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A BRIEF SURVEY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE RESEARCH
ON YUGOSLAV CULTURAL AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY

Joel M. Halpern
University of Massachusetts

The focus of this article is an examination of English-language sources dealing with Yugoslavia, mainly the works of American anthropologists in the postwar period. Since cultural and social anthropology as known in the United States and Western Europe does not exist as a separate discipline in Yugoslavia, it is necessary to broaden the field of inquiry to include certain aspects of ethnology and sociology insofar as we wish to include the works of Yugoslav scholars investigating aspects of their own country. The intellectual background and work of Yugoslav researchers has been considered in detail in an earlier article (Halpern and Hammel 1969). The present paper can be viewed as a supplement to the author's "Ethnology in Yugoslavia since World War II: A Review of Research and Publications" (forthcoming), which surveys primarily Serbo-Croatian sources.

There are some useful bibliographical aids. These include the section on Yugoslavia in Horecky's annotated Southeastern Europe, A Guide to Basic Publications (1969), particularly the unit on "The Society" (pp. 571-81), and the section "Ethnology and Related Fields," a subcategory within the unit "The People" (pp. 493-500) (Halpern 1969c). Supplemental information is contained in Thompson (1967) and Halpern (1969a). The latter is a general bibliography of
English-language sources on Yugoslavia, with units on peasant life, social structure, customs, folklore, minorities, oral literature, peasant life, and religion.

The number of American and British anthropologists concerned with Yugoslavia is rapidly increasing, so that even recent bibliographies tend to fall behind quickly. (There are French and German scholars as well, but their works are not analyzed in this survey.) As a way of introducing the English-language literature one can begin by comparing the efforts of Yugoslav sociologists and ethnologists with those of Anglo-American anthropologists. The latter appear to be concerned mainly with social structure and values particularly as these relate to modernization. On the other hand, Yugoslav ethnology is heavily oriented toward descriptions of material culture and questions of historical derivation, including ethnogenesis, with some emphasis on the related problems of historical migrations, particularly for rural populations. Little use is made of quantitative data, questionnaires, or statistics. Although much of the work of the Anglo-American anthropologists is based on the traditional participant-observer approach, some use has been made of questionnaires, and some urban problems have been studied. In this respect the work of Western anthropologists tends to overlap with that of the Yugoslav sociologists, at least as far as certain substantive interests in the contemporary scene and aspects of methodology are concerned. However, the foreign anthropologists have not tended to involve themselves with a study
of formal institutional structures such as the workers' councils or commune governments, favorite topics of Yugoslav sociologists. There is also a significant overlap with the work of rural sociologists such as those who publish in the journal Sociologija sela, issued in Zagreb.

A special emphasis of Yugoslav ethnology is folklore, which is excluded from this survey. However, if we consider material culture, the only fairly recent American publication is that of Thurner (1956) which deals with house types and farm buildings. In a village study originally published at the same time, Halpern (revised edition 1967c) devotes a chapter to "Shelter, Clothing and Food" which discusses these matters in a diachronic context, but here material cultural inventory is used mainly as illustrative background rather than as subject for study as such. This is also true of a more recent study of a Slovene village, containing many illustrations of houses and tools (Winner 1967b). By contrast, prewar works on peasant culture such as, for example, Lodge (1941), deal extensively with both material culture and customs in chapters such as "Crafts of the Home and Village," "National Costume," and "Wedding Customs and Ceremonies."

From the point of view of English-language publications Yugoslav ethnologists, particularly those associated with museums, have prepared a significant amount of interesting material directed in part toward the very large tourist trade. These include guides to museum collections and descriptions of holidays and folk customs.
which can still be observed. Gušić (1955) deals with materials exhibited at the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb including peasant costumes, rugs and storage chests, especially from the areas of Croatia, Dalmatia, and western Bosnia. She organizes her discussion in part on a type of culture-area approach using both historic and geographic data. Another volume directed specifically at the tourist is Žunić-Bas and Sertić, with abundant illustrations. In this connection extensive folklore and dance festivals are organized during the summer. Local general museums devote a significant amount of space to their ethnographic collections. Concentration on the material remains of the folk past at a time when the country is rapidly industrializing is, of course, of important ideological and social significance (Halpern and Hammel 1969). It is thus understandable that the material remains of the peasant crafts are celebrated in numerous museum publications. Examples are Peasant Tombstones and Roadside Memorials in Serbia and publications on toys, musical instruments, and folk costumes, issued by the Belgrade Ethnographic Museum. Closely related to this type of literature are numerous volumes on peasant "primitive" artists such as those by Bihać - Merin and Klemen (1969) (for detailed references see Halpern [1969], section on "Folklore and Peasant Art" [pp. 36-41]). Traditional peasant architecture is also the subject of a number of monographs and articles both in English and Serbo-Croatian (e.g., Milić [1955] and Kojić [1949, 1958]).
In addition to issuing the usual brochures dealing with conventional museum topics such as pottery, plows, and peasant architecture, the Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana held an exhibition in 1966 devoted to "Yesterday and Today in the Hills of Skočjan." It dealt extensively with the historical background of the area including emigration to America, changes in rural industries and agriculture, and the very real problem of rural depopulation.

