New Europe College Yearbook
Europe next to Europe Program
2013-2014
2014-2015

ANA ACESKA
DRAŽEN CEPIĆ
EDA GÜÇLÜ
SOKOL LLESHI
SLAVIŠA RAKOVIĆ
IOANNIS TRISOKKAS

OZAN ARSLAN
ČARNA BRKOVIĆ
SRDJAN JOVANOVIĆ
ANDREJ MITIC
RAMAZAN HAKKI OZTAN

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

ČARNA BRKOVIĆ

Born in 1985, in SFR Yugoslavia

Ph.D. in Social Anthropology, University of Manchester, 2012
Postdoctoral Fellow, CEU Institute for Advanced Study, 2013/2014
Postdoctoral researcher, Graduate School for East and Southeast European
Studies, Regensburg, 2015/2017

Research interests: welfare, social justice, humanitarianism, flexibility, power,
clientelism, history of ethnology and anthropology

Winner of 2015 Young Scholar Prize, International Society for Ethnology and
Folklore

BEING CAUGHT BETWEEN "ANTHROPOLOGY AT HOME" AND "ANTHROPOLOGY ABROAD": AN OVERVIEW OF EPISTEMOLOGICAL POSITIONS OF ETHNO-ANTHROPOLOGISTS IN THE BALKAN AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH CENTURY[1]

Abstract

This paper explores the epistemological vantage points used by ethno-anthropologists at the semiperiphery, by focusing on the discussion of zadruga (a large cooperative household in the mountainous regions of the Balkan, which existed during the 19th and early 20th centuries). Starting from Strathern's (1987) distinction between "anthropologists abroad" and "anthropologists at home", which is based on different ways of learning from socio-cultural differences, the paper demonstrates that ethno-anthropologists from the Balkan could occupy either of these two positions, as well as those of a nationalist intellectual, or a combination and reversal of these positions. Such multiplicity of epistemological choices for the scholars in the Balkan is probably the result of working in the semiperiphery (Blagojević 2009; Blagojević and Yair 2010). While it is potentially enriching, it also means that ethno-anthropology in the Balkan is difficult to capture as a distinct epistemological standpoint.

Keywords: ethnology, anthropology, ethnography, semiperiphery, nativity, *zadruga*

Introduction

Do ethnology and anthropology constitute the same discipline or not (Prica 1998/1999, Milenković 2008)? What about social anthropology and cultural anthropology? Is "ethnography" the name of a discipline, or the name of a research approach? The responses to these, and similar, questions largely depend on whom you ask, when, and where. For

219

instance, "ethnography" has been the name of a dominant approach to fieldwork in the Anglo-Saxon socio-cultural anthropology since the First World War, but it was also used as the name of a whole discipline in the former Soviet Union (Hann et al. 2007). To make things more complicated, socio-cultural anthropology is nowadays faced with calls to abandon the term "ethnography" in favour of "participant observation", in order to distinguish long term anthropological research from qualitative research conducted by sociologists, international relations scholars and other social scientists who also claim to do ethnography (Ingold 2014). What about anthropology? While several decades ago, the distinction between "social anthropology" and "cultural anthropology" seemed to be "irksome" (Levi Strauss 1963: 354), these terms are today predominantly understood as equivalents. "Social anthropology" and "cultural anthropology" are largely perceived as the same discipline, with certain differences in emphasis and historical trajectories in different countries.

In the last several decades, ethnology and anthropology started to refer to the same discipline across Eastern Europe. The contemporary theoretical, methodological, and empirical issues in ethnology can, but do not have to, differ from those in anthropology. However, if we take into account institutional set ups, ethnology and anthropology still seem to be different, in an important way (Buchowski 2004, 2012). Namely, doing ethno-anthropology at one of its centres means that one usually can avoid dealing with, or reflecting upon, this multiplicity of names and ideas concerning what constituted a discpline. A socio-cultural anthropologist fully educated in the US, for instance, could potentially spend her whole anthropological career without ever getting in close touch with ethnological departments, journals, book series, and other elements of disciplinary infrastructure of ethnology. However, an ethno-anthropologist educated in Serbia, for instance, would be enrolled in a department of "Ethnology and Anthropology", where she would learn different disciplinary histories and how they converged towards the end of the 20th century. Thus, from certain positions, ethnology and anthropology are clearly different kinds of endeavour, while from some other perspectives they refer to the same discipline.

In this paper, I will use the term "ethno-anthropology" as an umbrella term for socio-cultural anthropology, ethnography, ethnology, and their variations. From this short overview of disciplinary names, we can see that ethno-anthropology does not have a sense of distinctiveness on a global level. Broadly speaking, the trajectories of the terms "ethnology",

"ethnography", "anthropology" have been shaped by different intellectual traditions and disciplinary canons, as much as by unequal power relationships between disciplines and socio-political conditions of knowledge production. The concept of "world anthropologies" (Restrepo and Escobar 2005) is useful for thinking about ethno-anthropology as a polycentric discipline with multiple histories, origins, methodological assumptions, and political implications. It focuses on "the multiple and contradictory historical, social, cultural and political locatedness of the different communities of anthropologists and their anthropologies" (Restrepo and Escobar 2005: 100).

