

New Europe College Yearbook 2003-2004



ANDREI A. AVRAM
MARIN CONSTANTIN
SILVIA MARTON
MARIUS OPREA
MÁRIA PAKUCS
BRÎNDUȘA PALADE
DRAGOȘ PETRESCU
CORINA IOSIF SÎRBU
MIRUNA TĂTARU-CAZABAN
LAURA TUȘA-ILEA

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright © 2005 – New Europe College

ISSN 1584-0298

NEW EUROPE COLLEGE

Str. Plantelor 21

023971 Bucharest

Romania

Tel. (+40-21) 327.00.35, Fax (+40-21) 327.07.74

E-mail: nec@nec.ro



MARIN CONSTANTIN

Born in 1968, in Vasilați-Călărași

Ph.D. candidate, University of Bucharest, Faculty of Philosophy
Dissertation: *Anthropological Understanding of Village Communities in Romania*

Researcher, "Francisc Rainer" Anthropological Research Center, Bucharest
Associate professor of cultural anthropology, "Ion Mincu" University of
Architecture and Urban Planning, Bucharest

Fellow of Ecole Doctorale en Sciences Sociales
(Bucharest, Neuchâtel, 1996-2000)

Grantee of Romanian Academy of Sciences
(Bucharest, 1999, 2003, 2005-2006)

Grantee of Research Support Scheme, Soros Foundation (Prague, 2000-2002)

Grantee of Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research
(New York, 2002-2003)

Fellow of Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research
(New York, 2005)

Fellow of Centre for Advanced Study (Sofia, 2005-2006)

Participation in international symposia in Romania and Switzerland

Several articles and book reviews on ethnography and cultural anthropology published in Romania and abroad (Bulgaria, Germany, France, USA)

CAPITALISM AND TRANSHUMANCE: A COMPARISON OF THREE PASTORAL MARKET TYPES IN EUROPE (1950-2000)

Introduction

This research is about herders and capitalism. It represents an attempt to assess the economic potential of peasant husbandry in terms of pastoral transhumance in contemporary Europe. The ethnography of herders in Central Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France will be discussed here from the theoretical and methodological perspective of economic anthropology. While it would clearly be difficult to approach peasantry or any other social group in Europe today from outside the general framework of the market economy, it seems equally problematic to speak of capitalism among the herdsmen. As will be seen, this issue has already given birth to some controversial literature in the anthropology of pastoralism. At the same time, however, the debate centered on the emergence of the capitalist esprit and system of production and exchange does reach the peasant economy in general.

Are peasants really interested in making capital? According to Raymond Firth (1964), credit relationships, convertibility, and entrepreneurship can be identified among the peasants, though there is no further development on the capital market. When cultural change is reported in peasant societies, such as from the "paleotechnic" to "neotechnic ecotypes" (Wolf 1966), it is no doubt also thought to occur in technology, economic organization, and mentalities. Similarly, peasants may be involved in "sectional" or "network" markets (Wolf 1966), which link countryside growers to regional or urban clientele (Smith 1985). But as far as is usually accepted, what could generally be called the "capitalistic specialization" is neither consistent with the peasants' cultural change nor synonymous with their market involvement. If capital

implies production, price control, and investment for the market, not for immediate consumption (Firth 1964), how can this be related to peasantry and rural economies? As a rule, the peasant household and the village community are defined as being oriented towards a subsistence economy and autarchy, and rarely towards production and market exchange. As such, peasants are portrayed through "the image of limited goods" (Foster 1965), as if they were interested in domestic needs only, with no or too little strategy for accumulation and investment. Collective traditions, maintained by "ceremonial funds" (Wolf 1966), are expected to ascribe the economic self-reproduction of the peasant group, rather than to encourage competition and differentiation from within. Secondly, the kinship framework of the peasant social organization is not valued as a milieu adequate for capitalistic relationships. Personal arrangements between kinfolk are claimed to work against the contractual nature of any market economy. Evolutionary reconstruction of the economic process clearly argues that "market commerce" is different from "reciprocal exchanges" between kinsmen, neighbors, or friends (Polanyi [1958] 1968). Finally, it is maintained that peasants are poor. Capitalism is difficult to localize in the context of any "community poverty", characterized by a "high probability of low consumption" (Sandu 2003). Several "traits" of poverty as a "culture" have been identified (Lewis 1980 [1965]), such as the "lack of participation and integration in the major institutions of larger society", "low level of organization", "strong predisposition to authoritarianism", and the "strong feeling of marginality". They demonstrate that "rural landless workers", alongside city "slum dwellers" and some discriminated ethnic groups, would probably never meet the criteria of productivity or convertibility demanded by the market.

With respect to pastoralism, the critical point is not so much whether pastoral societies were impregnated by some capitalist mastery after coming into contact with the Western market economy, but rather the extent to which we can speak of certain capitalist developments within the pastoral economies *per se*. In other words, the debate consists of accepting or rejecting the working hypothesis according to which capitalism could arise in social contexts different from factories, banks, and overseas commerce in Europe and North America. In this debate, pastoralism seems equally misplaced since it usually evokes an archaic way of life, backward technology, under-development, and so on. Historical and ethnographic data would establish the strong belief that shepherds and their flocks have for millennia represented a subsistence

economic pattern in which innovation as a rule was lacking.¹ Last but not least, some aspects of nomadism and brigandage² in the life of pastoralists would be of little worth as an argument for economic growth and societal mutation. Pastoral transhumance is normally presented from an ecological perspective in terms of the need for pastures in relation to variation in altitude or climate (Jacobeit 1961) or labor division between pastoralists and agriculturalists (Braudel 1966 [1949]). As such, transhumance implies a seasonal circuit of herdsmen in which there is an alternation of climate and environment according to the requirements of managing ovine livestock. This approach depicts a phenomenon of adaptation to the natural milieu in which framework humans and animals depend on mountain and plain.³ Some descriptive details, however, such as the “specialized population of herders [in the Pyrenees]” (Braudel 1966), the “numerous ovine flocks of the employers [in the Romanian Carpathians]” (Vuia 1964), and “hired shepherds” (Vuia 1964; Rinschede 1977), seem to show more than an ecological framework *stricto sensu* in the definition of transhumance. As will be seen, the persistence of transhumance in the complex societies of Europe in the second half of the twentieth century cannot be explained solely as an “adaptation to ecosystem”; it has also been an adaptation to macro economic systems, such as socialism and the market economy.

A comparison study of pastoral transhumance in Europe

In 1997 and 1999, I carried out ethnographic research in Southern Transylvania among Romanian herders specialized in pastoral transhumance. In practice it was monographic research, focused on the village community of Tilișca. In that case, ethnography of the local mountain sheepfolds was followed by a genealogical inquiry meant to represent the local kinship structures and interpret them in relation to the village property relationships. My research findings have been discussed elsewhere.⁴ Suffice it to say here that Transylvanian highland herdsmen display an advanced form of farm organization that is different in terms of labor management, investments, and productivity from other rural economies (such as lowland agriculture and mountain forestry) in Romania today. Historical data provides evidence of pastoral transhumance in Southern Transylvania since (at least) the eighteenth century.⁵ However, at the time I conducted my fieldwork I was unsure whether the

transhumance in the area was the result of a Medieval heritage or was more related to the contemporary market economy (after several decades of communism).

Except for the neighboring region of Braşov (Southeastern Transylvania), there is no other area of specialized long-distance herding in Romania. Romulus Vuia's pastoral typology in Romania (1964: 21-189) distinguishes between "local agricultural herding", "agricultural herding with highland sheepfold", "herding in the foothill prairies", and "herding in summer highlands and winter lowlands [= transhumance]". When Vuia identifies transhumance in the southeastern areas of the Romanian Carpathians, he is concerned with the so-called "Ungureni" herders, namely those herders that originated in Southern Transylvania, which was under Austro-Hungarian rule until 1918. It thus seemed obvious to me that an understanding of transhumance more in relation to the market than to "tradition" would require more than monographic research on a given village community. Since the field data identified a single zonal specialization in this form of pastoralism in Romania, I then became interested in the use of comparison as a method of approaching transhumance as an *economic*, not only ecological, technique. And, since the only similar phenomenon in Southeastern Europe is that of the herding in the Pindos Mountains, I began to gather information on the Aromanian and Sarakatsan transhumance in Northern Greece.

