

## THE 'HINDU JOINT FAMILY': PAST AND PRESENT

Minna Säävälä

The family has had a central place in discussions about economic development in India for more than a century. This interest already started with one of the 'anthropological ancestors' of the Indian studies – Sir Henry Sumner Maine who was a lawyer, scholar, and a colonial administrator in British India. Maine analysed the 'Indian joint family' within a classical evolutionist framework and claimed that India lacked the social forces and moral qualities essential for social development (Madan 1994: 416), and that this was largely due to the 'archaic' family system. The 'Joint Undivided Family of the Hindoos', as Maine called it, was according to him the most primeval form of community in agricultural societies, a remnant of the past (Maine 1880: 78-79).

Maine came to this conclusion by comparing the Indian family system to its ancient Teutonic, Celtic and Slavic counterparts. His sources were Indological representations of Hindu texts and empirical material about the prevalent Indian family of the 19th century which he acquired from British administrators, travellers, and missionaries. Maine wrote about the joint family as primarily a proprietorial unit. A 'patriarchal family' was 'a group of men and women, children and slaves, of animate and inanimate property, all connected together by common subjection to the Paternal Power of the chief of the household' (Maine 1895: 15). The power of the patriarch (*patria potestas*) was sovereign and absolute. According to Maine, the 'paternal family' of the ancient Roman law had been preserved in the Hindu joint family even though it had disappeared in the West. This preservation had been possible in self-regulating Village Republics – independent, communitarian, and self-regulating village communities that had resisted outside political domination and the powers of history. This kind of village community was a remnant from the 'infancy of human society' – Indian society was thought to be based on status, whereas the transfer which had taken place elsewhere from joint to individually-owned property meant a change from status to contract. (Dumont 1966: 80-82.)

In the discussion *à la* Maine which was carried on long after his time, the Indian economy was regarded as stagnant due to the proprietorial features of the Hindu joint family. The inference runs as follows: as families are prevalently nuclear in Euro-American societies, where economic and industrial development has been

fast, the lack of economic development in India is an outcome of the absence of such a family structure. It is claimed that the authoritarian, tradition-bound, and collectivist family structure kills individual initiative, innovation, accumulation of capital, and social and spatial mobility (Madan 1994: 423). To use Maine's well-known concepts, society is based on *status* instead of *contract*. According to this form of thinking, which was to be found behind functionalism in sociology in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. Parsons & Bales 1955; ref. in Koning 1997: 44), economic development was possible only in a society where joint families were rare and nuclear families the norm and property was privately, not jointly owned. Economic development was thought to demand mental, physical, and financial mobility, which joint living would discourage.

The need to consider India as stagnant and the Indian family as 'undeveloped' was motivated by the same factors that could be found behind the modernization ideology and evolutionist thinking – they supported Western intellectual supremacy and justified domination over the 'undeveloped'. It was necessary conceptually to build a distance between Us and the Other, so that the moral conundrum of colonial and post-colonial domination was easier to cope with. The Indian society generally was regarded as a stagnant and unchangingly traditional prehistoric remnant which was changed by the British colonialists who brought history to India (in addition to Maine, this view was held among others by Marx 1972).

### THE CLASSICAL IDEA OF THE 'HINDU JOINT FAMILY'

Nowadays a joint family is most commonly defined as a set of at least two brothers with their wives and children, and possibly their parents and unmarried sisters, who usually share the same dwelling and a common hearth.<sup>1</sup> There may also be other relatives residing together. A joint family is joint economically, physically, socially, and ritually.

The idea of the joint family is essentially economic. Brothers in a joint family (if we speak about patrilineal communities) form a coparcenary, which means that they share a right to their ancestral property thanks to their patrilineal link. According to Manu's laws, the property of the family could not be divided until the patriarch had died, and basically the eldest son should keep the patrimony intact even after the death of the father and act towards his brothers like a father towards his sons. Manu (9.108-111) writes:

As a father (supports) his sons, so let the eldest support the younger brothers; and let the brothers in accordance with the law behave towards their eldest brother as sons

<sup>1</sup> This is the case in patrilineal communities; in matrilineal communities a joint family could also consist of married sisters with their spouses, unmarried brothers, and parents (e.g. the Mappillas of Kerala, the Tamils of Sri Lanka)

(behave towards their father). The eldest son makes the family prosperous or may bring it to ruin; ...Either let them thus live together or (get) apart if each desire (to gain) spiritual merit; for by separate living their merit increases, and hence separation is meritorious. (Quoted in Kapadia 1966: 220-221.)