Bearing this in mind, this paper looks at how ethno-anthropologists in different positions produced knowledge and to whom they directed their criticisms. More specifically, the paper explores some of the arguments developed during the discussion of *zadruga* (a large cooperative household in the mountainous regions of the Balkan, which existed during the 19th and early 20th centuries). It focuses on the epistemological strategies of producing ethnological and anthropological knowledge on the Balkan at the turn of the 20th century, especially by the so-called native scholars. It suggests that, while there is no need to distinguish ethnology and anthropology as separate disciplines, there are important specificities in the ways of learning from and about socio-cultural differences which are employed by anthropologists at home, anthropologists abroad, and ethno-anthropologists (cf. Strathern 1987). Starting from Strathern's distinction between anthropologists abroad (who aim to learn from the "non-Western" specificities in order to critically reflect upon "our, modernist, Western" ways of doing things), and anthropologists at home (who aim to discover difference and strangeness in the "Western" worldviews, as the social context in which anthropological analytical tools were developed in the first place), the paper demonstrates that ethno-anthropologists from the Balkan could occupy either of these two positions, as well as two others. An ethno-anthropologist from the Balkan, who ethnographically explores the Balkan, could occupy the position of an "anthropologist abroad", an "anthropologist at home", she could be a nationalist intellectual (who does not attempt to learn from socio-cultural difference at all), or she could combine and reverse the positions. Such multiplicity of epistemological choices for the scholars in the Balkan is probably the result of working in the semiperiphery (Blagojević 2009; Blagojević and Yair 2010). While it is potentially enriching, it also means that ethno-anthropology in the Balkan is difficult to capture as a distinct epistemological standpoint.

Ethnology and anthropology

The relationship between "ethnology" and "anthropology" has had a complex history and geopolitics. Namely, in the mid-20th century the distinction between ethnology and anthropology seemed to be relatively straightforward and clear cut – although there were different criteria for distinguishing them. For instance, Mihailescu (2007) suggests that "anthropology" referred solely to the field of physical anthropology in Romania – and something similar was the case in other Eastern European countries (see Turda 2010). In France, Levi Strauss has suggested that ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology "are in fact three stages, or three moments of time, in the same line of investigation, and preference for one or another of these only means that attention is concentrated on one type of research, which can never exclude the other two" (1963: 356). In his reading, ethnography "corresponds to the first stages in research - observation and description, field work" (Levi Strauss 1963: 354). Ethnology is a second stage, characterized by a comparative perspective, since it:

> represents a first step toward synthesis. Without excluding direct observation, it leads toward conclusions sufficiently comprehensive to preclude, or almost to preclude, their being based solely on first-hand information. The synthesis may be of three kinds: geographical, if information about neighboring groups is to be collated; historical, if the purpose is to reconstruct the past of one or several peoples; systematic, if one type of technique, custom, or institution is selected for special attention". (Levi Strauss 1963: 355)

As the last stage of a research, social or cultural anthropology has the widest theoretical ambitions. In Levi Strauss's reading, social and cultural anthropology is:

> linked to a second and final stage of the synthesis, based upon ethnographical and ethnological conclusions. In the Anglo-Saxon countries, anthropology aims at a global knowledge of man – embracing the subject in its full historical and geographical extension, seeking knowledge applicable to the whole of human evolution from, let us say, *Hominidae* to the races of today, and leading to conclusions which may be either positive or negative but which are valid for all human societies, from the large modem city to the smallest Melanesian tribe. (1963: 355)

In the US, Hofer (1968) offered a different kind of a distinction, using researcher's nativity as a criterion. In his reading, ethnology (or European national ethnography) presents "the study of one's own culture", while anthropology is "the study of other cultures". While "national ethnographers" (ethnologists) are focused on accumulating data, anthropologists are more concerned with comparative perspective and therefore more mobile, conceptually as well as psychically:

> This statement, I think, expresses the extreme mobility of American anthropologists, which is perhaps characteristic not only of their theories, but of their whole way of life. The theoretical orientation of the discipline as a whole, coupled with a continual search for the new, makes too long a cultivation of fields nonproductive and forces the anthropologist to slash and burn. These traits are in general missing from European ethnography. European ethnographers are not as mobile as their American colleagues. Geographically, their activities are confined for the most part to a single country, or perhaps only to a specific area of a country. They tend to make fewer theoretical statements, usually of a more limited range, than the anthropologists do. Scholars earn recognition with voluminous works that systematize great bodies of data. The period before obsolescence of scientific publications is by far longer than seems to be the case with anthropological literature. National ethnographers may be compared to granaries where generations of ethnographers, one after the other, hoard and preserve their knowledge. Ethnography is a cumulative discipline, like history. (Hofer 1968: 313–314)

After the end of the Cold War, ethnology and anthropology have started to be seen as the same discipline from some vantage points, but not from others. Whilst a sharp distinction between ethnology and anthropology is nowadays untenable, some of it shapes contemporary understandings of what constitutes fieldwork and of what constitutes an anthropologist in both Anglo-Saxon and Eastern European anthropologies and ethnologies (Prica 2001). For instance, since the aims, methods, theoretical and empirical scopes of ethnology and anthropology are taken to be the same in contemporary Serbia or Croatia, "ethnology" is there often used as a synonym with anthropology (Radojičić 2005, Milenković 2006, Čapo Žmegač et. al 2006). Yet, sometimes the term "ethnology" serves as a proxy for old-school, positivist, anti-theoretical collection of data about a "nation" or a "people", and then it is contrasted to theoretical and/or political aspirations of social anthropology (Buchowski 2004, Skovajsa 2008).