Transhumance in the Carpathians and transhumance in the Pindos are not entirely isolated from each other. As their ethnic name proves, Romanians and Aromanians share a Latin origin, which is also mirrored in their pastoral lexic.⁶ Ethnographic and historical literature, as well as mass media reports, mention contact and competition between Romanian and Aromanian herders, particularly in Southern Romania.⁷ Despite this, Romanians and Balkan Aromanians have always lived in separate countries. Moreover, Aromanians never succeeded in founding their own state, though they maintained their ethnic and cultural identity under different rulers, e.g. Byzantine, Ottoman, and Greek. Last, though equally significant, Aromanians today enjoy a macro-regional membership, following Greece's acceptance in 1982 into the European Economic Community (EEC). Ethno-linguistic origin and geographic proximity are criteria for use in comparing transhumance among Romanians and Aromanians according to methodological criteria such as "cultural area" with "common historical source" (Boas 1982 [1896]: 277) and "historically determined lines of descent" (Fox 2002: 182). At the same time, however,

while Romanians lived under communism from 1945 to 1989, the EEC membership of Aromanians and Sarakatsans places their pastoral economy beyond the historical and regional roots in Southeastern Europe. As will be seen, European legislation on transhumance also deals with and increasingly modifies the traditional framework of pastoralism in Northern Greece. The implications of such macro-regional legislation in terms of production and market distribution seem to associate Aromanian and Sarakatsan herders more with West European than with Carpathian pastoralism. To understand transhumance in contemporary Europe, then, I needed to look not only beyond a village monograph, but also beyond a comparison between two societies living in the same “cultural area”. As Köben suggests, comparison is no longer about “isolated traits” but with “clusters”, which does not mean “where A, there B”, but rather “where A, there B, there C...” (cf. Köben 1973: 591).

In Western Europe, relations between pastoral transhumance and EEC politics has been reported since the early 1970s (for the Pyrenean herders, see Gilbert 1975: 598). The Pyrennes had a historical background of transhumance in the Middle Ages (Le Roy Ladurie 1992 [1975]: 163-283; Braudel 1966 [1949]: 76-93) and even in Antiquity (Brun 1996: 36-8). Like in the Pindos, however, this tradition is today undergoing a new development on the unifying European market. The EEC involvement in the practice of transhumance is a process common to herders in Northern Greece and Southern France, which allows for comparison of the Aromanian and Sarakatsan herders with French and Basque sheep owners.

Our comparison thus takes into account three pastoral “ecotypes”, representing two particular cases: ethnic origin and micro-regional proximity (Romanians in relation to Aromanians plus the Sarakatsans); and EEC membership (Aromanians and Sarakatsans in relation to Frenchmen and Basques). In Romania, the dissolution of socialist economies and the planned accession to the EEC in 2007 are both processes that may change Carpathian transhumance according to European agricultural directives, similar the changes witnessed in Northern Greece and Southern France.⁸

The social organisation of transhumance

Transmission of inheritance among pastoral communities in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees is patrilineal. Sons (the youngest in

the Transylvanian village of Tilișca, and also in Samarina, an Aromanian village in Northern Greece) inherit their paternal household, together with its ovine flock (Constantin 2000: 107; Sivignon 1968: 16). The same practice is reported in Central and Eastern Pyrenees (Rinchede 1977: 399, 401). In the Southern Carpathians (Constantin 2000: 107-8) and in Western Pindos (Campbell 1964: 81), sons keep their household's property marks on the sheep's ears; while the youngest son takes the sign of paternal household, and his elder brothers make their new ear-signs once they found new households. Aromanian gender socialization teaches sons to follow their fathers in sheepfold work and girls to help their mothers with weaving (Fatse 1984: 65). In the Carpathians and Pyrenees, pastoral work similarly begins early at the age of 9 to 12 years old (Constantin 2003 b: 97; Rinschede 1977: 401; Ott 1993 [1981]: 158). In Southern Transylvania, as well as in Northern Greece (Sivignon 1968: 17), schools end their syllabuses early in order to allow pupils to follow their parents to the sheepfold.

Sometimes (in Samarina, Eastern Pindos), a sons' late marriage (after the age of 30) is explained in terms of using free labor instead of hired labor in the family (Sivignon 1968: 35). Among the Sarakatsan herders in Zagori (West Pindos), girls are not expected to marry before they reach around 20 years of age, since a "labor of years" is necessary "to accumulate a worthy dowry" (Campbell 1964: 82). In other cases (in the Pyrenees), the herder's father or brother are the ones to play this auxiliary role in herding (Hourcade 1969: 261). In Southern Transylvania, but also in the village of Samarina, the matrimonial orientation among herding groups is almost exclusively endogamous (Constantin 2000: 108; Sivignon 1968: 34). According to Campbell (1964: 214), "not more than 5 per cent of all Sarakatsan marriages [in Zagori village]" are exogamous. Among the herdsmen from the village of Margariti (West Pindos), only two marriages are reported outside the Aromanian group of 223 people (Kayser 1963: 81). Ott (1993: 157) identifies preferential marriage within the *olha*, the syndicate of Basque herders from the village of Sainte-Engrâce (Western Pyrenees). At Tilișca, marriage and godparenthood are mostly concluded between partners from families and lineages which own many hundreds of sheep (Constantin 2000: 108), while in Samarina, a dowry (together with a sum of money) consists of an average of 45 sheep (Sivignon 1968: 35).⁹ Cattle as a dowry are mentioned in connection with the Aromanians in Margariti (Kayser 1963: 84). Aromanian herders in the Pindos become related through marriage or godparenthood to the inhabitants of the farming

villages from Thessaly Plain (Schein 1975: 85-6). Similarly, Transylvanian herders found their families in the Banat region (West Romania), while some transhumant herders from Vallée d'Ossau (Western Pyrenees) conclude their marriages in the agricultural area of Gironde (Rinchede 1977: 396).

The kinship organization of transhumance is also reflected in the territorial distribution of related households in Tilișca (Constantin 2000: 109), as well as in the Aromanian brothers' pastoral co-operation (Sivignon 1968: 38; Chang 1997: 129). The Sarakatsan brothers manage their sheep in the framework of *stanis*, the local pastoral company (Campbell 1964: 88). Brotherly joint enterprises in herding are also reported in Western Pyrenees (Hourcade 1969: 261) and Eastern Pyrenees (Baticle 1974: 499). In the Carpathians, associations between brothers or affinal relatives may also include some neighbors or other co-villagers who hold a common *ciopor* (a large flock) on the ways of transhumance (Vuia 1964: 152). At present, association among Transylvanian herders has no legal basis (though some initiatives in this respect have recently appeared in Tilișca for the purpose of improving the local distribution of pastoral products). Association among Aromanian herders is displayed in the kinsmen's "partnership" (Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255), seen for example in the hiring of the summer pastures (Triantaphyllou 1983: 158). The attempt to organize Sarakatsan herding through an "Association of Nomad Pastoralists" (1950) failed beyond the company of kinsmen (Campbell 1964: 217). Instead, several Pyrenean herding organizations were founded in the 1970s and 1980s, such as the *Coopérative d'Exploitation en Commun* of local pastures in Arles, Eastern Pyrenees (Baticle 1974: 477), the *Coopération Garonne-Pyrénéenne* and the *Unité de Promotion des Races Rustiques*, in Central Pyrenees (Barrué-Pastor 1992: 155). Similarly, Basque herders from Sainte-Engrâce make up their own "syndicate", the *olha*, which has a corporate character and the right to regulate local grazing; *olha* membership is hereditary (Ott 1979: 702).¹⁰

Another phenomenon reported among communities of transhumant herders is social differentiation, which makes poor shepherds graze the flocks of rich herders (for Southern Transylvania, see Vuia 1964: 152). The hiring of flocks by pauper mountaineers is also practiced in the Pyrenees through the "gazailhe" system, in which herders entrust their livestock to families of mountaineers who receive the animal usufruct except for the newborn animals in exchange for their work (Rinchede 1977: 394). In the case of Aromanian and Sarakatsan herders, three distinct groups have

been identified. First are the *tselingas* (rich sheep owners, employers, and negotiators with the plain farmers); the second group are represented by individual owners (as a rule, the kinsmen); whereas the people with no livestock are a subordinated group in the work of transhumance (Fatse 1984: 57). In Zagori, poorer families with less than a hundred animals are “forced” to work as wage shepherds for richer Sarakatsani (Campbell 1964: 88). Like some Transylvanian herders who may be appointed mayor or church counselors, Aromanian *tselingas* enjoying a leading social status as village presidents or counselors etc. (Sivignon 1968: 16). Social differentiation is also correlated with the concentration of livestock in some of Aromanian communities, such as Avdella and Samarina (Sivignon 1968: 20; see also Fatse 1984: 58, 70). Differences in wealth sometimes lead to marriage avoidance between village communities, as in the case of Samarina in relation to the village of Smixi (Sivignon 1968: 20).