Among the more notable works of Yugoslav scholars on material culture is that of Bratanić on plows (1952). He maintains that the ancient Slavs knew the plow and that the role of the Slavic peoples in its development "was not an unimportant or passive one." Clearly studies of material culture are not unrelated to national images of identity. Filipović (1951) in his extensive monograph on "Women's Ceramics Among Balkan Peoples" (with English summary) ties together ethnography and archeology and is also concerned with culture change. He postulates that the first potters in general were women and that pottery-making is even today a woman's job among many peoples not yet technologically developed. He finds that ceramics made by women are to be found together with the works of male professional potters produced on the wheel and that the pots produced by women show a great stability in form over time. He also notes that the investigation of the technological processes and customs and magical beliefs connected with their manufacture can be of interest to archeology. His investigations are particularly significant in that women's ceramics are fast disappearing.
A sampling of other English-language references (including translations) by Yugoslav and Russian scholars reflects their strong historical orientation. Freidenberg writes about kin groups in Dalmatia in the eleventh to sixteenth centuries (1969) and is concerned with the kind of extended family which can be reconstructed on the basis of documentary sources. He focuses on property relationships and patterns of inheritance. Freidenberg maintains that "...no grounds exist for holding that urban life contraindicates extended-family relationships; thus, additional grounds are found for doubting that the joint family decayed along the Coast as early as the initial period of the existence of towns, the 11th century." Parallelling Freidenberg's interest in the *zadruga*, or South Slav extended household, is Glaščević's article on "The Forms of Collective Property in the Old Serbian Society" (1967). Dealing with the Turkish period he concludes:

The family cooperative is a very old form of social structure and it persisted to this very day mainly for the same reasons the tribe preserved its form. Namely, the natural economy under the Turkish occupation, the complete destruction of commerce and trade, etc., supported the old way of life. The tribe as a political formation was replaced by the state, but the *zadruga* remained in existence as a producer-consumer social organization and such it remained in existence even after the expulsion of the Turks and in some places to this very day.

Also concerned with the historical aspects of the *zadruga* but primarily from a demographic and social-structural point of view have been the writings of Halpern, Hammel, and Laslett. Halpern (1966) was concerned with comparing village censuses from 1863, 1928,
1948, 1953, and 1961 with respect to household size and composition. In subsequent papers (1970) he extends the range of comparison to include a number of villages in the same area (Šumdića, in central Serbia) and expends qualitative evaluation of the nature of interpersonal relationships within the household, supplementing the statistical data in a paper presented at the International Conference on the Comparative History of Household and Family (The Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, September 1969).

Hammel's paper for the same conference deals with "the phenomena of the extended family and lineage in southern and eastern Yugoslavia as parts of a single developmental cycle." Using published data from the tax roles for 1528 for the Belgrade region he suggests, "...with a fair probability of being correct, that the lineage cycle is dependent on a basic demographic factor of production of male heirs, constrained by others of ecology (manifested in economic activity, wealth, and settlement pattern) and those of religion, ethnicity and cultural tradition." For comparative purposes Hammel also utilizes data from Metohija relating to contemporary Albanians, and postulates tentatively that this "probably represents a demographic picture like that in much of Serbia a century ago." He cites data from the area of Prizren where in 1961 forty-one percent of the population lived in zadrugas that averaged 12.6 members each, with seventeen percent having more than 25 members. These sizes are considerably greater than those presented by Halpern for 1863 (1970),
when the average household size was under 10 for the villages considered and no *zadrugas* numbering more than 25 were recorded. In his conclusion Halpern stresses the need to consider the smaller nonextended households as well as the larger *zadrugas* to understand nineteenth century familial structures.

Laslett and Clark (1969) at the same conference present demographic analyses of the census for the Serbian section of the city of Belgrade for 1733-4. They find an average household size of between 6 and 7, depending on whether resident nonkin are taken into consideration. The authors note that this size is large by English standards. In addition the proportion of households headed by married couples is again high compared to England (83 percent as against 70 percent), and the wives seem to be much younger relative to their husbands than are their English counterparts.

Some Yugoslav ethnologists have also been interested in historic demographic analysis, notably Filipović (1958), and more recently Kremenšek (1968). But neither has used computer techniques for analyzing data, as has been done by the Americans and British investigators. Filipović states that if the *zadruga* is defined as a household composed of brothers, cousins, or uncles and nephews, 35 percent of the households in the Bosnian district of Modrica in 1851 fell into this category, and that a further 36 percent of the households composed of a father and his married or unmarried sons represented real or potential extended families. But of the 910 households listed only one family had more than 20 members, which
contrasts with the comparative data from Metohija previously cited and derived from the work of Krasničić and Radovanović. Another significant feature of the Serbian extended families in Bosnia was the frequent presence of servants (in 161 households); this contrasts with data reported by Halpern for 1863 for central Serbia (1970), where virtually no servants are present.

