

**University of Massachusetts Amherst**

---

**From the Selected Works of Joel M. Halpern**

---

1972

Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth-century, social and household structure as reflected in the census of 1863

Joel Halpern



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/joel\\_halpern/72/](https://works.bepress.com/joel_halpern/72/)

# Household and Family in Past Time

Edited with an analytic introduction  
on the history of the family  
by Peter Laslett



Cambridge University Press

# Nineteenth-Century Society

## Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data

Edited by E. A. WRIGLEY

*Of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and  
Social Structure*

This collection of nine essays demonstrates the opportunities offered by the accumulation of statistical information for studying nineteenth century society in depth, and discusses the associated difficulties.

The authors emphasize quantitative methods of analysis, and concentrate chiefly on the census. They discuss what information was required on census night, how the information was collected, how accurately and completely population characteristics were recorded, the problems which arise in attempting to use either the published census volumes or the enumerators' books, and the techniques which have proved useful in analysis. Related topics covered include the study of family structure, the use of information about occupation, the measurement of migration, criminal statistics, educational provision, and sampling in historical research.



*A Publication of the Cambridge Group  
for the History of Population and Social Structure*

## Household and family in past time

This volume is the first in a series of papers on the household and family in past time, covering the last three centuries in Europe, Africa, Asia, Japan and colonial North America. It includes materials from Western Europe.

Edited by *John H. Coatsworth*

Cambridge, MA

1977

200 pp.

£12.50

Cambridge Group for the History

of Population and Social Structure

# Household and family in past time

Comparative studies in the size and structure of the domestic group over the last three centuries in England, France, Serbia, Japan and colonial North America, with further materials from Western Europe

*edited, with an analytic introduction on  
the history of the family, by*

**PETER LASLETT**

*with the assistance of*

**RICHARD WALL**

*both of the Cambridge Group for the History  
of Population and Social Structure*

Cambridge  
at the University Press 1972

Published by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press  
Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London NW1 2DB  
American Branch: 32 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.10022

© Cambridge University Press 1972

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number: 77-190420

ISBN: 0 521 08473 3

Printed in Great Britain  
at the University Printing House, Cambridge  
(Brooke Crutchley, University Printer)

This volume is dedicated to the memory of JAMES THORNTON, who died in 1969, Director of the London Branch of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation of Lisbon. The studies at Cambridge which gave rise to these published results for England were first supported by the Foundation when Mr Thornton was its Director. The international interchange at which many of the papers were read in September 1969 also took place under the Foundation's patronage. Mr Thornton showed a remarkable understanding of a new branch of learning in the process of coming into being.

## Contents

List of contributors	page vii
Preface	ix
1 Introduction: The history of the family: Peter Laslett	
I The history of the family	1
II Definitions, methods and scheme of analysis	23
III Numerical comparisons between five areas	45
IV Familial ideology and familial experience	63
Appendix: Suggested rules for interpreting English documents	86
2 Some demographic determinants of average household size: An analytic approach: Thomas K. Burch	91
3 The evolution of the family: Jack Goody	103
ENGLAND	
4 Mean household size in England since the sixteenth century: Peter Laslett	125
5 Mean household size in England from printed sources: Richard Wall	159
6 A note on the household structure of mid-nineteenth-century York in comparative perspective: W. A. Armstrong	205
7 Household structure and the industrial revolution; mid- nineteenth-century Preston in comparative perspective: Michael Anderson	215
WESTERN EUROPE	
8 A southern French village: the inhabitants of Montplaisant in 1644: Jean-Noël Biraben	237
9 Size and structure of households in a northern French village between 1836 and 1861: Yves Blayo	255
10 Household and family in Tuscany in 1427: Christiane Klapisch	267
11 Structure of household and family in Corsica, 1769-71: Jacques Dupâquier and Louis Jadin	283

12	Variations in the size and structure of the household in the United Provinces of the Netherlands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: A. M. van der Woude	page 299
13	Size of households before the industrial revolution: the case of Liège in 1801: Étienne Hélin	319
SERBIA		
14	The zadruga as process: E. A. Hammel	335
15	Houseful and household in an eighteenth-century Balkan city. A tabular analysis of the listing of the Serbian sector of Belgrade in 1733-4: Peter Laslett and Marilyn Clarke	375
16	Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth century, social and household structure as reflected in the census of 1863: Joel M. Halpern	401
JAPAN		
17	Small families, small households, and residential instability: town and city in 'pre-modern' Japan: Robert J. Smith	429
18	Size of household in a Japanese county throughout the Tokugawa era: Akira Hayami and Nobuko Uchida	473
19	An interpretation of the size and structure of the household in Japan over three centuries: Chie Nakane	517
NORTH AMERICA		
20	The average size of families and households in the Province of Massachusetts in 1764 and in the United States in 1790: an overview: Philip J. Greven, Jr	545
21	Demography and psychology in the historical study of family-life: a personal report: John Demos	561
22	Rhode Island family structure: 1875 and 1960: Edward T. Pryor, Jr	571
	Bibliography	590
	Index	611

## Contributors

---

Anderson, Michael	Lecturer in Sociology, University of Edinburgh
Armstrong, W. A.	Senior Lecturer in History, University of Kent, Canterbury
Biraben, Jean-Noël	Chargé de Missions, Institut National D'Études Démographiques, Paris
Blayo, Yves	Chargé de Recherches, Institut National D'Études Démographiques, Paris
Burch, Thomas K.	Associate Director, Demographic Division, the Population Council, New York
Clarke, Marilyn	Research Assistant, Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure
Demos, John	Associate Professor of History, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, U.S.A.
Dupâquier, Jacques	Directeur D'Études, École Pratique des Hautes Études, VI <sup>e</sup> Section, Paris
Goody, Jack	Professor-elect to the William Wyse Chair in Social Anthropology and Fellow of St John's College, University of Cambridge
Greven, Philip J. Jr	Professor of History, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Halpern, Joel, M.	Professor of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, U.S.A.
Hammel, E. A.	Professor of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A.
Hayami, Akira	Professor of Economic History, Keio University, Tokyo, Japan
Hélin, Étienne	Professor of History, University of Liège, Belgium
Jadin, Louis	Research Assistant, École Pratique des Hautes Études, VI <sup>e</sup> Section, Paris
Klapisch, Christiane	Maître Assistant, École Pratique des Hautes Études, VI <sup>e</sup> Section, Paris
Laslett, Peter	Reader in Politics and the History of Social Structure and Fellow of Trinity College, University of Cambridge
Nakane, Chie	Professor of Anthropology, Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, Japan