The transhumant mode of production

In all three cases, pastoral transhumance implies two grazing regimes, one of which is during the summer (June to September), while the other is in winter (October to beginning of May). Summer grazing takes place on the mountain, at altitudes of 1,000-1,200 meters in the Carpathians (Constantin 2003 b: 95), 1,300-1,500 meters in the Pindos (Sivignon 1968: 5; Chang 1993: 692), and 1,500-2,400 meters in Central and Eastern Pyrenees (Rinschede 1977: 388). Transylvanian winter transhumance crosses territories of 100-300 kilometers in the plains of Western and Southeastern Romania (Vuia 1964: 154-5). Aromanian herders travel between 50-200 kilometers to the plains of Thessaly, Ellassona, and Larissa (Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 250-255). As for herders from Western Pyrenees, their route covers 120 kilometers to the plains of Languedoc or Roussillon, 200 kilometers, to Bordelais (Rinschede 1977: 393-7), and 150 kilometers to the Spanish province of Lérida (Olaizola et al. 1999: 222-8).

In Eastern Europe, transhumance becomes family work during the three or four months of summer grazing. In terms of personnel and organization, the sheepfold in the Carpathians is similar to the village household. Once the domestic herding group carries to mountain its home facilities (the gas stove, for example) and the rest of its domestic animals, the sheepfold takes the form of a livestock farm (Vuia 1964: 143; Constantin 2003 a: 18-19). Summer transhumance in the Pindos is described as the joint

work of the husband, wife, and their children, often with the participation of relatives (Triantaphyllou 1983: 157; Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255). According to Campbell (1964: 32), it is the woman's quality of motherhood that is valued in the work around the sheepfold, particularly in the care of children, as well as in tasks like the provision of food, clothes, and shelter for the family. The *katun* – the pastoral assemblage of huts and domestic animals among the Aromanians and Sarakatsans – is described as a seasonal settlement of about 50 families (Nandris 1985: 258). In the Pyrenees, however, herding, as a whole, appears to be a masculine occupation (Rinschede 1977: 401-3), sometimes even excluding the wives and daughters from the sheepfold work (Ott 1979: 702). At Sainte-Engrâce, the grazing of pigs, as sheepfold work, is the only task ascribed to women (Ott 1993: 162).¹¹ Several sources point to the use of trains for the transporting of herds in transhumance, as in Southern Transylvania (Vuia 1964: 178) and Southern France (Hourcade 1969: 259). Cars and pickup trucks have been equally reported in herding activities in the Carpathians (Constantin 2003 b: 97), Pindos (Chang 1993: 687), and Pyrenees (Rinschede: 1977: 398). The use of modern means of transport has not entirely replaced transhumance by foot, which is still seen in the Pindos (Sivignon 1968: 14), as well as in the Pyrenees (Rinschede 1977: 397). After 1990, the increasing cost of railway transportation restored transhumance by foot among Romanian herders (Constantin 2003 b: 97). However, railway and truck transportation is a mark of the new economic rhythm of pastoral transhumance today, which can eventually be correlated with other forms of long term investment among herdsmen, such as hiring shepherds and pastures. To winter their sheep in the lowlands as a rule requires that herders form associations. In the Carpathians, an *întovărășire* (company of herders) is explained in terms of the need for reciprocal aid on the long transhumance routes (for instance, while supplying food items or overseeing the hired shepherds at the birth of lambs). The plain pastures are hired from communal authorities. When necessary, supplementary fodder is bought (Vuia 1964: 158-9). Good relationships with the plain farmers allow for return to the same winter pastures for many years. Groups of Aromanian herders hire the plain pastures in Thessaly for the long term, receiving the required fields after paying a tax and ovine products (Schein 1975: 85-6). In describing the credit relationships between the Sarakatsan herders and the local merchants, Campbell emphasizes (1964: 247-56) the role of the "state of indebtedness" and mutual obligation in paying for the summer and winter pastures, on the one hand, and loan

interest, on the other. According to Baticle (1974: 493), 35% of herders in Crau (Eastern Pyrenees) needed to go into debt for their winter locations in 1963-63. In the Western Pyrenees, grazing flocks on the plain pastures or in the vineyards was paid for in cash or with lambs; on transhumant routes or the hired pastures, Pyrenean sheep owners sometimes prefer to hibernate their flocks on their own (Rinschede 1977: 396). Because of the difficulties of winter grazing, some herdsmen settle in the lowland regions. This is the case of South Transylvanian herders who set up their households in Banat (Constantin 2004: 90), Aromanian herders who establish themselves in the plains of Thessaly (Sivignon 1968: 37-9), and herders from Haut-Ossau (Western Pyrenees) who buy lands in the plain locations of Gironde (Hourcade 1969: 260).

In the Carpathians, Pindos, and the Pyrenees transhumant herding is under the control of this type of wealthy herder, whose ovine livestock will be mentioned below. Now I will point out the role of these *stăpâni* (masters, cf. Vuia 1964: 152-3) in managing pastoral production in Southern Transylvania through making their “herding companies” and culling their ovine breeds (Vuia 1964: 156). They are also involved in village auctions for hiring pasture, as well as in negotiation with land or forest owners for winter transhumance (Constantin 2003 b: 97-8). In the autumn, Aromanian herders leave for the lowland plains in order to establish contractual arrangements for winter grazing (Chang 1992: 80). In Haut-Ossau, herders buy lowland fields, stores, and animal shelters, and become a kind of “fermiers temporaires” (Hourcade 1969: 260). Without involving himself in grazing his flock, the herder is regularly present while milking the sheep, both in the Carpathians (Constantin 2003a: 18) and in the Pindos (Campbell 1964: 28; Sivignon 1968: 16; Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255). In Central Pyrenees, the herder checks his flock several times while it is hired for winter grazing in the gazailhe system (Rinschede 1977: 402). An important prerogative of the herders is their position as employers. Indeed, in Central Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France transhumance requires the use of hired labor. In Southern Transylvania, this labor resource is first recruited from among poorer fellow villagers (Vuia 1964: 152), then from diverse regions of Romania, particularly Moldavia (Constantin 2003 b: 97-8). The number of shepherds employed by Transylvanian herders is as a rule three or four, but – depending on livestock – this can rise to ten (in Tilișca) or even seventeen (in Poiana). Similarly, in the Aromanian village of Samarina, the *tselingas* can employ “a dozen shepherding families” (Sivignon 1968: 17). According to a recent

estimate (Chang 1997: 125, 132), “a half to two-thirds” of transhumant herders from Eastern Pindos benefit from the flow of Albanian illegal immigrants since 1990, something which is justified locally in terms of a “moral responsibility” towards Albanian shepherds with low incomes in their native country. In Central and Eastern Pyrenees, the percentage of hired shepherds is 40%, whereas most are of Spanish origin (Rinschede 1977: 398-9).¹²

The resources of the transhumant economy

According to ethnographic and geographic sources for the period studied, the size of pastoral communities in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees is that of a village population usually ranging from a few hundred to two thousand people. Estimations for the Transylvanian villages of Poiana and Jina indicate that the number of local inhabitants is as high as 5,000 (Stahl, Constantin 2004: 82). The remaining data, however, mention 1,517 people in Tilișca (Constantin 2000: 105), 376 people in Sainte-Engrâce (Ott 1993 [1981]: 19), 949 people in Auzat (Vallée d’Ariège, Eastern Pyrenees; Rinschede 1977: 407), 1,069 people in Margariti (Kayser 1963: 77), and 384 families in Samarina (Sivignon 1968: 11). In relation to this demographic volume, estimations of ovine livestock show the decrease of local herds during the second half of the twentieth century. Available data show 13,500 heads in Tilișca in 1999, down from 18,000 in 1940; 40,000 heads in Samarina in 1967, down from 81,000 in 1877 (Sivignon 1968: 37); and 3,292 in Auzat in 1971, down from 7,220 in 1952 (Rinschede 1977: 407). The division of winter lands in the Jannina Plain during the 1920s led to the reduction of flocks among the Sarakatsan families in Zagori from 2,000 to 500 sheep by 1955 (Campbell 1964: 15). The higher costs of transportation by truck and winter pastures, together with market demands for crossbred lambs, caused a reduction in livestock numbers between 1956 and 1971 in Languedoc and Crau at rates ranging between 33% and 37% (Baticle 1974: 501-2). Compared to the above population and its ovine livestock, the pasture resources of transhumant villages are small in Southern Transylvania (1,172 hectares in Tilișca) and in Western Pindos (3,960 hectares in Margariti, cf. Kayser 1963: 65). Larger resources, however, exist in Eastern Pindos (17,300 hectares in Avdella and 32,700 hectares in Perivoli, cf. Chang 1993: 694) and in Eastern Pyrenees (94,000 hectares in Auzat, cf. Rinschede 1977: 406).

