

ROLE OF THE STARJEŠINA SVATOVA AMONG THE BUNJEVCI

MILANA ČERNELIĆ
Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
Odsjek za etnologiju
41 000 Zagreb
Đure Salaja 3

UDK 392. 52
Izvorni znanstveni rad
Original scientific paper
Priljeno: 15. 06. 1990.

The introductory part establishes the boundaries of the regions within which the Bunjevci are proposed to be studied; the area is much wider than that covered by J. Erdeljanović.

Three wedding officers may have the role of the starješina svatova among the Bunjevci: the stari svat, kum, and staćel. The analysis of the role shows great differences between the role the stari svat has in the Danube regions and in other Bunjevci groups. The Danube Bunjevci do not have the stari svat in the role of starješina, but the kum and the staćel appear in the role with equal frequency. These two wedding officers are found in the other regions in the same roles, notably in Gorski kotar, Hrvatsko primorje and Lika with a higher frequency of the kum in the role, which points to similarities between the Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika and the Danube regions.

In two Bunjevci groups and in some parts of their potential area of origin, the kum and staćel are often elected starješina svatova, which seems to indicate that the roots of these roles must be sought in the area from which they originated and where this role has generally been taken over by the stari svat. In these areas this role of the kum and staćel has been pushed to the background by the more important stari svat, whereas elsewhere it has survived and become more prominent.

This account of the role of the head of the wedding party, the starješina svatova, in the Bunjevci (an ethnic group of Croatians) forms part of a broader study of the role of Bunjevci wedding officers.¹ One of the most important authorities on the Bunjevci is J. Erdeljanović, who was first to study in depth their origin by analysing surnames, place names, legends and customs. He divides the Bunjevci into three subgroups:

¹ M. Černelić, 1991.

(1) Bunjevci in the Danube area: north-eastern Bačka and the areas around Budapest and Baja in Hungary;

(2) Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika: parts of northern and southern Lika, Hrvatsko primorje;

(3) Dalmatian Bunjevci: northern Dalmatia and parts of central Dalmatia, notably the Dalmatian hinterland.

I believe that this regional delimitation should be extended, because the area it encompasses is too small for this ethnic group, whose origin, despite a great deal of research, is still a matter of conjecture. Moreover, the Bunjevci do not have the same awareness of their ethnic identity in all areas. In the Danube region, the Bunjevci identity is manifest and there are no doubts about the ethnic belonging of the group. In the two other subgroups, with the exception of the Bunjevci population in Hrvatsko primorje, the Bunjevci identity is less obvious. There are stories about the Bunjevci and the awareness that they are "somewhere among us". The Bunjevci are frequently identified with the Catholic population in these regions but it is rare that a population group is specified as Bunjevci. For this reason the ethnic criterion should not be the only one in identifying the Bunjevci as an ethnic group - the principal criterion should be cultural elements, the analysis of which will throw more light on the problems of origin of this ethnic group and the way various influences affected its development. For this reason, the potential area from which the Bunjevci originated has been extended to include the whole of Dalmatia (the coast and hinterland without the islands and with Boka kotorska in the southernmost part of the Adriatic area), the border regions of Bosnia, and Herzegovina. This extension of the boundaries is partly due to the numerous common cultural elements both within this area and in relation to the other two Bunjevci subgroups.²

As for the Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika, the analysis covers the whole area of Lika, Hrvatsko primorje and Gorski kotar. In Gorski kotar, there is considerable body of evidence about the Bunjevci ethnicity (historical data, toponyms, ethnonyms).

In the regions along the Danube, we also studied a larger area than Erdeljević and included all of Bačka and the Danube region in Hungary. Despite the fact that the awareness of a common ethnic belonging is strong in the Danube Bunjevci, four regional Bunjevci groups should be distinguished there. In addition to common cultural elements, each of these groups has some specific characteristics. They are the Bunjevci in and around Sombor, in and around Subotica, in northern Bačka, and the Bunjevci in the Budapest and Baja areas in Hungary.