Ethnology and native anthropology

The first departments, institutes, and publications in ethnology as well as anthropology were opened at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century (Mihăilescu, Iliev and Naumović 2005). Ethnology originated as an attempt to learn about the "internal Other", that is, about peasants and other groups of people living within a nation-state, but outside of the urban centres (Ssorin Chaikov 2003). Since peasants were understood as "the embodiment of the nation" (Halpern and Hammel 1969: 18), early 20th century ethnology was perceived as a nation-building science (Stocking 1982).[2] Anthropology, on the other hand, originated as an attempt to learn about the "colonised Other", that is about colonised populations which were presumably radically different from the European colonisers (Stocking 1982).[3]

The directions of the two traditions intersected towards the end of the 20th century. On the one hand, many departments of ethnology across Eastern Europe were renamed and changed curricula so as to incorporate topics, approaches, and bodies of literature produced in Anglo-Saxon anthropologies (Tužinská 2008). This has disturbed assumptions about what counts as ethnology/anthropology and who an ethnologist/anthropologist is (Kürti 1996). This issue remains open for negotiation (Hann et al. 2007), and is affected by various bureaucratic conundrums (Prica 1998/1999), new hierarchies of knowledge (Buchowski 2004), and various understandings of the meanings and uses of ethnography (Milenković 2008).

On the other hand, Anglo-Saxon anthropologies "returned home" and started researching places and topics in the West, including production of anthropology itself (Peirano 1998, Marcus and Fischer 1999). The concepts of "native anthropology" and "anthropology at home" have their roots in the historical development of the discipline in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, namely, in the relocation of anthropological interests towards the western countries in Europe and the North America (Peirano 1998). This relocation of intellectual interests was partly a consequence of wider socio- and geo-political changes, such as the end of colonial governance and the waves of migration to the Western Europe and North America (Ryang 1997). Although the concepts of "native anthropology" and "anthropology at home" illuminate some relations between a particular researcher and the people she worked with, they cannot be used as a straightforward explanation of a researcher's position, since they require

further determination of a frame of reference: native to what? What kind of home is in question (Narayan 1993)?

As Ryang (1997) demonstrates, anthropologists are never simply "native", but can be native to something. A large body of literature has discussed and criticised the relative importance and unimportance of nativeness for the anthropological learning process. While native anthropologists "are believed to write about their own cultures from a position of intimate affinity" (Narayan 1993: 671), strong anthropological criticisms of the notion of culture as a discrete, homogeneous whole (Wright 1998; Abu Lughod 1991; Kuper 1999) opened up many problematizations of this idea. For example, Abu Lughod wrote about *halfies*: "people whose national or cultural identity is mixed by virtue of migration, overseas education, or parentage" (1991: 137). Narayan goes a step further and claims that "two halves cannot adequately account for the complexity of an identity in which multiple countries, regions, religions, and classes may come together" (1993: 673). Instead, she argues for viewing "each anthropologist in terms of shifting identifications amid a field of interpenetrating communities and power relations" (Narayan 1993: 671). The "intimate affinity" with the field should not be read just in terms of citizenship, or national belonging. Intimate affinity can be the result of various shared social positions, including gender, sexuality, race, age, class, and so forth. Assuming that "anthropology at home" is, above all, anthropology conducted in one's own country, or national group, reflects methodological nationalism, or "the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world" (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002: 301). Let us take a brief look at alternative accounts of the difference between "anthropology at home" and "anthropology abroad".

Learning through contrivance versus producing self-knowledge

Strathern (1987) argues that there is a significant difference between "anthropology abroad" and "auto-anthropology" (or "anthropology at home"), and that it has not much to do with nativity, intimacy, or familiarity of the researcher with the field in which she is conducting ethnographic research. Rather, for Strathern, the difference is epistemological: it stems from different approaches to the production and organization of knowledge. *Anthropology abroad* means trying to make sense of radical

socio-cultural difference, to learn through the strange and the awkward. In other words, the aim of anthropology abroad is to de-exoticize the non-Western people by demonstrating that non-modernist practices, which may seem weird and counter-intuitive to the observers used to modernist categories, actually present reasonable and logical actions in a particular socio-historical context. To show that "their" strangeness, awkwardness, and contrivance make sense in "their" specific socio-cultural and historical context suggests that "our" concepts, practices, and relationships which seem so natural to "us" are also artificial, socio-culturally constructed, and dependent on history (and thus, implicitly, that they can be changed for the better). This has been a classic move of anthropology understood as a cultural critique:

> In using portraits of other cultural patterns to reflect self-critically on our own ways, anthropology disrupts common sense and makes us reexamine our taken-for-granted assumptions. (Marcus and Fischer 1999: 1)

The "we" of this sentence clearly refers to English speaking readership of socio-cultural anthropology in the West. This is not just a matter of a coincidence, or pragmatics. Anthropological thought developed in a particular modernist setting – that of Anglo-American and French intellectual traditions. Broad assumption that modernity has brought with itself a radical break with enchantedness and relatedness of the world has had a huge effect on anthropology: contemporary socio-cultural anthropology very often sees itself as an endeavour of translating between "their" enchantedness and relatedness and "our" [Western] neat, modernist, clear-cut, "purified" categories of ordering the world (Da Col and Graeber 2011). This is why Strathern claims that, as long as anthropologists are doing anthropology – that is, as long as anthropologists rely on anthropological analytical apparatuses and forms of thinking – it does not really matter whether they are "native" and where they come from:

> Whether anthropologists are at home *qua* anthropologists, is not to be decided by whether they call themselves Malay, belong to the Travellers or have been born in Essex; it is decided by the relationship between their techniques of organizing knowledge and how people organize knowledge about themselves. (1987: 31)

To state it shortly, an anthropologist is doing anthropology abroad when she researches the non-modernist, "weird", and "awkward" social practices by revealing their underlying social logics and principles. Anthropology at home, however, involves another way of dealing with socio-cultural difference and, therefore, another approach to creating knowledge. An anthropologist "at home" tries to find difference and strangeness in the social context that is familiar to her and her readers. The goal of anthropology "at home" is to expose the known and the intimate as artificial and socio-culturally produced, thus challenging the worldview which belongs both to the anthropologist and to the readers. The aim of making one's own concepts awkward and unusual is the same as the aim of anthropology abroad: it is to show the inherent artificiality, contrivance, and socio-historical situatedness of all human concepts, practices, and relationships.