Kremensk's study deals with a village in the Ljubljana region for the period 1781-1931, focusing on the mobility of the villagers and their occupational structure. He discusses the impact of cloth manufacturing, how it attracted tenants from other areas, and how tenants and workers came to constitute the majority of the population of this outwardly agrarian village in the course of the nineteenth century. He also explores the relationships between marriage patterns and property distribution, and describes the process by which this village became a suburb of Ljubljana, the main city and capital of Slovenia.

As has been indicated, there are many overlaps of interest between American anthropologists and Yugoslav sociologists. There remain, nevertheless, strong bonds, at least potential ones, with the ethnologists. For a combination of historical reasons Yugoslav sociology, which has undergone dramatic growth during the last two decades following liberalized political trends, is very closely related in many ways to American and Western European sociology. Yugoslav sociologists have strong theoretical and methodological interests; many often travel abroad, have had study tours in the
United States, frequently engage in collaborative projects with American colleagues, read English-language publications, and publish in English. With few exceptions none of these characteristics apply to Yugoslav ethnologists (Halpern, forthcoming). It is true that some of the works of American anthropologists can scarcely be distinguished from those of Yugoslav sociologists as in the case of Hammel's monograph on *Occupational Mobility in Belgrade* (1969d); characteristically, this research was undertaken with the cooperation of sociologists in the Institute of Social Sciences in Belgrade. As might be anticipated, the bibliography in Hammel (1969d) contains practically no references to ethnological publications while the more comprehensive bibliography in the second volume (Hammel 1968) is almost entirely concerned with the works of Yugoslav ethnologists. Since ethnology is a scholarly discipline which has existed for over a hundred years, the ethnological literature is voluminous and reference to it is essential when exploring a related topic in a Yugoslav context, especially one that has concern for time depth. On the other hand a sociological type of investigation need refer to only a few contemporary investigations and much more importantly must be concerned with the general literature on theoretical and methodological matters unconnected to specific Balkan interests.

Anglo-American anthropologists have a different type of training than do Yugoslav ethnologists and have different theoretical and ideological foci; still, they share a common emphasis on field
work and direct firsthand contact with the people under study. They also share a degree of common historical development in their respective disciplines. The different emphases of the two disciplines and the lack of direct relationship of the two literatures they produce is common to the work of foreign (mainly American) cultural as well as social anthropologists in Europe. These problems have been commented upon for the East European area generally by Arensberg (1969) and Hofer (1968). Arensberg's article appearing in a survey of East European language and area studies in the United States deals directly with the field work and organizational problems of American anthropologists in Eastern Europe. He summarizes their topical interests in a number of categories (Arensberg 1969:252).

First are the national character studies. Relatively little extensive work has been done in this field. Perhaps the most detailed postwar example is the work of the émigré Croat Tomasic (1948) focusing on Serb-Croat differences. This work must be viewed in a qualified way because of the obvious political inclinations of the author concerning the Serbs.

Hammel's paper titled "The Jewish Mother in Serbia" (not about Jews but about relations between the sexes in Serbian society) can be said to be an approach to certain original objectives of national character studies, even though this particular type of scholarly enterprise is no longer pursued directly. He suggests that the relationship between man and wife is more strongly oriented around their roles as parents than around their roles as spouses. Romantic
love and other indications of the conjugal bond as such are less strongly evident than in America. Men gather by themselves, and women, if time allows, visit other women. He sees the Serbian family as one in which spouses evolve a contractual relationship by which they are able to cooperate in the raising of children. The consumption of food is stressed and it is evident as a bond between the mother and her children and would also seem to be implied as support for the husband. The specific and exclusive manifestations of marital solidarity along sexual lines are at least overtly de-emphasized.

Related to this approach is Simic's "Management of the Male Image in Yugoslavia" (1969), where he compares male roles in Yugoslavia south of the Sava River and in Mexico. He sees the style of male expression as similar in both areas and contends that the problems encountered by some Yugoslav men derive in part from the anxieties created by the culturally approved male image. The concept of machismo is seen as important and reflected in items such as the drama of kafana life with prolonged and boisterous display of bravado. By contrast, "a wife's life centers in the home and family group while her husband is responsible for representation to the outside world" (Simic 1969:91). Significantly both Hammel and Simic use foreign cultures as points of reference, in the former Americans and Jews and in the latter Mexicans. Although comparison of Serbs with Croats or Slovenes has obvious potential political implications, it is clearly more important for an understanding of the dynamics of
Yugoslav society where all the different peoples are increasingly in contact. Erlich in her study of family relationships (1966) omits Slovenia from her analysis and seeks frameworks of comparison in Western Europe and North America.