In the final analysis of our material it turned out that a number of other regions should be included when discussing the Bunjevci, although their inclusion would not be justified on the basis of ethnic belonging alone. They are: Istria, parts of northern-eastern Serbia inhabited by Vlachs, and the Croats in Gradišće (see map). The reason for the inclusion of these areas is a wedding custom observed in all of them, namely the institution of the wedding party officer called variously *stačela*, *stačil*, *nastačilo*,

² Op. cit.

strčalo. The analysis of his role in these geographically distant regions has shown that there is sufficient ground for the assumption about the common origin of this custom.³ The role of this wedding officer will be discussed in greater detail in the description and analysis of the role of the head of the wedding party, the starješina svatova, which is the subject of the present study. Moreover, many other common cultural elements linked with the role of the wedding party officers indicate that these regions should also be included in the study, above all in relation to the Bunjevci along the Danube, but also to other Bunjevci subgroups.³

In our material, the starješina svatova and his role is described as follows: he supervises the wedding party, tells the wedding guests what to do, decides on every activity - its beginning and end, everybody has to ask him about everything, he is responsible for everything, he is obeyed by everyone, he looks after the wedding guests, he organizes the wedding party. The role of the wedding party organizer need not always be part of the starješina role, because a special wedding officer is appointed to do it. There is also the deputy starješina, who helps the starješina and ranks below him in the hierarchy. The hierarchy of the wedding party officers is very important for the functioning and the established order of the wedding party, especially in some regions.

In a Bunjevci wedding party one of the following officers may have the role of starješina: *stari svat*, *kum* and *stačel*.

In discussing the role of starješina svatova generally it would be logical to begin with the *stari svat*, who features prominently in South Slavs wedding customs. However, in our study of the Bunjevci the starting point is the Danube area and its Bunjevci population, which is the reason why the *kum* is considered first in our study. This wedding officer is found in all regional Bunjevci groups along the Danube, except in the Budapest area, where the role of the starješina is not particularly important. In the Danube and Bačka regions in general, including the Bunjevci population, there does not seem to be a particular wedding officer who performs the function of the starješina. However, occasionally, and most importantly in areas with a Bunjevci population, it is done by the *kum* (found in nine localities).⁴ Some evidence of this custom has been found in the Šokci and Serbs in Bačka.⁵

Within the more broadly defined regional boundaries of the Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika, the *kum* is frequently found in the role of the starješina; this is true especially of areas with a strong Bunjevci presence in Hrvatsko primorje, in parts of Lika and Gorski kotar where there is a Bunjevci component and also in the rest of the population, mainly Catholics.⁶ It is interesting to note that in Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the

³ Op. cit. 194-231

⁴ M. Mandić, 1975; M. Černelić, Field notes, 1983 (Gornji Sentivan), *Ibid.*, EZ FFZ NR 87 (Tavankut, Bajmok, Stari Žednik, Sombor, Salaši na Bezdanskom putu, Gradina, Lugovo). *Ibid.*, Field notes, 1984 (Đurđin). I. Knežević, 1881, 117.

⁵ J. Ilić, ONŽO JAZU sign. NZ 112; J. Evetović, 1909, 392; Vatroslav, 1909, 74, 75; B. Čiplić, 1930, 116; A. Hadzics, 1909, 374. S. Dimitrijević, 1969 - 70, 93.

⁶ N. Bonifačić Rožin, ZIF rkp 141; EAJ 351; EAJ 352; EAJ 353; J. Vondraček-Mesar, EZ FFZ NR 86; EAJ 1352; EAJ 1363; I. Franić, 1973, 121. N. Sokolić, EZ FFZ SR 10; M. Černelić, EZ FFZ NR 109 (Krmote, Krivi put); EAJ 1434; EAJ 347; EAJ 348; EAJ 350; N. Bonifačić Rožin, ZIF rkp 279 and ZIF rkp 327; EAJ 281; N. Krausel, ZIF rkp 288; EAJ 53; EAJ 55; EAJ 23; D. Nožinić, EZ FFZ NR 95; I. Ivančan, ZIF rkp 186; EAJ 480; EAJ 1511. Under a "Bunjevci component" in Primorje, Lika and Dalmatia we mean the existence of Bunjevci surnames in an area.

