But these global figures vastly understate that nature of the dramatic figures in specific communities. Thus for Orašac itself the total percentage of grandchildren in 1863 was 8.8% but by 1961 it had practically doubled to 15.1%. While Orašac was the highest of all communities in 1961 there are a number of others with closely related percentages as in the case of Velešte at 13.2% and the nearby (to Velešte) mixed Moslem and Orthodox village of Labunište with 11.8%.

When comparisons are made to 1863 from 1961 the notable exception that stands out is the Albanian village of Velešte in 1961 which bears a striking resemblance to Orašac in 1863. Alone among all the 1961 communities Velešte had about 2% or more in each of the fraternal extensions categories (brother's wife, brother's son and brother's daughter) in 1961. This indicates that fraternally extended households were still present in this community and approaching the proportions found in 1863 by about half (5.6% in these categories for Velešte as opposed to 11.2% for Orašac in 1863). It also had by far the highest percentage of brothers at 3.5% again approaching that of Orašac for 1863 which had 5.7%. In other respects Velešte is also markedly deviant from the other communities as in having the lowest percentage of household heads, the lowest percentage of wives, among the highest percentage of sons, and of daughter-in-laws. Given the overall shift to lineal extension through generations as opposed to lateral extensions through brothers it is understandable that the percentage of daughter-in-laws is greater overall in 1961, it increased by more than half in Orašac (4.5% to 7.2%).

These preliminary observations only begin to exploit the richness of the data and the complex relationships manifested in these tables. In sum, we can say that Orašac in 1863 was a relatively representative case although its social structure did appear, in some respects to be more conservative than the surrounding villages but within a relatively small variation. Albanian social structure in the one village for which we have data while by no means a replica of Orašac and other Serbian communities a century earlier did show a considerable degree of similarity of structure. The widespread prevalence of lineally extended households with proportionately larger numbers of grandchildren that had been present a century earlier in Serbia is perhaps one of the more striking findings. Thus despite much talk of the disappearance of extended households during a period of modernization they were still very much present in the first Yugoslav census after the mid century. The only exceptions are the town of Arandelovac were, as expected, the nuclear family dominates. It is also notable that this predominance of nuclear family structure seems to be the case in both the Muslim village of Župča in Bosnia and the Montenegrin community of

Bukovica. But this lineal extension is readily evident in the three Croatian communities as well as in Orašac and in the Macedonia communities.

III Concluding Perspective

We don't have any neat conclusions at this point in our research. But since our general focus has been on process and adaptation in terms of the development and evolution of the complex family and in analyzing its functioning some tentative generalizations can be made. First, when we spoke of the question of the origins of the Balkan family this was co-terminous with the ready reversability of ecological and related social processes of adaptation whether to mountainous upland pastures or to farming in the valleys. Groups had options to respond to changes in political power and kinds of administration by moving. In our century these options have been foreclosed by the omnipresent bureaucratic state whose reach is unlimited. Some temporary escape may be possible, especially during times of intense conflict, but no long lasting ecological change is an option. Thus had policies of 'ethnic cleansing' been attempted in an earlier era the threatened populations would simply have moved even though in the process they may have suffered grievous injury both to persons and property. However, despite the closing off of patterns of migrations other than those regulated by the state on the level of the family household it has been possible to adapt. Thus just as there had earlier been the myth of past stability focusing on some kind of achieved complex household for all, ignoring both economic differentiation and demographic variability, so with the industrialization and urbanization processes in full swing it was assumed that the complex family would not survive. This presupposed some simplistic transition from complex to nuclear households. While this myth has been challenged for decades in various cultural setting throughout Europe and elsewhere we have had the opportunity here to see some of the precise ways in which these patterns worked out in the Balkans within a context of great cultural variability.

Карл КАСЕР и Јоел МАРТИН ХАЛПЕРН

САВРЕМЕНО ИСТРАЖИВАЊЕ ПОРОДИЦЕ НА БАЛКАНУ. АНТРОПОЛОШКИ И ИСТОРИЈСКИ ПРИСТУП

Рад је писан с циљем да представи истраживање на пројекту „Историја балканске породице“, који се од 1993. године ради на Институту за југоисточну Европу Универзитета Карл Франзенс у Грацу. Овде се разматрају два кључна питања везана за модел балканске породице: порекло и патријархална структура.

Најпре се изнесе индикације о томе да је модел балканске породице архаичног порекла и да је повезан са сточарском привредом; култ предака, на пример, општа је особина сточарских друштава. Други аргумент је патрилинеарности патрилокалност, односно идеологија агнатског сродства.

У историјској перспективи разматрају се адаптивне стратегије такве породичне структуре, проширене породице, у односу на социјалне и политичке промене на Балкану - римска и турска освајања у прошлости, и савремене друштвене процесе.

На примеру шумадијског села Орашац и албанског села Велеште, који се прате у неколико пописних годишта у распону од готово сто година, аутори показују на које се начине проширена породица прилагођава променама и одржава, упркос општем уверењу да такав облик породице не може да преживи процесе урбанизације и индустријализације.