1977

Individual life cycles and family cycles. A comparison of perspectives in Yugoslavia

Joel Halpern
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, jmhalpern@anthro.umass.edu

Cuisenier

the family life cycle in european societies

le cycle de la vie familiale dans les sociétés européennes

Mouton

the family life cycle in european societies

le cycle de la vie familiale dans les sociétés européennes

edited by/sous la direction de

Jean Cuisenier

Mouton

New Babylon

Studies in the Social Sciences

28

Mouton · The Hague · Paris

The family life cycle in European societies

Le cycle de la vie familiale dans les sociétés européennes

edited by / sous la direction de

JEAN CUISENIER

with the assistance of / assisté de

MARTINE SEGALEN

Mouton · The Hague · Paris

Cet ouvrage a été publié avec le concours du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Les contributions qu'il rassemble ont été présentées dans une première version et discutées au cours du XIIIe Séminaire International de Recherches sur la Famille, qui s'est tenu à Paris du 24 au 28 septembre 1973. Ce Séminaire a été organisé grâce au concours du Service de Coordination de la Recherche du Ministère de la Justice, de la Caisse Nationale des Allocations Familiales, et du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

ISBN: 90-279-7822-0

Printed in the Netherlands

19. Individual life cycles and family cycles. A comparison of perspectives*

JOËL M. HALPERN

This paper seeks to relate changing individual life cycles to changing cycles of family development. My data refer specifically to Yugoslavia (although it is hoped that some of the points made will have more general applicability). Within Yugoslavia primary reference is to a village in central Serbia which I have studied intermittently over the past twenty years, but comparative data will be presented from other regions as well.[1]

Over the past century in central Serbia, in common with many other regions of Europe, there has been a dramatic decrease both in mortality and in fertility (Table 1). The detailed implications of these commonplaces are only now beginning to get the attention they deserve. Also, it now seems clear that some earlier simplified assumptions associated with the processes of modernization and accompanying urbanization as these relate to the shift from the large extended family to the small nuclear one are now seriously being questioned and reevaluated.[2] We are beginning to come to terms with the implications that demographic changes have for social structure.

What seems clear is that for the fewer children born to individual mothers in this century, there are more options for kinship relationships and general life experiences. In the last century the larger number of deaths in infancy, early childhood and in childbirth, as well as the smaller chances of survival into the 60s and 70s were some of the restrictive parameters conditioning the development of family life and structuring the nature of family cycles.

* The research on which this paper is based was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health and the Research Committee of the University of Massachusetts. This paper is intended as an initial research report.

Table 1. *Fertility, mortality and rate of natural increase per 1000, 1880–1961: Central Serbia, Kragujevac district and Orasac village, compared*

	Fertility			Mortality			Rate of increase		
Years*	S	K	O	S	K	O	S	K	O
1880–1890		46.0			24.0			22.0	
1884–1895			39.5			22.2			17.3
1900–1910			37.5			20.5			17.2
1901–1910	38.3	38.1		23.1	21.1		15.2	17.0	
1921–1930	37.0	30.1		20.5	16.7		16.5	13.4	
1921–1931			36.4			15.6			20.8
1931–1940	28.8	24.2		13.7	15.1		10.9	13.3	
1948–1953			24.5			11.6			12.9
1951	24.5			13.1			11.4		
1961	17.2			8.4			8.8		

* According to years for which data from each of the 3 areas are available; S = Serbia, K = Kragujevac, O = Orasac

Sources *Prirodno kretanje stanovnistva Srbije od 1863–1954*, Zavod za Statistiku Narodna Republika Srbije, Beograd, 1957, prikaz 20: 21, 23, 25.
Vladimir Simeunovic, Stanovnistro Jugoslavije i Socijalistickih Republika 1921–1961, Zavod za Statistiku, Studije, Analize i Prikazi, 22, 1964: 43, 46.
Joel M. Halpern (1956), *Social and Cultural Change in a Serbian Village*, New Haven, Human Relations Area Files: 117.

Restrictive parameters on familial cycles

As an example of the consequences of restrictive parameters in terms of their effect on the nature of extended household composition, one can refer to the four-generation household which appears to have been a rarity a hundred years ago, in part because of the comparative infrequency of 60- to 80-year-olds, assuming twenty years to the generation (Tables2, 3A and 3B).[3] In this respect the data from Orasac are suggestive of broader trends, for the increased frequency of the four-generation household must be taken together with the overall decline in household size leading to the emphasis on vertical as opposed to horizontal extension (Table 4). It seems, at least in the case of Orasac and the surrounding villages, that the households were large in great part because of the number of young children and particularly because of the frequency of the categories daughter and son, when households are analyzed with respect to their kin ties to the household head (see Table 5).[4]

Table 2. *Number and percentage of generations in households headed by males,* for selected census years, by selected villages*

	Number and percentage of generations										Total
Year and village	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	
1863 – Arandjelovac	114	54.0	91	43.1	4	1.9	2	.9	—	—	211
1863 – Banja	37	20.0	98	53.0	48	26.0	2	1.1	—	—	183
1863 – Bukovik	22	20.8	66	62.3	17	16.0	1	.9	—	—	106
1863 – Kopljare	6	6.7	64	71.1	19	21.1	1	1.1	—	—	90
1863 – Orasac	5	3.9	78	60.5	46	35.7	—	—	—	—	129
1863 – Stojnik	32	19.3	103	62.0	31	18.7	—	—	—	—	166
1863 – Topola	30	12.2	115	64.1	57	23.3	1	.4	—	—	245
1948 – Bobovac	34	14.3	90	37.8	92	38.7	22	9.2	—	—	238
1961 – Bobovac	58	21.8	66	24.8	105	39.5	36	13.5	1	.4	266
1948 – Lekenik	48	19.9	116	48.1	70	29.0	7	2.9	—	—	241
1961 – Lekenik	115	28.5	198	49.1	75	18.6	14	3.5	1	.2	403
1961 – Orasac	57	13.7	140	33.7	187	45.1	31	7.5	—	—	415
1931 – Slano	31	16.6	97	51.9	59	31.6	—	—	—	—	187
1948 – Slano	26	11.7	113	50.9	80	36.0	3	1.4	—	—	222
1961 – Slano	42	16.1	126	48.3	90	34.5	3	1.1	—	—	261
1961 – Veleste	23	6.0	206	53.4	151	39.1	6	1.6	—	—	386
1961 – Zupca	32	13.7	174	74.4	27	11.5	1	.4	—	—	234

* Households headed by males are used here, rather than all households, in order to render data from the 20th century more comparable to 19th century data, since there were virtually no female household heads recorded in 1863.

As the data from Orasac make clear, the husband-wife tie has tended to replace the father-child tie as the one of greatest frequency.[5] This is related to decreasing household size, for in more recent times fewer children are born and fewer remain at home. If we look at the category mother in age-specific terms, we see that this has significant implications for the duration or the potential duration of the husband-wife tie. Holding the factor of divorce constant for Orasac (in the case of this Serbian village it is still a minor factor) then, for example, the potential for a couple to experience 5 decades of life together seems progressively more likely as we approach our own time.

Thus, if we have fewer widows or widowers and more long-term married couples and comparatively fewer children produced by each mother, these parameters are already significant in influencing the kind of household cyclical development we might expect. But if we take as a model the kind of patrilineal, patrilocal and patriarchical culture that has existed in Serbia in the 19th century with the *zadruga* as the ideal prototype, we can already see the ways in which these demographic changes influence the

Table 3. *Percentage age structure of the population, 1863–1961**

A. Central Serbia and Orasac village, compared

Age	1921 Serbia	1931 Serbia	1948 Serbia	1953 Serbia	1961 Serbia	1961 Orasac
0–19	46.2	43.7	41.4	37.8	34.7	30.8
20–39	28.8	32.3	29.2	31.1	34.9	31.0
40–59	16.5	16.7	20.9	22.2	20.0	21.5
60+	8.5	7.3	8.5	8.9	10.5	16.7

Source: Simeunovic, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

B. Kingdom of Serbia and Orasac village, compared

Age	1863 Orasac	1890 Orasac	1900 Serbia	1953 Orasac	1961 Orasac
0–10	42.3	31.8	29.6	19.7	17.7
11–20	20.5	23.6	24.1	17.6	14.9
21–30	17.4	15.0	15.8	18.9	13.2
31–40	10.2	12.0	11.9	9.1	17.0
41–50	5.0	8.0	8.5	13.8	8.6
51–60	3.6	6.0	5.6	10.6	13.1
61–70	1.0	3.0	2.9	6.7	9.4
71+	—	.6	1.5	3.6	5.2

Sources: *Statisticki Godisnjak, Kraljevina Srbije 1878–1899*, Beograd, Vol. 4, 1902: 55; and J. Halpern and David Anderson (1970), The Zadruga, a century of change", *Anthropologica*, N.S., XII, 1,: 86.