viii *Contributors*

- Pryor, Edward T. Jr Chairman and Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada
- Smith, Robert J. Professor of Anthropology and Asian Studies, Vice-Chairman, Department of Anthropology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
- Uchida, Nobuko Research Assistant, Faculty of Economics, Keio University, Tokyo, Japan
- Wall, Richard Research Officer, Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure
- van der Woude, A. M. Senior Lecturer, Department of Rural History, Agricultural University, Wageningen, The Netherlands



## 16. Town and countryside in Serbia in the nineteenth-century, social and household structure as reflected in the census of 1863<sup>1</sup>

---

Joel M. Halpern

Balkan familial and household structure has been the subject of discussion and study for over a century, but not much attention has been paid to the specifics of size and kinship composition. If we give as a brief tentative definition of the *zadruga* an extended household composed of a father and his married sons and their offspring (paternal *zadruga*), or two or more married brothers and their children (fraternal *zadruga*), how many people in a given community actually lived in these types of households? What about the size of the households themselves? Much of the literature with respect to the *zadruga* seems to dwell on the exceptional case which is then described in detail. Such an approach, however, does not help us understand the conditions under which the majority of the people lived. In this chapter an attempt will be made to establish in a preliminary way specific data bearing on household size and composition as it existed in the nineteenth century in certain villages in central Šumadija in Serbia (Orašac, Banja, Bukovik, Kopljare, Stojnik and Topola) and one emergent market town (Arandjelovac).

A glance at Tables 16.1a-h establishes that with the notable exception of the market town the large majority of households contain six or more people according to the 1863 Census.<sup>2</sup> Arandjelovac has approximately 20% of its people listed as living alone (see below, Table 16.1a), although this may be in part an artifact of the Census since many of these were probably boarders in other

<sup>1</sup> The research on which this paper is based was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Mental Health. Appreciation is also acknowledged for assistance provided by the Archives of the Republic of Serbia, permitting access to census records, to personnel at the Serbian Archives who aided in the transcription of data, and to the University of Massachusetts Faculty Research Committee. A related paper, drawing exclusively on Orašac, one of the villages cited here, is Halpern, *The zadruga, a century of change* (1970).

<sup>2</sup> Despite the differences in the structure of households, it is noticeable that in the towns of Western Europe smaller households occurred more frequently than in the surrounding countryside. See above, van der Woude, Chapter 12, pp. 308-309; Hélin, Chapter 13, pp. 332-333. Compare the survey by Klapisch of fifteenth-century Tuscany, see above, Chapter 10, p. 275.

households. Still, it is clear that these merchants and craftsmen were either young men beginning their careers or older men temporarily or permanently detached from their families. From what we know of contemporary rural-urban kin relationships in Serbia it is reasonable to suppose that many of these single people were migrants from surrounding villages, and they probably returned to their home villages fairly regularly. It would seem highly unlikely that they were without important kin ties in the surrounding area. It is also probable that few if any of these single individuals were born in the town. Of course, the whole idea of town or urban center must be used in a very restricted occupational sense, since we are here talking about a settlement of only 566 people.

If we use as our focus of interest the population at large rather than the household structure as such, we can see clearly that again, with the striking exception of Arandjelovac, the majority of the population lived in households size 6 or over, ranging from as high as 89 % in the case of Orašac, to a minimum of 69 % in Bukovik (the settlement adjoining Arandjelovac, and also containing commercial establishments).

If we compare the 1863 data with information available for the same villages for 1890 (Table 16.2) we see that with the exception of the town there have been no dramatic changes. The major change in Arandjelovac is the very sharp decline in households of size 1. This may be in part a characteristic of the way in which the 1863 Census was carried out, or it may be explained by the growth of Arandjelovac as a trading center, so that by 1890 the merchants and craftsmen were more established with families. It is also possible that the decline in single person households in Banja, Bukovik and Stojnik may be explained by the greater accuracy of the later Census. Most important, however, is that the predominance of size 6-10 households continues to include approximately half the number of households and more than half the population in most cases. It also seems significant that, with the exception of Stojnik and Banja and the special case of Arandjelovac, the other villages in this survey show some decline in the relative proportions of households of size 11 and over. This is balanced by some increase in the size 4-5 category in most cases. Broadly viewed when compared to changes which were to occur in the twentieth century, the nineteenth century seems to have been a period of relative stability in household size. If we take all data into account, however, there does seem to have been a steady decline in average household size. In Orašac, for example, there was a decline of 1.4, from a high of 8.3 in 1844 (the first records) to 6.9 in 1890. (In the much shorter period 1910-58, the decline was 2.1, from 6.6 to 4.5.)