Some other law-givers preceding Manu were nevertheless clearly against the impartibility of the property and wanted to secure the same dividend for all brothers, stating that a father should divide the property equally amongst his sons before he died (Kapadia 1966: 220-229). According to Kapadia (*ibid.*), there were already tendencies towards granting individual rights to property against the truly 'patriarchal family' during the first centuries of the Christian era. Despite the spiritual merit that was granted to the establishment of new households (see the last sentence of the above quotation), joint-ness remained an ideal.

Until around 150 years ago, brothers could not legally demand their share of the property unless it was divided by a common decision. During the British rule, such demands were given judicial blessing by British Courts in India, and the sale of land was made possible, which brought a certain disintegrating tendency to joint families. The British ruling was a logical outcome of the Maineian idea that the patriarchal family as a proprietorial unit was a remnant of the evolutionary past, and that it necessarily had to be transformed in order to direct society along the path to a higher level of cultural evolution. However, such demands for partitioning by individuals were not common in practice, and the traditional authority of the senior generation kept such tendencies among coparcenaries in check for a long time (Kapadia 1966: 309-311).

Physically, the joint family ideally resides together and eats food cooked in the same hearth. The shared hearth is an icon of the economic unity of the household – it manifests the sharing of all income earned by the work of any of the brothers and possibly their wives and children. Living and eating together are the 'external symbols of the homogeneity of the family' (Kapadia 1966: 309). Income is pooled together, and all the household members' needs are catered for from this pool – food, clothes, education, medical expenses, marriages, recreation. Socially, the joint family shows loyalty when facing the outer world, and defends its members' interests and honour. Social security, especially for the elderly, is based on the joint relationship. Brothers who form a corporate group share ritual obligations towards their ancestors and are expected to perform many rituals together. They are all affected by pollution related to childbirth and death in the family.

## FROM FAMILY TO HOUSEHOLD

What has this far been said about the Hindu joint family is mainly derived from Indological and classical texts, where the joint family is defined through coparcenary property relations, regulating ritual, marriage and inheritance practices. The Indological definition is a legalistic one – stating the ideal and the norm. Behind the Indological notion of the Hindu joint family we may sense an exoticising element – orientalist distancing of the Indian family, seeing it as generically different from the Western or any other family system. Following the example of Sir Henry Sumner Maine, the joint family has been seen as a particularly Indian (e.g. Kapadia 1966: 245), or particularly Hindu practice, but the same type of social formations are prevalent in agrarian societies of East Asia, generally in various religious communities of South Asia, in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and Northern Africa as well (Skinner 1997: 58).

The first difficulty in talking about the Indian family already occurs in the question of definitions. The notion of the Hindu joint family is quite different in the Indological context and in the sociological context, where we are interested more in the actual living and eating arrangements of people, viz. households. Households are domestic units most commonly but not necessarily formed on the basis of family ties; families do not necessarily reside together, even if they act economically as a unity; the household is above all a domestic economic unit, whereas the family is an ideological grouping tied together by bonds of filial, parental, or marital relations; these facts are now general anthropological knowledge.

The anthropological study of family systems and household patterns is plagued with a dense jungle of categorizations and classifications. Nearly every scholar has invented her/his own concepts, which has caused a lot of confusion. In some writings, the *joint family* household is restricted to mean a household shared by at least two married brothers; sometimes it means any household which is something other than a nuclear household of one married couple. Some speak of *simple households* vs. *complex households* (Shah 1973), some about *no family households*, *simple family households*, *extended family households* and *multiple family households* (Sanjek 1982). Skinner (1997) differentiates *conjugal family households*, *joint family households*, and *stem family households*. In the following I will use 'complex households' to mean households where two or more married couples and their children (or some residual of these) share a common hearth; this is what most lay people mean when they speak about the 'joint family'. By a simple household I refer to a household that consists of a married couple and their children or any residual of these.