Since anthropology is closely related to Western modernist analytical categories, Strathern implies that anthropology at home can be conducted only by "Western" anthropologists working in the "West" – the social setting which produced the forms of reasoning and categorical apparatuses used in anthropology. She argues this means that auto-anthropologists are in a different position from, for example, Malay anthropologists working in a Malay society. A Malay anthropologist would employ analytical apparatuses and forms of thinking which did not stem from "Malay" intellectual traditions, but from the traditions of the Western modernity. Anthropologist at home, on the other hand, produces self-knowledge because she would use modernist knowledge practices (of anthropology) generated from the social setting that she studies (Western modernity).[4]

Strathern's interpretation of the distinction between "auto-anthropology" and "anthropology abroad" is very useful for thinking about the relationship between anthropologists who conduct ethnographic research abroad and those who do fieldwork close to their place of residence. However, it raises an issue of knowledge practices of Eastern European ethno-anthropologists, especially those from the Balkan. How did Eastern European, and particularly Balkan, ethno-anthropologists learn from socio-cultural difference, if at all? When they ethnographically studied social practices in their own countries, did they attempt to de-exoticize the "weird" and the "unusual" practices of peasant groups? Did they attempt to find differences in the intimately familiar? Did they engage with differences in some third way? Eastern Europe has had its own alternative frameworks of modernity – most notably those of communist

and socialist modernities (Gaonkar 2001; Collier 2011). The assumptions and categories of the alternative modernities cannot be directly translated onto the assumptions and categories of the Western European modernity – there are many similarities, but there are also important differences. All of this has implications for the production of ethno-anthropological knowledge in the Balkan.

Taking into account Strathern's distinction, in the rest of the paper I will discuss how Balkan ethnologists working "at home" engaged with contrivance, when they did so. I would also like to suggest that asking such questions about ethno-anthropologists in the Balkan reveals the importance of the direction of the anthropological criticism and of its intended audience. The scope of the "we" in an ethno-anthropological account shapes its line of argumentation and its way of learning from socio-cultural difference. As we have seen so far, social anthropology / cultural anthropology / ethnology / ethnography is not a singular body of knowledge. Different intellectual anthropological/ethnological traditions allow researchers to engage with different questions, while leaving aside some others. Besides the researcher's positions in the "field" and her educational background, the kind of "we" that she uses – to whom her analysis and criticism is directed – affects how she engages with contrivance, and thus how she organizes knowledge in an ethno-anthropological account.

Depending on who they write for, ethno-anthropologists engage with difference in different ways

By "ethno-anthropologists from the Balkan" I refer to people who have completed at least an element of their professional career in a scientific institution which is located somewhere in the Balkan. The criterion for an "ethno-anthropologist from the Balkan" in this discussion is whether a person had to fulfil requirements posed by a scientific institution in the Balkan in order to successfully complete some part of their professional life – this may be undergraduate or postgraduate studies, postdoctoral fellowship, a lectureship, professorship, and so forth. Therefore, in this discussion the citizenship or ethno-national senses of belonging of a researcher are irrelevant (i.e. an "ethno-anthropologist from the Balkan" is not necessarily someone who has, for instance, Serbian citizenship, or someone who feels ethno-nationally like a Bulgarian, unless they

completed undergraduate studies in Serbia, or they were promoted to the associate professorship by an ethno-anthropological institute in Bulgaria). Taking that into account, let us consider several different ways of engaging with socio-cultural difference which are employed by ethno-anthropologists from the Balkan with respect to the institution of *zadruga* (a cooperative).

Anthropologists abroad: Law versus ethnography

First, ethno-anthropologists may take the position of anthropologists abroad, if they aim to demonstrate that modernist categories oppress and fail to capture relationality and messiness of everyday life and local knowledge (often for the English speaking audience). This is the epistemological move of anthropology abroad: it learns about ("their") small-scale, grassroots, locally grounded relationships in order to criticize ("our") modernist concepts and dominant academic or political discourses. This is probably why ethno-anthropological works which employ this approach communicate well with ethnographic works conducted in other places. A case in point is the work of Milenko Filipović.

Zadruga is a neologism coined by Vuk Karadžić in 1818 (*Serbian Dictionary*), to refer to large family households which consisted of several families, counting from 7-8 to 100 people in certain cases. *Zadruga* was practiced in the 19th and early 20th centuries in parts of contemporary Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Serbia, and western Bulgaria. There is an enormous body of ethno-anthropological, legal, sociological, and other kind of scholarly works about *zadruga* from the 20th century, which focus largely on the origins, functions, and characteristics of *zadruga* (Novaković 2005; Byrnes 1976; Vittorelli 2002). Nowadays more or less accepted views suggest that *zadruga* is not a *longue duree* institution present among all "South Slav" groups. In historical terms, *zadruga* can be traced back to the 19th century and any discussion about its earlier origins remains in the domain of speculation. In geographic and geopolitical terms, *zadruga* is not related to a particular religious denomination or ethno-national group, but presents a context specific response to the mountainous life style (Todorova 1993).