* National census data from the late 19th century uses different age categories from later surveys, hence the breakdown of this table to represent both systems.

extended family structure. Death and birth appear to have been major determinants in family cycle formation 100 years ago, while today demographic changes are reflected in the altering focus of dyadic relationships, especially that of husband and wife. One may grant that the coming into prominence of the husband-wife tie, in a society which formerly had a primary agnatic focus on the father-son and brother-brother tie, is as much a matter of changing ideology as of mere frequency; still, it is important to consider the effect that raising fewer children and living longer in a smaller extended family unit has had on husband-wife relationships.

Table 4. *Household size relative to population and number of households for selected census years, by selected villages*

Year and village		Size of household % in each category 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	Mean*	Median
1863 Banja	pop.	2.07	1.90	4.92	3.80	7.33	10.35	13.29	10.35	9.32	36.67	1159	7.61	8
	hh.	12.97	5.95	10.27	5.95	9.19	10.81	11.89	8.11	6.49	18.38	185	5.81	6
Bukovik	pop.	2.04	2.72	5.09	8.83	11.88	21.39	11.88	4.07	4.58	27.50	589	7.27	6
	hh.	10.28	7.48	9.35	12.15	13.08	19.63	9.35	2.80	2.80	13.08	107	5.29	5
Kopljare	pop.	.44	.88	1.32	5.86	7.32	7.91	12.30	15.23	5.27	43.48	683	9.29	8
	hh.	3.33	3.33	3.33	11.11	11.11	10.00	13.33	14.44	4.44	25.56	90	6.84	7
Orasac	pop.	.09	.37	1.39	3.70	5.55	8.32	11.65	12.57	7.49	48.89	1082	8.36	9
	hh.	.76	1.53	3.82	7.63	9.16	11.45	13.74	12.98	6.87	32.06	131	7.43	8
Stojnik	pop.	1.48	2.17	3.55	8.29	12.34	16.58	10.37	9.48	7.11	28.63	1013	7.99	7
	hh.	8.38	6.59	6.59	11.98	14.97	16.77	8.98	7.19	4.79	13.77	167	5.66	6
Topola	pop.	.68	2.61	2.42	6.96	9.01	12.00	12.62	13.92	10.07	29.71	1609	8.06	8
	hh.	4.40	8.40	5.20	11.20	11.60	12.80	11.60	11.20	7.20	16.40	250	6.16	6
1948 Bobovac	pop.	.96	6.76	13.90	18.24	20.59	11.47	7.21	7.65	5.29	7.94	1360	5.39	5
	hh.	4.19	14.84	20.32	20.0	18.06	8.39	4.52	4.19	2.58	2.90	310	4.33	4
1961 Bobovac	pop.	2.48	10.56	12.38	18.15	23.51	21.78	6.93	1.98	2.23	—	1212	4.66	5
	hh.	9.43	20.13	15.72	17.30	17.92	13.84	3.77	.94	.94	—	318	3.81	4
1948 Lekenik	pop.	2.33	11.99	15.99	22.65	19.57	14.99	4.66	4.66	2.25	.92	1201	4.52	4
	hh.	8.54	21.95	19.51	20.73	14.33	9.15	2.44	2.13	.91	.30	328	3.66	3.5
1961 Lekenik	pop.	3.98	13.59	19.66	22.54	19.29	13.99	4.72	.98	1.65	—	1633	4.14	4
	hh.	13.24	22.61	21.79	18.74	12.83	7.54	2.24	.41	.61	—	491	3.33	3
1961 Orasac	pop.	1.14	6.52	9.49	15.03	20.27	22.84	14.19	4.75	2.67	3.11	2023	5.34	5
	hh.	5.08	14.57	14.13	16.78	18.10	17.0	9.05	2.65	1.32	1.32	453	4.46	4
1931 Slano	pop.	.90	2.79	5.16	6.56	8.20	14.75	11.48	15.74	12.54	21.89	1220	7.16	8
	hh.	5.31	8.70	10.14	9.66	10.14	14.49	9.66	12.08	8.21	11.59	207	5.84	6
1948 Slano	pop.	2.71	4.03	8.75	10.83	16.67	15.0	13.61	10.0	4.37	14.07	1440	6.28	6
	hh.	12.71	9.36	13.71	12.71	15.72	12.04	9.36	6.02	2.34	6.02	299	4.69	5
1961 Slano	pop.	2.39	5.82	9.84	15.81	16.41	16.55	13.57	10.74	4.70	4.18	1341	5.60	5
	hh.	10.70	12.71	14.38	16.72	14.72	12.37	8.76	6.02	2.01	1.67	299	4.38	4
1961 Veleste	pop.	.48	1.03	3.85	4.25	10.08	11.65	14.88	12.90	7.26	33.64	2729	7.60	8
	hh.	3.31	3.56	8.91	7.38	13.99	13.49	14.76	11.20	5.60	17.81	393	6.39	6
1961 Zupca	pop.	1.29	3.62	9.83	18.28	19.40	16.55	10.26	8.28	4.66	7.84	1160	5.66	5
	hh.	6.05	8.47	15.32	21.37	18.15	12.90	6.85	4.84	2.42	3.63	248	4.67	4

* The mean is somewhat lower than that recorded in the author's "Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth century: social and household structure as reflected in the 1863 census" (in *Household and Family in Past Time*, Peter Laslett and Richard Wall (eds.) (1972), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 409–417) because the 10 & + categories are collapsed in this table, e.g., household size relative to population is 8.3 for all 1863 villages, with 10.0 for Orasac and 9.3 for Kopljare, to cite the two highest.

Duration of father-son ties

It does not require great exercise of the imagination to visualize the greater potential for conflict if these ties were of long duration within a larger extended family. What is suggested is that two married brothers and their families, the basic units in the traditional ideal *zadruga* type, could co-exist for a longer period in the mid-19th century given the fact that the death of the father could be expected within one generation and not within two. Or, reciprocally, a father could exercise greater control over his married sons while they were in their 20s with young children, while when they reached their 40s and had marriageable children there would be a tendency toward fission. The data from the census of 1863 seem to suggest that there were simply not enough old men around to force decisions of fission, for that reason. That is, if a question of division came up, it did so after the father's death.

Less than a third of household heads were over age 50 in the 1863 census of Orasac, and the percentage is less for the other villages and towns of this period. The extended family ideal, the *zadruga* of married brothers and their families plus their parents, or a minimum of about eight people, was a setting participated in by half the population at a given point in time (49.46% of 6,650 persons in 1,149 households analyzed in the 1863 census data available lived in size 7 households or under).