areas from which the Bunjevci may have originated, there is little evidence of this role - to be more precise, one example for each of the areas around Bukovica, Knin, northern Dalmatia, Bosansko Grahovo, Glamoč and Kupres in western Bosnia, in Duvno and several villages in the Posušje area in Herzegovina and on the island of Pelješac.⁷ Erdeljanović does not mention this role of the *kum* in any of the Bunjevci groups. Writing about the wedding customs of the Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika, he says only that some elements of wedding customs of "these Bunjevci differ significantly from those found in most Dalmatian Bunjevci. The main figure among the wedding officers there is the *kum*, followed by the *stari svat*. This may mean that the *kum* in the Dalmatian Bunjevci has the role of *starješina* as the main figure in the wedding party, but this remains to be studied in greater detail.⁸ It is true to say that the information about the *kum* in the role of *starješina svatova* in these areas is the result of comparatively recent research, in which all the available sources were used, including independent and planned field studies, archive material, questionnaires of the Ethnological Atlas of Yugoslavia and written sources. Without such a comprehensive approach, that is if we had relied on written sources only, we would not have collected enough data to conduct our investigation in the right direction. As regards the above mentioned role of the *kum*, it should be remembered that it is also found in some parts of north-eastern Serbia in the Vlach population, where the *kum* is much more important than the *stari svat*.⁹

Another important wedding officer who acts as *starješina svatova* is the *staćel*. Already Erdeljanović recorded this role of the *staćela* in two Bunjevci areas in Bačka.¹⁰ More recent field research confirms his data, although not in the same areas, but it indicates that this role of the *staćela* is somewhat more widespread among the Bunjevci in the Danube areas.¹¹ In some villages in the Sombor area, the *staćela* stands in for the bridegroom's father and is in charge of keeping order at the wedding, but in actual fact he also has the role of the *starješina svatova*.¹² This role of the *staćela* has been confirmed in nine villages in the Danube region.

The same customs relating to the role of the *staćel* are found in the other two Bunjevci groups. Evidence of this exists for Hrvatsko primorje and northern Lika (in the Orthodox population, but only according to Erdeljanović); in some parts of Lika, the *staćel* stands in for the host.¹³ Fortis observed it in the Morlachi in Dalmatia: the *staćel* took and executed *stari svat*'s orders, which makes him a kind of his assistant or deputy.¹⁴ A similar role of the *staćel* is found in Istria. According to Valvazor, *nastačili* assist two *starješinas*, each of whom represents his side.¹⁵ This role is confirmed by later sources for western Istria.¹⁶

7 M. Černelić, Field notes, 1984 (Jasenice); I. Bucić, MS (Jasenice); EAJ 1295; J. Sunara, ZIF rkp 404; EAJ 367; EAJ 546; EAJ 544; S. Rubić, ONŽO JAZU sign. SZ 61; EAJ 3; EAJ 6; EAJ 4; EAJ 324.