However, once we get outside the Serbian culture area a different situation seems to prevail. In considering the case of village areas of the Republic of Dubrovnik for the end of the seventeenth century the differences are dramatic, with only approximately half of the population living in size 6 and larger households (Table 16.3). Interestingly, figures from Dubrovnik are slightly lower than

those for the English village of Ealing at the end of the sixteenth century but much closer to the English than the Serbian situation.<sup>3</sup>

This point is further emphasized when compared to other European data. In Belgrade in 1733 80 % of all persons were living in housefuls<sup>4</sup> of 6 and above, but this figure is rivalled by three of the villages in our sample (Banja 79 %, Kopljare 83 % and Orašac 89 %; these are all households, not housefuls), as Tables 16.1a-h show. The mean size for the Serbian villages, taking the household as point of reference, range from 5.5 for Bukovik to 8.3 for Orašac, with the Belgrade data falling within this range. It is too early in this type of research to say that the Serbian data is unique, but from a European point of view it does contrast noticeably with the data from England.<sup>5</sup>

It is possible to set some limits on the frequency of large-size households in nineteenth-century Serbia. The evidence is clear from Tables 16.1a-h that households of size 20 and over were rare. Specifically, they occur in only two of the villages, and there is one case from Belgrade. What do some of these large households look like in terms of kin structure? We can take as an example the 22-member Janko Nedić zadruga of Orašac. Here there is a combination of paternal and fraternal zadruga structure. Unfortunately since all kin are listed in relationship to the head of household we cannot determine the precise pairing of sons with wives and children. Generally, specific daughters-in-law can be linked to sons by age similarities. A further confusion is that although there are Slav words for daughter-in-law (*nevjesta* or *mlada*, for example), the Serbo-Croatian term *snaha* means both daughter-in-law and sister-in-law, thereby combining them in one category, but daughters-in-law are generally listed first, matching the preferential listing given sons over brothers.

Much more common are the households with 10 or more members, i.e. those of approximately half the size of the Nedić household. In Orašac almost half of all households were of size 10 or over (48 %), and of these the most numerous were those of sizes 10 and 12. Tables 16.1a-h show that there were only one or two households in each category above size 13, representing in most cases no more than one or two percent of the total population in each category. Further, if we consider size 13 and over as a percent of the total population, only 9 % in Bukovik, 17 % in Kopljare and 19 % in Orašac belonged to such households. Although these figures are not insignificant as compared with pre-industrial England for example, where only 1 % of persons lived in such domestic groups, it is clear that most people in these Serbian villages of the 1860s spent at least part of their lives in smaller-size households.

Further examples from Orašac in 1863 of a size 10, a size 8 and a size 6 house-

<sup>3</sup> For Ealing see above, Laslett, Chapter 1, Table 1.7, p. 77.

<sup>4</sup> See above Laslett and Clarke, Chapter 15. The authors distinguish between a *household* which is a kinship-family unit and the *houseful* which includes all the inhabitants of a particular house, including lodgers. For an exact definition of these terms see above, Laslett, Chapter 1, pp. 34-40. See also Hammel, Chapter 14, p. 339, footnote 13.

<sup>5</sup> See above, Laslett, Chapter 4, pp. 130-131, 135-143; Wall, Chapter 5, pp. 174-190.

hold give us a better idea of the kinds of family structure within which most people passed their lives. In Orašac approximately 52% of the population is found in size 6 to 10 households inclusive, and for all settlements the percentage is about 50. The size 10 household of Milosav Nedić may be taken as an illustration: it had two married brothers, aged thirty and twenty-seven, with their wives, one and two years younger respectively. The head of the household had 3 small daughters. Three nieces were also listed, aged fifteen, twelve and seven, though only one of these could have been the child of the younger brother, given the customary age at marriage; they were more likely to have been the orphans of an older deceased brother.<sup>6</sup>

The issue of the adoption of a deceased brother's children and his wife is not without interest in connection with this particular household in Orašac in 1863, since the death of parents in the primary family formation years of twenty-one to forty was much greater in the nineteenth century than it is today. The relative proportion of all deaths in this age group for the period 1881–2 was 15%, while in 1951–2 it was only 3.8%.<sup>7</sup> Although scattered death records for Orašac do exist for the 1860s their incompleteness makes comparison with later years unsatisfactory, but it is reasonable to assume that if the comparison were made for the 1860s and the 1960s the contrast would be even greater.

Unlike the size 22 household, which has a maximal combination of married brothers with their children, plus the married sons of the oldest brother and their offspring, the 10-member household of Milosav Nedić was a *zadruga* of brothers in the process of formation. Obviously at ages thirty and twenty-seven neither brother was likely to have completed the formation of a family in terms of the number of children each young wife might bear.

A size 8 household in Orašac headed by Milan Jovanović, fifty, with a forty-year-old wife and two married sons, aged twenty-five and twenty-three respectively, the two daughters-in-law and two children, gives an example of a paternal *zadruga* in the process of formation; the daughters-in-law are in an even earlier stage of producing children than are the young couples in the household previously cited. We may finally look at a household of 6 headed by Nikola Pavlović, forty, which included his forty-year-old wife and their 4 children ranging in age from twelve to three. Here the head of the household either had no brother or did not have one he chose to remain with in a *zadruga*. At the same time, his eldest child had not reached marriageable age.

In households of size 6 and below, the classic nuclear family is most frequent, comprising about a third (31%) of all households. However, if the nuclear family

<sup>6</sup> It is not difficult to imagine the problems eventually faced by this randomly selected household, with six young girls to marry off in the overwhelmingly patriarchal and patrilocal village society of that time. The total holdings of the household were 10 hectares, roughly the same amount as the previously cited *zadruga* of 22 persons. Therefore it would be reasonable to suppose that this size holding did attract at least one in-marriageable male.

<sup>7</sup> Halpern, *Social and cultural change* (1956) Table 13: 121, based on the records of the Orašac Village Council.

is taken as a unit, its formation is not necessarily a simple matter to analyse. For example, in the case of Stevan Lukić, thirty, his wife, twenty-two, his son, two, and daughter, five, judging by the difference in age of husband and wife and by the age of the daughter, there is a possibility that the daughter was borne by a former wife, possibly one who had died in childbirth. We also find a case where a boy of seventeen is listed as the household head living with his brothers aged thirteen, eleven and nine. It is possible that this group occupied a separate house, but received help from neighboring kin.<sup>8</sup> Certainly if there had been fewer brothers, or if they had had more land than the 2.3 hectares due them, they might have been brought up in a paternal uncle's household, if such existed. There were also small nuclear families in Orašac just beginning to make their way, as in the case of Srećko Rajčić, twenty-two, his wife Andjelija twenty-five, and their infant son.

