

LAND AVAILABILITY AND JOINT FAMILY HOUSEHOLD IN CIVIL
SLAVONIA ACCORDING TO THE CAMERAL CENSUS FROM 1736*Robert SKENDEROVIĆ*Croatian Institute for History, Branch Office for the History of Slavonia, Syrmia and Baranya,
Ante Starčevića 8, 35000 Slavonski Brod, Croatia
e-mail: rskender@isp.hr*ABSTRACT*

According to the cameral census of Civil Slavonia from 1736, around one third of all households were joint family households. Such an outcome raises the question why some Slavonians lived in joint family households while others did not. The answer includes different factors: cultural, demographic and economic. This paper presents an analysis of economic factors, especially of land availability, important for the agrarian society. In the paper villages with extra high or low percentage of joint family households were extracted for a better understanding of the connection between land availability and household structure. The analysis of household structure, average number of heavy livestock and land per household provides an answer about the importance of land availability for the size and structure of the household. In this sense one must differentiate Civil Slavonia and Slavonian Military Border. In Military Border military officials recognized joint family household as an exceptional type of household that could not only provide maximum of soldiers, but also take care for war invalids, widows and orphans. Military officials created efficient system that provided all the military families with sufficient land. On the contrary, in Civil Slavonia feudal landowners did not have any particular interest in supporting joint family households among the peasants.

Keywords: Slavonia, 18th century, joint family household, land availability, cameral census

LA DISPONIBILITÀ DI TERRA E LE FAMIGLIE CONGIUNTE NELLA
SLAVONIA CIVILE SECONDO IL CENSIMENTO CAMERALE DEL 1736*SINTESI*

Secondo il censimento camerale della Slavonia civile del 1736 le famiglie congiunte contavano circa un terzo di tutti i nuclei di convivenza dell'area in questione. Tale risultato solleva la domanda: "Perché solo alcuni abitanti della Slavonia vivevano in questo tipo di nuclei familiari?" La risposta a questa domanda comporta molteplici fattori culturali, demografici ed economici. Questo articolo presenta un'analisi dei fattori

economici, in particolare la disponibilità della terra che è di importanza vitale per le società agricole. Selezionando gli insediamenti con il numero molto alto o molto basso di famiglie congiunte si voleva comprendere il collegamento tra la disponibilità della terra e la struttura dei nuclei familiari. L'analisi della struttura dei nuclei familiari, del numero medio degli animali da tiro e della quantità della terra arabile per nucleo rende chiara l'importanza della disponibilità del terreno per la grandezza e la struttura dei nuclei in discussione. In questo senso, si deve distinguere la situazione nella Slavonia civile dalla situazione nella Frontiera militare della Slavonia. Le autorità militari della Frontiera militare hanno riconosciuto le famiglie congiunte come un tipo eccezionale di nucleo familiare che non solo assicura il massimo numero di soldati, ma fornisce l'assistenza agli invalidi di guerra, alle vedove e agli orfani. Le autorità militari hanno istituito un sistema efficace secondo il quale veniva assegnata una quantità sufficiente di terra arabile per le famiglie militari. D'altra parte, nella Slavonia civile i latifondisti feudali non avevano un particolare interesse a sostenere le famiglie congiunte tra i contadini.

Parole chiave: Slavonia, Settecento, famiglie congiunte, disponibilità di terra, censimento camerale

PREFERENCE OF JOINT FAMILY HOUSEHOLD

The cameral census of Civil Slavonia from 1736, published by Ive Mažuran in 1993, represents a precious source for the research of joint family households in the 18th century (Mažuran, 1993). Slavonia is interesting in particular because in 1702 it was divided into two parts – Civil Slavonia and Slavonian Military Frontier. Joint family households existed as a family model in both administrative parts. In the 2nd half of the 18th century, the Military Government in Slavonian Military Frontier gave it a special status because it was recognized as an ideal model of life for the peasant soldiers. The Military Government supported joint family households because they helped in securing the subsistence of a soldier's family (women and children) when he was in war (Kaser, 1997, p. 359). Furthermore, it was ideal for the cases when peasant soldiers were killed or became disabled. In both cases joint family households would take care of his family. In case that a peasant soldier became disabled, a joint family household would take care of him too. Thus, in Slavonia there was no need for such institutions like *Invalidenhaus* that were built in Austria and Hungary. Therefore, the joint family household was protected and supported by the Military Government and that is why it was a predominant type of household in the Slavonian Military Frontier. On the other side, landlords in Civil Slavonia were not especially interested in any type of household. The shaping of households in Civil Slavonia depended on the local economic and demographic factors.