## ARE 'JOINT FAMILIES' DISAPPEARING?

A common conviction among Indians, and among some scholars (e.g. Kakar 1997: 111), is that the joint family used to be universal in India and that its prevalence has eroded in recent decades. For example, the Indian Census Commissioner has been writing about the disintegration of the joint family since 1911 (Madan 1994: 428). The question is beset with stark ideological underpinnings; mostly it is the educated middle class that is worried about the changes in the Indian family. They share a conviction that the 'traditional' Indian way of life has come under attack in the face of the Euro-American invasion of money, media, and migration. The middle-class Indian's nostalgic lament against the globalizing world is commonly shared by the middle-classes elsewhere as well. The following statement from a featured Indian newspaper article is a typical expression of the middle-class anxiety:

...the society is without role models of the old variety; the political order is corrupted...; and both the family and school systems are on the verge of total disintegration. (Khare 1994, quoted in Kakar 1997: 113.)

Nostalgia for the old and the need to build one's own ethnic – and middle class – identity through such strong icons as the 'Hindu joint family' are understandable when people experience global changes as threatening and uncontrollable. There is an inherent need for people to see the Indian family through such discursive practices: to reclaim their own unique, harmonious, and glorified past from destruction by outside forces.

Setting aside for the moment the analysis of discourses, we will ask: is the joint family actually disappearing in India? There are several pitfalls we have to keep in mind in trying to answer this question: methodological problems, conceptual problems, and problems of principles. First, we have to decide what we mean by the joint family – are we speaking about the ideal, the structure, or the activities, and what kind of activities? Do we mean by this statement that people have started to live and eat in relatively smaller units, comprising less people and more limited types of relations, i.e. that household structure is nuclearizing? Or do we mean that the joint family has lost its importance as the ideal in people's minds? Or that activities carried out in the close family network have become less numerous? Or that family relations have grown less intensive? In order to make some sense of the discussion, we should make a clear difference between family and household. What most interlocutors say in claiming that the joint family has come to its demise actually mean that complex households, i.e. households comprising at least two married couples have become less common.

Have simple households then become more common and complex households less common in India during this century? The answer to this question is: No, they

have not. If we look at the average household size recorded in decennial census operations since the beginning of the century, the household size has grown instead of decreasing. Below a few census figures of the average number of people per household in India:

1911: 4.6

1961: 5.2

1981: 5.7

1991: 5.6

(Madan 1994: 428; *Statistical Outline of India* 1997-98).

As the average number of children born to a woman has been declining strongly since 1970s, the only reason for the persistently high household size is household structure. Instead of having become rare in India, joint living must have grown more common than it used to be. There are also historical case studies such as that by Wadley and Derr (1994) which show that the joint family<sup>2</sup> became more common than it used to be in their study area in Uttar Pradesh from the 1920s to the 1980s, contrary to the common belief. There are case studies in urban settings which state that even in the cities the nuclear family is no more common than in the countryside (e.g. Ramu 1991). It is nevertheless difficult to draw a general picture of the changes in household structure in India due to wide regional and community differences in family life (see e.g. Sharma 1986: 51).

The impression that complex households are disappearing is partly an outcome of sheer demographic ignorance. Firstly, even in a society where joint living is an ideal which people strive to realize whenever possible, the proportion of families in the joint phase may fall as low as 10 per cent in conditions of high child and adult mortality (Skinner 1997: 58). This is due to simple demographic factors. If many children die before adulthood, there is a large proportion of families where there are no brothers who could share a household in the first place, and if people's average life expectancy is low, many elderly people die before their children get married or soon after, leaving the family a nuclear family. One of the reasons why the average household size has stayed so high and even risen in India in this century is that more children survive and parents live longer, making joint living a possibility for more and more people for longer periods.