Filipović (1991) asserts that the legal definition of *zadruga* which is used in the Civic Law in Serbia from 1844 does not correspond to the everyday practices: the Law ratifies „the regulations on inheritance and property which have created a confusion and much damaged *zadruga*

as an institution" (cited in Miljković Matić 2012: 165). Namely, the Law considers *zadruga* as a community founded upon three categories: kinship, property, and residence.[5] Filipović's ethnographic work, on the other hand, demonstrates that in everyday life and from villagers' perspectives, *zadruga* did not have to be a community of kin, or a community of residence. Some *zadruge* (plural of *zadruga*) consisted of families which were not directly related by kinship (Filipović calls this a non-kinship cooperative, or *nesrodnička zadruga*), while in other *zadruge*, families lived in two or more places (a divided cooperative, or *predvojena zadruga*). Additionally, while property was shared among members of all *zadruge*, there were several principles which regulated how property should be used and inherited. Therefore, in Filipović's view, a *zadruga* was a community of shared subsistence – its main characteristic is that all its members worked together to secure their shared livelihoods. Since the Civic Law from 1844 was still in force in 1945, when Filipović was writing his study, he used ethnographic data to criticize "the adaptation of people's understandings and institutions to the legal regulations" which has occurred during the past hundred years.

Filipović's intervention presents a case of what Stathern calls "anthropology abroad" – it demonstrates that there is a fine logic and sensible reasoning behind an institution which was often perceived as "the manifestation of a lower civilization" (see Rakitsch 1914, in Vittorelli 2002). Understood as a "cultural other" to the urban nuclear family, *zadruga* was often taken as an indicator of impeded modernization of people who live in the Balkan (*ibid.*). By demonstrating that *zadruga* was founded upon clear economic principles of shared subsistence, Filipović finds economic rationality in the practice which seems "backward" from modernist vantage points. Furthermore, he offers a cultural critique of rigid modernist legal definitions, by contrasting them to the everyday forms of knowledge and practice. In his reading, the 1844 Civic Law in Serbia, written under the strong influence of Western European legislature, fails to understand the principles of local non-modernist categories of family life and subsistence. Thus, as a social scientist who also published in English, Filipović engaged in ethno-anthropology as a cultural critique: he used "portraits of other [villagers'] cultural patterns to reflect self-critically on our own [urban modernist] ways" (Marcus and Fischer 1999: 1), disrupting common sense in the process and making political and legal elites in the country and abroad to re-examine their taken-for-granted assumptions about what a family is, or what it should be.

Anthropologists at home: Finding difference in what seems to be the same

Second, ethno-anthropologists may take the position of anthropologists at home, if they write for the audience in a Balkan country, with the aim to find something strange and counterintuitive in the known and the familiar. Since these works are usually not written in English language and since they are directed primarily for the audience in the Balkan, their relevance is often judged as local and area specific – although if geopolitical constellations were different, some of these works may be judged as having global anthropological relevance. As Blagojević reminds us: "an innovation in the social and political change has a very similar destiny as innovation in science: the location determines the appropriate timing and recognition, as feminist critique has convincingly shown" (2009: 37). Let us take a look at Valtazar Bogišić's discussion of *zadruga*.

Bogišić's (1884) analysis focuses on similarities and differences in family types which are called the urban family (*varoška porodica*), large rural family household (*zadruga*), and rural nuclear family (*inokoština*). Many authors, including Vuk Karadžić, defined *zadruga* as an "antithesis" to a nuclear family (Bogišić 1884: 20). Nuclear family was often understood as urban, modern, and European, while *zadruga* was largely perceived as specific to a village life, *longue duree*, and South Slav. In light of such oppositions, it does not surprise that *inokoština*, or a village family which consisted only of parents and their children, was understood as more or less the same type as an urban nuclear family. However, Bogišić demonstrates that "everywhere where we can find *zadruga*, we can also find *inokoština* as its correlative" (Bogišić 1884: 13-14).

Namely, Bogišić looks at the property rights in these three family types which were practiced in the 19th century. First, in an urban nuclear family, father had an unlimited right to use the whole property without consulting any other family member; in *zadruga*, the head of the household had no right to use property without an explicit approval of all adult members; in *inokoština*, the father had no right to use property without an explicit approval of his sons.

Second, in an urban nuclear family, the father could draft a will to regulate the property inheritance after his death; the heads of *zadruga* and *inokoština* households could not do that (since here property belonged to a family, rather than to an individual).

Third, even after he got sick or incapacitated, the father of the urban nuclear family (or his representative) remained the manager of the family matters; the head of the *zadruga* household could be replaced at any point when all other *zadruga* members saw it fit; father of *inokoština* household could be replaced by one of his sons if he proved to be incapable to fulfill his duties.

Fourth, no one but the father in an urban nuclear family had the right to decide upon dividing property; in *zadruga*, any male adult member could request his share of *zadruga* property whenever he liked; in *inokoština*, sons could ask for their share whenever they wanted (which is usually after they got married), and the father got an equal share with his sons.

Fifth, after the death of the father of an urban nuclear family, property was divided among other family members, which means that with his death, the family household also came to an end; in *zadruga*, after the household head died, another one was elected and *zadruga* continued to function as before; *inoko□tina* also continued to exist as before after the father's death, if his sons decided to remain in the cooperative (which they were free to leave during father's life).

Taking into account these qualities of social relationships, Bogišić argues that *zadruga* and *inokoština* present two different points in the cyclical development of the same rural family type, rather than an antithesis of one another. Depending on a variety of circumstances, including wars and poverty, the number of people in *zadruga* could drop to those of *inokoština* (parents and their children). And *vice versa* – *inokoština* easily transforms into a *zadruga* when sons get married. The quality of social relations in *zadruga* and *inokoština* is the same in Bogišić's view, which is why they present two points in the cycle of a same family type. Furthermore, although it may look the same as urban nuclear family, *inokoština* is drastically different from it: "In our opinion, it is illogical to *a priori* deduce the sameness of the principle from the similarity in the external form" (Bogišić 1884: 13).