Thus, although it is easy to fault Tomasic, it must be fairly said that he is confronting an important problem. However, it is true that for American anthropologists working in the Balkans the relevant subculture is not Balkan scholarship but the works of other American anthropologists. A broad general approach by an American social historian with anthropological interests is Stoianovich's Balkan Civilization. He devotes the concluding section in his relatively brief work to "personality and culture," considering topics such as work and leisure, time and space, and "individuality." He concludes, evaluating the difference between communism and the past heritage of capitalism: "It [Communism] looks back to a more distant past and forward to a more distant future. In so doing it may be able to effect a reconciliation between the old values and the new personality and culture, but precisely how remains a question" (1967:197). This viewpoint may also be helpful in understanding some of the present-day emphasis in American anthropological works, especially as considered in this paper.

The second topic cited by Arensberg is "village studies, treating the social organization and its psychological functions for peasant life." In this category would be the community studies of Serbian and Slovenian villages by Halpern (1967c) and Winner (1967).
Halpern's study is descriptive with a strong historical focus, based on data collected in 1953-4, with updating based on a 1966 revisit. It deals with the topics found in many community studies, including historical background, agricultural and life cycles, religion and folk beliefs, role of the government, and contacts of villagers with the larger world.

Winner considers many of the same themes. She conducted her research in 1965-6, and has since presented a number of papers (1966, 1967, 1969) dealing with various aspects of her researches. Although the zadruga was not present in Slovenia in historic times, she indicates (1967) that primogeniture and the stem family did not have as secure a position as norms would indicate. Concerning social status, Winner views the traditional elite historically in terms of the system of land tenure and the role of impartible and single inheritance, patterns which continue to be of importance today. However, there is a new elite that can be defined in terms of certain life-style elements but whose members do not perceive of themselves as a group. The traditional elite has greater prestige, while the new group has but more power. Ties to the land remain strong and so far no young person has willingly relinquished his claim to land inherited upon the death of his parents. Winner's data from Slovenia contrast with the observations of Halpern on a revisit to Serbia in 1966, where a "rural revolution" is seen as occurring, one feature of which is "mass migrations by villagers to towns and cities, where rural-derived values play a significant role
in the shaping of the new urban dimension" (1967c:301). In a survey dealing with agriculture as an occupation in various parts of Yugoslavia he found that "the negative attitudes of villagers toward hard agricultural work and toward their way of life appear to encompass an aversion to farming in general, including the state-supported and mechanized variety" (1967a:369).

Recent work in rural Macedonia has been carried on by Balikci (1965 and ms.) and Rheubottom (1967, 1968, 1969). Both are concerned with the relationship between economic productivity and forms of social organization. Balikci, who did his field work in a village near the Greek border in 1962, sees the major activity of sheep-breeding when combined with a mixed agricultural system as leading necessarily to the emergence of collaborative patterns despite the loosening of kinship ties due to the decay of the zadruge. He cites Campbell's study of Greek shepherds as throwing light on the relations between married women within the same extended family: "brothers would undoubtedly live together all their lives were it not for the quarrels of their wives" (1964:71). He gives considerable attention to quarrels, seeing them as one factor in the subdivision of the extended family in the context of a village society with limited resources. In terms of his conceptual framework he draws on the dyadic contract as presented by Foster and the model of amoral familism as presented by Banfield in his study of an Italian village. In another paper he compares the pre-World War I Turkish agrarian structure with French rural society during the higher Middle Ages as described by
Marc Bloch. Balikci's aim is "to establish relations between different village and state institutions as seen from the village, and this in historical perspective."

Rheubottom examines peasant productive systems in Skopska Crna Gora near Skopje where he did field work in 1966-7. "Stimulated by studies in industrial sociology," he stresses the importance of production and productive activities in peasant households. He explores the division of labor as task organization and the ways in which tasks are linked. This he calls "ethno-management."

Rheubottom sees one of the primary concerns of the household head as keeping task demands and personnel resources in a kind of equilibrium. Task organization and kinship set the basis for conflict within the household, reaching its greatest expression when the household contains two or more established nuclear families (1968). He sees the head of each component nuclear family as being principally concerned with ensuring the long-term viability of the household over which he will eventually preside (1967). There is a close relationship between landholdings, labor, and wealth with large households tending also to be wealthy. Their labor resources thus enable them to engage in activities such as shepherding and viniculture which require intensive labor while only poor or very wealthy households permit one of their sons to work outside for wages.

It is interesting to contrast the village studied by Balikci with the one investigated by Rheubottom. In the former the average household size is 5.7 and in the latter it is 7, with some units
having as many as 20 individuals. Judging by the data available, it would seem that the village Rheubottom studied is more prosperous and less isolated than the one investigated by Balikci but it is hard to make comparisons because each investigation is testing different kinds of theoretical models.

Barić, who has done most of her field work in Croatia, is concerned with attempting to isolate the social variables associated with low productivity and low investment in Yugoslav agriculture. She sees as important the strong recognition of kinship obligations, a large group of effective kin, and a situation where the older generation is left on the farm while members of the younger generation have gone elsewhere. In addition the land is fragmented through inheritance, there is industry located in the vicinity, and a high evaluation is placed on being a worker, giving rise to the category of worker-peasant. These factors all occur in a period of rapid administrative change where flexibility is preferred to constraint. Clearly, where being a full-time peasant restricts mobility in a geographic and social sense it is unlikely that, given a combination of the above conditions, a great deal of private investment for increased production in traditional agriculture will occur (1967).