Secondly, joint-ness is a phase in a domestic cycle of family development, not a permanent and static structure. Joint households always dissolve at a certain point, due to death or separation. When brothers' children grow up in a joint family, the brothers together with their children tend to form their own households by dissolving the old household, land and other assets. These new nuclear families will in time become complex ones when the sons marry. A census on family types in a community with a joint family system usually shows the majority of families to be

<sup>2</sup> Defined by the authors as a household of two or more married couples who are lineally or collaterally related.

something other than the classical joint type at any particular moment. A typical division would be that fifteen per cent of households are jointly shared by married brothers; three-generation households without married brothers co-residing would consist of ten per cent of households; and 55% would be nuclear of some type (Skinner 1997: 58).

Joint living is usually just one stage in the developmental cycle of family formation – married couples commonly live with the husband's parents and brothers in the beginning of their marriage, but break away later on to form their own household. The way this cycle works differs greatly between regions and socio-economic classes and castes. The phase of joint family living is said to last longer in the north Indian 'Hindi Belt', and to be shorter in southern and northwestern India (Kolenda 1987). In my own rural fieldwork area in Coastal Andhra in southern India, families that consisted of married brothers sharing a household were rare (two per cent – 8 out of 398 households surveyed). Most of these people were landowners and well-to-do people who had a vested interest in keeping the land undivided as long as possible (cf. elsewhere in southern India: Caldwell, Reddy & Caldwell 1984: 27). There was also one household shared by married sisters. Most families that were not nuclear consisted of a conjugal unit and the husband's or wife's parent(s) which is sometimes called a 'stem family'. In the fieldwork *panchayat* (administrative unit), 65% of households were nuclear, which is relatively high proportion by Indian standards, even though it is nothing exceptional in the context of south India. (See Säävälä 1997: 137-139; Caldwell, Reddy & Caldwell 1984.) Whether there is nuclearization of household structure in India or not, the majority of Indian people have always lived at any point of time in simple family households. However, if we look at people's life histories, it turns out that most people have lived *some period* in their past in a complex household. Whatever the actual living arrangements, joint family living has been, and still is, the prestigious ideal. To recapitulate: even though the majority of Indians live in nuclear households, the proportion of people living in this way does not appear to be greater than at the beginning of the century.

Even though speaking about households instead of families has clarified the picture conceptually, we cannot stop our analysis here. We have to ask what the meaning of living arrangements is. Is there a clear division into simple and complex households? What are familial relations like in Indian homes? Has the character of familial relations changed in India since the beginning of the century?

The concept of the household is not a very fruitful one to begin with. It starts from the premiss that people are permanently settled, and that it is easy to say to which household someone belongs (and that one person can belong only to one household at a time). Usually the definition of the household in India is based on who eats together food cooked in the same hearth. In practice, households are far from clear-cut structural units. As Trawick (1990: 87) describes Tamil households: they 'are better seen as points of confluence than as "holds" in any stable sense. In

them, many currents meet, mingle, and redivide.' Thus Trawick prefers to use the concept of 'houseflows' instead of 'households', which wrongly gives a fixed and stable image of living arrangements. In Gopalapalli *panchayat* in A.P., where I carried out fieldwork, it is far from clear to what 'household' someone belongs to – people can clearly state who eats together, but at the same time, those who are supposed to eat together may well not have done so for the last half year. People visit constantly relatives, staying at times for months, and children are 'loaned' to relatives and neighbours for varying periods of time. Real life is disorderly, not surrendering to strict structural definitions and categories such as 'household'. It is misleading to speak about complex households and simple households as if they were an exhaustive dichotomy – in fact there are innumerable varieties of household forms. Even in complex households, there can exist socio-psychological nuclearizing tendencies of varying intensity; the relationship between young married couples may be more or less important within a complex household (Kakar 1997: 116).

This means that if we want to know what is happening to the Indian family, we should look at the actual activities of households and families in order to determine if there is change taking place in the way families work. We should find out how choices are made, who quarrels with whom, who helps whom, if money is borrowed, loaned and given and on what conditions, how often people visit each other, how old people are taken care of, and so on.