If we look at Bogišić's work through the lens of Strathern's terminology, we could say that he was doing "anthropology at home". In demonstrating that social relationships in *inokoština* were not the same as social relationships in the urban nuclear family (although they looked the same), Bogišić found something counterintuitive and unusual in the known and familiar. His analytical insight that *inokoština* presents a point in the cyclical development of *zadruga* household, and not a version of urban nuclear family, was also intended as a cultural critique of the existing

legislature (Bogišić 1844: 7-12; 22-35). However, Bogišić's analysis of similarities and differences of family types was not the same as Filipović's. Filipović found a difference between the modernist legal definition and the ethnographic knowledge of non-modern practice of *zadruga*, and he claimed this difference was oppressive. Bogišić found a difference in what looked the same to many domestic and foreign scholars – *inokoština* and the urban nuclear family – and argued this perceived similarity was oppressive.

Nationalist intellectuals: No attempt to learn from socio-cultural differences

Third, ethno-anthropologists may take the position of nationalist intellectuals, if they do not attempt to learn from socio-cultural difference and, therefore, do not criticize, but rather celebrate the everyday life and concepts in the Balkan. Probably the majority of ethnological works in the Balkan produced in the 20th century could be placed in this category. For instance, a lawyer Ivan Strohal (1909) discussed *zadruga* as an institution which reflects the ethno-national character of South Slavs. He criticized romanticist interpretations of *zadruga* as a practice which originated thousands years ago, in India. He contended that such attempts to make a link with the "golden past" have hurt *zadruga* in the eyes of the Western observers, who then assumed that these are "primitive, cruel regulations that exist only among the people at the lowest stage of cultural development" (Strohal 1909: 228). He asserts that *zadruga* demonstrates South Slav altruism: "It is a fact that Slav peoples have two legal regulations that could exist only among the people with a strong sense of altruism" (Strohal 1909: 229).

Combining and reversing positions

Fourth, ethno-anthropologists from the Balkan may attempt to combine and reverse the positions. They may decide to critically engage with locally specific, non-modernist forms of knowledge and practice on the basis of political exclusivity, elitism, or oppressiveness. For instance, this could mean exploring gender-based differences and inequalities in *zadruga*, and thus taking the position of a critically engaged scholar.

Something similar was attempted by Rakitsch (1914, in Vittorelli 2002), who criticized patriarchal "backwardness" of *zadruga* by contrasting it

to the "civilized" modernist nuclear forms of family. The potential for feminist criticism of *zadruga* was thus significantly weakened, because it was framed in evolutionary terms. Rakitsch placed the modernist, middle class, Western European family as the desirable goal of family transformation in the Balkan, disregarding forms of oppression which characterized the middle class family at the time. Had Rakitsch managed to frame the criticism of gender inequalities and patriarchal character of *zadruga* without such yearning for modernity, she would have offered a radical critique of the existing political and economic frameworks of family life, and opened up possibilities for creating alternative ones, which would have been useful both for the Balkan and for Europe more broadly.

However, the combination and reversal of epistemological positions is perhaps more adequate to describe the work of contemporary ethno-anthropologists, than those at the turn of the 20th century. For instance, today they may decide to look at the differences between socialist and post-socialist practices, where it is unclear which one would be "theirs" or "more local", and which one would be "ours", or "more modern", and in what way. Or they may decide to critically approach neoliberal experimentation in their countries, by looking at how new forms of economy and governance get translated into the existing forms of sociality and relatedness, directing the criticism both towards the "more local" and towards the "more global" actors. And so forth.

As we can see, there is a variety of epistemological options for ethno-anthropologists from the Balkan. The same person can employ several of these options in different publications or research projects. This multiplicity of perspectives is the result of the semi-peripheral status of the Balkan.

Producing ethno-anthropology in the Balkan

Blagojević (2009) suggests that production of knowledge at the semiperiphery is a process usually subsumed under two larger, already existing discourses. It is either subsumed under discussions of knowledge production at the core (in comparison to which it appears to be slow and unoriginal), or it is subsumed under postcolonial discussions of creating knowledge at the periphery (where it seems to be too specific and, therefore, useful only for comparisons). Focusing on knowledge production in gender studies, Blagojević argues that the semiperiphery needs its own specific standpoint epistemology "in order to become part of conversation

and exchange, and not just a poor copyist of theory produced elsewhere". The "core" in her discussion refers largely to the former Western European colonial centers, while the "periphery" refers to the former colonies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The semiperiphery is, then, the space of "Non-'White' Whites, Non-European Europeans" (Blagojević 2009: 27). It has characteristics of both the core and the periphery, which makes it a large scale social hybrid: "In a comparison to the core, the semiperiphery is in a condition of 'being different, but not being different enough', while from the perspective of the periphery, the semiperiphery is 'different, and not similar enough'" (Blagojević 2009: 37). Blagojević suggests that the hegemonic interpretations of differences between the core and the periphery rely on racial or cultural terms; however, the differences between the core and the semiperiphery are hegemonically understood in temporal terms. Namely, semiperiphery is assumed to be struck by slow, impeded, and never fully achieved modernization: "It is essentially shaped by the effort to catch up with the core, on one hand, and to resist the integration into the core, so not to lose its cultural characteristics, on the other hand" (Blagojević 2009: 33-34).

This sense of temporal stagnation forms of the basis of hegemonic discourse on the Balkan as well. The Balkan is most often presented as semi-developed, semi-modern, and inherently ambiguous: if orientalism is a discourse about imputed opposition, balkanism is a discourse about imputed ambiguity (Todorova 2009). While balkanism is most powerfully present in journalist accounts, travelogues, fine literature and other elements of cultural history of the Balkan, it does not just affect how things seem, but also how they are. This hegemonic view has become internalized and today it shapes a lot of self-understanding of the Balkan *vis a vis* the hegemonic categories of the West and the East (Bakić Hayden 1995; Jansen 2001; Obad 2012).