8 J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 322.

9 N. Pantelić, 1970, 131. Ibid., 1975, 130.

10 J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 237.

11 M. Černelić, Field notes, 1983 (Kačmar, Gara); Ibid., EZ FFZ NR 87 (Stari Žednik, Josići, Nenadići).

12 Ibid., EZ FFZ NR 87 (Nenadići, Matarići).

13 J. Erdeljanović, 1930.

14 A. Fortis, 1984, 49.

15 Valvazor o Istranima, 1970, 92, 96.

16 J. Mikac, 1963, 346; J. Ptašinski, ONŽO JAZU sign. SZ 111;

There are interesting similarities concerning the *staćel* in various regions, especially with regard to his behaviour during the wedding. In Istria, according to Valvazor, the *starješina*, *nastaćilo* and *zastavnik* sit still and watch with respect the dancers as if they were judges ("gledaju tance kao da su oni suci"); a report from the area of Sombor in the Danube region points out that during the wedding the *staćela* only watches, sitting in a place of honour. In Erdeljanović we find a saying based on some features of the *staćel's* role: "The man's been sitting there like a *staćela*" ("Ovaj zaseo kao *staćela*"), referring to a person who comes somewhere and shows no intention of leaving.¹⁷ In this connection there are some interesting reports about the *staćel's* role in northern Dalmatia. In the village of Lišani Ostrovički in Ravni Kotari, the *staćel* is remembered in the following story: "When they all sat around the table, my grandfather used to tell me, they would say: 'Just look at that Turkish bey, look at the *staća*, isn't he like Sarajevo aga, look at the pasha, lord of the land, he's as red as the sun in the evening.'" ("Vidi de bega turskog, vidi *staću*, ali nije aga sarajevski, vidi pašu, gospodara krajine, rumeni se ka' i sunce u vičer").¹⁸

Although the *staćilo* is more prominent in some other roles in the areas inhabited by the Croats of Gradišće, in one of the villages he performs some tasks which are similar to those of *starješina* *svatova*: the same meaning may be attributed to the general information that the *staćilo* is a kind of stage manager.¹⁹

Although the *starješina* *svatova* need not always be the organizer of the wedding party, this role of the *staćela* among the Bunjevci in two areas near Budapest and occasionally in southern Hungary and in the surroundings of Sombor in Bačka seems to be significant.²⁰ The role of the wedding party organizer is also stressed in some areas in which the *staćel* is found as the *starješina* *svatova* or his deputy in the Danube region and in some areas in Lika.²¹

All the above details about the role of the *staćela* in the Bunjevci wedding stress those aspects of his function which relate him to the *stari svat*, the wedding officer who often has the role of *starješina* in the area which is considered as the potential original homeland of the Bunjevci. A number of interesting details have been observed in connection with this phenomenon in field studies. In Gara in southern Hungary the role of the *staćela* is identical to that of the *stari svat*.²² According to one informant from Bajmok near Subotica, *staćela* and *stari svat* are local variants denoting the same wedding officer. The term used in Bajmok is *stari svat*. According to another informant, the *staćela* has the same role as the *kum*; the latter is found in the role of *starješina* elsewhere in the Danube Bunjevci.²³ Writing about the Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika, Erdeljanović points out that in the areas where the *staćel* is found there is no *stari svat*,

17. Valvazor o Istranima, 1970, 96; M. Černelić, EZ FFZ NR 87; J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 237.

18 L. Marijan, Field notes, 1988.

19 Z. Rajković, ZIF rkp 954; M. Gavazzi, 1935, 7.

20 M. Deisinger, NMB EA 3029; Ibid., NMB EA 4023; M. Černelić, Field notes, 1983 (Tukulja, Vancaga, Gara); Ibid.; EZ FFZ NR 87 (Nenadići).

21 M. Černelić, EZ FFZ NR 87 (Matarići); J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 233, 237.

22 M. Černelić, Field notes, 1983.

23 Ibid., EZ FFZ NR 87.

while in other areas the role of the *stari svat* is analogous to that of the *staćel* in these regions.²⁴

In the Bunjevci village of Kačmar in southern Hungary, the bridegroom's father or the eldest person in the house, is elected starješina svatova and is called *staćela*; in some areas in the Danube region inhabited by the Bunjevci the name *staćela* is used to denote these persons not only at wedding.²⁵ According to Erdeljanović, the *staćel* is the bridegroom's father in many places in the area of Knin.²⁶ The same information was later confirmed further east, in south-western Bosnia.²⁷

All the examples of the *staćel* in the role of starješina are interesting and, though often fragmentary, complement each other and add element after element in the mosaic which still has many gaps. They are especially interesting as regards the role of *stari svat* and other related wedding officers, especially the bridegroom's father, the more so because *stari svat* is not found in this role, except in a few cases when the *staćel* is *stari svat*. Other ethnic groups in this area attach equally little importance to the role of the *stari svat*. The *stari svat* is found in Gorski kotar, Hrvatsko primorje and Lika mainly among the Orthodox population; among the Catholics his presence is limited to the Bunjevci population, who are somewhat more numerous in Hrvatsko primorje. In the broader potential homeland of the Bunjevci, this role of the *stari svat* is much more widespread.²⁸ Evidence of this is found in Fortis and Lovrić among the Morlachi.²⁹ It is interesting to note that Erdeljanović does not mention him in that role in the Dalmatian Bunjevci, which is surprising bearing in mind the two older records and the more recent ones in which the role is confirmed.