## THE ROLE OF MONEY AND WEALTH IN FAMILY RELATIONS

Since the times of Aristotle, money has been thought to have a bearing on morals (Bloch & Parry 1989: 2). As a result of monetary wages and salaries, it is feared that the younger generation will become shrewd and individualistic, undermining the ideals of joint-ness. Money, the scarce, durable, transposable substance that embodies abstract economic value, is the manifestation of an economic system where commodities are valued in terms of their exchangeability (Simmel 1978: 120). Money is not a recent phenomenon in India, even though it is common to depict 'Traditional India' as a non-monetary society (Fuller 1989: 43). Even if the use of money is not a recent phenomenon, the importance of money and consumption has undoubtedly increased in Indian society during this century.

Money is a pervasive Western symbol, often fetishized by scholars and laymen alike. In order to disentangle the various meanings and moral statements embedded in it in relation to the family, it is necessary to turn briefly to the history of Western thought. Two main approaches to money can be distinguished: the 'discourse of nostalgia' and the 'discourse of civilization' (Harris 1989: 234-238). Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and Marx represent the nostalgic approach – a romantic condemnation of the monetary exchange. For Marx money is an acid which attacks



kinship-based moral society through impersonal relationships (Bloch 1989: 170). Money is the sign of alienation, individualism, and the breakdown of social and communal values (Harris 1989: 234). Engels (1968) thought of the family as a haven in a heartless world where relations were governed by principles distinct from the selfish actions of people in the economy.<sup>3</sup> In the Christian tradition, money is connected to evil and sin – the antithesis of the holy. Self-sufficiency is ultimately good and desirable, and money and commodity exchange morally questionable practices.

In the 'discourse of civilization', represented by liberal thinkers, Adam Smith and Simmel among others, the basic attitude towards money is positive. Money has the capacity to erode and destroy previous forms of social hierarchy; it is a radical leveller which creates a new kind of equality in society. According to the 'discourse of civilization', money makes it possible for the dominated – women and the young in the realm of the family – to free themselves from authoritarian control.

In a joint household, family members pool their earnings together and from this pool the needs of the family members are catered for according to the decisions of the senior male or female. If a landowning family is concerned, the need to keep the family farm undivided usually plays an important role in keeping the joint household together. When the importance of land as a form of wealth decreases and the importance of money increases, this has an effect on the familial relationships. Unlike land, money is a highly movable and alienable form of wealth, and it can be used for a multitude of purposes. Along the lines of the 'discourse of nostalgia', money is said to make it easy to forget family obligations of giving money, sharing the expenses of marriages, taking care of the elderly. In this discourse, human nature is seen as profoundly selfish and asocial, so that whenever opportunities arise, the individual will act selfishly and forget his/her social obligations. According to Marx, independent communities become dependent and dependent individuals become independent, which is destructive to society (Bloch & Parry 1989: 4). Here we can see Marx's thinking and the Judaeo-Christian tradition converge.

Those scholars and writers who nowadays see money as the acid that corrupts family obligations, in fact partake in the thoroughly Western, Christian discourse, according to which money and moral obligations cannot live side by side. The 'discourse of nostalgia' is to be heard behind concerned statements on the disappearance of family loyalty, which the older generation claims is happening. However, in classical Hindu thinking, money, profit, commerce and commodity exchange are not antithetical to *dharma* (morally right conduct, duty) – *artha* (worldly success, profit) is the means by which people may attain the delights of *kāma* (love, sensual pleasure) and sustain the moral order of *dharma* (Fuller 1989: 83). Hinduism is not

<sup>3</sup> This view of the family as a corporate whole is widely criticized in gender studies (e.g. Dwyer & Bruce 1988).

hostile nor ambivalent towards money, unlike the Christian tradition (*ibid.*; Bloch & Parry 1989).

Deductive thinking where money is supposed to create a certain kind of individualism and corrode familial networks does not correspond to empirical facts in India. For example, Marwaris, a merchant caste functioning practically everywhere in India but originating in Rajasthan, offer a good example of how money, trading, extended household structure and close kin ties can work together successfully. Marwaris are usually successful traders who keep up lively contacts with their home district in Rajasthan. Their whole trading and money-lending business is organized through family connections so that credit is given only to family or lineage members. Because trust is central in monetary transactions related to trading, the secret of the Marwaris' success has been their close-knit kinship organization which has not been loosened by migration and geographical distances. (Gregory 1997.) Joint families, understood as strong kinship networks of assistance, obligation, and decision-making, are hardly inimical to economic success in India.