In the 18th century Civil Slavonia was a predominantly agrarian society. Having that in mind, one has to look at the pre-modern family strategy through the prism of economic conditions, especially the issue of land availability. According to Josip Bösendorfer, peas-

ants preferred to live in joint family households because they were economically more stable and stronger (Bösendorfer, 1950, p. 51). Peasants tried to create a sustainable system, i.e. to live in autarky. Living in bigger families obviously had economic advantages, but the 1736 conscription shows that only one third of all households in Civil Slavonia were joint family households. Considering that fact, it is obvious that most peasants did not have the possibility to establish it.

The reasons for failure were many. Some of them are demographic. Firstly, joint family households in Slavonia were patrilineal and patrilocal. Therefore, many households were not able to create a joint family household simply due to the lack of male children or high mortality rate. In an effort to find economic reasons, the lack of available land can be considered at first. However, the first cameral census of Slavonia from 1698 shows that in all parts of the region there was an abundance of land, much more than peasants could cultivate (Mažuran, 1988). Such abundance was a precondition for the later rapid growth of population and cultivated land which was recorded throughout the whole 18th century.

In the first decades of the 18th century, the number of inhabitants and cultivated land grew in both parts of Slavonia – Civil and Military. According to Ive Mažuran, around 45.000 inhabitants lived in Civil Slavonia in 1702, but already in 1736 the number grew to around 90.000 inhabitants - as twice as 34 years before (Mažuran, 1988, p. 42; Mažuran, 1993, p. 43). Approximately one third of all households in the 1736 conscription were joint family households. To be more accurate, according to the census from 1736 there were 14.400 conscripted households and 4.600 married brothers and sons. Although in some households three or more nuclear families were registered, the overwhelming majority of joint family households were households with two families – those of the parents and one married son (Mažuran, 1993, p. 72).

The number of inhabitants in Civil Slavonia continued to grow later too. According to the *Tabella Impopulationis* from 1773, 210.492 inhabitants lived on the territory of Civil Slavonia (then already organized in three Slavonian counties – Požega, Virovitica and Sirmia), which is a growth of about 230% in comparison with 1736 (Skenderović, 2010).

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The focus of interest in this paper is the village as an economic unit. In pre-modern feudal Slavonia much of economic activity was organized within the village. Inhabitants of the village even owned some joint property, such as pasture and woods, sometimes even arable land. Therefore, in the analysis of economic conditions of the Slavonian peasant family it is necessary to understand the differences that existed from village to village.

Due to the fact that the average Slavonian village in 1736 had one third of all households organized as joint family households, the analysis in this paper will focus on villages with “extra high” and “extra low” percentage of joint family households. The fact that the average percentage of joint family households per village was around 30% points to the conclusion that villages with less than 10% could be proclaimed as villages with extra low percentage of joint family households. Accordingly, villages with more than 50% of joint family households would be villages with extra high percentage. The first

step in the analysis is to excerpt such villages. The second one is to find out what the differences in the amount of land and heavy livestock between the villages with high and low percentage of joint family households are. Such analysis provides in the end a better insight into the correlation between family structure and land availability.

In the analysis of heavy livestock oxen and horses were taken into consideration even though there is a dispute over the use of horses for farming in Slavonia during the 18th century. Contemporaries Friedrich von Taube, Franz Stephan Engel and Matija Antun Relković wrote in their works that Slavonian peasants did not use horses for plowing, but only oxen. Such claims were accepted in the Croatian Historiography (Čapo, 1991, p. 44; Galiot Kovačić, 1998, p. 221; Vrbanus, 2002, p. 212). However, according to the cameral census from 1736, the number of horses in Civil Slavonia was 12.385, while the number of oxen was 13.467 (Mažuran, 1993, p.74). It is not likely that the number of horses was almost as high as the number of oxen and yet that those horses were not used in farming at all. Therefore, in this analysis both horses and oxen were taken into account.