Household size as evidenced by these examples is, of course, something that exists only at one point in time. It is constantly changing, through the birth of new members or the death of the old and also of the young. It is further affected by influences connected with economy of size, by personality conflict and by various other factors such as government or tax regulations, which might cause brothers and their families to split off from each other, or sons to separate from fathers. Although households go through cycles as their members mature, if the sample is large enough, as in a village of a hundred or more households, it is reasonable to find households in various stages of formation as we have seen above.<sup>9</sup>

The obvious economic influence affecting household stability was the size of the land holding. With a large labor force it was possible for the *zadruga* to save money and purchase land, so that to some extent in the relatively egalitarian peasant economy, a large unit could prosper if well organized, even if it had started out with a small initial holding. In 1863 holdings ranged from a little over one hectare to as much as 14 hectares, but generally there was a fair correlation between the size of the holding and the size of the household. A family of 15 lived on the largest holding in 1863, while the largest household of 22 members had about 11 hectares. Of course, the important variable here was the number of able-bodied males rather than the total number of people in the household.

These statistics seem to me to show that the right combination of several married males together in one household, each with a relatively complete nuclear family, occurred in only a minority of cases.

<sup>8</sup> Compare Dupâquier's statements about households of orphaned children remaining as independent units in Corsica in the 1770s, above, Chapter 11, pp. 292, 294. In England such children would usually be taken in by relatives, possibly with some help from the parish; see above, Anderson, Chapter 7, pp. 227–228.

<sup>9</sup> For an example of the evolution of an individual through eight household formations in the course of seventy years, see Joel and Barbara Halpern, *A Serbian village in historical perspective* (1972). See also above, Hammel, Chapter 14, pp. 370–373.

Tables 16.4a-f analyze the distribution of children in Arandjelovac and five of the villages. If children are defined as those eighteen years of age and under, between 60 % and 71 % were children of the head of the household, and 4 % to 15 % were his grandchildren. Offspring of other household members, primarily brothers of the household head, amounted to 20 % to 29 %. This contrasts with Ealing where 89 % of the children were children of the household head.<sup>10</sup> Despite the relatively large number of grandchildren and nieces and nephews, the nuclear family was the basic structural component of the extended family household structure in Serbia.

This is further amplified by Tables 16.5a-p where breakdowns are given according to selected kin categories. Characteristic of the most important kin links tying together the Serbian extended family structure in the nineteenth century was the relationship of the head of the household to one or more sons. If we compare Tables 16.5a and 16.5b and 16.5e and 16.5f, we see that the number of sons exceeds the number of household heads in every village. The number of daughters also exceeds the number of household heads, though not by such a wide margin. For the five villages we get a ratio of 1.5 sons for every household head,<sup>11</sup> and if daughters are included the ratio rises to 2.6. On this basis, taking households headed by married persons only, including heads' wives but excluding other relatives, we get a mean household size of 4.6. Since the mean size of the household for all villages is 6.7, approximately 70 % of household composition can be attributed to nuclear family relationships. Put another way, using Orašac as an example, in 1863 out of 1,082 inhabitants, 703 were either household head, wife, son or daughter (calculating relationships with respect to the household head). Married coresident sons have been included in the nuclear families of their fathers. (Arandjelovac is excluded from the above calculations and those that follow.)

We can also take as a point of departure the population of children (under eighteen and unmarried). Tables 16.4a-f demonstrate that children composed from 52 % to 58 % of the population in the Serbian villages of 1863, whereas in Arandjelovac in that year, Belgrade in 1733<sup>12</sup> and Ealing in 1599<sup>13</sup> children were approximately one-third (31 % to 37 %) of the total population. As we have seen, about two-thirds of the children were the offspring of the head of the household, and between one-fifth and a quarter were the offspring of brothers of the household head, with the remaining numbers (reaching as high as 15 % in Orašac) constituting grandchildren of the household head. It should be noted that there are very few four-generation households. These data reaffirm again the importance of the nuclear family core within the extended family household.

<sup>10</sup> Taken from the files of the Cambridge Group. It must be remembered, however, that these figures are for all children (all children present in the households), not simply those under eighteen.

<sup>11</sup> Compare Hammel's analysis of the Serbian Census of 1528, above, Chapter 14, pp. 361-362.

<sup>12</sup> See above, Laslett and Clarke, Chapter 15, pp. 379-380, 385.

<sup>13</sup> Taken from the files of the Cambridge Group.

It may be noticed, however, that the head of the household and his wife were not necessarily a part of this nuclear core. This would seem to be true in about a quarter of the households, when the eldest son had reached an age to found his own family. This occurred generally when the household head and his wife were in their forties (see Tables 16.5a-d).

A good way to follow the cycle of extended household formation, reformulation and division is to focus on nuclear family formation within the extended kin unit. As a son married and produced children, so the date of death of the parents approached. In the circumstances of 1863 in Serbia, the major factor affecting change was the death of the father, although division occasionally occurred before his death. Viewed from another perspective, if there were two married brothers together in a *zadruga*, they were most likely to divide as their children matured. We can see this by contrasting the age of brothers (Table 16.5j) and of household heads (Table 16.5b); about a quarter of the household heads were over forty but only some 5 % of the brothers were in this category.

If we take households of size 10 and above, we can see that the son ratio rises to 2.5, and the overall ratio of siblings to the household head rises to 4.3. It can simply be stated that households were large in part because of the number of children of the household head. However, these figures and those cited in the preceding paragraphs take no account of the matter of married sons. The relatively larger proportion of mature sons in households of size 10 and above is reflected in the fact that most daughters-in-law are in the larger households (from one-third to three-quarters; see Tables 16.5o and 16.5p). If the small sample of six in Bukovik is disregarded because of the small percentage of sons in the over-twenty age group, then we see that the lowest percentage is 52 %.<sup>14</sup>

Viewed in terms of one specific village, Orašac, 32 % of the households are in the 10-plus category (Table 16.1e), but these households contain 40 % of the sons (Table 16.5e), 60 % of the daughters-in-law (Table 16.5o), 37 % of the daughters (Table 16.5g), 59 % of the brothers (Table 16.5i), 93 % of the nephews (Table 16.5m), and 80 % of the grandsons (Table 16.5k). However, in terms of total population households of over 10 persons contain only 49 % of the population.