In analysing and comparing the role of the starješina svatova we have identified an interesting phenomenon.³⁰ In our investigation outside the Bunjevci areas proper, we have found that there is a number of other wedding officers (in addition to the *kum*, *staćel* and *stari svat*) who have the role of the starješina svatova, with a frequent duplication of roles, ie at one and same wedding there may be a starješina svatova plus another or several wedding officers who have a similar role.³¹ This indicates the importance of the starješina svatova in these regions, who, unlike in the Danube region, is obviously a key figure in the wedding customs. The bridegroom's father is sometimes elected *stari svat* or a wedding officer with a similar function, which was discussed earlier in connection with the *staćel's* role.³² Despite the fact that in the Bunjevci areas along the Danube the bridegroom's father does not have the status of a wedding officer (except when he is the *staćel*), in the area around Sombor his participation and presence in the wedding customs is stressed.³³ All these examples point to a tendency of

24 J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 233.

25 M. Černelić, Field notes, 1983 (Gara, Aljmaš); *Ibid.*, EZ FFZ NR 87 (Salaši na Bezdanskom putu).

26 J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 233.

27 R. Kajmaković, 1961, 82.

28 M. Černelić, 1991, 65, 66, 197 (Table 13).

29 A. Fortis, 1984, 49; I. Lovrić, 1948, 121, 122.

30 M. Černelić 1991, 65, 66, 67, 68.

31 *Ibid.*, 66, 67.

32 *Ibid.*, 62, 195 (Table 12).

33 M. Černelić, EZ FFZ NR 87 (Matarići, Đinići)

identifying real-life and symbolic roles: the master of the house retains this role in the wedding customs as well.

When we consider the total geographic area with a Bunjevci population we can see very clearly the difference in the role of the *stari svat* in the Danube region (ie the absence of this kind of role) on the one hand, and Lika, Gorski kotar, Primorje and the potential area of origin of the Bunjevci on the other. It should however be stressed that the *stari svat* does exist as a wedding officer in the Danube regions, and not only among the Bunjevci, but his role is marginal. Having said this, we must also point out that one piece of evidence has been recorded in three Bunjevci regions (the surroundings of Budapest, southern Hungary and Subotica) in which the *stari svat* ranks second after the *kum*, though this has been only partly confirmed by his real role in the wedding customs.³⁴ Such data, through sporadic, may point to his former, more important role among the Danube Bunjevci.

While the *stari svat* is not found in the role of the *starješina svatova* among the Danube Bunjevci, the *kum* and *stačela* appear in it with equal frequency. They also appear in other regions in the same roles, especially in Gorski kotar, Lika and Primorje, with the *kum* being slightly predominant. This indicates some overlapping with the Bunjevci in Primorje, Lika and the Danube regions as far as this role is concerned. The fact that the *kum* or, more rarely, the *stačel* is the *starješina svatova* in two Bunjevci groups, a phenomenon not unknown in the area of their potential origin, indicates that the roots of these roles should be sought in latter, where, in a broader area, this role is entrusted to the *stari svat*. In these regions this role of the *kum* and the *stačel* has been replaced by the more prominent *stari svat*, while in other two Bunjevci groups it has been maintained and even strengthened. The *kum* and the *stačel* have a more important role than the *stari svat* in the Danube regions. This also seems to apply to the Bunjevci in Primorje and Lika, but here the *stari svat* is equally found as the *starješina svatova*. Moreover, the *kum* and *stačel*, though rarely, also equally share the role of deputy host in the Danube regions, ie in the Sombor (three sites) and Subotica regional groups (one site) and occasionally in Lika (among the Primorje - Lika Bunjevci this role is performed by the *stačel*).³⁵ Although Erdeljanović gives only meagre and incomplete information about the role of the *starješina svatova* in all three Bunjevci groups, his statement that the *stari svat* ranks second after the *kum* in Dalmatian Bunjevci may be indicative, if the problem of the role of *starješina svatova* throughout the areas inhabited by the Bunjevci is considered.