According to Mažuran the number of heavy stock already grew rapidly in the period from 1698-1702. Such growth was the chief factor that influenced the rising amount of cultivated land in Civil Slavonia (Mažuran, 1993, p. 46). Comparing human working force and heads of heavy livestock with the size of the peasants' property, it is evident that human working force was important and could be a substitution for the heavy livestock only on smaller farms. On larger farms, with a lot of arable land, heavy livestock was irreplaceable (Vrbanus, 2002, p. 212). Due to the backward techniques, Slavonian villages needed much more men power and heavy livestock in the process of farming. According to Relković plowing was practiced with a wooden plow, which required some three to five pairs of oxen hitched to a single plow. Next to every pair of oxen one man had to stand and drive them into the right direction, which means that such plowing needed three to five men at work (Galiot Kovačić, 1998, p. 221).

STRUCTURE OF THE FAMILIES

According to Karl Kaser joint family households in Croatian and Slavonian Military Frontier belonged to the Balkan type of joint family he named "Balkan family household" (*Balkanfamilienhaushalt*) (Kaser, 1995). The main features of it are patrilineal and patrilocal life with male dominance. Kaser's analysis was focused only on the Military Frontier in Croatia and Slavonia, but available sources are showing that the same structure of family existed in Civil Slavonia too.

Cameral census of Civil Slavonia from 1736 does not provide a detailed insight into the structure of joint family households, but it shows that married brothers and sons lived together. In the census only the head of the household was recorded by name. Other adult male members of the household were recorded only in numeric form, divided in two different groups: 1) married brothers and sons, 2) not married brothers and sons. Due to that fact other sources are needed for the analysis of family structure in Civil Slavonia at that time. Another source, although local, provides valuable proof that joint family house-

holds in Civil Slavonia were also patrilineal and patrilocal. It is the conscription from 1730 that was recently found in the Franciscan Monastery of the Holy Spirit in Požega (full Latin title: *Liber Nominalis completens tam intra, quam extra utriusque Sexus Nomina Personarum totius Parochiae Conventus Sancti Spiritus metropolitanae, liberae, regiaeque Civitatis Poseganae.*). According to the title and the content, the conscription was obviously made for the religious purposes because it was done by the Franciscans and included the villages of the Holy Spirit Parish in Požega. According to my reconstruction of the families, the conscription includes only adult members of the households (Skenderović, 2001, p. 115-116). The head of the household was the only person recorded by name and surname. His wife was recorded as “domaćica” (housewife). Sons and their wives were recorded only by name and with the kin relation to the head of the household (as brother, son, sister-in-law, daughter-in-law etc.).

For example, Family Maistorovich from the village Vidovci:

Nicolaus Maistor

Mato szyn (Matthew, son)

Fragnio szyn (Francis, son)

Gargo szyn (George, son)

Symun szyn (Simon, son)

Annicsa Baba (Anna, grandmother)

Mara snaha (Maria, daughter-in-law)

Jagnia snaha (Joanna, daughter-in-law)

Josa kcser Mate (Josepha, Mato’s daughter)

Reconstruction of Maistorovich family (Skenderovic, 2001, p. 115)

A. Ana

AA. Nicholas Maistor (head of the household)

AAA. Matthew, wife Maria

AAAA. Josepha

AAA. Francis, wife Joanna

AAA. George

AAA. Simon

Fifteen conscripted villages of the Holy Spirit Parish show that in all of them the same patrilineal and patrilocal model of joint family household was present. The percentage of joint family households in the total number of households ranges from 11.11 to 66.67 %. The average percentage of joint family households per village is 38.07, i.e. around 1/3 of all households in the Holy Spirit Parish (Table 1). It is evident that the average percentage of joint family households in “Liber Nominalis” matches the average percentage of joint family households in the cameral conscription of Civil Slavonia from 1736. It proves that the extraction of “-10%” and “+50%” villages is a good model for the analysis of the villages with extra low and extra high percentage of joint family households.