Household size and composition

In 1863 only 10 out of 131 households in Orasac (7.63%) had 2 or more daughters-in-law[6] while 66% had no brothers, although 60% of the households in Orasac at that time contained relatives beyond the nuclear family.[7] But giving statistics in terms of households can be somewhat misleading, for what seems more important than frequency of households as such is the nature of particular kinds of family experiences to which the population as a whole was exposed; thus the mean and median household sizes are always larger when reference is made primarily to numbers of people rather than numbers of households. In Orasac in 1863 approximately 49% of the population lived in size 10 or larger households, and these households were only about a third of all households. Conversely, in Orasac in 1961 a little over 1% of the population lived alone, but this was more than 5% of the total households (see Table 4). These

statistics, with their primary reference to households, do, however, provide a welcome corrective to the ideal type descriptions so often seen in discussing the extended family. One learns a great deal about the extended family from many studies, but one is rarely given sufficient information in order to correlate a selected case study with the life experiences of the population considered, to determine whether it was a common experience or an ideal pattern participated in by relatively few.[8]

In Orasac in 1863 almost 60% of the households contained relatives beyond the nuclear family. Only 252 people out of a population of 1,082 lived in a nuclear family setting. However, the majority of those in the extended family were actually the core nuclear family. Thus, out of 685 who lived in extended family households 419 were the head, his wife or children. It must also be borne in mind that doing analysis from a set of census data and projecting cyclical variations onto it through an analysis of different sets of relationships, while the focus of this paper does necessarily leave out the individual dynamics. A case where one proceeds to map out an individual's life experiences in terms of the number of different household types to which he belonged in his lifetime provides a perspective different from that of the family cycle view.[9]

It would seem reasonable to define a "different" household as one changed through the death or departure of an adult or the birth of a child, particularly a first child. But it would be necessary to restrict the definition of the role of births, particularly when dealing with large households in the 19th century, when a half dozen or more children were not unusual.[10]

Most ethnographic monographs focus on general typologies based on specific case histories or aggregate census data but neglect the complexities of a series of individual experiences within a family cycle or series of family cycles.

If birth and death are seen as biological forms of entry and exist and marriage as a volitional form of entry, with divorce as a volitional form of exit, the consanguine tie of out-marrying women can be seen as a relationship whose potential for reactivation is always present, even if cultural values or individual circumstances might make this unlikely at a given point in time. Finally, there are, of course, artificially extended kin ties such as adoption. These are basic considerations to be kept in mind in viewing the data presented here.

Table 5. *Age-specific kin ties, under 20 years, for selected census years, by selected villages**

Year and village	Ages	Head N	Head %	Son N	Son %	Daughter N	Daughter %	Brother N	Brother %	Sister N	Sister %	Grandson N	Grandson %	Granddaughter N	Granddaughter %	Daughter-in-law N	Daughter-in-law %	Bro's son N	Bro's son %	Bro's daughter N	Bro's daughter %	Wife N	Wife %
1863 Arandjelovac	Total[a]	219		104		92		13		8		3								1		101	
	0–9[b]	3	1.4	67	64.4	73	79.3	5	38.5	4	50.0	3	100.0							—		—	
	10–19	24	11.0	31	29.8	19	20.7	1	7.7	4	50.0	—								1	100.0	1	1.0
Banja	Total	185		227		195		92		50		41		38		40		41		34		130	
	0–9	—		114	50.2	113	57.9	11	12.0	13	26.0	35	85.4	32	84.2	—		28	68.3	22	64.7	—	
	10–19	15	8.1	69	30.4	74	37.9	38	41.3	32	64.0	6	14.6	6	15.8	1	2.5	11	26.8	12	35.3	1	0.8
Bukovik	Total	107		119		109		41		23		9		6		6		34		19		75	
	0–9	2	1.9	73	61.3	78	71.6	12	29.3	4	17.4	7	77.8	4	66.7	—		23	67.6	16	84.2	—	
	10–19	13	12.1	41	34.5	31	28.4	10	24.4	18	78.3	1	11.1	2	33.3	1	16.7	8	23.5	3	15.8	4	5.3
Kopljare	Total	90		153		131		50		36		15		9		14		25		25		76	
	0–9	1	1.1	79	51.6	85	64.9	12	24.0	10	27.8	10	66.7	9	100.0	—		16	64.0	19	76.0	—	
	10–19	8	8.9	56	36.6	44	33.6	16	32.0	23	63.9	3	20.0	—		1	7.1	5	20.0	6	24.0	2	2.6
Orasac	Total	131		257		203		68		25		56		39		50		43		46		—	
	0–9	—		119	46.3	127	62.6	6	8.8	4	16.0	48	85.7	36	92.3	—		36	83.7	35	76.1		
	10–19	5	3.8	79	30.7	73	36.0	18	26.5	20	80.0	8	14.3	3	7.7	2	4.0	3	7.0	11	23.9		
Stojnik	Total	167		193		169		82		38		22		14		25		49		31		135	
	0–9	—		103	53.4	105	62.1	11	13.4	10	26.3	20	90.0	13	92.9	—		21	42.9	22	71.0	—	
	10–19	14	8.4	62	32.1	63	37.3	31	37.8	23	60.5	2	9.1	1	7.1	3	12.0	21	42.9	8	25.8	6	4.4
Topola	Total	250		390		312		91		40		38		38		50		62		48		201	
	0–9	—		203	52.1	183	58.7	7	7.7	4	10.0	35	92.1	38	100.0	—		39	62.9	33	68.8	—	
	10–19	11	4.4	132	33.8	125	40.1	35	38.5	28	70.0	3	7.9	—		5	10.0	22	35.5	15	31.2	4	2.0
1948 Bobovac	Total	310		231		119		8		6		90		90		146		8		7		225	
	0–9	—		35	15.2	28	23.5	—		—		52	57.8	50	55.6	—		1	12.5	1	14.3	—	
	10–19	2	0.6	85	36.8	68	57.1	6	75.0	2	33.3	29	32.2	28	31.1	8	5.5	4	50.0	4	57.1	3	1.3
1961 Bobovac	Total	318		188		86		—	—	—		62		49		89		4		6		252	
	0–9	—		37	19.7	32	37.2					34	54.8	26	53.1	—		2	50.0	5	83.3	—	
	10–19	—		71	37.8	39	45.3					22	35.5	18	36.7	11	12.4	—		—		3	1.2
1948 Lekenik	Total	328		208		181		—		4		44		36		57		2		1		—	
	0–9	—		44	21.2	53	29.3			—		21	47.7	22	61.1	—		—		1	100.0		
	10–19	2	.6	84	40.4	84	46.4			1	25.0	16	36.4	13	36.1	5	8.8	2	100.0	—			

Year and village	Ages	Head N	Head %	Son N	Son %	Daughter N	Daughter %	Brother N	Brother %	Sister N	Sister %	Grandson N	Grandson %	Granddaughter N	Granddaughter %	Daughter-in-law N	Daughter-in-law %	Bro's son N	Bro's son %	Bro's daughter N	Bro's daughter %	Wife N	Wife %
1961 Lekenik	Total	491		286		218		3		5		53		41		50		—		—		358	
	0–9	—		100	35.0	89	40.8	—		—		35	66.0	29	70.7	—						—	
	10–19	2	.4	92	32.2	88	40.4	2	66.7	1	20.0	16	30.2	10	24.4	4	8.0					2	.6
1961 Orasac	Total	453		350		194		11		11		163		152		160		3		3		367	
	0–9	—		60	17.1	66	34.0	—		—		86	52.8	88	57.9	—		—		—		—	
	10–19	—		96	27.4	91	46.9	1	9.1	3	27.3	54	33.1	45	29.6	5	3.1	—		1	33.3	3	.8
1931 Slano	Total	203		277		222		87		58		36		30		—		1		11		—	
	0–9	—		67	24.2	65	29.3	—		—		31	86.1	28	93.3			—		6	54.5		
	10–19	1	.5	76	27.4	71	32.0	4	4.6	7	12.1	5	13.9	2	6.7			—		3	27.3		
1948 Slano	Total	299		301		271		21		52		48		42		—		10		6		—	
	0–9	—		69	22.9	79	29.2	—		—		25	52.1	26	61.9			6	60.0	2	33.3		
	10–19	2	.7	129	42.9	106	39.1	2	9.5	4	7.7	16	33.3	15	35.7			2	20.0	2	33.3		
1961 Slano	Total	299		269		189		20				56		60		—		4		1			
	0–9	—		52	19.3	44	23.3	—				34	60.7	40	66.7			1	25.0	—			
	10–19	1	.3	84	31.2	78	41.3	1	5.0			16	28.6	17	28.3			1	25.0	1	100.0		
1961 Veleste	Total	393		698		433		95		13		204		156		173		59		39		330	
	0–9	—		256	36.7	220	50.8	—		3	23.1	156	76.5	121	77.6	2	1.2	42	71.2	28	71.8	1	.3
	10–19	3	.8	188	26.9	195	45.0	11	11.6	7	53.8	42	20.6	34	21.8	13	7.5	8	13.6	10	25.6	2	.6
1961 Zupca	Total	248		336		284		4		2		14		14		31		—		—		206	
	0–9	—		137	40.8	125	44.0	—		—		13	92.9	13	92.9	—						3	1.5
	10–19	—		103	30.7	116	40.8	1	25.0	1	50.0	—		1	7.1	5	16.1					—	

* Great-grandchildren categories are not included here since great-grandchildren were essentially non-existent in the 1863 census and the situation was relatively infrequent in all villages. Most notable occurrences show up in 1948-Bobovac and 1961-Orasac. These data do not take into account the categories "mother" and "grandmother" and so understate the number of great-grandchildren relationships existing within a household.

a. Total number of individuals in this category for all age-groups.

b. This early age for household head presumably designates the heir and not actual authority.