Access to upland pastures is obtained through public tender, which is organized by the local mayorality (for Tilișca see Constantin 2003 b: 98) or by the communal syndicate in Central Pyrenees (in Haut-Garonne, for instance, cf. Rinschede 1977: 392). According to Gilbert (1975: 598), the hiring of pastures can contribute 50% to the budget of mountain villages in the Pyrenees. In Sainte-Engrâce, the local herding syndicates - the *olhas* – have the benefit of free grazing rights on their mountain pastures of 589 hectares (Ott 1993: 22). Despite the large amount of mountain grassland, using local pastures is taxed by the communal authorities among the Aromanians of Samarina (Sivignon 1968: 15). In the Pindos, there is a tendency towards private appropriation of communal mountain pastures (Sivignon 1968: 15), while in Ariège, 19% of highland pastures are privately owned (Rinschede 1977: 392).

On a household level in the three cases, transhumant ovine herds are still important. An individual *ciopor* can obtain 1,500 heads in Tilișca and 1,300 in Poiana. In winter, livestock sizes increase through the joining together of flocks from four or five transhumant herders, each of whom usually owns several hundred sheep. The agricultural register of Tilișca for 1996 mentions 55 owners with a minimum 100 sheep. In Western Pindos, among the Sarakatsan herders of Zagori, a *stanis* of 80 owners is mentioned with 2,000 sheep (Campbell 1964: 89). At Samarina, the number of sheep owned individually averages 180 heads, while at Smixi it is 150 (Sivignon 1968: 20). For these Aromanian villages, including the communities of Avdella and Perivoli, more recent data indicate herds of 200 to over 1,000 heads (Chang 1992: 80; Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255). A number of 19 herders, with flocks of 100-600 heads, own the ovine livestock at Auzat (Rinschede 1977: 407). According to Baticle (1974: 492), the flocks of “mérinos” sheep in Crau (Eastern Pyrenees) usually comprise between 1,000 and 3,000 heads. In Central Pyrenees, the largest flock (at the end of the 1960s) included 1,500 heads, while in Western Pyrenees (Vallée d’Ossau) the average is 150 heads (Rinschede 1977: 405). As for the Spanish Pyrenees (the valleys of Benasque, Broto, and Baliera-Barraves), the size of transhumant herds averages 702 sheep (Olaizola et al. 1999: 228). According to market fluctuations or political system, livestock management is oriented towards the production of cheese, wool, and meat. On the mountain pastures of Tilișca, one ewe produces 10-12 kilograms of *burduf* cheese (hard cheese matured in a lambskin, cf. Ryder 1994: 7) and, on the plain pastures, 6-8 kilograms of *telemea* (soft cheese). Sometimes, summer transhumance starts in June,

not in May, because it favors the breeding of lambs. At present, the value of the cheese and wool in Southern Transylvania is less than before 1990, unlike the higher prices for meat, which is sold abroad. According to Kayser (1963: 74), in Margariti each ewe produces about 80 kilograms of milk (50 of which during winter), while the number of lambs is about half that of livestock. At Samarina, the price of a kilogram of meat is seven times higher than a liter of milk; lambs are sold before the summer, while ewes are kept; the wool production of local sheep is one kilogram per capita (Sivignon 1968: 14, 17-18). In Western Pyrenees (Vallée d'Ossau), one herder's flock of 400 ewes produces about 200 liters of milk from one milking, while lambs of 12-15 kilograms are sold in order to open the milk production (Rinschede 1977: 402-4). In the same area, one herd of 180 heads gives birth to 10-12 lambs one week, between December and March (Hourcade 1969: 261).¹³

The market and clientele of transhumance

The trading of the products of transhumant herding mainly takes place in the cities at fairs from the lowland regions where the flocks go to hibernate. Besides this, herders engage in some exchange relationships within the framework of local social networks and artisanship branches, subordinated to resources of transhumance. According to local herdsman, there is a Greek entrepreneur and farm owner who collects the lambs in Southern Transylvania. In Samarina, the Aromanian herders sell their ovine meat to local butchers (Sivignon 1968: 26) or to butchers from the town of Grevena (Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255). In the Pindos, the sale of lambs is maximized during important religious holidays, such as St. Elias's Day and the Holy Virgin Day (Sivignon 1968: 28), or at Christmas and Easter (Chang 1993: 694). Due to the cost of labor, herders in Eastern Pyrenees prefer to sell lambs of 25 kilograms for 100 Francs, rather than lambs of 32 kilograms for 125 Francs (Baticle 1974: 494). After specializing in meat production, the herders from Central and Eastern Pyrenees sell their lambs at fairs during the spring and in the fall in towns like Tarascon and Mont Louis (Rinschede 1977: 404-5) or in Lannemezan for the Maghrebian clients (Barrué-Pastor 1992: 153). In Haut-Ossau, the sale of lambs comes under the control of local merchants (Hourcade 1969: 262). On the market in Mauléon (Western Pyrenees), the Basque herders of Sainte-Engrâce sell their 11-15 kilogram lambs for 12-15 Francs per

kilogram; the local clientele is also Basque and the peak market period is before Christmas (Ott 1993: 188). In the case of Romanian transhumance, cheese is sold at marketplaces in Bucharest (for example, Obor marketplace), as well as in towns like Ploiești, Galați, Reșița, and Timișoara. Transylvanian herders prefer to sell their cheese on their own, fighting over the market position with local traders. Among the Tilișcans, those who stay on the market are the herders' wives – the *băcițe* – while their husbands and sons deal with the winter transhumance. In Eastern Pindos, cheese distribution flows through networks of relatives or friends to the market of Grevena (Chang 1997: 128, 136). As a rule, the local merchants follow the herds to highland summer pastures and then distribute the milk for the making of *feta*, the so-called “fromage grec par excellence” (Sivignon 1968: 14; Schein 1975: 85). Cases of “Aromanian monopoly” in the trading of cheese have been reported in Epirus (Schein 1975: 92). While the merchants' cheese-making stations in Western Pindos collect the milk of 1,000-2,500 ewes, there is report of a merchant who controls 45 stations and can draw on the milk production of 50,000 ewes (Campbell 1964: 249). Another specialization in milk production occurs in the Western Pyrenees, where Roquefort cheese is one of the products of local transhumance. In other cases, wholesalers are the ones to conduct the local cheese trade, such as at the fairs of Bedous or Béost (Rinschede 1977: 404; Hourcade 1969: 261). While between 1933 and 1976, Basque herders engaged in commercial exchanges with the Roquefort Society, in 1976 they were to redirect their milk to a cheese-making factory in Béarn (Ott 1993: 188). The cheese made in Sainte-Engrâce and sold in the marketplace of Tardets costs 40 Francs per kilogram (Ott 1993: 191).¹⁴

Some auxiliary or secondary occupations within the pastoral communities follow as a rule the “dominant” economy of transhumance. Thus, in Transylvanian villages of Tilișca, Poiana, and Jina, a peasant textile artisanship is still at work, using the wool of transhumant sheep. The folk artifacts – such as *straițe* and *desagi* (wallets), as well as woolen carpets and sheepskin coats – are sometimes sold to tourists with the mediation of the Museum of Peasant Technology in Sibiu or even still transmitted as a dowry (Constantin 2004: 104-20). Among the Sarakatsan herders in Zagori, the shearing of sheep is experienced as a community festival; the local woolen blankets are offered as a dowry (Campbell 1964: 30, 85). In Samarina, a co-operative society for the folk artisanship was founded in 1957; its specialization was to be weaving and the commercialization of the *flocati*, woolen rugs, sold at fairs in the fall in