If what might be called the key non-nuclear family kin are taken into account, that is daughters-in-law and grandsons, we can see that for Topola and Banja, where 30 % and 37 % of the population are in households of size 10 and above, 52 % and 73 % of the daughters-in-law and 63 % and 54 % of the grandsons are in this category. In these same villages 46 % of the Topola population lives in size 1-7 households and 44 % in Banja. Households of these sizes include, respectively, 47 % and 42 % of the sons, 22 % and 10 % of the daughters-in-law, and 8 % and 15 % of the grandsons. In the case of nephews the percentages for these categories are 13 % and 15 %.

<sup>14</sup> Bukovik seems to share a number of characteristics with Arandjelovac, including small average household size and younger age of household head (see Table 16.5b).

This preliminary analysis does not attempt any comprehensive survey of the social structure of households in nineteenth-century rural Serbia. What it seeks to emphasize is that the complex kin relationships which characterized the *zadruga* were ordinarily participated in at any one time by less than half of the population.

This statement applies not only to non-nuclear kin relationships, such as grandparent-grandchild, father-in-law-daughter-in-law and uncle-nephew, but partly also to those occasioned by multiple siblings, e.g. older brother-younger brother, older sister-younger brother. Much has been written elsewhere about the relationship between a daughter-in-law and a mother-in-law and between daughters-in-law in the same household. Obviously these are the people experiencing the full pattern of kin relationships occurring when the family cycle follows the classic pattern. But what of those families where there was only one son or where parents or siblings died young? What of the household whose limited land holding could support only a restricted number of members? Are these cases not as important as the 'ideal' ones, which can have been experienced by only a minority?

The fraternal and paternal *zadrugas* or combinations of these have attracted the interest of scholars. Investigations indicate that villagers of high status tended to come from larger, more complex households, which were in a better position to enlarge their holding precisely because of their superior manpower. During the nineteenth century, as the land began to fill up in central Serbia, economic and social competition intensified in the villages, since there was no large-scale outlet through emigration to towns. The ideal of several married sons joining together with their father or, after his death, several brothers and their families continuing to live in a joint household, persisted in a remarkable way. But we may well ask whether the significant proportion of people who lived in nuclear households (one-third) and households of size 5 and under (approximately a half) were in a generally deprived state? The question can be asked with respect to their standard of living, and with regard to their experiencing an emotional environment similar to that of the larger households. Given the realities of the family cycle, many individuals in the course of their lifetimes probably lived in both nuclear and extended family environments.

Scholars concerned with social structure have tended to concentrate on the fully complex, ideal patterns and neglected the smaller nuclear and fragmented households. We will not achieve a full picture of social life in the nineteenth-century Serbian household unless we look at the smaller households as intensively as we have looked at the larger ones.

## Appendix<sup>a</sup>

Tables 16.1 to 16.3 *Detailed size of households, 1863 by settlements<sup>b</sup>*

Two measures each for *mean* and *median* size of household, are used. The first (A) states that on the average the household has X people according to the formula

$$\epsilon \frac{\text{si} \times \text{hsi}}{\text{no. of households}}$$

that is, the size of the household(s) times the number of households in that size category (i), indicating all the different categories taken sequentially, and  $\epsilon$  representing their sum total, e.g. for Arandjelovac (see Table 16.1a)

$$\frac{1 \times 94 + 2 \times 27 + 3 \times 39 \dots}{221}$$

The second measure (B) indicates that on the average an individual lives in a household with X people according to the formula

$$\epsilon \frac{\text{si} \times \text{psi}}{\text{no. of people in village}}$$

e.g. the sum total of the size of the household times the number of people in that size category: for Arandjelovac this would be represented by

$$\frac{1 \times 94 + 2 \times 54 + 3 \times 117 \dots}{566}$$

The second measure is higher because it takes the individual rather than the household as the point of departure, and this is reflected in the mean as well.

Table 16.1a *Arandjelovac*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	94	42.53	94	16.60
2	27	12.21	54	9.54
3	39	17.64	117	20.67
4	29	13.12	116	20.49
5	20	9.04	100	17.66
6	6	2.71	36	6.36
7	3	1.35	21	3.71
8	1	0.45	8	1.41
9	—	—	—	—
10	2	0.90	20	3.53
Total	221	100	566	100

  

Mean size of household	Median no. of persons
A = 2.6	A = 2
B = 3.8	B = 4

<sup>a</sup> The structure of Tables 16.1 to 16.4 follows that established by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure.

<sup>b</sup> Arandjelovac, Banja, Bukovik, Kopljare, Orašac, Stojnik, and Topola (plus comparative data from Dubrovnik, 1673-4).

Table 16.1b *Banja*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	24	12.79	24	2.07
2	11	5.94	22	1.89
3	19	10.27	57	4.91
4	11	5.94	44	3.79
5	17	9.18	85	7.33
6	20	10.81	120	10.35
7	22	11.89	154	13.28
8	15	8.10	120	10.35
9	12	6.49	108	9.31
10	12	6.49	120	10.35
11	4	2.16	44	3.79
12	6	3.24	72	6.21
13	3	1.62	39	3.36
14	2	1.08	28	2.41
15	1	0.54	15	1.29
16	—	—	—	—
17	3	1.62	51	4.40
18	1	0.54	18	1.55
19	2	1.08	38	3.27
Total	185	100	1,159	100

Mean size of household

A = 6.3  
B = 8.8

Median no. of persons

A = 6  
B = 8Table 16.1c *Bukovik*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	11	10.28	12	2.03
2	8	7.47	16	2.71
3	10	9.34	30	5.09
4	13	12.14	52	8.82
5	14	13.08	70	11.88
6	21	19.62	126	21.39
7	10	9.34	70	11.88
8	3	2.80	24	4.07
9	3	2.80	27	4.58
10	4	3.73	40	6.79
11	5	4.67	55	9.33
12	1	0.93	12	2.03
13	2	1.89	26	4.41
14	1	0.93	14	2.37
15	1	0.93	15	2.54
Total	107	100	589	100