Table 6. *Age specific kin ties, over 60 years, for selected census years, by selected villages*

Year and village		Ages	Head		Wife		Sister		Father		Mother		G-mother		Mo-in-law	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1863	Arandjelovac	Total[a]	219		—		—		—		5		3		—	
		60–69	3	1.4							—		—			
		70–79	—								—		—			
		80 & +	—								—		—			
	Banja	Total	185		130		—		3		31		—		—	
		60–69	13	7.0	1	.8			—		—					
		70–79	3	1.6	—				1	33.3	1	3.2				
		80 & +	—		—				—		—					
	Bukovik	Total	107		75		—		—		13		—		—	
		60–69	3	2.8	1	1.3					4	30.8				
		70–79	—		—						2	15.4				
		80 & +	—		—						—					
	Kopljare	Total	90		—		—		—		18		3			
		60–69	4	4.4							3	16.7	2	66.7		
		70–79	—								2	11.1	—			
		80 & +	—								—		1	33.3		
	Orasac	Total	131		—		—		1		21		—		—	
		60–69	12	9.2					—		5	23.8				
		70–79	2	1.5					1	100.0	2	9.5				
		80 & +	—						—		—					
	Stojnik	Total	167		—		—		—		26		—		—	
		60–69	4	2.4							3	11.5				
		70–79	—								—					
		80 & +	—								—					
	Topola	Total	250		201						35		1		—	
		60–69	10	4.0	5	2.5					10	28.6	—			
		70–79	4	1.6	1	.5					3	8.6	—			
		80 & +	—		—						1	2.9	1	100.0		
1948	Bobovac	Total	310		225		6		8		67		8		3	
		60–69	36	11.6	24	10.7	1	16.7	2	25.0	19	28.4	4	50.0	1	33.3
		70–79	16	5.2	4	1.8	—		4	50.0	12	17.9	2	25.0	2	66.7
		80 & +	—		—		—		1	12.5	6	9.0	—			

Year and village		Ages	Head		Wife		Sister		Father		Mother		G-mother		Mo-in-law	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1961	Bobovac	Total	318		252		—		12		86		19		9	
		60–69	48	15.1	19	7.5			4	33.3	26	30.2	5	26.3	3	33.3
		70–79	9	2.8	2	.8			5	41.7	21	24.4	10	52.6	2	22.2
		80 & +	3	.9	1	.4			3	25.0	3	3.5	1	5.3	1	11.1
1948	Lekenik	Total	328		225		4		6		35		1		15	
		60–69	48	14.6	30	13.3	—		—		15	42.9	—		8	53.3
		70–79	18	5.5	2	.9	2	50.0	2	33.3	7	20.0	—		3	20.0
		80 & +	4	1.2	—		2	50.0	2	33.3	7	20.0	1	100.0	3	20.0
1961	Lekenik	Total	491		358		5		7		45		8		14	
		60–69	90	18.3	35	9.8	1	20.0	—		10	22.2	2	25.0	7	50.0
		70–79	21	4.3	8	2.2	—		5	71.4	18	40.0	6	75.0	4	28.6
		80 & +	6	1.2	—		—		1	14.3	7	15.6	—		2	14.3
1961	Orasac	Total	453		367		11		5		78		10		9	
		60–69	98	21.6	70	19.1	4	36.4	2	40.0	26	33.3	4	40.0	2	22.2
		70–79	44	9.7	21	5.7	—		2	40.0	24	30.8	5	50.0	2	22.2
		80 & +	11	2.4	—		—		—		7	9.0	1	10.0	2	22.2
1931	Slano	Total	203		165		58		3		34		—		2	
		60–69	49	24.1	27	16.4	4	6.9	1	33.3	11	32.4			—	
		70–79	30	14.8	10	6.1	—		2	66.7	11	32.4			1	50.0
		80 & +	1	.5	—		—		—		5	14.7			1	50.0
1948	Slano	Total	299		187		52		6		55		3		1	
		60–69	45	15.1	20	10.7	8	15.4	1	16.7	15	27.3	—		—	
		70–79	30	10.0	6	3.2	—		2	33.3	18	32.7	1	33.3	—	
		80 & +	12	4.4	1	.5	—		2	33.3	15	27.3	2	66.7	1	100.0
1961	Slano	Total	299		217		26		2		36		—		9	
		60–69	75	25.1	41	18.9	6	23.1	—		9	25.0			3	33.3
		70–79	23	7.7	9	4.1	2	7.7	1	50.0	13	36.1			2	22.2
		80 & +	14	4.7	2	.9	2	7.7	—		10	27.8			3	33.3
1961	Veleste	Total	393		330		—		2		71		3		1	
		60–69	61	15.5	26	7.9			—		27	38.0	1	33.3	1	100.0
		70–79	21	5.3	9	2.7			—		17	23.9	1	33.3	—	
		80 & +	10	2.6	1	.3			1	50.0	7	9.9	1	33.3	—	
1961	Zupca	Total	248		206		—		3		9		1		1	
		60–69	33	13.3	10	4.9			1	33.3	6	66.7			—	
		70–79	12	4.8	1	.5			1	33.3	1	11.1	1	100.0	1	100 .0
		80 & +	2	.8	—				—		—		—		—	

a. Total number of individuals in this category for all age groups.

Sons and household heads

A useful point of departure is the problem of longevity and its effect on the family cycle. Information can be gained by looking at age-specific kin ties at both ends of the life cycle (Tables 5 and 6), that is, the nature of kin relationships for those who are joining a household through birth and for those who are approaching the age of normal mortality and exit. Granting the imperfect nature of our comparative data, nevertheless certain contrasts between the mid-19th century and the mid-20th century from various cultural areas of Yugoslavia are readily apparent. In all the 1863 data the number of sons notably exceeds the number of household heads. In Zupca (1961), Slano (1931), and most notably in Veleste (1961), the number of sons continues to exceed the number of household heads. But even in Veleste, where the contemporary proportion is highest (about 1.8 proportion of sons as compared to household heads, opposed to 2.0 for Orasac in 1863), it still ranks below the 1863 figures.

The case of Slano is significant in that the data for 1948 marks something of a transitional point; here the number of sons barely exceeds the number of household heads (301 as opposed to 299), while by 1961 the situation had clearly been reversed. Age-specific kinship data for Orasac for 1928, 1948 and 1953 is not available, but a quantitative count of kinship designations is, and is comparable to the gross figures given in Table 5. By 1928 the number of household heads had already exceeded the number of sons but only by a ratio of 333 to 302; by 1948 the gap had widened proportionately from 495 to 391.

A number of factors are involved. First is the decline in the birth rate, so that fewer sons are born to each couple. Second, the migration of sons from the village in the post-war period, when opportunities were greater, has obviously played a role and is an unaccounted-for variable in our data. Third, multiple mature sons do not share the same household as formerly; contemporarily, only one mature son remaining with the father. Fourth, because of the increasing frequency of single person households or households of older married couples the position of household head does not imply a resident male heir with the same frequency as was formerly the case.