Yugoslavia is of course an area of considerable socioeconomic and cultural diversity and the conclusions formed by anthropologists studying Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia obviously are in part reflecting the different levels of modernization and industrialization. It would certainly be interesting to see Rheubottom's model
of ethno-management applied to the Slovene village studied by Winner, and Balikci's model of conflict used in a central Serbian village. Baric is much concerned with the impact of industrialization and government planning in the Croatian commune of Klanjec. "I have argued that extra-household kinship is a complex institution with many functions in a planned society, especially one that, like Yugoslavia, is developing rapidly" (1966:308). She sees the kin tie as serving "to underpin the transition from a peasant to a modern society." Baric is also interested in the institutional history of the zadruga and includes an historical appendix to her dissertation (1966), Kinship and Community in Tribal and Feudal Croatia. Here there is a clear overlap of interest with the Soviet scholars Freidenberg and Bromlei (1964).

Jensen (1968) compares the study of a central Serbian village (Halpern 1958) with Sander's study of a Bulgarian village near Sofia (1949) and discusses the change in structure from the zadruga pattern to the stem family. He sees the nature of changes as first in the direction of larger, more democratic households and then to more tightly knit ones. These changing family structures are viewed as adapting to a more sophisticated economic and social environment while retaining enough of their traditional values to provide self-confidence and security for their members. He looks at the weakness of agrarian parties in Balkan politics in retrospect and relates these inadequacies to the nature of the rural cooperatives, drainage commissions, credit schemes, and insurance plans which were the
practical side of peasant politics. He maintains that these were too often aimed at the large household with a manageable surplus and at the peasant with enough leisure to serve on boards and committees. Thus the real benefits were skimmed off at the top and the peasant parties were prevented from putting down strong roots in the village communities.

Mosely, who did his field work in the prewar period, whose academic disciplines are government and history, and who was one of the first two Americans (the other was Sanders) to do social field studies in the Balkans, takes a broad historical view in defining what he takes to be the three principal belts of zadruga society. One is the region including the pre-World War I state of Montenegro and northern Albania where until into this century, he feels tribal society represented one of the most ancient social systems functioning in Europe. A second and larger area extends through the mountain systems of Bosnia, Hercegovina and western Croatia, northern and central Macedonia, and central Albania. Here in this nontribal zone the raising of cattle and sheep together with the general insecurity of life preserved the zadruga into the twentieth century. In the third area of Croatia, Slavonia and pre-World War I Serbia, central Bulgaria, southern Macedonia, and southern Albania he feels that the zadruga tradition had begun to fade by the 1930s. Since this article appeared (1953) almost all of the above-cited studies have been undertaken but to date this broad culture-area typology has not been followed up. Other writings of Mosely, describing the
internal social functioning and reasons for the breakup of the 
zadruga as a kin unit (1940), have been commented on by Balikci, 
Halpern, and others. Many of these studies cited here focus on the 
ways in which households and family units function in specific 
areas, with less attention being paid to the ways in which they 
vary over broad geographic areas. Clearly Mosely and Stoianovich 
as historians have taken a broad view of Yugoslavia and the Balkans 
in general while the anthropologists have been concerned with the 
details of their case studies. However, in Mosely's case he too 
investigated a specific zadruga in Slavonia in 1943. Possibly in the 
future there will be more comparative studies.

In exploring the structure of kin relationships and the nature 
of their artificial extension, important work has been done by 
Filipović. His English-language articles on vicarious paternity 
(1958), symbolic adoption (1965), and ritual kinship (1960) are in 
addition to his numerous descriptive works in Serbo-Croatian. 
Hammel, beginning with his earlier work on Serbo-Croatian kinship 
terminology (1957), has attempted an evaluative synthesis based 
on field work and the existing literature. He concentrates on a 
single institution, kumstvo or godfatherhood, in his book Alternative 
Social Structures and Ritual Relations in the Balkans (1968). 
This monograph is "...an attempt to elucidate the nature of cultural 
and social patterning from the standpoint of a single institution. 
It is at the same time, although imperfectly, a structural, function-
al, cultural and behavioral account." He notes the ways in which
both lexical patterning and grammatical categories reflect certain institutional features. The objectives of the study include a general description of the major features of this institution. He contrasts the official canonical ideology with the folk view of the system and both of these with folk practice, describing the social structure in which they are embedded as necessary background. This includes the nature and developmental cycle of lineage organization, with the extended household and related rights and obligations in property, names, religious obligations, and in exchange of women. He also discusses the structure of the kinship system as reflected in kinship terminology. Initiation, maintenance, and termination of godparenthood relationships and ritual behavior between persons so linked are also dealt with. In his conclusion Hammel stresses the degree of fit between the institution of godparenthood and others in the social system. On a more modest and restricted scale is the article by Simic (1967) on the blood feud in Montenegro in which he attempts to describe this institution "...in terms of the historic, geographic and social background and to suggest the possible functions it may serve to the individual, family and society in general."