Table 1: Number and percentage of joint family households in “Liber Nominalis” (Požega, 1730)

Village	No. of households	No of j. f. households	% of j. f. households
Emovci	22	7	31.81
Alaginci	4	2	50.00
Šeovci	6	4	66.67
Golobrdci	19	8	42.10
Štitnjak	7	4	57.14
Blacko	19	8	42.10
Viškovci	17	3	17.64
Srednje Selo	17	5	29.41
Orljavac	11	3	27.27
Dolac	11	6	54.54
Dervišagino Selo	18	4	22.22
Vidovci	23	14	60.86
Drškovci	9	1	11.11
Novo Selo	26	10	38.46
Završje	9	4	44.44
Total:	218	83	38.07

DIFFUSION OF JOINT FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS IN CIVIL SLAVONIA ACCORDING TO THE 1736 CENSUS

The situation in the Parish of the Holy Spirit in Požega shows similarities with the situation in whole Civil Slavonia. Among the conscripted towns and villages, from the 25 estates included in the cameral conscription, only in a few of them there was not a single joint family household. Those settlements are by name: Tvrđa Osijek, village Remeta at the Ilok estate, villages Svetoblažje, Kondrić, Drenje, Beketinci and Vučevci at the Đakovo estate, village Poreč at the Valpovo estate, village Sušine at the Našice estate, village Lipovac at the Virovitica estate and village Završje at the Brestovac estate. Among them Tvrđa Osijek is an exception because it was the most urban settlement in whole Slavonia. Therefore, it will not be a part of the analysis in this paper. However, it is important to stress that among five Slavonian towns recorded in the conscription, only in Tvrđa Osijek not a single joint family household was recorded, while in the other four

(Donji Grad – Osijek, Gornji Grad – Osijek, Požega and Virovitica), there were at least a few of them.

Ten previously mentioned villages without a single joint family household represent only 2% of all conscripted villages which shows that joint family households were a widespread phenomenon in whole Civil Slavonia. From 25 estates, in 19 of them there were villages with less than 10% or with more than 50% of joint family households among all households. The extraction of villages with “-10%” and “+50%” joint family households is shown by estate in Table 2:

Table 2: Number of villages with “-10%” and “+50%” joint family households

Estate	Number of vil- lages	Villages with “-10%” j. f. households	Villages with “+50%” j. f. households
Ilok	17	2	1
Vukovar	35	2	1
Nuštar	8	0	3
Dalj	5	3	0
Đakovo	53	19	2
Valpovo	44	2	3
Našice	11	1	5
Orahovica	25	0	17
Virovitica	27	1	6
Voćin	44	0	17
Velika	40	0	15
Crnković	3	0	1
Brestovac	24	2	9
Cernik	19	0	11
Sirač	12	0	3
Podborje (Darugar)	17	0	4
Pakrac	37	1	9
Subocka	26	3	2
Kutina	7	0	2

According to Table 2, Dalj and Đakovo estate are especially interesting as examples of estates with low percentage of joint family households. On the other side, Našice, Ora-

hovica, Voćin, Velika and Cernik are interesting as examples of estates with high percentage of joint family households. Geographically, estates with more “-10%” villages were situated in eastern lowland, while estates with more “+50%” villages were located in the hilly western part of Slavonia. It is partly unexpected because eastern Slavonia is known for the abundance of cultivated land which would lead to the conclusion that one could expect to find more joint family households and “+50%” villages there.

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF LAND AND NUMBER OF HEAVY LIVESTOCK

The key issue in this analysis is how the percentage of joint family households correlates with the land availability and with the heavy livestock ownership. According to Ive Mažuran in the 1736 conscription there were 44.943 acres of arable land conscripted on the territory of the whole Civil Slavonia (Mažuran, 1993, p. 76). Comparing that number with the 14.400 conscripted households, the result of 3.12 acres as the average amount of the arable land per household at that time is obtained. Also, the 1736 conscript counted 12.385 horses and 13.467 oxen. (Mažuran, 1993, p. 74). Therefore, in whole Civil Slavonia the average number of heavy livestock per household was 1.78. Next step is to compare the average amount of land and the number of heavy livestock in the villages with extra small and with extra high percentage of joint family households. Such analysis was made in Table 3 and Table 4. For the 19 extracted estates, Table 3 shows the average amount of land (in acres) and number of heavy livestock per household in the villages with small percentage (“-10%”) of joint family households.