The reason for this sense of temporal stagnation and of the need to "catch up" with the core is largely structural. The semiperiphery:

> is in its essence transitional, in a process of the transition from one set of structures to another set of structures, and therefore, it is unstable, and often has characteristics of the void, chaos, or the structurelessness. (…) The social change at the semiperiphery is either too fast or too ambivalent, or both at the same time, to enable creation of the stable structures. Often it is not even the real social change, as much as it is 'eventfulness', an illusion of change created on the very surface of the social life, while in

deeper layers things remain the same, unchanged. (…) Semiperiphery often find itself in a condition of 'permanent reform', which in reality means that one reform is following the other while the previous has not been finalized, nor its effects explored (…) A gaze from a historical distance (…) could reveal an overall repetition of unfinished reforms, constant cyclical trials which end up often at a lower level than where they started from. (Blagojević 2009: 34-36)

This structural condition of repetition of unfinished reforms in the Balkan means that different modernist and non-modernist frameworks enter unpredictable assemblages, in which the meanings and practices of a number of concepts is negotiable, including "the everyday", "legality", "modern", "traditional", "socio-cultural sameness", "socio-cultural difference", "historical difference", and so forth. This is why Blagojević argues that studying the semiperiphery implies almost a different epistemic approach: "it is the search for the nucleus of social change which really is an issue" (2009: 39). As the result, producing the semiperiphery offers a variety of possibilities to engage with and to learn from socio-cultural difference. While this is potentially enriching, it also means that ethno-anthropology in the Balkan is difficult to capture as a distinct epistemological standpoint. This may be a task for any future thinking about ethno-anthropological knowledge in the Balkan.

NOTES

[1]   The text includes excerpts from the article 'Epistemological Eclecticism: Difference and the 'Other' in the Balkans and Beyond' published in the journal 'Anthropological Theory', November 20, 2017.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499617741063

[2]   Naumović suggests that native Balkan ethnological researchers were in the position of double insiders: "they in principle belong to the group they study, and share its language, traditions, dominant values, and interests, while simultaneously belonging to the special social subgroup of their group, whose task is to study, consolidate, invent, and eventually, defend the 'cause' of their group" (1998: 101). In many different contexts, the task of ethnologists was to collect pieces of the 'puzzle' of how the modernised, urbanised members of a nation presumably lived in past, which means that ethnology was expected to "confirm that there really existed a nation (by enforcing cultural and linguistic unity upon heterogeneous peasant populations)" (Naumović 1998: 108).

[3]   At first, the radical difference was explained temporally – the colonized populations presumably embodied the past stages of human evolution and therefore, indicated what Europeans used to be like in the past. Later on, the radical difference between the anthropologist and people she researched was explained by evoking the concept of culture and socialization (see Mihailescu 2007).

[4]   However, a number of contemporary ethno-anthropologists claim they are doing auto-anthropology, because their research is "carried out in the social context which produced it" (Strathern 1987: 17). For instance, Gulin Zrnić suggests that in her research "the process of 'going native' takes a new orientation – 'going strange'" (2004: 4)

[5]   Serbian Civic Law, article 507 defines that "*Zadruga* is where there is a mixture of shared residence and property, related by kinship or adoption, by nature established and confirmed" (*Zadruga je onde, gde je smesa zajednič*kog života i imanja svezom srodstva ili usvojenjem po prirodi osnovana i utvrđena). Available at: https://sr.wikisource.org/sr-el/%D0%A1 %D1%80%D0%BF%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8_%D0%B3%D1%80%D0 %B0%D1%92%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8_%D0%B 7%D0%B0%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%BA_-_%D0%BE %D1%80%D0%B8%D0%B3%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B0%D0%BB

References

Abu-Lughod, L. 1991. 'Writing Against Culture', in G. R. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, 137-54. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Bakić-Hayden, M. 1995. 'Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia', *Slavic Review*, 54(4): 917-31.

Blagojević, M. and Yair, G. 2010. 'The Catch 22 syndrome of social scientists in the semiperiphery: Exploratory sociological observations', *Sociologija*, 52(4): 337-358.

Blagojević, M. 2009. *Knowledge Production at the Semiperiphery. A Gender Perspective.* Belgrade: Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja. Available at: http://www.gb.rs/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Knowledge-Production-at-the-Semiperiphery1-3.pdf

Bogišić, V. 1884. *O obliku nazvanom inokoština u seoskoj porodici Srba i Hrvata.* Beograd: Štamparija narodne stranke.

Buchowski, M. 2004. 'Hierarchies of Knowledge in Central-Eastern European Anthropology', *Anthropology of East Europe Review*, 22(2): 5-14.

Buchowski, M. 2012. 'Intricate relations between Western anthropologists and Eastern ethnologists', *Focaal: European Journal of Anthropology*, 63: 20-38.

Byrnes, F. R. 1976. *Communal Families in the Balkans. The Zadruga, Essays by Philip Mosely and Essays in His Honor.* London: University of Notre Dame Press.

Čapo Žmegač, J., Gulin Zrnić, V., Pavel Šantek, G. 2006. *Etnologija bliskoga : poetika i politika suvremenih terenskih istraživanja.* Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, Naklada Jesenski i Turk.

Collier, J. S. 2011. *Post-Soviet Social. Neoliberalism, Social Modernity, Biopolitics.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Da Col, G. and Graeber, D. 2011. 'Foreword. The return of ethnographic theory', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 1(1): vi-xxxv.

Filipović, M. 1991. *Milenko Filipović. Čovek među ljudima.* Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, kolo LXXXIV, knjiga 553.