Related to these changes is the fact that in cases where diachronic data are available, the absolute numbers of sons have tended to rise in part related to overall population increases.[11] If the 0–9 and 10–19 age categories are compared within census periods, certain dynamics become

apparent. In Orasac in 1961, for example, the greater number of sons in the latter age group is approximately offset by the decline in the number of grandsons (a gain of 36 versus a loss of 32). This implies (if one postulates that the birth rate has held approximately constant over the last ten years, and not considering migration) that in the contemporary context a proportion of those who are born as grandsons and to a lesser extent those who are born as great-grandsons (with respect to their relationship to the household head), become, in the course of a decade, sons. This can be seen as due to the death of a grandfather or great-grandfather, or the dividing off of a son from his father as that son's children mature. It is not the purpose, in an exploratory article such as this, to document each of these transitions conclusively but rather to suggest, on the basis of the summary data presented here, the kinds of transitions which may occur.

Impact of early mortality

In the 1863 villages in our sample and the structurally associated 20th century villages there is another process occurring, although it should not be assumed that it is entirely similar for both periods. In 1863 there was considerable attrition through earlier death. If one considers the population of Orasac, for example, there is an approximate difference of 2–3 percentage points in the proportion of the total population in the 0–10 as opposed to the 11–20 age groups in both 1953 and 1961 (as opposed to a difference of 8.2% in 1890 and approximately 22% in 1863).[12] (There remain significant regional differences in mortality; Macedonia overall is about 10% higher than Serbia proper – about 10 versus 9 per 1,000. Veleste is an Albanian village in southern Macedonia, and so the proportional difference may be even greater between Orasac and Veleste than between their two republics. The death rate is also about 10% higher in Bosnia, where Zupca is located.)[13]

With respect to the dynamics of the family in conservative 20th century communities such as Veleste, it is significant to look at the role of grandson versus that of brother's sons, e.g., the frequency of a *zadruga* of extended household of brothers and their nuclear families as opposed to one of a father and his married sons. In Veleste the category of grandson outnumbers that of brother's son by almost four to one, while for the 1863 data from Serbia, brother's sons tend to outnumber grandsons. If we add

up the data from the 1863 villages, we find that there are a total of 172 grandsons of all ages while the figure for brothers' sons is 220, or about 22% higher. This is partly explained by the earlier death of the household head. If 1881–1882 and 1951–1952 are compared as sample years, fully 57% of all deaths in the latter period were of people over the age of 60, while the comparable percentage for the early 1880s was only 11%.[14] In 1881–1882, 28% of all deaths occurred in the 21–60 age group, the primary parental and grandparental years.[15]

Multi-generational households

A further view of the family cycle in the 1863 period is illustrated in the dramatic fall in the category of grandson and the rise in the category of brother as between the 0–9 and 10–19 age groups. Significantly the drop in the grandson category is not nearly as precipitous in Veleste, while there are no brothers in Veleste in the 0–9 age group since there is a higher rate of survival to old age for the household head than in the 1863 villages. (In Orasac in 1863 only 14% of the population was over the age of 40 as compared with over 20% in Veleste in 1961.) The situation of the categories of daughters, granddaughters and brothers' daughters for the most part parallels that of their male counterparts. The total number of sons, brothers' sons and grandsons is, of course, greater than daughters, brother's daughters and granddaughters, reflecting the fact that overwhelmingly it is women who marry out in this society. Unfortunately the number of great-grandchildren is too small for significant generalization as a category, but the growth in the proportion of four-generational households at the same time that overall household size is declining is important (see Table 2). This illustrates lineal extension and growth in structural complexity.

On the average the son or grandson is older today, reflecting in part the greater average life span and also the greater duration of these dyadic relationships within the context of the household. The occurrence of earlier succession to household head status: a household head under age 20 was not a rarity a century ago but did occur in about 8–12% of the cases. Today, in all villages, the proportion of such individuals is negligible, under 1%.

Looking at the over-60 group (see Table 6) we get a reciprocal picture. In only about 10% or less of the cases were household heads over age 60

in 1863. In a number of cases for 1863 more were under 20; approximately 20% seems to be a minimum figure for the proportion of household heads over 60 in the 20th century data, although in this respect there is much variation among cultural regions, i.e., Bobovac in 1948 with 16.8% and Slano in 1961, 37.5%. Veleste, which has the greatest proportion of extended households and most closely approaches the traditional *zadruga* organization, still has a greater proportion of household heads over 60, (23.4%) as many of the villages where complex extended families are less common. Notable is the virtual absence of the category wife and mother for the 1863 census in the over-60 category. The small proportion of wives in the over-60 category in the 20th century data is a reflection of the increasing number of female household heads in the older age categories.[16] The low proportion of wives is somewhat offset also by the other categories of elderly women such as mothers, grandmothers and sisters. The overall sex distribution in the later years tends to be increasingly female. Fathers tend to be a small category, not because men remain active so much longer in Yugoslavia than in other cultures but because they are formally regarded as head of the household in most of these culture areas as long as they can function to any perceptible degree. Most women seem to finish out their lives as mothers or grandmothers and men as household heads. In the over-70 category the mothers and grandmothers clearly outnumber the wives and female household heads.

The nature of role succession

What is the nature of role succession in the family cycle that we can postulate with respect to the 19th century and 20th century data? For the male in Serbia in the 19th century, it appears to have been son to household head. Alternately, the pathway was son to brother to household head, or in a clear minority of cases, brother's son to son to household head, and finally grandson to son to household head. Our focus has been on the changing roles of the individual and not on the household as such. A distinction needs to be made between the restructuring of a household, as on the death of the father, when one of the sons most likely succeeds to headship, if normal conditions prevail, and when subsequently two married brothers, each with his own family, decide to divide.

In the Serbian case, the most basic dynamic is the succession of son to household head. In Orasac in 1863 the percentage of sons is highest, at

46.4%, in the first age group, and progressively declines.[17] The age frequency pattern for household heads ranges from 3.8% to 12.1% in the 10–19 age group in 1863 (very young household heads are almost entirely absent in the 1961 census data (see Table 5); this category peaks at 28.2% in the 40–49 group and then declines progressively to 1.5% in the 70–79 group. There is some variation in the proportion of over age 60 household heads, ranging up to 5.6% for Topola and 8.6% for Banja; in the 20th century Bobovac, 1948, which has the lowest at about 17%, is still almost double the highest 1863 figure (see Table 6).

Since 19th century Serbian villages left few written records, there are no specific data on the particular timing of the succession of son to household head as might be reflected in formal written agreements found in some western and central European cultures. (An attempt has been made, for Orasac 1863, to examine a few selected households at various stages in the familial cycle. In these cases ages of household heads range from 18 to 40, heading households of 4 and 18 members respectively.)[18]

The proportionate number of household heads which grows until it reaches its peak in the 40–49 age group in Orasac, 1863, with a negligible number of women. Considering the male population, the proportions for the different age groups declines progressively after remaining relatively stable for the 10–19 and 20–29 age groups (20.7% and 18% respectively), reaching 10.2% for the 30–39 group and leveling off to 5.7% for the 40–49 and 50–59 groups. The major shift to the household head category seems to occur in the 20–29 group, and by 30–39 to be virtually complete (in 1863). By contrast, the brother category remains rather stable in absolute numbers from ages 10–19 through 30–39 (18 to 23 to 18 in terms of absolute numbers), but by the next age groups there is a drastic decline (to 2).

These figures are suggestive of the fact that the brother to household head transition occurs later relative to that of son to household head. There is a logic in this sequence of events in that the older son's succession to household head in the mid-19th century was most probably related to the death of the father, since only 1.5% of all households were composed of couples living alone. The internal evidence inclines toward the interpretation that younger married brothers would tend to stay together while their children were in the first ten years of life and would divide subsequently. Thus 83.7% of all brothers' sons and 76.1% of all brothers' daughters are in the 0–9 age category (see Table 5). Similarly, 85.7% and 92.3% of the grandsons and granddaughters are in the 0–9 age category.

It seems internally consistent to project that in the next decade most became sons and daughters in divided and reorganized households.