Table 3: Average amount of land and number of heavy livestock per household in the villages with “-10%” joint family households

Estate	Average amount of land (acres)	Average number of heavy livestock
Ilok	1.15	1.55
Vukovar	1.8	2.13
Dalj	1.6	1.35
Đakovo	3.29	1.53
Valpovo	3.94	1.51
Našice	1.57	0.86
Virovitica	4.88	0.75
Brestovac	3.53	0.96
Subocka	2.64	1.71
Total average	2.71	1.37

Comparing the data in Table 3 one can conclude that the average amount of land and number of heavy livestock per household in the “-10%” villages was very low. Actually, average possession of households was less than 3 acres of land, while the average number of heads of heavy livestock was 1.37. It shows that “-10%” villages were very poor. Their households lacked land and heavy livestock. Therefore there was no economic basis for the creation of joint family household. For better understanding of the economic conditions it is necessary to do the same analysis for the “+50%” villages. This analysis is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Average amount of land and number of heavy stock per household in the villages with “+50%” joint family households

Estate	Average amount of land (acres)	Average number of heavy livestock
Ilok	1.63	2.13
Vukovar	2.54	2
Nuštar	14.12	3.47
Đakovo	5.26	1.2
Valpovo	5.95	2.92
Našice	3.07	3.04
Orahovica	3.85	2.5
Virovitica	5.73	2.06
Voćin	6.26	3.35
Velika	4.22	2.5
Crnković	5.5	2.75
Brestovac	3.65	1.89
Cernik	4.19	2.24
Sirač	3.68	2.5
Podborje (Daruvar)	3.47	3.13
Pakrac	2.66	2.14
Subocka	3.8	1.84
Kutina	3.5	3.55
Total average	4.62	2.51

According to the Table 3 and Table 4 both villages with “-10%” and with “+50%” joint family households were pretty poor. The average amount of 4.62 acres per household in the villages with extra high percentage of joint family households shows that most peasants in those villages were also smallholders. However, the comparison of Table 3 and Table 4 shows that the average possession of land and average number of heavy livestock in the villages with “+50%” joint family households was almost double (4.62 compared to 2.71 acres, 2.51 compared to 1.37 of heavy livestock) than in “-10%” villages. It shows that the average household in villages with more joint family households had more land and more heavy livestock, i. e. that such villages had better economic preconditions for the creation of joint family households.

For the purpose of adequate methodology application, it is also important to take the quality of land into consideration. It is not possible to discover the quality of land for every single village in Civil Slavonia, but an erroneous interpretation of the results would be lower if the analysis compared the situation in “-10%” and “+50%” villages within each particular estate. Therefore, Table 5 and Table 6 were made. Table 5 shows comparison between the average amount of land in “-10%” and “+50%” villages on the nine estates which had both groups of villages.

Table 5: Average amount of land (in acres) in “-10%” and “+50%” villages: a comparative analysis within nine particular estates

	“-10%” villages	+“50%” villages
Ilok	1.15	1.63
Vukovar	1.8	2.54
Đakovo	3.29	5.26
Valpovo	3.94	5.95
Našice	1.57	3.07
Virovitica	4.88	5.73
Brestovac	3.53	3.65
Pakrac	2.26	2.66
Subocka	2.64	3.8
Total:	2.78	3.81

For the same purpose it is important to do the comparative analysis of the average number of heavy livestock in the “-10%” and “+50%” villages. Such an analysis was done in the Table 6.

Table 6: Average number of heavy livestock in “-10” and “+50%” villages: a comparative analysis within nine particular estates

	“-10%” villages	+“50%” villages
Ilok	1.55	2.13
Vukovar	2.13	2
Đakovo	1.53	1.2
Valpovo	1.51	2.92
Našice	0.86	3.04
Virovitica	0.75	2.06
Brestovac	0.97	1.89
Pakrac	0.89	2.14
Subocka	1.71	1.84
Total:	1.32	2.14

Table 5 and Table 6 show that the satisfactory amount of available land and number of heavy stock gave the opportunity for the creation of joint family households. In most villages it meant some 3 or more acres of land and of some 2 or more heads of heavy livestock per household. Only in Ilok, Vukovar and Pakrac estate joint family households were widespread even in villages with less than 3 acres per household. On the other side, in Đakovo, Valpovo, Virovitica and Brestovac even “-10%” villages had an average of more than 3 acres per household but in those estates there was evident lack of heavy livestock (in Đakovo and Valpovo less than 2 per household, in Virovitica and Brestovac even less than 1 per household). If one accepts that 3 acres of land and 2 heads of heavy livestock were a minimum for the existence of the joint family household, it is possible to explain the situation with the percentage of joint family households in each village in Slavonia.