Mean size of household

A = 5.5  
B = 7.4

Median no. of persons

A = 5  
B = 6

Table 16.1d *Kopljare*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	3	3.33	3	0.45
2	3	3.33	6	0.90
3	3	3.33	9	1.35
4	10	11.11	40	6.00
5	10	11.11	50	7.50
6	9	10.00	54	8.10
7	12	13.33	84	12.60
8	13	14.44	104	15.60
9	4	4.44	36	5.40
10	6	6.66	60	9.00
11	3	3.33	33	4.32
12	6	6.66	72	10.80
13	3	3.33	39	5.80
14	2	2.22	28	4.16
15	—	—	—	—
16	1	1.11	16	2.38
17	—	—	—	—
18	1	1.11	18	2.67
19	—	—	—	—
20	1	1.11	20	2.97
Total	90	100	672	100

Mean size of household

A = 7.5  
B = 9.3

Median no. of persons

A = 7  
B = 8Table 16.1e *Orašac*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	1	0.76	1	0.09
2	2	1.52	4	0.36
3	5	3.81	15	1.38
4	10	7.63	40	3.69
5	12	9.16	60	5.54
6	15	11.45	90	8.31
7	18	13.74	126	11.64
8	17	12.97	136	12.56
9	9	6.87	81	7.48
10	13	9.92	130	12.01
11	3	2.29	33	3.04
12	13	9.92	156	14.41
13	4	3.04	52	4.86
14	2	1.52	28	2.58
15	2	1.52	30	2.77
16	—	—	—	—
17	—	—	—	—
18	2	1.52	36	3.32
19	1	0.76	19	1.75
20	—	—	—	—
21	—	—	—	—
22	1	0.76	22	2.03
23	1	0.76	23	2.12
Total	131	100	1,082	100

Mean size of household

A = 8.3  
B = 10.0

Median no. of persons

A = 8  
B = 9

Table 16.1f *Stojnik*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	14	8.38	14	1.39
2	11	6.59	22	2.18
3	11	6.59	33	3.28
4	20	11.98	80	7.96
5	25	14.97	125	12.43
6	28	16.77	168	16.71
7	15	8.98	105	10.44
8	12	7.19	96	9.55
9	8	4.79	72	7.16
10	5	2.99	50	4.97
11	6	3.59	66	6.56
12	3	1.80	36	3.58
13	2	1.20	26	2.58
14	2	1.20	28	2.78
15	—	—	—	—
16	2	1.20	32	3.18
17	2	1.20	34	3.83
18	1	0.60	18	1.79
Total	167	100	1,005	100

Mean size of household

A = 6.0

B = 8.0

Median no. of persons

A = 6

B = 7

Table 16.1g *Topola*

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	11	4.40	11	0.68
2	21	8.40	42	2.61
3	13	5.20	39	2.42
4	28	11.20	112	6.96
5	29	11.60	145	9.01
6	32	12.80	193	11.99
7	29	11.60	203	12.61
8	28	11.20	224	13.92
9	18	7.20	162	10.06
10	15	6.00	148	9.19
11	8	3.20	88	5.46
12	6	2.40	72	4.47
13	7	2.80	91	5.73
14	1	0.40	14	0.87
15	2	0.80	30	1.86
16	—	—	—	—
17	1	0.40	17	1.05
18	1	0.40	18	1.11
Total	250	100	1,609	100

Mean size of household

A = 6.4

B = 8.0

Median no. of persons

A = 6

B = 8



Table 16.1h Detailed size of households, all settlements

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	158	13.78	158	2.37
2	83	7.24	166	2.49
3	100	8.72	300	4.51
4	121	10.55	484	7.27
5	127	11.08	635	9.54
6	131	11.43	786	11.81
7	109	9.51	763	11.47
8	89	7.76	712	10.70
9	54	4.71	486	7.30
10	57	4.97	570	8.57
11	29	2.53	319	4.79
12	35	3.05	420	6.31
13	21	1.83	273	4.10
14	10	0.87	140	2.10
15	6	0.52	90	1.35
16	1	0.08	16	0.24
17	6	0.52	102	1.56
18	6	0.52	108	1.62
19	3	0.26	57	0.85
20	1	0.08	20	0.30
21	—	—	—	—
22	1	0.08	22	0.33
23	1	0.08	23	0.34
Total	1,149	100	6,650	100

Mean size of household

A = 5.8  
B = 8.3

Median no. of persons

A = 5  
B = 8Table 16.2 Household size in all settlements, by percentages in each category, 1863 and 1890, compared<sup>a</sup>

Settlement	Year	Size						No. of households
		1	2-3	4-5	6-10	11-15	16+	
Arandjelovac	1863	42.5	29.9	22.2	5.4	—	—	221
	1890	8.3	27.7	34.5	26.6	2.6	0.3	383
Banja	1863	12.8	16.2	15.1	43.8	8.6	3.2	185
	1890	1.1	6.5	22.9	52.7	13.7	2.7	262
Bukovik	1863	10.3	16.8	25.2	38.3	9.3	—	107
	1890	3.1	16.2	33.0	43.0	2.6	2.1	191
Kopljare	1863	3.3	6.7	22.2	48.9	15.5	3.3	90
	1890	3.2	14.1	23.7	48.1	7.7	3.2	156
Orašac	1863	0.8	5.3	16.8	55.0	18.3	3.8	131
	1890	0.5	13.1	24.8	47.6	12.6	1.4	214
Stojnik	1863	8.4	13.2	27.0	40.7	7.8	3.0	167
	1890	1.1	11.3	26.7	47.4	10.1	3.4	266
Topola	1863	4.4	13.6	22.8	48.8	9.6	0.8	250
	1890	2.5	17.9	27.6	45.8	5.5	0.5	435

<sup>a</sup> Based on *Population Census of the Kingdom of Serbia 1890* (1892) 1: 246, quoted in Halpern (1956) Table 47: 285.Table 16.3 Republic of Dubrovnik, 1673-4<sup>a</sup>

Size	Households		Persons	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	151	3.8	151	0.8
2	462	11.7	924	4.8
3	671	16.9	2,013	10.5
4	758	19.1	3,032	15.7
5	753	19.0	3,765	19.5
6	468	11.8	2,808	14.6
7	299	7.5	2,093	10.9
8	181	4.6	1,448	7.5
9	85	2.1	765	4.0
10	75	1.9	750	3.9
Over 10	62	1.6	1,523	7.9
Total	3,965	100	19,272	100

Mean household size = 5.0.