If we look more to the networks of assistance and obligation and not so much to the actual household composition (which is essentially fluid anyway, no matter how much we try to 'freeze' it for scholarly purposes), we see that joint family relations have turned out to be adaptable and resilient to modern forces such as urbanization, consumerism, migration, industrialization and mass media. Those who earn money and have attained good positions in urban centres are usually bound with close ties to their kin groups in the countryside. Formally nuclear households may be inundated with kinship duties, obligations and privileges which derive from joint family relations. (Srinivas 1972: 138.)

## A LOCAL DISCOURSE ON MONEY AND THE FAMILY

In Gopalapalli in Coastal Andhra where I carried out fieldwork in 1994-95, people talk a lot about money and familial relations. Generally, these two topics are among the most popular subjects of conversation, in addition to food and eating. Family life centres around food and money, and social obligations, duties and privileges, are constantly negotiated in everyday life.

One of the central themes regarding the role of money in a family in Gopalapalli is household separation – the process of splitting up a complex household. In such a household, money one earns is for everyone's consumption, and it is not acceptable to privilege one's own offspring or spouse over others. Young women and men who had school-going children stated that they preferred to save for their own children instead of supporting the whole joint family. They felt the need to have money in order to educate their children, to buy them clothes, and take them to see a doctor when necessary. In a monetised economy there is a growing need for

cash in order to secure a good life for children, and even if a joint landowning household may produce their own food together, they usually find it essential to supplement their income by waged labour or business. Young parents felt that in a shared complex household the fruits of all their toil were dispersed so widely through the family that their own children could not see any benefit from their parents' work. These comments can be interpreted as reflections of a tendency to family nuclearization.<sup>4</sup> Usually a young married couple shared a common hearth with the husband's parents and siblings for at least five years after the marriage, but after ten years of marriage, joint living started to be rare as quarrels divided households. It was also usual that an older married son moved out when a younger brother got married and brought his bride to the household.

In fact, the expression 'move out' should be in quotation marks, as it does not necessarily mean physical separation. Even when complex households separated into smaller units, people usually kept on living in the same compound or even in the same house. Separation meant that food was cooked in a separate hearth and day-to-day expenses were covered from separate funds and separate granaries. Even if cooking was separate, brothers did not necessarily divide their landed property but could keep on cultivating together. They would nevertheless divide the harvest between themselves, and thus separate their consumption. Even after a complex household was divided, relatives continued to be close knit through ordinary everyday interaction, obligations of assistance and sharing, and demands for help. Division gives the young couple a feeling of being in control of their own finances and being full-fledged persons on a par with others, even if they could never imagine – nor wish – to be totally 'independent' financially or socially from their family and kin.

Separation does not mean annulment of familial obligations. Everyone feels the importance of kinship ties both in their everyday life and especially when big decisions such as marriage, dowry, and land sale are in question. The younger generation does not wish to continue joint family living for decades, but at the same time it could not live without close kinship networks of assistance and sharing.

## CONCLUSIONS

Discourse on the 'Hindu joint family' has been an ideological battleground where the concept has been used to prove the stagnancy of the Indian economy as well as evoke a glorified and harmonious past in contrast to the corrupt present. Even though the Indian layman would state that joint families (i.e. complex households)

---

<sup>4</sup> However, we cannot deduce anything about temporal changes just by listening to their comments; we cannot know if the tendency towards nuclear household units has become more pronounced than earlier.

have become less common, actually it seems that complex households have become more common during this century. Despite this, the majority of Indians have lived, and continue to live, in nuclear families.

Whatever the structure of the family, the fact remains that extended familial networks are central for most Indians. Modernizing forces – urbanization, wage labour, consumption, the media, migration – are impinging on people, and simultaneously family obligation and assistance are maintained as close and abiding. Despite the fact that the money economy has been important for decades (if not centuries; see Fuller 1989) in India, familial relationships have retained their distinctive characteristics in India – people building up their social and personal identity through joint family relations, even if they are not living in complex households. Family and kinship connections have become even more central than before among the socially mobile urban groups, where education, jobs, and good marriage alliances depend crucially on such connections (see Sharma 1986; Béteille 1994). Discourses on the role of money in families continue to hold the stage with regard to social and economic developments in India.