An interesting illustration of the different sources and the problem of the role of *starješina svatova* in the Bunjevci regions is the village of Krivi Put in Hrvatsko primorje, where all three wedding officers are reported to have that role: the *stačel* according to Erdeljanović, the *stari svat* according to the Ethnological Atlas of Yugoslavia questionnaire and the *kum* in my own field notes. The latest field studies in Krivi Put have confirmed the existence of only the *kum* and *diver*, ie two wedding officers, whose number has obviously been reduced in the course of time.³⁶ This example is important because it reflects the complexity of the questions encountered when studying the role of the *starješina svatova* in Bunjevci areas.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, Field notes, 1983. (Tukulja) M. Mandić, 1975, 122; M. Čemelić, Field notes, 1984 (Đurđin).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, EZ FFZ NR 87 (Salaši na Bezdanskom putu, Nenadići, Matarići, Tavankut); J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 233; EAJ 23; EAJ 24; EAJ 266.

³⁶ J. Erdeljanović, 1930, 233; EAJ 478; M. Čemelić, EZ FFZ NR 109.

LITERATURA

PUBLISHED SOURCES

1. Černelić, Milana *Uloge i nazivi odabranih svatova u Bunjevaca*, Zagreb, 1991.
2. Čiplić, Bogdan O ženidbi i udadbi u srednjem Potisju, *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja u Beogradu 5*, Beograd, 1930, 113-125.
3. Dimitrijević, Sofija Etnološka istraživanja u okolini Sombora, *Rad vojvodanskih muzeja 18-19*, Novi Sad, 1969-1970, 82-100.
4. Erdeljanović, Jovan *O poreklu Bunjevaca*, Beograd, 1930.
5. Evetovics, János Sokaczok, *Bács-Bodrog vármegye egyetemes monografiája 1*, Budapest, 1909, 384-394.
6. Fortis, Alberto *Put po Dalmaciji*, Editor Josip Bratulić, Zagreb, 1984.
7. Franić, Ivo Hrvatsko primorje 1, *Meja i Praputnjak*, Zagreb, 1937.
8. Gavazzi, Milovan Stara Hrvatska baština u narodnom blagu gradišćanskih Hrvata, *Kalendar "Napredak" za g. 1936*, Sarajevo, 1935, 1-13 (offprint).
9. Hadzics, Antal Szerbek, *Bács-Bodrog vármegye egyetemes monografiája 1*, Budapest, 1909, 368-386.
10. Kajmaković, Radmila Ženidbeni običaji, Etnološka i folkloristička ispitivanja u Livanjskom polju, *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu n. s. 15/16*, Sarajevo, 1961, 203-219.
11. Knežević, Lazar O Bunjevcima, *Letopis matice srpske 128*, Novi Sad, 1881, 102-118.
12. Lovrić, Ivan *Bilješke o putu po Dalmaciji opata Alberta Fortisa i život Stanislava Sočivice*, Translated by Mihovil Kombol, Zagreb, 1948.
13. Mandić, Mišo Svadbeni običaji čavoljskih Bunjevaca, *Etnografija južnih Slavena u Mađarskoj 1*, Budimpešta, 1975, 113-148.
14. Mikac, Jakov Istarski narodni običaji, nošnja, stočarstvo i istarska oruđa, *Problemi sjevernog Jadrana 1*, Rijeka, 1963, 295-403.
15. Pantelić, Nikola Svadbeni običaji u Negotinskoj krajini, *Glasnik etnografskog muzeja u Beogradu 33*, Beograd, 1970, 123-148.
16. Pantelić, Nikola Ženidbeni običaji u okolini Bora, *Glasnik etnografskog muzeja u Beogradu 38*, Beograd, 1975, 123-146.
17. Sušić, Zvonimir Valvazor o Istranima, *Dometi 3/5*, Rijeka, 1970, 92-95.
18. Vatroslav, Svatovski kum, *Crtica iz prošlosti, Neven 10*, 1909, 74-75.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Abbreviations used in quoting archival sources:

ZIF - Zavod za istraživanje folklor (Institute for Folklore Studies)

ONŽO JAZU - Odbor za narodni život i običaje Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti (Comitee for Folk Life and Customs of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts)

EZ FFZ SR - Arhiv Etnološkog zavoda Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu - stariji rukopisi (Archives of the Ethnological Institute of the Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb, older manuscripts)

EZ FFZ NR - Arhiv Etnološkog zavoda Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu - noviji rukopisi (Archives of the Ethnological Institute of the Faculty of Philosophy, Zagreb, recent manuscripts)

EAJ - questionnaires of the Ethnological Atlas of Yugoslavia

NMB - Néprajzi Múzeum Budapest (Ethnographical Museum, Budapest)

1. Bonifačić Rožin, Nikola Hrvatske narodne pjesme, običaji i priče iz kotara Delnice, ZIF rkp 141, 1953.
2. Bonifačić Rožin, Nikola Folklorna građa iz okolice Perušića i Otočca, ZIF rkp 276, 1955.
3. Bonifačić Rožin, Nikola Folklorna građa iz okolice Brinja i Josipdola, ZIF rkp 279, 1955.
4. Bonifačić Rožin, Nikola Folklorna građa iz Donjeg Lapca i okolice, ZIF rkp 327, 1957.
5. Černelić, Milana Svatovske časti (Krpmote, Krivi put), EZ FFZ NR 109, 1986. (Sombor i okolica, okolica Subotice), EZ FFZ NR 87, 1986.
6. Deisinger, Margit Néphit és népszokások, népi játékok, népzene (bunyevác), NMB EA 3029, 1952.
7. Deisinger, Margit Délszláv (bunyevác) szokás és népi hitvilág gyűjtés, NMB EA 4023, 1953.
8. Ilić, Josip Narodna nošnja i običaji kod Šokaca u Bačkom Bregu, ONŽO JAZU sign. NZ 112, 1960.
9. Ivančan, Ivan Folklorna građa iz okolice Gospića, ZIF rkp 186, 1955.
10. Krauesel, Nada Folklorna građa iz okolice Metka, ZIF rkp 218, 1955.
11. Nožinić, Dražen Običaji pri sklapanju braka (Križkamenica, Stajnica kod Otočca), EZ FFZ NR 95, 1987.
12. Ptašinski, Josip Narodni život Hrvata i Slovenaca u Istri, Istarska ženidba i pir, ONŽO JAZU sign. SZ 111, 1890-1899.
13. Rajković, Zorica Običaji gradišćanskog sela Frakanava, ZIF rkp 954, 1973-1976.
14. Rubić, Stojan Etnografska građa iz Duvna, ONŽO JAZU sign. SZ 61, 1899.
15. Sokolić, Nada Svadbeni običaji u Novom Vinodolskom, EZ FFZ SR 10, 1956.
16. Sunara, Josip Folklorna građa iz Cere, ZIF rkp 404.
17. Vondraček-Mesar, Jagoda Običaji pri sklapanju braka (Srpske Moravice - Gorski kotar), EZ FFZ NR 86, 1987.
18. EAJ: 3, 4, 6, 23, 24, 53, 54, 55, 266, 281, 324, 347, 348, 350, 351, 352, 353, 367, 478, 480, 544, 546, 1352, 1363, 1434, 1511, 2055.

UNINVENTORIED FIELD NOTES

1. Bucić, Ivan MS (Jasenice near Obrovac).
2. Černelić, Milana Field notes, 1983, Hungary (villages: Tukulja near Budapest, Baja, Vancaga, Gornji Sentivan, Matević, Bikić, Aljmaš, Kačmar, Gara in southern Hungary).
3. Černelić, Milana Field notes, 1984 (Đurđin near Subotica).
4. Černelić, Milana Field notes, 1984 (Jasenice near Obrovac, Pridraga near Novigrad).
5. Marijan, Livio, Field notes, 1988 (Ivoševci - Bukovica, Lišane Ostrovičke - Ravni kotari).