Comparison of the amount of land and number of heavy livestock between the two groups of villages (-10% and +50%) in all examined estates shows that both elements were important. In situations when villages had an abundance of land, but lacked heavy livestock, the precondition for creating joint family household was as bad as in the opposite situation when they had enough of heavy livestock but lacked arable land. For example, village Lipovac at the Virovitica estate, which was without a single joint family household, had an average of 4.88 acres per household but only 0.75 heads of heavy livestock. It shows that in Lipovac there was a serious lack of heavy livestock which was a possible decisive factor for the absence of joint family households in that village.

CONCLUSION

Large majority of villages conscripted in the 1736 cameral conscription of the Civil Slavonia had at least a few joint family households. Only in 2% of villages not a single joint family household was recorded. The 1736 conscription and “Liber Nominalis” from 1730 represent a historical proof that joint family households in Civil Slavonia were patrilineal and patrilocal.

Starting from the thesis that most Slavonian peasants wanted to live in joint family households and from the fact that such households comprised only one third of all households in Civil Slavonia, the question of economic elements appears as the important one. The analysis of the joint family households in Slavonia shows that this phenomenon was a part of the agrarian society. In urban settlements it was rare or not present at all. Therefore the availability of land and of heavy livestock was the most important economic factor which determined the size and structure of a household.

The correlation between the factors shows that the villages with extra small percentage of joint family households (less than 10%) suffered from the lack of land and of heavy livestock. In the villages with extra high percentage of joint family households (more than 50%), the average amount of land and number of heavy livestock were not high (of land less than 5 acres), but still almost as twice as the amount of land and number of heavy livestock in the “-10%” villages. It shows that both, the amount of land and number of heavy livestock were important for the creation of joint family households and that they were mutually connected. Finally, the fact that the average amount of land in “-10%” villages was less than 3 acres, while in the “+50%” villages it was more than 3 acres leads to the conclusion that 3 acres was the minimal amount of land needed for the creation of a joint family household. The same analysis leads to 2 heads of heavy livestock needed for the farming of such a property. Three acres of land and two heads of heavy livestock represent a small possession and the 1736 conscription shows that it was typical in the 18th century Civil Slavonia. It also proves the backward methods of agriculture that were practiced in Slavonia during the 18th century.

RAZPOLOŽLJIVOST ZEMLJIŠČ IN ZDRUŽENE DRUŽINE V CIVILNI
SLAVONIJI NA OSNOVI KAMERALNEGA SEZNAMA IZ LETA 1736

Robert SKENDEROVIĆ

Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, Ante Starčevića 8,
35000 Slavonski Brod, Hrvatska
e-mail: rskender@isp.hr

POVZETEK

Kameralni seznam civilne Slavonije iz leta 1736 omogoča vpogled v strukturo velikosti gospodinjstev na tem področju in zato predstavlja zelo dober zgodovinski vir. Ana-

liza tega seznama nam odkriva, da so v tem letu združene družine obsegale komaj eno tretjino vseh gospodinjstev. Kameralni seznam obsega tudi podatke o gospodarski moči vsakega posamičnega gospodinjstva – velikosti zemljiške posesti in številu živine, ki so jih le-te imele v lasti. Na osnovi tega seznama je možno narediti tudi analizo medsebojne pogojenosti strukture gospodinjstev in gospodarske razvitosti v Civilni Slavoniji v tem obdobju. Posebej je zanimivo razmerje med kompleksnostjo družine in velikostjo posesti. Korelacija med strukturo družine in velikostjo zemljiške posesti je pomembna zaradi lažjega razumevanja pogojenosti razvoja družine z gospodarskimi dejavniki, ki so se v Civilni Slavoniji precej razlikovali od Slavonske vojne krajine. Namreč, v Slavonski vojni krajini je velikost zemljiške posesti bila pogojena z položajem kmetajovjaka, pravzaprav z njegovim vojaškim činom, za razliko od Civilne Slavonije, kjer še vedno ni jasno, kateri dejavniki so odločilno vplivali na velikost posesti posameznega kmečkega gospodinjstva.