## REFERENCES

- BÉTEILLE, André 1994. The family and the reproduction of inequality. In: Patricia Uberoi (ed.), *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India* (Oxford in India Readings in Sociology and Social Anthropology): 435-451. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- BLOCH, Maurice & Jonathan PARRY 1989. Introduction: Money and the morality of exchange. In: J. Parry & M. Bloch (eds.), *Money and the morality of exchange*: 1-31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CALDWELL, John C., P. H. REDDY & Patty CALDWELL 1984. The determinants of family structure in rural South India. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46(1): 215-229.
- DUMONT, Louis 1966. The 'village community' from Munro to Maine. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 9: 67-89. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- DWYER, Daisy & Judith BRUCE (eds.) 1988. *A Home Divided. Women and Income in the Third World*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- ENGELS, Friedrich 1968. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State in the Light of Researches of Lewis H. Morgan*. 7th ed. Moscow: Progress.
- FULLER, C. J. 1989. Misconceiving the grain heap: a critique of the concept of the Indian jajmani system. In: J. Parry & M. Bloch (eds.), *Money and the Morality of Exchange*: 33-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GREGORY, C. A. 1997. *Savage Money. The Anthropology and Politics of Commodity Exchange*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- HARRIS, Olivia 1989. The earth and the state: the sources and meanings of money in northern Potosí, Bolivia. In: J. Parry & M. Bloch (eds.), *Money and the Morality of Exchange*: 232-268. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KAKAR, Sudhir 1997. *Culture and Psyche. Selected Essays*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- KAPADIA, K. M. 1966. *Marriage and Family in India*. 3rd ed. Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- KHARE, H. 1994. Copycat consumerism. *The Times of India* (16 Jan 1994).
- KOLENDA, Pauline 1987. *Regional Differences in Family Structure in India*. Jaipur: Rawat.

- KONING, Juliette 1997. *Generations of Change. A Javanese Village in the 1990s*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- MADAN, T. N. 1994. The Hindu family and development. In: Patricia Uberoi (ed.), *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India*. (Oxford in India Readings in Sociology and Social Anthropology): 416-434. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- MAINE, Henry Sumner 1880. *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions*. London: John Murray.
- 1895. *Village Communities in the East and West*. 3rd ed. London: John Murray.
- MARX, Karl 1972. The future results of the British rule in India. In: Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *On Colonialism: Articles from the New York Tribune and Other Writings*: 81-87. New York: International Publishers.
- PARSONS, T. & R. BALES 1955. *The Family: Socialization and Interaction Process*. New York: Free Press of Clencoe.
- RAMU, G. N. 1991. Changing family structure and fertility patterns: an Indian case. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 26(3-4): 189-206.
- SÄÄVÄLÄ, Minna 1997. *Child as Hope. Contextualizing Fertility Transition in Rural South India*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- SANJEK, R. 1982. The organization of households in Adabraka. Toward a wider comparative perspective. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23: 57-103.
- SHAH, A. M. 1973. *The Household Dimension of the Family in India*. Delhi: Orient Longman.
- SHARMA, Ursula 1986. *Women's Work, Class, and the Urban Household. A study of Shimla, North India*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- SIMMEL, Georg 1978. *The Philosophy of Money*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- SKINNER, G. William 1997. Family systems and demographic processes. In: David I. Kertzer & Tom Fricke (eds.), *Anthropological Demography. Toward a New Synthesis*: 53-95. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- SRINIVAS, M. N. 1972. *Social Change in Modern India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Statistical Outline of India 1997-98*. Mumbai: Tata services Limited, Department of Economics and Statistics.
- TRAWICK, Margaret 1990. *Notes on Love in a Tamil Family*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- WADLEY, Susan & Bruce DERR 1994. Karimpur families over sixty years. In: Patricia Uberoi (ed.), *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India*. (Oxford in India Readings in Sociology and Social Anthropology): 393-415. Delhi: Oxford University Press.