Role of women

The two increasing categories when the 0–9 and 10–19 age groups are compared sequentially are those of brother and sister. This is suggestive of the fact that while brothers' children as well as grand-children were becoming the children of the newly succeeded household head, others were becoming brothers and sisters to the new household head who replaced the deceased father – that is, the older brother, who in some cases might not even be married, replaces the deceased father, with the mother remaining in the household.[19] Genealogical evidence also suggests that occasionally a brother who became household head might also adopt the children of his deceased brother.

Considering the family cycle with respect to the exchange of women, by the 20–29 age group only 1.5% of the daughters and 4.0% of the sisters remain, and both of these categories disappear by the 30–39 age group. By contrast, the in-marrying daughter-in-law category peaks at age 20-29. The in-marrying women, of course, could become directly the wife of the household head, and this is undoubtedly the origin of the 25.9% of all wives by the 30–39 age group. This occurs at the same time that there is a relative 8% decline in the total proportion of women in these two age groups.

We would logically expect this increase to come out of the daughter-in-law category, which does, in fact, decline relatively, by 70% in this period. The sister-in-law category, like that of daughter-in-law, peaks in the 20–29 age group (75 and 80% respectively), and both these groups essentially phase out by age 40. They are not perfectly synchronized with their male counterparts of married sons since men did tend to be a few years older at age of marriage.[20] Marriage records from the 1880s and 1890s for Orasac, when statistics begin to be reliable for this area, give the age range as 16–24 years for brides and 16–27 for grooms. Almost none married under age 16 or over 30.[21]

By age 40 as of 1863, women had become wives relative to household heads, even if they had originally entered the household as daughters-in-law or sisters-in-law. This was also an age at which women begin to become widows, so that we have the appearance of the category mother,

as might be expected, on a generational basis for the first time in the 40–44 age group and progressively increasing. Approximately only 2% of the population was over age 60 in 1863, so these categories are not pursued further.

The major kin transitions in the family cycle in Serbia, based on the 1863 Orasac example, then are son to household head, brother to household head, grandson to son, granddaughter to daughter, brother's son to son, and sons and daughters to brothers and sisters. Household heads do not become fathers (1 case in Orasac in 1863). In the other 1863 villages, this category is either absent or negligible, and even in the 1961 data, it is a non-significant category in all of the villages considered (see Table 6). Sisters and daughters marry out, while in-marrying women become wives, sisters-in-law or daughters-in-law and then subsequently wives of the household heads, paralleling the change of status of their husbands. Finally, wives become mothers on the decease of their husbands.

Looking at Orasac in 1961 we can, on the basis of the previous discussion, make some predictions based both on the changing demographic parameters and the changing kinship ideology.[22] First, given the disintegration of that specific part of the zadruga ideology in Orasac based on an alliance of married brothers we might assume that there are few married brothers and that the sister-in-law category, therefore, is virtually empty. In the 1961 Orasac data, there are actually no sisters-in-law and only 11 brothers (in a population of 2,023), with no brothers over 30. A brother is apparently only temporarily resident in his brother's house, probably because of the relatively recent death of their father. For 1961, it is logical to suppose that one will either shortly form his own household upon marriage or else will leave the village.

Fertility, longevity and lineal extension

More significant from the point of view of the total village social structure, we would expect, given the lower birth rate, that there are proportionately fewer sons and daughters with respect to the household head. In 1863 there were 3.5 sons and daughters per household head, while in 1961 the proportion was 1:2. The decline in fertility is well illustrated by birth records, which give birth order. When 1881 and 1951 are compared, we find that in the latter year the number of first and second births was about equal, about a fifth of the yearly total of infants born are third children

and tenth are fourth children. There are no cases of a higher birth order. In 1881 half of the births were of a fifth child or higher.[23]

It is worth mentioning that although changes in kinship ideology and related factors of modernization are undoubtedly the principal reason for the decline in the fraternal *zadruga*, it is also true that there simply are not enough sons being born per father to form *zadrugas* in the traditional way. In 1863 there were 2 sons per household head but in 1961 only .8.

Increasing longevity has an immediate impact on the nature of an individual's participation in the family cycle. In 1863 approximately 25% of the children in the 0–9 age group were in the category of grandchildren with respect to the household head. In 1961, 58% were grandchildren. Given the much greater life span, with almost a fifth of the population over age 60 (see Table 3A) the various transitions would seem logically to take place at a later age; thus there should be older sons and daughters-in-law. The expected contrasts are dramatic: 29.4% of the sons are over 30 versus 5.5% in 1863, with 56.8% and 16% respectively for the over-30 age group of daughters-in-law in the two census periods. This relationship of a smaller number of children to longer living grandparents is clearly important in an individual's life experiences. But such differences do not readily appear in historically oriented qualitative descriptions of changes in family structures. Perhaps one reason might be because a century ago the existing observers were not sensitive to the sorts of things that interest us today and so there is a lack of comparative data.

The same transitions of son to household head and grandchild to child still occur, with the addition of the great-grandchild to grandchild transition. Overall there appears to be a twenty-year add-on, which reflects, of course, the coming into existence of the over-60 age group as a significant factor in the family cycle. Conceptually, like the large household, it was always there, but it was an ideal not often achieved in actuality. In 1961 most great-grandchildren are in the 0–9 age group, but about 20% are in the 10–19 age group. In 1863 no grandchildren were over age 19. In 1961 14% of the grandsons were in this category (see Table 2 for data on generations in household).

The twenty-year extended life span

It seems pertinent to state here that the statistics with which we are operating tend to understress the total nature of the transformation in

social relationships related to the demographic transition. Thus our figures deal only with those grandchildren who remained in the village to be counted as part of their grandfathers' households. But there are sons and grandchildren who migrated to the market town or to Belgrade or other cities in Serbia and still visit the village regularly, or village grandparents who regularly interact with their urban kin. Such mobility was not an option in 1863, and we can reasonably assume that at that time almost all grandchildren remained within the household.

It is important to point out that about 55% of the grandchildren are still in the 0–9 age group. The transformation of grandchildren to children in terms of the family cycle helps to explain the approximate 50% increase in the son and daughter category of the 10–19 age group as compared to that of the 0–9 age group, even though the percentage of the total population in both age categories in 1961 is approximately the same (15% and 15.8% respectively).

Daughters continue to marry out, so there is a net quantitative decline in the number of daughters in 1961 Orasac data, from 91 to 16 from the 10–19 to the 20–29 age groups. By contrast, the numbers of sons drops by only 5, from 96 to 91.

There is, however, the appearance of a new category, that of son-in-law (12 in 1961 versus none in 1863). This helps to explain the presence of 21 over-30 daughters in 1961 (a few are widows of men killed in the second World War). The status of son-in-law is not the most desirable in a patriarchal society, but, given a shortage of sons, it would seem to be more common in contemporary times as well as more acceptable with the lessening of the patriarchal ideology. Here again the demographic parameters impact on the social structural possibilities. Certainly parents, when they decide to limit their number of children, do not thereby indicate an overt preference for a possible future son-in-law, but this is a possible consequence of such action.

Given the approximate 20-year extended lifespan in 1961 as opposed to a century earlier, the largest number of household heads is then predictably in the 50–69 age group in 1961 as opposed to 30–49 in 1863. However, a complicating factor in 1961 is the importance of emigration, an option which did not exist in 1863. There is thus a gap in the 40–49 generation in 1961. This group is only 8.8% of the overall population as opposed to 17.3% for the preceeding cohort and 12.7% for the older group. This gap does not exist in Moslem villages such as Zupca and Veleste, where there has been comparatively less permanent migration.

Those who were 40–49 in 1961 were 24–33 at the end of the war. Some men were killed, but there is also a deficit of women in the 40–49 age group, while in the 50–59 group, which participated in the war extensively, there is actually a greater number of men. Thus the 40–49 age group deficit seems to be due to emigration from the village and not to war losses.