Arensberg's third category concerns "the acculturation of village emigrants in the cities; urbanization of peasants and peasantization of cities." Hammel in his chapter "The 'Balkan Peasant'; a View from Serbia" combines the first three categories of Arensberg and also traces the historical origins and development
of kin ties mainly in Montenegro and Serbia from medieval times to the present. His general survey combines ecological, psychological, and historical explanations. He argues for the continuity of kinship relations into the period of industrialization. The viability of the family core is emphasized. Rather than being weakened by the growth of mining and industry in rural areas, Hammel sees it as strengthened, as when employed sons have been able to contribute cash to meet family needs. Family and kin units rather than being destroyed by the upheavals and rapid mobility of industrialization served as "the orienting thread and conduit of mobility." Thus according to Hammel more important than any theoretical or systematic notions of how an industrial society should work is the question of how it must work when people move into a strange cultural environment. There is a need to trust someone to show the way. "Who better," asks Hammel, "than an uncle?" He also notes that these ties can be maintained because the movement has been carried out within a relatively small geographic area. The changes in urban culture are seen as being rapidly transmitted to the village "in knowledge if not in fact" so that modernization and industrialization do not realize their potential to divide the nation. He cites a central dilemma involved in the overt conflict between modernization and a sense of national identity, "...how can one damn the idiocy of rural life when that life is the cradle of national consciousness?" Hammel also cites the conflict between specific ethnic traditions and the idea of a unified nation state: "How can one cherish local
tradition when that tradition has set Serb against Croat, Orthodox against Moslem for centuries?" In examining Hammel's comments with respect to systematic and theoretical notions of how an industrial society should work, set against the ways in which it must work to accommodate people, it is interesting to read his monograph The Pink Yo-Yo; Occupational Mobility in Belgrade (1969) alongside this essay. The interpretative, freewheeling discourse and the structured presentation need not contradict one another but may provide variations on a theme. In any case they represent the strivings of a scholar who realizes he cannot totally stand apart from the phenomena he is describing, despite the aid of sophisticated methodological tools.

In three other articles Hammel has expanded upon his investigations in Belgrade. In one, dealing with economic change, social mobility, and kinship (1969), he suggests the need to distinguish ideology from behavior. That is, what has happened to the kinship system in Serbia within modern Yugoslavia, Hammel feels, has more to do with massive historical changes which are responsible for individual mobility; personal factors, although important, are seen as secondary. Among the workers surveyed, kin were found to be more important than friends with linkages specified largely in agnatic terms. The important family assets remain within the control of men. As Hammel expresses it, "the maps in peoples' heads really are the last thing to go." However, it would seem to this observer that one of the assumptions of the people leading the Yugoslav
revolution was that it was possible to alter the course of history and change cultural values. And at least among some Yugoslavs many changes are attributed to the abilities of Tito, one of the very few World War II leaders still on the world scene. One of the complexities, of course, lies in the fact that in our present state of knowledge it is extremely difficult to differentiate personal factors as such from culturally conditioned roles—or perhaps better put, the degree of influence of the latter on the former.

To some extent Hammel seeks to reconcile conflicting positions in his article on Serbian cousinship (1969), where he makes clear his attempt to demonstrate that explanations of social fact based on structure and those based on sentiment are not mutually exclusive. He depicts cousin relationships as a perpetuation of parental-sibling ties but as being markedly affected by structural factors. "Liking" seems to him to be a matter of loyalty, trust, and obligation strongest along the male lines. Thus, as might be expected, the closest cousin ties are between the sons of brothers, and male relatives outrank female ones on almost every criterion of judgment. One does not "like" women, one depends on them, "as in most patriarchal societies one is in a very real sense ruled by them."

Here he stresses a theme developed in his "Jewish Mother" article.

Finally in the paper "The Ethnographer's Dilemma: Occupational Prestige in Belgrade" (ms.), Hammel makes the very logical point that it is not possible to maximize both ethnographic and comparative understanding at the same time. In this instance he is emphasizing
some of the distinctions which separate the Yugoslav ethnologist from his American and Western Europe cultural and social anthropologist counterpart.

As has been made clear in the present survey, almost all the non-Yugoslav authors referred to have given a high priority to seeking comparative understanding. An instance of this approach in a direct way is Halpern's use not of models derived from the study of other societies to study Yugoslav culture but rather an attempt to relate his experiences in peasant cultures as diverse as those of Laos and Serbia within a single conceptual framework (Halpern 1961a, 1961b).

Hammel contends in the "Ethnographer's Dilemma" that the key is the matter of cognitive orientation. He states that his most accurate characterizations of Serbian society are meaningless to those who have not lived in Serbia, for the simple reason that these observations are best communicated to Serbs by means of the Serbian language (an observation that might be open to some discussion). He contends that the more accurate they are for a given society, the less useful the same observations are in terms of current theory and comparison. These observations are used to introduce a detailed analysis of the ranking of occupational categories in a sample of workers interviewed in his Belgrade study.