Gaonkar, D. P. (ed.) 2001. *Alternative Modernities.* Duke University Press.

Gulin, Zrnić, V. 2004. Auto-ethnography: research into one's own culture: some methodological insights. Paper presented at *Seventh International Conference on Urban History: European City in Comparative Perspective*, Panteion University, Athens - Piraeus, Greece, 27-30 October 2004, Session: Constructing urban memories: the role of oral testimony. Available at: http://pandemos.panteion.gr/index.php?op=record&pid=iid:472&lang=en

Halpern, J. M. and Hammel, E. A. 1969. 'Observations on the Intellectual History of Ethnology and Other Social Sciences in Yugoslavia', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 11(1): 17-26.

Hann, C., Benovska, M., Bošković, A., Buchowski, M., Kalb, D., Podoba, J., Scheffel, Z. D., Skalník, P., Stewart, M., Uherek, Z. and Verdery, K. 2007. 'Anthropology's Multiple Temporalities and its Future in Central and Eastern Europe: A Debate', *Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Working Papers*, Halle/Saale.

Hofer, T. 1968. 'Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages: Comparative Notes on the Professional Personality of Two Disciplines', *Current Anthropology*, 9(4): 311-315.

Ingold, T. 2014. 'That's enough about ethnography!', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4(1): 383-395.

Jansen, S. 2001. 'Svakodnevni orijentalizam. Doživljaj „Balkana" / „Evrope" u Beogradu i Zagrebu', *Filozofija i društvo,* 18: 33-71.

Kuper, A. 1999. *Culture – the anthropologists' account.* Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.

Kürti, L. 1996. 'Homecoming: Affairs of Anthropologists in and of Eastern Europe', *Anthropology Today*, 12(3): 11-15.

Levi-Strauss, C. 1963. *Structural Anthropology.* New York: Basic Books.

Marcus, E. G. and Fischer, J. M. 1999. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences.* University of Chicago Press.

Mihailescu, V. 2007. 'Autochthonism and national ethnology in Romania', *CAS WORKING PAPER SERIES*, 1-26. Centre for Advanced Study Sofia.

Mihailescu, V., Iliev, I. and Naumović, S. (eds.) 2009. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe.* Lit Verlag.

Milenković, M. 2006. 'Postmoderna teorija etnografije. Prolegomena za istoriju postmoderne antropologije', *Antropologija* 2: 44-66.

Milenković, M. 2008. 'Da li je etnografija deo antropologije ili je antropologija deo etnografije?', *Etnoantropološki problemi*, 1(3): 275-278.

Miljković Matić, J. 2012. *Milenko Filipović u srpskoj etnologiji.* Doktorska disertacija. Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu.

Narayan, K. 1993. 'How Native Is a 'Native' Anthropologist?', *American Anthropologist*, 95(3): 671-686.

Naumović, S. 1998. 'Romanticists or Double Insiders? An Essay on the Origins of Ideologised Discourses In Balkan Ethnology', *Ethnologia Balkanica* 2: 101-120.

Novaković, N. 2005. 'Teorije o nastanku i strukturi porodičnih zadruga', *Stanovništvo* 1-4: 105-134.

Obad, O. 2014. 'On the Privilege of the Peripheral Point of View: A Beginner's Guide to the Study and Practice of Balkanism', in T. Petrović (ed.), *Mirroring Europe*, 20-38. Brill.

Peirano, G. S. M. 1998. 'When Anthropology is at Home: The Different Contexts of a Single Discipline', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27: 105-128.

Prica, I. 1999. 'Etnologija ali antropologija! Prilog diskusiji na temu: Etnologija i?, ili?, i/ili,? kroz?, versus? (itd.) antropologija', *Studia ethnologica Croatica*, 10/11: 201-214.

Prica, I. 2001. *Mala europska etnologija*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing.

Radojičić, D. 2005. *Etnologija i antropologija: stanje i perspektive*. Beograd: Zbornik EI SANU 21.

Ryang, S. 1997. 'Native Anthropology and Other Problems', *Dialectical Anthropology*, 22: 23-49.

Skovajsa, M. 2008. 'Social anthropology and national ethnography in post-socialist academic fields: partners or rivals?', *GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences. Knowledge Base Social Sciences Eastern Europe*. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/3631036/Social_anthropology_and_national_ ethnography_in_post-socialist_academic_fields_partners_or_rivals_.pdf

Strathern, M. 1987. 'The Limits of Auto-Anthropology', in A. Jackson (ed.), *Anthropology At Home*. , 16-37. London, New York: Tavistock Publications.

Strohal, I. 1909. 'Zadruga u južnih Slovena', *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja* 21(1): 215-296.

Stocking, G. 1982. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. University of Chicago Press.

Ssorin Chaikov, N. 2003. *The Social Life of the State in Subarctic Siberia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Todorova, M. 1993. *Balkan Family Structure and the European Pattern*. Washington: American University Press.

Turda, M. 2010. 'Introduction: Whither race? Physical anthropology in post-1945 Central and Southeastern Europe', *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 58: 3–15

Tužinska, H. 2008. 'How far have we gone with being applied? From Narodopis to Antropologia, curricula heterogeneity and public engagement in Slovakia', *Studia ethnologica Croatica*, 20: 193-209.

Todorova, M. 2009. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vittorelli, N. 2002. 'An "Other" of One's Own: Pre-WWI South Slavic Academic Discourses on the *zadruga*', *Spaces of Identity* 2(3): 27-43.

Wimmer, A. and Glick Schiller, N. 2002. 'Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences', *Global Networks*, 2: 301-334.

Wright, S. 1998. 'The Politicization of Culture', *Anthropology Today*, 14(1): 7-15.