<sup>a</sup> Sundrica (1959).

Mean size of household

A —  
B —

Median no. of persons

A = 4  
B = 5

Tables 16.4a-f Children by kin relationship, sex, and as a proportion of the population, 1863, by settlements

Table 16.4a Arandjelovac

Kin relationship	Children <sup>a</sup>			
	Male	Female	Total	%
Child of head	97	92	189	91.3
Grandchild of head	3	0	3	1.44
Child of other household member <sup>b</sup>	7	8	15	7.24
Total	107	100	207	100

  

	No.	%
Children	207	37.0
Total population	566	100

<sup>a</sup> Children are defined here as eighteen years or younger and unmarried.<sup>b</sup> Primarily children of brother of household head.

Table 16.4b Banja

Kin relationship	Children			
	Male	Female	Total	%
Child of head	179	184	363	60.09
Grandchild of head	41	38	79	13.07
Child of other household member	85	77	162	26.82
Total	305	299	604	100

  

	No.	%
Children	604	52
Total population	1,159	100

Table 16.4c Bukovik

Kin relationship	Children			
	Male	Female	Total	%
Child of head	113	108	221	66.96
Grandchild of head	7	6	13	3.93
Child of other household member	55	41	96	29.09
Total	175	155	330	100

  

	No.	%
Children	339	56
Total population	589	100

Table 16.4d Kopljare

Kin relationship	Children			
	Male	Female	Total	%
Child of head	134	124	258	67.01
Grandchild of head	13	9	22	5.71
Child of other household member	49	56	105	27.27
Total	196	189	385	100

  

	No.	%
Children	385	56
Total population	683	100

Table 16.4e Orašac

Kin relationship	Children			
	Male	Female	Total	%
Child of head	196	199	395	63.40
Grandchild of head	56	39	95	15.24
Child of other household member	63	70	133	21.34
Total	315	308	623	100

  

	No.	%
Children	623	58
Total population	1,082	100

Table 16.4f Topola

Kin relationship	Children			
	Male	Female	Total	%
Child of head	329	304	633	71.2
Grandchild of head	38	38	76	8.54
Child of other household member	100	80	180	20.24
Total	467	422	889	100

  

	No.	%
Children	889	55
Total population	1,609	100

Tables 16.5a-p *Structure of households, by selected kin categories, 1863, by settlements<sup>a</sup>*

A = Arandjelovac; T = Topola; Ba = Banja; Bu = Bukovik; O = Orašac; K = Kopljare.

Table 16.5a *Percentage of heads of households, by household size*

Household size	A n = 221	T n = 250	Ba n = 185	Bu n = 107	O n = 131	K n = 90
1	42.5	4.4	13.0	10.3	0.8	3.3
2	12.2	8.4	5.9	7.5	1.5	3.3
3	17.6	5.2	10.3	9.3	3.8	3.3
4	13.1	11.2	5.9	12.1	7.6	11.1
5	9.0	11.6	9.2	13.1	9.2	11.1
6	2.7	12.8	10.8	19.6	11.5	10.0
7	1.4	11.6	11.9	9.3	13.7	13.3
8	0.5	11.2	8.1	2.8	13.0	14.4
9	—	7.2	6.5	2.8	6.9	4.4
10 & +	0.9	16.4	18.4	13.1	32.1	25.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

<sup>a</sup> This series is arranged in the order of kin categories used in the 1863 Serbian Census.Table 16.5b *Percentage of heads of households, by age groups*

Age	A n = 221	T n = 250	Ba n = 185	Bu n = 107	O n = 131	K n = 90
10-19	12.3	4.4	8.1	12.1	3.8	8.9
20-29	36.1	22.4	25.9	29.9	13.7	24.4
30-39	26.5	30.4	23.8	38.3	24.4	25.6
40-49	18.3	23.2	20.5	12.1	28.2	27.8
50-59	5.5	14.0	13.0	2.8	19.1	7.8
60-69	1.4	4.0	7.0	2.8	9.2	4.4
70-79	—	1.6	1.6	—	1.5	1.0
Unknown	—	—	—	1.9	—	1.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5c *Percentage of wives, by household size*

Household size	T n = 201	Ba n = 130	Bu n = 75	O n = 112	K n = 76
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	5.0	2.3	2.7	1.8	2.6
3	4.0	11.5	10.7	3.6	3.9
4	10.4	5.4	12.0	5.4	10.5
5	12.4	9.2	16.0	7.1	11.8
6	15.4	13.1	22.7	12.5	10.5
7	12.4	14.6	12.0	14.3	14.5
8	13.4	11.5	4.0	14.3	13.2
9	8.5	8.5	4.0	8.0	5.3
10 & +	18.4	23.8	16.0	33.0	27.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5d *Percentage of wives, by age groups*

Age	T n = 201	Ba n = 130	Bu n = 75	O n = 112	K n = 76
0-9	—	—	—	—	—
10-19	2.0	0.8	5.3	—	2.6
20-29	31.8	37.7	44.0	25.9	40.8
30-39	34.3	32.3	37.3	35.7	34.2
40-49	19.4	19.2	9.3	20.5	15.8
50-59	9.5	9.2	2.7	17.9	6.6
60-69	2.5	0.8	1.3	—	—
70-79	0.5	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5e *Percentage of sons, by household size*