This gap obviously affects the family cycle, so that fewer sons become household heads in the 40–49 age group: there are also fewer sons in the 20–29 age group, and presumably fewer grandchildren, which is why the younger groups have declined proportionately and the over-60 group has increased so dramatically, more than might be expected from the demographic transition as such.[24] This gap may also help explain why the proportion of household heads over 60 in Orasac is 33.7% as opposed to 23.4% for Veleste, although relative mortality rates do make some difference. The figures from Bobovac and Zupca (see Table 6) would also appear to confirm this view.

Despite emigration and the existing age gaps, family cycles continue to operate in the villages. Since the fathers now are not apt to die until they are in their 60s or 70s, sons don't become household heads by natural succession until they are in their 40s or 50s. There is, of course, the option of forming a separate household, but empirical observation in Orasac leads this observer to conclude that most cases where there are old couples living alone is due to the fact that their children have moved to town and not because of household fission.

Even with large-scale emigration there were still 19 sons and 19 daughters-in-law in the 40–49 age group in 1961. Given the still existing although considerably modified patriarchal ideology this does not necessarily imply the tension of waiting to inherit so prevalent in other cultures. In fact, most often a father turns over to his son much of the responsibility for the management of the household, even though he himself formally continues as household head. This is not to imply that conflict is absent but rather it appears manageable. The prolonged relationship of a single daughter-in-law to her mother-in-law would seem to be one worth examining in detail.

Limitations of census data and new categories

It needs to be stressed that the census data used here as a basis for calculation represent formal categories, and not necessarily power and

decision-making roles. The fact that there are only 5 individuals in the category father among 453 households in 1961 does not imply that the over 60 and particularly over 70 household heads necessarily run matters. It is certainly significant that sons outnumber fathers in the over 50 age group in Orasac 1961, by 8 to 5.

In part because of the war but mainly because of the demographic transition, there is an almost four-fold increase in mothers, although the overall population has only approximately doubled in the past century. There also appears the new category of mother-in-law and some other affinals, the figures for which, although small, taken together with the growing role of the son-in-law, do suggest a minor but nevertheless perceptible shift away from the exclusive agnatic ideology prevalent a century earlier.

Not a simple transition

The changing affective nature of family relationships has been discussed in this paper only in passing, for its primary purpose has been to suggest ways in which demographic parameters condition family cycle. In contemporary Orasac this has meant smaller households than a century ago, but these are households in which there is a different diversity of relationships and relationships which last longer. While the roles of brothers, brothers' wives and brothers' children have almost entirely disappeared in terms of the role of laterally extended kin, and also in the pre-marriage years the multiple sibling relationships are now more restricted, there has been development of the important lineal extension with the coming into play of the greater role of grandchildren as well as great-grandchildren and some lateral extension to affinal kin such as son-in-law. Most important has been the greater duration of relationships, exemplified primarily by the over-60 kin and also by the greater proportion of individuals surviving over 40 combined with a lower birth rate.

Although divorce continues to be a minor factor in rural Serbia, there is no question but that a shared life for fifty years is not necessarily a golden option – but it is now an increasingly available option.

Previously there was superficial discussion among casual students of the family, expressing the attitude that where there were once extended families, there are now nuclear families, due to modernization. We know that smaller size does not necessarily mean exclusively nuclear families,

and similarly the formerly larger size of family units did not necessarily imply an extended family unit. We now know that it is meaningless to talk in terms of a simple extended to nuclear family transition in European terms. It also seems necessary to abandon talk of a unilateral modernization of the family as such. In the 19th century, alternatives were lacking.[25] Relative longevity was not a 19th century possibility. Since the basic demographic parameters are so very different, the social forms could not possibly remain the same.

RÉSUMÉ

Cycles de vie individuels et cycles de vie familiaux
Comparaison des perspectives

L'objet du présent article est de rapprocher les cycles de vie individuels en évolution des cycles du développement familial en évolution en Yougoslavie. L'on se référera surtout à un village de la Serbie centrale et l'on comparera les recensements qui y ont été effectués en 1863 et en 1961. Des données comparées d'autres villages (1863) et régions (1961) ont été également présentées. Il y eut, en Serbie centrale au cours du siècle passé, comme d'ailleurs dans beaucoup d'autres régions d'Europe, une baisse spectaculaire du taux de mortalité et de natalité. Certaines des anciennes hypothèses portant sur des processus de modernisation – en ce qu'ils sont liés à la transformation de la grande famille étendue en une petite unité nucléaire – ont été révisées et le rapport existant entre la baisse du taux de natalité et l'allongement de la durée de la vie par rapport aux structures en évolution, a été étudié. Moins une mère a d'enfants et plus elle a de possibilités de nouer des relations de parenté qualitativement différentes. Les décès lors de la naissance, en bas-âge, et dans la première enfance, les chances réduites de survie à partir de 60–70 ans, ont constitué les paramètres restrictifs qui ont conditionné le développement de la vie de la famille, structurant ses cycles au cours du 19e siècle.

Les données du village d'Orasac en Serbie mettent en évidence que le lien mari-femme a tendance à remplacer celui de parent-enfant par sa plus grande fréquence. Ces changements sont étroitement liés à la réduction des dimensions de la famille. L'importance croissante de la dyade mari-femme, dans une société qui, auparavant, avait un foyer agnatique primaire fondé sur les liens père-fils et frère-frère, résulte d'une idéologie qui évolue, ainsi que d'un changement dans la démographie. Deux frères mariés et leurs familles, unités de base de la *zadruga* idéale traditionnelle, pouvaient co-exister pendant longtemps vers la moitié du 19e siècle du fait que le décès du père était prévisible au moment où ceux-ci atteignaient leur maturité. Les données du recensement de 1863 semblent indiquer qu'il n'y avait pas assez d'hommes âgés dans les familles pour déterminer la fission des familles élargies.

En ce qui concerne le type de succession des rôles masculins dans le cycle familial en Serbie au 19e siècle, nous sommes en droit de supposer – en nous fondant sur les données du 19e et du 20e siècle – que c'est le fils qui prend la place du chef de famille. Ou bien c'est le fils qui succède au frère, qui succède lui-même au chef de famille. Il

semble, d'après les données, que la transition du frère au chef de famille advienne plus tard que celle du fils au chef de famille puisqu'au 19e siècle, ce dernier prenait probablement la tête de la famille à la mort du père. De même, tandis que les enfants du frère ainsi que les petits-enfants devenaient les enfants du nouveau chef du famille, d'autres devenaient des frères et soeurs du nouveau chef de famille, ce dernier remplaçant le père défunt.

Quant au mouvement des femmes, vers les années 40, la plupart d'entre elles étaient devenues la femme du chef de famille, même si initialement elles n'étaient entrées dans la maison qu'en tant que belles-filles ou belles-soeurs. Par ailleurs, à cet âge, beaucoup d'entre elles commençaient d'être veuves. Les principales transitions de parenté observées dans le cycle de la famille en Serbie, fondées sur l'exemple d'Orasac en 1863, sont du fils au chef de famille, du frère au chef de famille, du petit-fils au fils, de la petite-fille à la fille, du fils du frère au fils et des fils et filles aux frères et soeurs.

Malgré l'émigration et les vides existant dans les groupes d'âge, les cycles familiaux continuent de se dérouler aujourd'hui comme il y a 100 ans dans les villages de Yougoslavie. Puisqu'aujourd'hui les pères ne s'éteignent pas avant d'arriver à l'âge de 60 ou 70 ans, les fils ne deviennent pas chefs de famille par succession naturelle avant d'atteindre 40 ou 50 ans. Dans la pratique, le père donne très souvent à son fils la plus grande part des responsabilités pour gérer le ménage familial même s'il continue de rester officiellement le chef de famille.

N'oublions pas que les données de recensement utilisées comme base de calcul reflètent l'idéologie officielle et non pas nécessairement la réalité des choses. Le premier objectif du présent article est d'indiquer la manière dont les paramètres démographiques influencent les cycles familiaux. Ainsi, dans l'Orasac contemporain (1961), les familles sont plus petites qu'il y a un siècle mais les relations dyadiques sont de nature différente et durent plus longtemps. Le rôle des frères, femmes des frères et enfants des frères a presque entièrement disparu en ce qui concerne l'influence qu'il a sur la parenté étendue latérale; dans les années pré-nuptiales, les relations de parenté entre germains sont désormais plus réduites. La parenté linéaire s'est développée avec le nombre croissant d'arrières petits-enfants et l'apport de parents par alliance, comme dans le cas du gendre.