In another (possibly only other) comprehensive urban study undertaken by a Western anthropologist, Denitch (1968) uses structured interviews carried out on a sample of 200 people who
migrated after World War II from villages to the town of Titovo Užice in western Serbia. Socially mobile former peasants are viewed as sharing a common social environment in which it is possible to choose from a range of courses of action and "thereby to exercise determination over the conditions of their own lives." She makes an analogy with the childrens' game "Giant Step," where players "must individually work out strategies whereby they can advance their positions within a common framework -- the stratification system."

The analogy is seen as applying best to a period of economic expansion when there is an opportunity for all players to move ahead rather than having to compete for a fixed number of openings. Given Yugoslavia's current economic situation it is possible that if Denitch had been beginning her field work now -- in 1970 -- she might have used a different approach. The choices of options are seen as: leaving the village, finding a job in the city, finding a place to live, deciding upon the extent of one's political activity, the attainment of permanent housing and material goods, and subsequent occupational mobility.

In a paper, "Level of Changes in Yugoslav Kinship," Barić (1967) presents the idea that the extent of communication through kin links brings a wider variety of bilateral kin and affines into day-to-day contact than at the time when the kin unit, work unit, and local community largely coincided. Studying the same problem as does Denitch, but approaching it from a different angle, Barić states that for Croatia "when rural dwellers come to town they usually attempt
to follow up the channel of kin communication in order to obtain lodging and moral and/or material support while in the cities. A number of case studies suggest that in urban areas of Croatia the newly married couple is most likely to live with the parents who have resources available in terms of rooms or wealth." She strongly implies that these may be either husband's or wife's kin, thus differentiating the situation somewhat from that observed by Hammel in Belgrade where he stresses the importance of agnates.

Barić distinguishes between corporate kin units such as those that existed in the village, e.g., the zadruga, and the web of kin which can become more important in the present period of industrialization. Thus kinship can now be considered a special case of expressive relations such as friendship, she maintains, so that where kin structures disintegrate on the one hand, live ties remain powerful on the other. She concludes: "It cannot be said that kinship is, in absolute terms, less important than it was in the days of the operating corporate kin group." It is possible to see some of these studies as complementary. Denitch's focus is on the rural migrants after they have arrived in town, while Barić is concerned with the context of the rural environment from which they come. It would indeed be interesting to see both types of monographic studies for the same cultural area. In a roughly analogous way Halpern's studies of a Serbian rural community give some of the background from which Hammel's urban workers emerged, even though no precise comparisons are possible. Clearly all are seeking similar kinds of
understandings, as evidenced by the large number of parallel conclusions.

In his article "Yugoslav Peasant Society in Transition -- Stability in Change" (1963), Halpern deals with regional cultural variations and the problems involved with the transitional status of the peasant worker. He also stresses some of the same themes later treated by Baric, Denitch, and Hammel, describing how the rural to urban movement is facilitated by kin ties. He develops the idea of reciprocal relationships: the rural parents of the urban student send food to the family providing him housing in town; at the same time the student often returns home in the summer to help with the farm work. Halpern parallels the comments of Hammel in maintaining that "kinship has the potentiality to remain more important in a country like Yugoslavia [since]...most migration to towns takes place within the limits of the republic or general cultural-religious area."

Halpern considers reciprocal influences between village and town, discussing the peasantization of the town in the same context as the urbanization of the village. Through the use of biographies, in a number of articles Halpern (1965, 1967) explores the transition from full involvement in rural life to full commitment to an urban situation as it occurs over the course of several generations. He also looks at the urban situation in historical perspective, exploring briefly the different histories of Zagreb and Belgrade as well as referring to family commercial enterprises which existed in towns.
(1969). In discussing this situation he draws on Stojanovich's "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant" (1960).

In attempting to explore the complexities of modernization Halpern (1969) uses materials from children's primers issued in specific national editions by each republic and for each ethnic group. He also investigates the comparative occupational aspirations of children in different republics as expressed in essays describing their desired future occupations, finding very high aspirations among relatively isolated Montenegrin shepherds who list top professional jobs, as opposed to the more realistic skilled factory jobs aspired to by Slovenian children from a highly industrialized area. Halpern is concerned with the problems facing Yugoslavia in terms of its ethnic diversity being reshaped under the pressures of modernization:

A new settlement of urban workers in Zagreb or Belgrade may have points of differences which reflect the specific qualities of being Croat or Serb, but the conflicts do not appear to be developing over the possibility of having a sense of national identification; rather, conflicts seem to arise in rendering urban living a satisfying experience under conditions of crowding and economic stringency. These are, of course, the problems of our era, and the diversity within the Yugoslav nation presents an intriguing experiment in the possible variety of ways in which they are being worked out.