Jannina and Larissa (Sivignon 1968: 22-3). In Central and Eastern Pyrenees, the wool – collected by the local syndicates of herders – is sold to spinning factories (Rinschede 1977: 404). In terms of herders' local clientele, the practice of some modern professions also appears to be convergent with transhumant production. Thus the agriculture register of Tilișca mayoralty mentions professions such as “veterinary surgeon”, “tailor”, “furrier”, and “leather dresser”. Tailoring as a second occupation is also reported among the Aromanian herders (Schein 1975: 87). In Samarina, a butcher is said to own a herd of 100 sheep (Sivignon 1968: 27). As butchers, the herders from Central Pyrenees avoid the fluctuations of the meat market (Rinschede 1977: 400). Above all, such “subsidiary professions” to the economy of transhumance (Chang 1993: 697) prove the herders' “generalized adaptation” (Schein 1975: 87-8) and, in any case, outline their “pluri-activity” (Olaizola et al. 1999: 230).¹⁵

An ethnographic debate on pastoral capitalism

In an article written in 1971, Robert Paine examines the role animals play as “capital”. Paine (whose assertions are based on his ethnography of the Lapps and their reindeer culture) begins by defining capital as “a resource in respect of which one controls its reproductive value”. In this regard, capital management is seen as “an aspect of herd management”. Herders appear preoccupied with keeping “certain balances” between their “herds, pastures, and personnel”. Unlike hunters, pastoral people exercise their control over “the herd reproduction” and “the herd's seasonal movements”, as well as practicing – as “rudimentary capitalists” - some “conversions from this [pastoral] capital form to another”. As “livestock, production, capital, and aggrandizement” are their core values,

[...] it is only the size of the herd, not the size of the meal that really demonstrates merit among pastoralists. [...] As producers, not consumers, pastoralists have a more severe ethic than hunters regarding work contributions of each individual (for example, in herding which is undertaken collectively); for the same reason, inheritance of wealth is a matter of greater significance among pastoralists. (Paine 1971: 169)¹⁶

Walter Goldschmidt (1972) provides another argumentation for capitalism among the herdsmen. This author describes the “entrepreneurial competence” of a cattle owner from the Sebei, a Nilo-hamitic population in Uganda. Kambuya, the Sebei herdsman, keep data on “31 separate lines of animals, involving over 700 animals”, which allows him to do 188 economic transactions and 105 ritual payments. According to Goldschmidt (1972: 191),

A capitalist enterprise involves two interrelated functions: it must enable the entrepreneur to draw off a profit, and it must be self-maintaining. The latter function is generally achieved by actions designed to insure a continuing capital growth. The transactions engaged in by Kambuya clearly demonstrate both functions.

Over some 50 years, as Goldschmidt notes, Kambuya’s profit was nearly 4,500 Shillings, namely “180 Shillings per annum”. As a rule, Kambuya bought, rather than sold, reproductive animals. Monopoly was restricted, however, by Kambuya’s ritual payments, like the bride wealth. Above all, in Goldschmidt’s view, the “profit motive” would thus have been “demonstrated” as “characterizing the social behavior of tribal peoples”.¹⁷

Like Paine, Tim Ingold carried out fieldwork on the Lapp reindeer economy. Again, Ingold’s perspective on pastoralism is built up (1980) in relation to hunting – similar to what Paine also did. However, Ingold is also concerned with another reference economy, that of ranching. This further reference is perhaps an explanation of Ingold’s quite different discoveries in the field. After noticing that

[...] the cumulative growth of pastoral herds [...] *is a process going on in nature*. The task of the herdsman is to establish the conditions for, and to appropriate, this increase [...]

Ingold claims that the pastoral “self-production” is not a capital, since

[...] one cannot define ‘capital’ as a class of objects possessing the property of increase, irrespective of the social context in which they can be found. (Ingold 1980: 222, 229)

Even if he attends the market, the herdsman aims at “domestic consumption”, not at “investing in factors of production”. As the animals represent the herder’s “wealth, resource, and workforce”, there would be “no need to exchange a product”. While it does contrast with hunting by “accumulation” (as a pastoral attribute), pastoralism is equally different from ranching by “production”. Ranching is, according to Ingold, “a particular manifestation of capitalism”, taking into account factors such as existence of market, stock raising, territorial control and compartmentalization, qualitative selection of animals, and hired labour.¹⁸ The critique that Robert M. Boonzayer Flaes brings (1981) to interpretations of pastoral capitalism hinges on the issue of surplus, understood as “that part of total production in a society, which remains after the basic needs are fulfilled”; capitalism occurs where such a part “is produced and reinvested”. Is the increase of the herd seen as income or capital? According to Boonzayer Flaes (1981: 89),

Due to the unpredictability of pastoral production (in the sense of fast gains and fast losses), a part of the greater than minimal herds are neither surplus nor capital, but an insurance against harder times.

As accumulation does not lead to any “externalization” of surplus, “no market is needed” among the pastoralists. Investment is minimal here and surplus is not redistributed “for communal ends”, such as the roads or storage buildings. At the social level, surplus is “centralized”, which degenerates into “stratification”. Boonzayer Flaes also remarks that, as a technique, pastoralism is more “adaptation” than “structural [for extensive production] transformation of terrain”.¹⁹ Paul Spencer makes use (1984) of Paine’s formula of “rudimentary capitalism” in analyzing some “supply and demand” transactions among the pastoral societies in Kenya. Spencer’s focus is on the bride wealth transactions – as expressed in cattle - in what particularly concerns the credit relationships. Among the Maasai population, for instance, exchange of women and cattle is seen as a local “devotion to the growth of the family and its herd”. Spencer depicts (1984: 70) this system in terms referring to some market “ethic”:

To the extent that one can envisage credits, debts and marriage transactions, individual families have to be very credit-worthy and marriageable. [...] This is rudimentary capitalism with a stern ethic [...].²⁰

The merit of pastoral capitalism theory is that of regarding pastoralism as more than a pattern of subsistence – it can clearly generate accumulation, which may or may not be equated with “the profit orientation”. According to Paine, Goldschmidt, and Spencer, in Finland, Uganda, and Kenya, herdsman prove to be capable of “herd-management”, “reproductive value control”, “conversions”, “entrepreneurship”, and “credit relationships”. How precise are these labels and what degree of ethnographic reality do they really cover? Clearly, this is a Western-inspired economic terminology, which again carries with it the risk of transplanting institutions and practices of Euro-American capitalism into different cultural areas – it is what the theory of pastoral capitalism fails to make clear.²¹ Criticism of Ingold and Boonzayer Flaes is here quite pertinent. They are right to question the extent to which pastoral accumulation might accurately be called “capital”. If pastoral production is a fact, how does it relate to the market? The bridge between pastoral husbandry, as a “consumption” unit, and the “communal” investments in infrastructure and connection to the macro-regional and international economy, appears hard to sustain. At the same time, this criticism remains too rigid in its Western categorization and perspectives. In doing so, it tries to frame the hypothetical capitalist relationships among the herdsman in “other cultures” through the same criteria of Western development – with little concern for the possibility of inter-connections and acculturation.²²

To conclude, it can be expected from theorizing pastoral capitalism and also from its counter-arguments, either to approach pastoralism within Western economic macro-regions, institutions, and practices, or to link it to them on ethnographic and geographic grounds. Like Western commodities, Western market practices are mobile and “reproducible” in a de-localized market economy. On the other hand, pastoral groups are no longer autarchic enclaves, but participate in further and complementary social and economic networks.²³

Historical reconstructions of pastoral transhumance

Historians have for a long time outlined the particularity of transhumance as a system of pastoral production in Europe. Their reconstruction makes use of modern categories such as “market demand” and “investments for profit”. This, of course, might be problematic as the

epochs under question are the Middle Age and even Antiquity. What for anthropologists was an issue of cultural relativism in space is among historians a matter of social development in time.²⁴ Jean-Pierre Brun analyses (1996) the upsurge of transhumance in Roman times as regards the high demand for wool on urban markets in Italy. Brun specifies (1996: 33) that

La transhumance à longue distance, qui suppose une organisation complexe, ne peut se développer que pour des grands troupeaux appartenant à des propriétaires puissants et dont l'exploitation est essentiellement tournée vers la production de laine de grande qualité.