Nous savons maintenant que les familles de dimension plus réduite ne sont pas nécessairement des familles nucléaires et aussi que les anciennes grandes unités familiales n'étaient pas toujours des unités de familles étendues. On ne peut donc pas parler de changement de famille étendue à famille nucléaire.

Notes

1. The following book-length studies by the author have been published on the Serbian village of Orasac in the region of Sumadija in central Serbia: *Social and Cultural Change in a Serbian Village*, New Haven, Human Relations Area Files, 1956; *A Serbian Village*, revised edition, New York, Harper and Row, 1967; *A Serbian Village in Historical Perspective* (with Barbara Kerewsky Halpern), New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972.

   For 1863 data other villages to which reference will be made – Banja, Bukovik, Kopljare and Stojnik – are all located in the vicinity of Orasac. Arandjelovac and Topola are the nearby market towns. In 1863 the latter were essentially very small towns with many resident agriculturalists and some merchants and artisans. Other villages for which comparative data are given are: Veleste, an Albanian ethnic settlement near the towns of Struga and Ohrid in southern Macedonia; Zupca, a Moslem community in Bosnia, north of Sarajevo, in which a significant proportion of the men are peasant-workers employed as coal miners; Lekenik, a Catholic village near Zagreb; Bobovac, in the same region, but more isolated and with relatively few peasant-workers in comparison with Lekenik; Slano, on the Dalmatian Coast, north of Dubrovnik, a small trading center now developing tourism.

   Census data for 1863 were obtained from the Serbian National Archives, and the use of material from 1931, 1948 and 1961 is based on availability. The 1931 census data was an accidental find, through the courtesy of a district clerk. Data from 1948 and 1961 were made available through the cooperation of the Federal Statistical Bureau and pertinent Republic statistical offices, whose assistance is here acknowledged with appreciation.
2. Examination of the data in Table 1 shows that there is fairly close correspondence in each of these statistical series for central Serbia, the district of Kragujevac and the village of Orasac. Fertility and mortality have declined by approximately half in the period considered, and the evidence seems to be that these trends are continuing, although clearly the major changes have already taken place and the amount of future decline in these rates would appear to be limited.

   Peter Laslett remarks in his "Introduction" to *Household and Family in Past Time* (P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds.) (1972), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 8), "As the evidence is surveyed, it becomes difficult not to suppose that there has been an obstinately held wish to believe in what William Goode has trenchantly described as the 'classical family of Western nostalgia'. This belief, or misbelief, certainly seems to display a notable capacity to overlook contrary facts and to resist attempts at revision."
3. See Tables 2, 3A and 3B. The contrasts with respect to the existence of four-generation households are clearly illustrated in Table 2. The percentage figures are not the complete picture, in that for the 1863 census materials the overall sample size is smaller. The percentages range at approximately 1% or less for those villages in 1863 in which four-generation households occur, while in the 20th century the percentage is as high as 13.5% for the village of Bobovac in 1961. Not all villages have a significant percentage of four-generation households. However, in the latter part of the 20th century lower percentages may be due to the migration of younger generations, e.g., if the grandchildren and great-grandchildren have moved to town, so that the percentage of four-generation type relationships is perhaps understated by this data. Such mobility opportunities did not exist in central Serbia in the middle of the 19th century. (Only male household heads are considered in Table 2 since it was felt that in this way the overall data would be more comparable to the villages from 1863, where female headed households were a comparative rarity.)

   Tables 3A and 3B document the great increase in the over 60 population, from some 3.5% for Serbia in 1900 to 10.5% for approximately the same area in 1961. The percentage of 16.7% for Orasac is relatively high but is roughly equivalent to that of the neighboring villages of Stojnik, Kopljare and Banja, although the overall Arandjelovac Commune is only 11%, reflecting migration to the local market town and general out-migration from the villages.
4. For example, comparing Orasac in 1863 and 1961, the total number of sons increased from 257 to 350 with an approximate doubling of the population, but the number of sons in the 0–9 years category actually decreased from 119 to 60. There are, of course, brothers' sons as a significant category in 1863, which added 43 to the total: this was more or less offset by approximately the same increase in the young grandson category in 1961.

5. See Halpern and Halpern, *op. cit.*, 1972, Table 1, p. 29. In 1863 the kin terms in order of frequency in terms of relationships to household head were son, daughter, household head and wife. In 1961, they were household head, wife, son, daughter.
6. See J.M. Halpern and D. Anderson (1970), "The zadruga, a century of change", in *Anthropologica*, N.S., XII/1: 91, Table 6.
7. *Ibid.*: 95, Table 9, and 90, Table 5.
8. This is the major point of the author's "Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth century: social and household structure as reflected in the Census of 1863", in Laslett and Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time, op. cit.*
9. Such a case study is presented in Halpern and Halpern, *op. cit.*: 36–38.
10. *Ibid.*
11. The increase in sons has, however, been slower than population growth. Incomplete figures for Orasac in 1928 give a population of 1,585, and there was an approximately one-third increase (based on this admittedly incomplete 1928 estimate) to 2,023 in 1961. However, the number of sons increased by only about a sixth from 302 to 350, while the number of household heads grew by about a third (333 to 453) and the number of wives by more than a third (227 to 367).
12. This is shown in Table 3A and 3B; the differential listings of age groups for various census periods is due to the fact that the 19th and early 20th century statistics used the 0–10 years convention, while modern demographic publications use 0–9 years. An effort has been made to make the statistics comparable.
13. For example, see *Statisticki Godisnjak, FNRJ, 1962*, Beograd, Savezni Zavod za Statistiku: 331, Table 302–309. In Veleste the proportionate drop in males is 14.1‰, as opposed to 8.6% for females between the 0–9 and 10–19 age groups. In Zupca the overall decline is 4.9% and 7.7% for males between these two age groups. This contrasts with gains of 2.1 overall for Bobovac in 1961 and 3.6 for males in this latter community. By contrast, Lekenik in 1961 had decreases of 1.8% overall and 2.8% for males. At present no medical data is available which would help provide some specific data on mortality for these communities. Analysis of death registers in these communities would obviously be very useful.
14. The contrast between the 1860s and 1960s would be even more marked.
15. See Halpern, 1956, *op. cit.*: 121, Table 13.
16. The number of women over 60 who are household heads is, however, from a general point of view not very significant. This category did not seem to exist in 1863 and in the 20th century data ranges between 10 and 30 percent in a single case (Lekenik, 1961).
17. In Orasac in 1863 the progressive decline of the son category from the 0–9 age group over the four succeeding 10-year periods to the 40–49 age group is reflected in the following percentages: 46.3, 30.7, 17.5, 4.7, and .8.
18. Halpern and Halpern, *op. cit.*: 33–35.
19. See *ibid.*: 35, Figure 6, for an illustration of such a case.
20. Halpern, 1956, *op. cit.*: 370, Table 60.
21. *Ibid.*
22. The change in values concerning family structure has been extensively covered in Halpern, 1967, *op. cit.*, and Halpern and Halpern, 1972, *op. cit.* See the latter for an extensive bibliography of the literature.
23. Halpern, 1956, *op. cit.*: 139, Table 10.
24. A comparative perspective can be gained by looking at the data from Bobovac, Veleste and Zupca, villages which have all had comparatively little out-migration as contrasted with Orasac.
25. In the case of rural Serbia available field data indicate that there was considerable birth control in the 20th century, by means of abortion without the use of medical techniques. It is also true, however, that in the 19th century a woman was much more likely to die from a badly performed abortion than in the 20th. It is difficult to separate out in any precise way the motivation for smaller families, related to 19th century ecological changes and the filling up of the central part of rural Serbia, and more generalized influences for modernization emanating from the growing towns. There was undoubtedly a perception that medical help was increasingly available, a development more pronounced in the post-war period.