ULOGA STARJEŠINE SVATOVA KOD BUNJEVACA

Sažetak

U uvodnom dijelu izlaganja određuje se regionalni okvir unutar kojega se Bunjevci razmatraju i postavlja se znatno šire nego što je to učinio J. Erdeljanović, koji je prvi utvrdio regionalne okvire za tri bunjevačka ogranka. Razlozi tome su slijedeći. Bunjevci su etnička skupina čije porijeklo još uvijek nije razjašnjeno i pored brojnih pokušaja analize i tumačenja. Pored toga, u nekih je bunjevačkih ogranku jasno izražena svijest o vlastitom etničkom identitetu (podunavski i primorski Bunjevci), dok u drugih te svijesti nema ili ona nije dovoljno jasno izražena (lički i dalmatinski Bunjevci). Stoga glavni kriterij pri proučavanju Bunjevaca treba da budu kulturni elementi kojih će analiza objektivnije i pouzdanije rasvijetliti problematiku porijekla i povijesnog razvoja ove etničke skupine u uvjetima etničkih i kulturnih preplitanja i prožimanja na južnoslavenskom tlu (vidi kartu s označenim regijama relevantnim za proučavanje bunjevačkih običaja).

Ulogu starješine svatova kod Bunjevaca mogu imati tri svatovska časnika: *stari svat*, *kum* i *stačel*. Analizom ove uloge tih triju svatovskih časnika dolazimo do određenih rezultata. *Stari svat* je jedan od glavnih nositelja te uloge u južnoslavenskim svadbenim običajima. Ta je uloga *starog svata* i u širem potencijalno izvorišnom bunjevačkom prostoru znatnog raširenja, a potvrđena je i na području primorsko-ličkih Bunjevaca (Gorski kotar, Hrvatsko primorje i Lika). U podunavskih Bunjevaca *stari svat* nema ulogu starješine svatova, njegova je uloga više marginalna i bez preciznih pokazatelja određene istaknutije uloge.

U podunavskih Bunjevaca ulogu starješine svatova dijele ravnomjerno dva druga svatovska časnika: *kum* i *stačela*. Ta dva svatovska časnika potvrđena su i u ostalim regijama u istim ulogama, osobito izraženo u gorsko-kotarsko-primorsko-ličkom prostoru s prevagom *kuma* u toj ulozi, što ukazuje na stanovite podudarnosti kod primorsko-ličkih i podunavskih Bunjevaca u vezi s ovom ulogom.

Postojeća tendencija da *kum* ili rjeđe *stačel* bude starješina svatova u dva bunjevačka ogranka, a da ta pojava nije nepoznata ni u području njihove potencijalne postojbine, ukazuje da bi korijene tim ulogama trebalo tražiti u njihovoj postojbini gdje u širem prostoru takvu ulogu ima *stari svat*. Na tim je prostorima ova uloga *kuma* (dijelom i *stačela*) potisnuta pred jačim *starim svatom*, da bi se kod druga dva bunjevačka ogranka održala i još više razvila. *Kum* i *stačela* u podunavskih Bunjevaca očito imaju važniju ulogu od *starog svata*. Čini se da ta konstatacija vrijedi i za primorsko-ličke Bunjevce uz naznaku da je na ovom prostoru i *stari svat* ravnomjerno starješina svatova.

Orientation map of the areas (without precise boundaries) covered by the study of the wedding customs in Bunjevci regions.

1. The Bunjevci areas according to Erdeljanović (Dalmatia, Primorje-Lika and Danube regions).
2. Areas with evidence (historical, anthroponymic, and ethnological) of the Bunjevci groups without the ethnic name of Bunjevac.
3. Areas with important ethnological parallels with customs in the Danube Bunjevci (notably the *staćel* and others).