Documentation for transhumance in Greece, Spain, and North Africa under Roman rule is generally scarce. However, Brun finds several sources for this pastoral pattern in the Apennines Mountains (between Apulia and Abruzzes) and in Eastern Pyrenees (in Arles and Crau) from the second century BC to the fifth century AD. Data are provided for the imposition of Roman State in regulating transhumance through taxes, pasture locations, and free circulation of herds. It is the Roman aristocracy, not peasantry that manages this "mutation économique", in order to draw off a "profit élevé et régulier" from a "demande constante" for the wool and meat. Demographic growth, monetary circulation, and political unification particularly favored this transhumant development, which was to cease once the Roman Empire collapsed.

A well-known chapter of Fernand Braudel's book on the Mediterranean world in the fourteenth century (1966 [1949]) is dedicated to pastoral transhumance in Southern France, Spain, and Italy. On Pyrrean transhumance, for example, Braudel writes (1966: 77) the following:

Arles, au XVI^e siècle, depuis quatre ou cinq cents ans peut-être, est la capitale d'une large transhumance d'été, qui commande aux troupeaux de la Camargue et surtout de la Crau et les expédie chaque année, par les route du bassin de la Durance, vers les pâturages de l'Oisans, du Dévoluy, du Vercours, jusqu'au voisinage de la Maurienne et de la Tarantaise. Une vraie « capitale paysanne » : là demeurent les « capitalistes », ainsi appelait-on, hier encore, les maîtres de cet élevage moutonnier; là instrumentent les notaires devant qui s'enregistrent les contrats.²⁵

In the same period, the “gros propriétaires” in Italy owned herds of “10, 15, 20 ou 30.000 brebis”, which was quite profitable for the customs authorities of the vice-kingdom of Napoli, as well as for the local wool and meat merchants. As for “la grande transhumance castillane”, the antecedents of local pastoral “syndicate” of Mesta are attested since 1273. According to Braudel, Castilian transhumance (practiced by “bergers spécialisés”) will “gagner les [wool] marchés” in cities like Genoa or Florence. Braudel also mentions the increasing taxes Spanish herdsmen had to pay at the end of the sixteenth century. Another historical description of transhumance in the Middle Age is given by David Prodan (1944). He deals with the transhumance of eighteenth century Romanians from Southern Transylvania across the Carpathian Mountains, towards Wallachia and Moldavia. According to Prodan (1944: 143, 148-9),

Almost never [the Transylvanian transhumance] was done with one’s own herds, but with those of others, such as some particular owner, the feudal landowner, or the state. [...] A series of small industries developed in such pastoral villages, on the basis of ovine products, [with] a specific trade extended over other items too. Thus villages like Rășinari, Poiana, Săliște, and Săcele became market towns with a great power of diffusion and veritable nurseries of merchants and manufacturers who spread to the entire country.

Under the Austrian Empire, the Transylvanian herdsmen had their flocks registered by customs officers (who in 1769 registered a number of 350,574 sheep in transhumance). In Wallachia they were also requested to redeem the local rent in animals. Similar to the anthropological relativism of pastoral capitalism beyond the confines of Western societies, the historical reconstruction of transhumance is an interpretation of ancient pastoralism from the perspective of modern economics. This time, however, the pastoral economic specialization is no longer outside or peripheral to Europe. The Roman and Castillian types of transhumance, and to some extent Transylvanian transhumance as well, are integrated in West European commerce. It is the Roman aristocracy, the Castillian syndicate of herdsmen, and the Transylvanian sheep owners, not the poor peasants, who perform the management of transhumance. Does this mean that, as a result, transhumance is a “modern” phenomenon? This is probably not the case – historical transhumance, even in its spectacular forms, seems not to exceed the general framework of ancient and medieval economies.

Roman, Spanish, and Austrian authorities intervened by regulating or exploiting transhumance, which, as such, does not make it an autarchic or “revolutionary” mode of production. According to Brun, Braudel, and Prodan, historical transhumance has flourished in relation to the demographic and economic growth of cities, which is an important correlation.²⁶ This time, pastoralism is not seen merely from within its own *modus operandi* (as in the ethnographic instances above), but also in a larger socio-economic context.

Pastoral entrepreneurship

As seen before, Goldschmidt identifies (1972: 190) “entrepreneurial competence” through the “set of transactions” fulfilled by a Sebei herdsman. These transactions (economic and ritual) may be related to the “balances” kept between the Lapp pastoral resources (Paine 1971: 161), as well as the “ethic of credits and debts” among the pastoralists in Kenya (Spencer 1984: 70). The “gros [sheep] propriétaires” (Braudel 1966: 81) from the historical accounts seem to be associated with such an economic authority and competence. Can the economic specialization of herders in Europe be taken as evidence of pastoral entrepreneurship? First of all, it can be said that rich herdsmen do not represent a “mass” category within peasant communities in Europe today. Prosperity and entrepreneurial esprit (to the extent to which such traits can be verified and correlated with pastoral transhumance) can be associated, as seen before, with a local or regional tradition in large scale herding. However, this can not be equated with any collective “heritage” of entrepreneurship as a social behavior, but rather with an individual and competitive orientation to the market.²⁷ Critics of pastoral capitalism seem to minimize this personal element in the practice of transhumance. Boonzayer Flaes prefers to speak of “pastoral groups” even when dealing with the social “stratification” within these groups. When Ingold admits of the making of an “entrepreneurial class” in the “ownership of livestock”, he associates it with ranching only. But what can be said about the East European cases (Romanian, Aromanian, and Sarakatsan herders) of transhumant “ranching”? Ethnographic information on transhumant sheep owners in contemporary Europe does not outline any homogenous “class” or privileged group. These owners may equally be partners or competitors; their common or divergent interests have not so much originated from

the “pastoral tradition” (although they incorporate it), as from social relationships of market. Authors like Kopczyńska-Jaworska (1963), Vuia (1964), and Constantin (2003 a, b) evoke the “leading” pastoral role of *baci* as an “entrepreneur” in the practice of Romanian transhumance, particularly in connection with his prerogatives in managing sheepfold labor and assuming the associated “risks and profits”.

[In the village of Tilisca, Southern Transylvania] The head herder S. G. (age 63) is the *baci* (cheese-maker) of his sheepfold. He works together with his son and two other partners. S. G. establishes the grazing tasks and also cooks and takes part in milking the herd. Another head herder, N. Z. (age 60) is said to be a ‘patron’ by his four employed shepherds. In other instances, the head herder co-ordinates his family when working at the sheepfold. On the other hand, he returns daily to his residence village for supplies, and from time to time will go to the marketplace. It is the herd owner that represents his household’s interests during the village auction for summer pastures in the Romanian Carpathians as well performs, on his own or together with other partners or shareholders, the task of hiring winter pastures in Banat or Dobroudja. (Constantin 2003 a: 18-20)

There are several sources (Campbell 1964; Schein 1975; Chang 1997 etc.) for the Aromanian and Sarakatsan “tselingat” status in Northern Greece, which means the control of summer or winter grazing by a “tselingas”, the head of an extended family and later of a “stanis” (pastoral company of local families).

In 1954 the [plain] land used [during the winter] by the stani became village common land and without village citizenship the Sarakatsani no longer had any grazing rights [...]. The stani commissioned two patrons who are influential lawyers in Jannina to present their case to the Governor-General of the Epirus. [...] By late October the sheep were already on the road. The tselingas now appealed to his cheese merchant who suggested a present of fifty pounds to be passed by himself to his friend the Nomarch’s [local prefect’s] Chief of Staff. It is impossible to say how this money was used, or if indeed it ever left the pocket of the merchant. But early in November, when the sheep had almost reached the village, an order was sent by the Nomarch to the President of the village that he must again receive the sheep of the Sarakatsani into the pastures. (Campbell 1964: 89-90)

In Eastern Pyrenees, transhumant herdsmen own some double holdings - on the mountain and in the plain - according to which they organize their seasonal work.

