



来自于印度次大陆 (sub-continent) 的家庭与家族研究, 从以下两个概念化和理论化的有力位置, 进入了社会学和人类学的讨论。其一是联合家庭, 从一开始, “联合家庭”伴随着种姓、村庄和宗教而成为印度社会学和人类学中的一个中心的描述性的概念。在次大陆, 联合家庭这一概念被看成一种普遍价值和实践。联合家庭相对的衰落具有极大的争议性, 它被看作是工业化和现代化冲击的结果。其二是德拉威亲族关系 (Dravidian kinship), 这一概念在摩根 Morgan 早期的研究中, 对于亲族研究的历史理论化与结构理论化有着重要作用。但在近几十年来, 由于缺乏对婚姻实践的深入研究, 德拉威亲族关系对于秩序的重要性被遮蔽。

经过本文作者粗略回顾了80年代末期开始的研究, 并选择性的考察了随后的研究, 本文认为, 尽管能够总结出共同的结构和程式, 但在次大陆上, 家庭和婚姻的日常经验和产生作用的因素却大相径庭。在过去的一个世纪中, 尤其是在父系的、家长式的家庭——不管是联合的、扩展的、核心的或是简单的家庭——娶进者的较高地位等方面, 似乎存在着某种同质化的倾向, 这种倾向超越了地域、种姓和宗教的差别。

这并不是对传统的回归, 也不是不是现代化或西方化的产物。这一阶段, 在家庭和婚姻研究领域内, 对于已获得认同的观点而言, 关于差异的论断是主流的观点。同时, 各种可以见到的中产阶级的生活方式, 也被表述成为坚持家庭价值和新婚姻实践的典范。尽管印度不存在社会政策意义上的“铰链式家庭” (articulated family), 但我们仍然可以看到上文所谈到的政治经济、固有的国家政策、群体与个体谋略间相互铰接的倾向。

作者: 拉姬妮·帕丽瓦拉, 德里大学社会学系。

SEEKING THE INDIAN FAMILY

Rajni Palriwala,

Department of Sociology, University of Delhi
Family and kinship studies of/from the sub-continent entered sociological and anthropological discussions from two substantive-conceptual-theoretical vantage points. One was the joint family, a central descriptive construct in the sociology and anthropology of India from their inception, along with caste, village, and religion. The joint family was taken as having been a universal value and practice across the

subcontinent. The apparent decline of the joint family was much debated, its demise taken as certain under the onslaught of industrialization and modernization and mourned. The second vantage point was that of Dravidian kinship, a construct which from Morgan's early work was critical to historical and structural theorizations in kinship studies. However, the importance of 'Dravidian kinship' for the discipline was belied by the paucity of intensive studies on marriage practices, especially in the last couple of decades.

Based on an extensive review of research till the late eighties and a more selective review of later studies, this paper starts from pointing out that even as common patterns and structures could be culled out, the everyday experience and parameters of agency in familial and marriage practices across the sub-continent showed great diversity. It is in fact over the last century that certain trends of homogenization, particularly in terms of the patrilineal, patriarchal family—whether joint, extended, nuclear, simple—and the superior status of wife-takers, seem to have gathered force, cutting across region, caste, and religious differences. These are neither returns to tradition nor examples of modernity or westernization. Yet this is a period when the assertion of difference in the fields of family and marriage have become central to assertions of ascriptive or achieved identity and status. Simultaneously, the life styles of a visible middle class, also differentiated, are being projected as examples of persisting familial values and new marriage practices. Though the Indian state has no articulated family of social policy, one can see in the above mentioned trends the articulation of political economy, implicit state policies, and group and individual strategies.

文档附件:

编辑: 文章来源:

版权所有: 中国社会科学院社会学研究所

E-mail: ios@cass.org.cn

欢迎转载, 敬请注明: 转载自《中国社会学网》[<http://www.sociology.cass.cn>]