Household size	T n = 390	Ba n = 227	Bu n = 119	O n = 257	K n = 153
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	0.5	1.3	—	—	0.7
3	2.1	3.1	3.4	0.4	—
4	6.9	3.1	8.4	2.7	6.5
5	10.3	6.2	8.4	6.2	7.2
6	13.8	11.9	26.1	10.1	12.4
7	13.6	16.7	14.3	15.6	13.1
8	13.3	11.0	7.6	19.5	16.3
9	12.6	6.6	5.9	5.8	4.6
10 & +	26.9	40.1	26.1	39.7	39.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5f *Percentage of sons, by age groups*

Age	T n = 390	Ba n = 227	Bu n = 119	O n = 257	K n = 153
0-9	52.1	50.2	61.3	46.3	51.6
10-19	33.8	30.4	34.5	30.7	36.6
20-29	11.8	13.2	4.2	17.5	10.5
30-39	2.3	5.7	—	4.7	1.3
40-49	—	0.4	—	0.8	—
50-59	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5g *Percentage of daughters, by household size*

Household size	T n = 312	Ba n = 195	Bu n = 109	O n = 203	K n = 131
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	0.6	1.0	1.8	—	—
3	1.0	3.6	2.8	2.0	2.3
4	8.0	5.1	6.3	2.5	4.6
5	10.6	10.8	19.3	4.9	6.9
6	14.1	10.8	22.0	12.3	9.9
7	12.8	16.9	22.9	15.8	14.5
8	15.7	10.8	2.8	17.7	14.5
9	12.8	8.7	5.5	7.9	9.2
10 & +	24.4	32.3	16.5	36.9	38.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5h *Percentage of daughters, by age groups*

Age	T n = 312	Ba n = 195	Bu n = 109	O n = 203	K n = 131
0-9	58.7	57.9	71.6	62.6	64.9
10-19	40.1	37.9	28.4	36.0	33.6
20-29	1.3	3.6	—	1.5	1.5
30-39	—	0.5	—	—	—
40-49	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5i *Percentage of brothers, by household size*

Household Size	T n = 91	Ba n = 92	Bu n = 41	O n = 68	K n = 50
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	4.4	1.1	4.9	—	—
3	4.4	4.3	4.9	1.5	—
4	2.2	2.2	17.1	7.4	8.0
5	6.6	4.3	7.3	4.4	4.0
6	11.0	13.0	17.1	5.9	2.0
7	18.7	17.4	2.4	7.4	14.0
8	16.5	8.7	2.4	5.9	24.0
9	4.4	17.4	7.3	8.8	—
10 & +	31.9	31.5	36.6	58.8	48.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5j *Percentage of brothers, by age groups*

Age	T n = 91	Ba n = 92	Bu n = 41	O n = 68	K n = 50
0-9	7.7	12.0	29.3	8.8	24.0
10-19	38.5	41.3	24.4	26.5	32.0
20-29	36.3	29.3	34.1	33.8	26.0
30-39	9.9	12.0	7.3	26.5	18.0
40-49	5.5	4.3	4.9	2.9	—
50-59	1.1	1.1	—	—	—
60-69	1.1	—	—	—	—
70-79	—	—	—	1.5	—
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5k *Percentage of grandsons, by household size*

Household size	T n = 38	Ba n = 41	Bu n = 9	O n = 39	K n = 15
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	2.6	—	—	—	—
3	—	—	—	—	—
4	—	2.4	—	—	—
5	—	2.4	—	—	—
6	—	7.3	22.2	—	—
7	5.3	2.4	—	7.7	—
8	15.8	26.8	11.1	—	—
9	13.2	4.9	11.1	12.8	6.7
10 & +	63.2	53.7	55.6	79.5	93.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5l *Percentage of grandsons, by age groups*

Age	T n = 38	Ba n = 41	Bu n = 9	O n = 56	K n = 15
0-9	92.1	85.4	77.8	85.7	66.7
10-19	7.9	14.6	11.1	14.3	20.0
20-29	—	—	11.1	—	13.3
30-39	—	—	—	—	—
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5m *Percentage of nephews (brothers' sons), by household size*

Household size	T n = 62	Ba n = 41	Bu n = 34	O n = 43	K n = 25
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	—	—	—	—	—
3	—	—	—	—	—
4	—	—	2.9	—	—
5	3.2	—	5.9	—	—
6	4.8	4.9	11.8	—	—
7	4.8	9.8	8.8	2.3	4.0
8	14.5	—	5.9	2.3	4.0
9	9.7	2.4	—	2.3	8.0
10 & +	62.9	82.9	64.7	93.0	84.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5n *Percentage of nephews, by age groups*

Age	T n = 62	Ba n = 41	Bu n = 34	O n = 43	K n = 25
0-9	62.7	68.3	67.6	83.7	64.0
10-19	35.5	26.8	23.5	7.0	20.0
20-29	1.6	4.9	8.8	9.3	4.0
30-39	—	—	—	—	8.0
40-49	—	—	—	—	4.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5o *Percentage of daughters-in-law, by household size*

Household size	T n = 50	Ba n = 40	Bu n = 6	O n = 50	K n = 14
1	—	—	—	—	—
2	—	—	—	—	—
3	—	—	—	—	—
4	2.0	—	—	2.0	—
5	6.0	2.5	—	2.0	—
6	6.0	5.0	16.7	2.0	—
7	8.0	2.5	—	12.0	—
8	14.0	12.5	16.7	10.0	14.3
9	12.0	5.0	33.3	8.0	21.4
10 & +	52.0	72.5	33.3	64.0	64.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 16.5p *Percentage of daughters-in-law, by age groups*

Age	T n = 50	Ba n = 40	Bu n = 6	O n = 50	K n = 14
0-9	—	—	—	—	—
10-19	10.0	2.5	16.7	4.0	7.1
20-29	82.0	77.5	83.3	80.0	71.4
30-39	8.0	17.5	—	10.0	21.4
40-49	—	2.5	—	4.0	—
50-59	—	—	—	2.0	—
Total	100	100	100	100	100