Il s'agit d'un élevage transhumant des Pyrénées orientales qui dispose de deux points d'attache complets, à la montagne et dans le bas pays, chacun comportant bergerie et maison d'habitation, pâturages et terres cultivable. Le propriétaire du troupeau a 45 ans [...]. Au printemps il monte s'installer avec ses parents et son troupeau à Porté, à 1600 m d'altitude [où il possède 19 hectares de pâturages] et revient à l'automne à Lézignan [...] où il possède une maison dans un jardin de 800 m², avec un hectare de pâturage et une grande bergerie neuve de 600 m². [...] De 1964 à 1967, il partageait son troupeau qui comptait 720 bêtes en six groupes dont cinq confiés à des bergers à gages; [...]. Depuis de nombreuses années, son troupeau se déplace par chemin de fer de Porté à Lézignan via Toulouse. (Rinschede 1977: 403)

As such, "pastoral entrepreneurship" in Europe seems to reflect a social and economic vantage point. It refers to expertise, resources, and mobility in performing pastoralism as a specialized and large-scale enterprise. As a "patron", the herdsman represents the interests of his farm (rather than of a subsistence household) in contexts specific to the market economy, such as at village auctions for pastures and urban marketplaces. He knows what occurs in the area of his branch (levels of input and output in the private management of pastoral resources like pastures, means of transport, and hired shepherds) and in the marketplace (flow of goods and fluctuation of prices). The sheep owner may take part in the daily tasks of his sheepfold, but he is mostly expected to calculate his sheepfold's long-term ventures and direct them accordingly. Equally important, he will intercede (as with the Sarakatsan *tselingas*) in different layers of the social and administrative hierarchy of the state, becoming engaged in clientelistic relationships, not only with merchants, but also with village presidents and lawyers (cf. Campbell 1964: 224-46). Thus, the roles herders assume through the practice of transhumance are (to different degrees) those of farmer, manager, employer, accountant, supplier, and negotiator. In theory, the herdsman cumulates these roles. In practice, they may be shared or delegated in family labor division, association with other herders, or hired labor. While the roles of "farmer" and "manager" are better suited to the summer mountain grazing and family involvement in the sheepfold, winter transhumance develops the roles of "employer" and

“negotiator”; and, as will be seen, the role of “accountant” is a more permanent one.

We could now ask if, above all, by his status, accumulation, knowledge, and dynamism, the herdsman as entrepreneur is, or could become, a kind of “homo oeconomicus”, in the sense discussed, for example, by Isachsen, Hamilton, and Gylfason (1992: 40):

[Homo oeconomicus] is a rational decision-maker who tries to achieve as much as possible with as little effort as possible. Moreover, he prefers to avoid taking risks, but is not unwilling to do so if the expected reward is great enough. ‘Economic Man’ is fully informed as to prices and technology. Furthermore, he knows what he likes and does not like. This means that he is perfectly capable of making all the choices that his economic adjustment requires. [...] If we look at the way people as a whole behave, we will find that they often on average approach the behavior of ‘Economic Man’, even though it may be difficult to find specific individuals who do so.

Herdsman in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees are not, of course, entirely “rational decision-makers”. Their transhumance is also regulated by religious events such as the feast-days of St. George in Romania (Ryder 1994: 4), St. John in Northern Greece (Chang 1993: 692), and St. Madelaine in Western Pyrenees (Ott 1993: 168).²⁸ The ritual payments among the herdsman have indeed been opposed to the ethic of “homo oeconomicus” (cf. Goldschmidt 1972: 200). On the other hand, however, the transhumant entrepreneurs share a series of important traits ascribed to this (perceived ideal) economic type, namely abilities in trading and “public relations”, coping with competition risks, socio-economic “adjustments” (where necessary), and so on.

Supply and demand, competition, and price-making

The law of supply and demand claims that “things cost more the scarcer they are and the more people want them” (Kottak 1991: 266). As already seen, Spencer discovers (1984: 62) some “supply-and-demand” logic in the transactions around the bridewealth among the herdsman in Kenya, to the degree in which credits and debts are enacted “to grow the family and its herd”. On another level of analysis, Brun points out (1996: 41) “l’offre et la demande de laine et de viande” on the urban markets of

Roman Empire, while Prodan correlates (1944: 149) the diffusion of the “ovine products” in Transylvania with the development of local “market towns”. The question arises here as to whether supply and demand could also work in the case of transhumance in Europe today and on the territory of the market economy in general.²⁹ When contrasting pastoralism with ranching in terms of the law of supply and demand, Ingold argues (1980: 231-2) that pastoralists would behave on the market “quite contrary to the principles of maximization”:

Since pastoralists sell to realize a target income, defined by domestic needs, it is to be expected that they would bring more stock to market if prices are low, and less if prices are high. [...] [The rancher] will sell fewer animals when prices are low, attempting to hold stock off the market until prices are high again, when he will sell more.

In other words, are the European herdsmen only “consumers” of some autarchic rural production? Conversely, could they be regarded as market-involved producers, either on their own, or as shareholders in joint enterprises? The ethnographic literature examined above provides us with data on the pastoral resources and clientele in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees. Among these resources, we have identified the mountain and plain pastures hired during the summer and winter grazing for herds of several hundred sheep or more. Depending on the degree of demand, pastoral products – cheese, meat, and wool – are sold preferably on the urban markets in Southern Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France; the selling is done by herdsmen or specialized traders.

M.B. (a woman-herder from the village of Tilisca, Southern Transylvania) sells the cheese from her household livestock, whose number is 1,500. During the summer transhumance (on the mountain pastures rented from the home village mayoralty), M. B.’s ewes produce 6-7 kilograms cheese per capita. In winter, M.B.’s husband and two sons graze the household herds in Dobroudja (Southeastern Romania) on plain pastures rented from local village authorities. M.B. sells the cheese for 100,000 lei per kilogram. She remains on the market (together with her sister) from Monday to Friday every week in winter. M.B. sells only in the Bucharest marketplaces of Amzei, Matache, and Obor, where she claims to have made “her own clients”. (Constantin, field information, 2004)

[In the village of Margariti, Western Epirus] Chaque brebis [of the 8,700 transhumant sheep] donne environ 80 kilogrammes de lait (dont 50 l'hiver), et le produit d'agneaux représente à peu près la moitié du nombre de têtes du troupeau, chaque année. Les agneaux sont vendus, à Noël et à Paques surtout, aux négociants des villes qui font silloner les routes du pays par leur camions. La plus grande partie du lait est ramassée par les employés d'une puissante famille marchande d'Igoumenitsa, d'origine valaque et tenant pour cela bien en mains le plus important groupe de bergers. Ces marchands ne se bornent pas à collecter le lait et fabriquer du fromage; ils exploitent aussi des milliers d'hectares de pâturage en basse Épire et dans les montagnes de Macédoine [...]. En face d'eux, la coopérative laitière de Margariti [...] ne reçoit que 20.000 kilogrammes de lait chaque année, tandis que les marchands en collectent plus de dix fois plus. (Kayser 1963: 74-5)

M.I., président du Syndicat des Eleveurs des Cerdagne [Eastern Pyrenees], possède une très belle bergerie à Estavar et une autre à Caillastre, 100 m plus haut et située au milieu d'excellentes prairies. Il a 300 brebis, en deux troupeaux: l'un, croisé avec des béliers Berrichons du Cher, pour le croisement industriel, l'autre croisé avec les Lacaunes pour implanter cette dernière race. [...] La plus part des brebis donnent trois agneaux, certaines, deux par an, les deux agnelages étant celui de printemps, le plus prolifique en jumeaux, le second, celui d'automne. Les principales périodes de vente sont Août et Décembre, celle-ci étant une date traditionnelle dans toute Méditerranée, celle-là due à l'affluence des touristes sur la Côte Vermeille. Comme beaucoup d'autres éleveurs, M.I. s'entend avec un boucher de Perpignan pour la vente [...]; quelque soit le cours de la viande, les deux parties s'entendent pour traiter sur la base de 5 F/kg, garantie en cas de baisse exagérée des prix. (Baticle 1974: 499-500)

As distribution of their products takes place on competitive territory, in particular on the urban market, these herders (above) must either find and keep their own clientele (such as in Romania) or escape price fluctuation by resorting to wholesale (such as in Northern Greece and Southern France). Such market strategies are sometimes intermingled (see the Aromanian double specialization in herding and trading, in Schein 1975). Retail and wholesale trading, then, are to be seen as requisites of competition among herders and meant to maintain the external flow of the market on a regular basis. To infer the "maximization of pastoral production" with regard to transhumance in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees, it must be materialized as trading at certain periods and places on which wholesale and retail depend. The seasonal adaptation of herders

to their ecosystem is this time followed by the market calculation of pastoral resources. From the herders' perspective, however, "market" and "supply and demand" are not merely institutions of the city. The Margariti case is relevant to the local competition over such pastoral resources, including the pastures and also milk collecting. We may still wonder about the character of economic transactions among the pastoralists and if they really can fit the modern exchange patterns of the market economy. In a classic study, Karl Polanyi conceptualizes (1968 [1958]) three "patterns of [economic] integration", each of them related to specific social organization and "form of trade". "Reciprocity" is equated with the social "symmetry" and "gift trade"; "redistribution" with a [political] "center"; and "administrated trade" and "exchange" with the "price-making markets" and "market trade". According to Polanyi (1968: 140-1),

[...] Market and exchange are co-extensive. [...] Market institutions shall be defined as institutions comprising a supply crowd or a demand crowd or both. Supply crowds and demand crowds, again, shall be defined as a multiplicity of hands desirous to acquire, or alternatively, to dispose of, goods in exchange. [...] Competition is another characteristic of some market institutions, such as price-making markets and auctions, but in contrast to equivalencies, economic competition is restricted to markets. [...] 'Price' is the designation of quantitative ratios between goods of different kinds, effected through barter or higgling-haggling. It is that form of equivalency which is characteristic of economies that are integrated through exchange.