A small town in Bosnia populated by commuting peasant-workers, artisans, and farmers is the subject of study by Bresloff (1967). He surveys the Turkish past and the Austro-Hungarian period of this Moslem community and considers the types of family units which have evolved in the present period, paying attention also to the position
of women and the status of craftsmen compared to the new group of industrial workers.

Most of these studies concentrate on kin structures and problems of modernization. In contrast, Filipović (1954) describes the background of folk religion among the Orthodox population in eastern Yugoslavia while Obrebski (1969) examines the functional aspects of religion and social structure in a Macedonian village in the 1930s. Interestingly, both of these scholars, now deceased, one Yugoslav and the other Polish, although partly educated with Malinowski in London, are separated from the mainstream of modern Western anthropological endeavors. The Serb ethnologist Vukanović has published a number of interesting descriptive articles on Yugoslav Gypsies, including material on demography, material culture, music, status of women, and ritual (1961, 1962, 1963, 1964). Lopashich (1958) has published a brief article on the small community of Yugoslav Negroes, located on the southern Montenegrin coast near the Albanian border.

The foregoing remarks are not intended to be comprehensive, but rather to present the reader a sampling of the kind of research being done by anthropologists concerned with Yugoslavia. A number of unpublished papers have been cited as well as several doctoral dissertations. This is intentional; given normal conditions it is reasonable to suppose that some of these will reach formal publication status before long. In addition, American doctoral candidates in anthropology are now in the process of completing dissertations on such topics as Montenegrin values and social organization and
Bosnian market patterns. Other investigations are in process and some are still in the planning stage. Further, a number of researchers have considerable amounts of unpublished data. Certainly the Yugoslav part of the Balkan area is destined to become much better known to the English-speaking anthropological world.

Despite this bright aspect of the situation, the Hungarian scholar Hofer, in his "Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages: Comparative Notes on the Professional Personality of Two Disciplines" (1968), and both Arensberg and Maday (1968) have all called attention to some important problems which very much pertain to the work being carried on by foreign scholars in Yugoslavia.

Arensberg suggests the need for some reciprocity, suggesting that provision be made to bring East European scholars to the United States to carry on research with and without the collaboration of American anthropologists. There is also a real problem of communication, since so much of the work of East European ethnologists is published in their own languages, making the results almost inaccessible to the great majority of American anthropologists. But he also mentions lack of interest and communication between American anthropologists and local ethnologists in the countries concerned, even where language is not a barrier. This would also seem to be partly applicable to the Yugoslav situation.

Hofer gets to the heart of the problem when he observes:
An anthropologist may consult books written by European ethnographers only to be disappointed when he finds that most of what the ethnographers have written is irrelevant to his own problems. He may well conclude that ethnographers in Central Europe are underdeveloped anthropologists unable to rid themselves of a narrow-minded 19th-century empiricism and to reach a higher level of generalization and theorization.

This attitude is fully reciprocated: "The case is not better on the other side. In general, the ethnographer can add little to his own knowledge from community studies of Europe done by Americans." Although he might admire what the American has done in his fresh approach, the conclusions drawn by the American on the basis of his restricted data "dash through the layers where the European ethnographer feels that his problems lie." Hofer makes the very useful suggestion that American anthropologists study European ethnologists much as they have elsewhere, studied shamans—as the guardians of traditional knowledge in their own society.

Conversely, his comments on the life-style of the American anthropologist who "is generally unable to invest a lifetime's work in the study of a single European national culture," and who is himself extremely mobile in his job status, in contrast to his European colleague, certainly have significant consequences. He states that ethnologists working within the boundaries of their own nation are well trained in their own national tradition from the point of view of various scholarly disciplines, especially literature and history. This is certainly not true reciprocally to the same extent of their American counterparts, whose knowledge of
their own tradition is apt to be fragmentary. As a visitor to the United States, Hofer observed that in the Smithsonian the collections from all the world's cultures are housed in the Museum of Natural History with the notable exception of the "White Man in America," which is displayed in the Museum of History and Technology.

Certainly the concern with the problems of modernization can be seen as exploring an aspect of how Yugoslavs and Americans are becoming more alike. This is in itself a reversal of the nineteenth century anthropological tradition where diverse customs and origins were emphasized. However, in that context the idea of unilinear evolution was important. If one is conscious of the relationship between scholarship and the social setting in which it exists it would seem reasonable to suppose that, after the decade of the 1960s with its interest in the process of modernization and the ways in which kin structures and values adapt to this process, the coming decade may well see a reversal: that is, an exploration of the ways in which specific national traditions, having failed to melt in the caldron of modernization, assert themselves in new forms. It may thus be possible that as the anthropologists begin to explore more fully the historical roots of national identities, they may well meet the ethnologists seeking a wider perspective on their own origins. Given the vigorous assertion of specific ethnic identities in the United States, American scholars may acquire more perspective on what Hofer calls "the anthropological universal church," and become more interested in "the colorful, rich, intricate fabric of
cultural processes which the ethnographers have explored and described in a language differing from that of the anthropologist."
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