V svoji analizi sem se osredotočil na naselja z izjemno velikim deležem združenih družin (50%) in na tista, kjer je njihov delež bil izredno nizek (manj od 10%), oziroma na dejstvo, da je povprečno na področju celotne Civilne Slavonije delež združenih družin v naseljih znašal okoli 30% vseh gospodinjstev. Razen podatkov o strukturi gospodinjstev in količini obdelovanih površin, sem v analizi uporabil tudi podatke o številu vprežne živine. Rezultati kažejo, da samo v desetih naseljih (2% od vseh) Civilne Slavonije ni bilo niti ene združene družine, kar priča, da so bile le-te zelo prisotne na njenem celotnem področju. Dodatni viri, kot je seznam gospodinjstev v vaseh župnije Svetega Duha v Požezi iz leta 1730, dokazujejo, da so združene družine bile patrilinearno i patrilokalno organizirane. Povprečna količina obdelovalnih površin po gospodinjstvu je za vsa naselja Civilne Slavonije znašala 3,12 jutra, povprečno število vprežne živine pa 1,78 glav po gospodinjstvu. Analiza naselij z manj kot 10% združenih družin kaže, da sta povprečna količina obdelovalne površine in povprečno število vprežne živine bili pod povprečjem Civilne Slavonije, da pa so naselja z več kot 50% združenih družin imela večje povprečje od povprečja Civilne Slavonije. Celotna analiza kaže, da je za oblikovanje združene družine povprečna minimalna količina obdelovalne zemlje znašala okoli tri jutra, minimalno število vprežne živine pa dve glavi. Razen tega sem ugotovil, da je velikost obdelovalnega zemljišča bila enako pomembna kot število vprežne živine. Pomanjkanje katerega koli od teh dveh dejavnikov bistveno zmanjša gospodarsko moč vasi in možnost združitve v kompleksnih družinskih gospodinjstvih.

Ključne besede: Slavonija, 18. stoletje, združene družine, razpoložljivost zemljišč, kameralni seznam

REFERENCES

- Bićanić, R. (1951):** Doba manufaktura u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji 1750.-1860. Zagreb, JAZU.
- Bösendorfer, J. (1950):** Agrarni odnosi u Slavoniji – Prilozi za istraživanje gospodarske povijesti. Zagreb, JAZU.
- Čapo, J. (1991):** Vlastelinstvo Cernik – Gospodarstvene I demografske promjene na hrvatskom selu u kasnome feudalizmu. Zagreb, Institut za etnologiju I folkloristiku, Posebna izdanja, 16.
- Engel F. Š. (Engel, Franz Stephan) (2003):** Opis Kraljevine Slavonije i Vojvodstva Srijema (1786). Novi Sad, Matica srpska.
- Galiot Kovačić, J. (1998):** „Gospodarski i kulturni utjecaji njemačkih doseljenika na tradicijski život Slavonije, Baranje i zapadnog Srijema od početka 18. stoljeća do 1941. godine“. *Etnološka istraživanja*, Vol. 1, No. 12/13 siječanj. Zagreb, 213-230.
- Gavrilović, S. (1960):** Agrarni pokret u Sremu I Slavoniji početkom XIX. veka. Beograd, SANU.
- Kaser, K. (1995):** Familie und Verwandtschaft auf dem Balkan: Analyse einer untergehenden Kultur. Böhlau Verlag Wien-Köln-Weimar.
- Kaser, K. (1997):** Freier Bauer und Soldat: Die Militarisierung der agrarischen Gesellschaft an der kroatisch-slavonischen Militärgrenze (1535-1881). Böhlau Verlag, Wien-Köln-Weimar.
- Mažuran, I. (1988):** Popis naselja i stanovništva u Slavoniji 1698. godine. Osijek, Zavod za znanstveni rad JAZU u Osijeku.
- Mažuran, I. (1993):** Stanovništvo i vlastelinstva u Slavoniji i njihova ekonomska podloga 1736. godine. Osijek, Zavod za znanstveni rad JAZU.
- Relković, M. A. (1762):** Satir iliti divji covik. Dresden.
- Skenderović R. (2001):** “Struktura obitelji u selima Požeštine tijekom 18. stoljeća”, *Scrinia Slavonica*, No. 1. Slavonski Brod, 109-123.
- Skenderović, R. (2010):** “Popis stanovništva hrvatskih i slavonskih županija iz 1773. (Tabella Impopulationis pro Anno 1773)”, *Povijesni prilozi*, No. 39. Zagreb, 73-92.
- Taube von, F. (1777):** Historische und geographische Beschreibung des Königreiches Slawonien und des Herzogthums Syrmien. Leipzig.
- Vrbanus, M. (2002):** “Ratarstvo u Slavonskoj Posavini krajem 17. stoljeća”, *Scrinia Slavonica* No. 2. Slavonski Brod, 202-260.