In contemporary Europe, pastoral transhumance seems to be best related to the "market trade" pattern, since it makes use of supply-and-demand "multiplicity of hands", as well as of competition and price making on the market. The question which arises, however, relates to what happens when the elements of Polanyi's logical "process" interrelate with one another and when his clearly evolutionist model is subverted into new successive or concomitant degrees. For instance, the important role that kinship network plays in the trade of transhumant herders from Central Romania and Northern Greece is equally consistent with the "reciprocity" pattern of exchange. Similarly, the legislation on transhumance in the European Economic Community also clearly places the pastoralists in the framework of "administrated trade" (see *infra*, "The EEC legislation on transhumance..."). While it is not easy to frame into

one or another pattern of exchange, the transhumance in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees appears to be a form of mobilizing the pastoral resources for the market, and not for domestic consumption only. As seen above, rather than becoming a subsistence practice, transhumance in fact sustains diverse small-village economies like folk artisanship or modern animal medicine (in the Carpathians). Partnership with merchants is similarly an annex to transhumant production (equally in Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France) within a market network allowing the management of time as another pastoral “resource”.³⁰ Price is regulated here through direct negotiation, whereas unifying pastoral entrepreneurship with trading specialization simply builds up a local monopoly (in the Pindos) in the distribution of sheepfold products. As for the selective crossbreeding of sheep races (in the Pyrenees), it is of course a practice imposed by the market, not by the consumption needs of the pastoral household.³¹

Profitability, conversions, and investments

According to Paine (1971: 169), [the Lapp] pastoralists can “undertake minimal conversions” from the “incomes” they get to another “capital form”. Goldschmidt (1972: 192) similarly uses the term “profit” for the revenues of a Sebei herdsman. Likewise, Spencer resorts (1984: 67) to the notion of “productive investment” in relation to “stock, labor, and skills” among the pastoralists in Kenya. From a historical point of view, Brun discusses (1996: 40) the “profit élevé et régulier” that Roman aristocracy extracted from transhumance. While it seems evident that pastoralists produce, there is no consensus on how to consider this accumulation. Speaking about what “exceeds the minimum [herd] size necessary [to a household]”, Ingold (1980: 219) calls it “surplus”. However, Boonzayer Flaes (1981: 89) does not agree with this, claiming that pastoral accumulation is not “externalized through the market” but is politically “centralized”.³² As seen earlier, one of the main critiques that Boonzayer Flaes and Ingold bring to the idea of market orientation among herders is that of low (if not absent) investment in production. In an attempt to approach the issue of pastoral wealth increase according to ethnography of transhumance in Europe, we need to relate it to market techniques of conversions (or equivalencies) and investments. Diverse field reports from the 1960s still pointed out the “fortune” or “prosperity” of pastoral

communities in the Carpathians (Kopczyńska-Jaworska 1963: 87), Pindos (Sivignon 1968: 21), and Pyrenees (Hourcade 1969: 263). In the following, we will consider three instances representing each of our case studies concerning some monetary aspects of pastoralism. The purpose is to establish whether transhumance implies any operations or strategies for grounding profitability.

I. B. [a herder from the village of Tilisca, in the Romanian Carpathians] bought his ARO (Romanian all-terrain vehicle) in 1980 with money from the sale of 1,000 kilograms of wool. In 1997, he paid the summer grazing in Carpathians foothills with 2 million lei and winter pastures in the district of Vâlcea with 800,000 lei. Such rental contracts with the local authorities stipulate that the respective terrain not be under-rented. In 1999, I.B. will pay 25 million lei for the upland grazing of his 300 sheep herd, and will also employ three Moldavian shepherds, paying each a wage of 300,000 lei per month. (Constantin 2003 b: 97-8)

[...] Traditionnellement, chaque famille [in Samarina, Eastern Pindos] a ses pâturages habituels et y revient d'année en année. La seule obligation est le versement d'une redevance perçue par la commune et qui à Samarina est de 6 Drachmes par tête de petit bétail et de 12 Drachmes pour le gros bétail. (Sivignon 1968: 15)

Transhumant herders [in the Pindos] tend to have large flocks, ranging from 250 to 600 [...]. Today, many herders own small pickup trucks, while others continue to rely on donkeys, mules and horses for milk delivery. (Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255)

In 1993 at one upland farming and herding village [...] six of the 10 [Aromanian] herders had hired illegal Albanian immigrants during the year. During the summer of 1993 wages ranged from 1,000 to 2,000 Drachmes per day for the hired shepherds. (Chang 1997: 132)

[...] M. P. exploite 450 ha appartenant à la Société des Fermes Françaises [...]; situés dans la Crau [Eastern Pyrenees], 75 ha sont en prairies naturelles, 30 en luzerne, 30 en herbes de printemps, 120 en coussouls; [...] M. P. est un privilégié car il loue cette place régulièrement depuis 25 ans mais, m'a-t-il dit, il n'est jamais sûr de la retrouver l'année suivante. Le prix de location est 45 000 F, 80 tonnes de foin comprises; les coussouls sont payés en laine, à raison de 15 kg/ha. M. P. fait paître ici 1600 brebis, dont 1100 adultes et 500 antenaises, ce qui nécessite l'emploi de 40 personnes salariées toute l'année. Pour la transhumance, ce troupeau est transporté

par d'énormes camions à 4 étages, capables d'emporter 600 moutons; ils appartiennent à 5 ou 6 entreprises [...]. (Baticle 1974: 496)

Pastoral surplus, or profitability, then, is to be assessed as a function of (at least) three variables related to the herd management: (1) hired pastures; (2) means of transport; and (3) hired labor. Each of these must be paid for and each is therefore a form of investment. Accordingly, all the variables examined are supposed to expand the herding enterprise beyond the limits and constraints of any autarchic village economy.³³ Of equal importance, "pastures", "transportation", and "labor" are not isolated from each other, but become inter-related elements in the productive system of transhumant husbandry. To work, such inter-relation calls for balance and fluidity of pastoral resources, in other words: conversion. That is, payment for pasture should not to exceed the salary fund for employing shepherds, as each is adjusted according to the necessity for transportation. Similarly, the benefits resulting from the sale of pastoral goods (milk, cheese, wool, and meat) must exceed the mentioned costs, so that the herders create profitability from their work. Altogether, the capital calculation in the practice of transhumance is suggested by the costs and benefits. Max Weber (1993 [1904]: 12-3) argues that the "rational calculation" is, together with "the commodity market" and "the enterprise detachment from the household", a key element of the Western capitalist development. As mentioned, the herders of the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees, consider their transactions in the value of their own national currencies; when this currency turns out to be unstable (as in post-socialist Romania), herders make use of their sheepfold products as an alternative "unit of account". Is this the sign of insufficient "detachment from the household"? As Weber (1993: 9) points out,

To us, a 'capitalist' economic fact must first be based on the expectation of a gain by using the *exchange* chances and thus *peaceful* chances of (formal) gain. [...] Where there is a rational aspiration for the capitalist gain, the respective actions are guided after the capital *calculation*. In other words, [...] the periodically calculated value on a *balance sheet* of the wealth with financial value of a continuously practiced entrepreneurial activity [...] would *exceed*, at the end of the calculation, the 'capital': that is, it would exceed the estimated value – on a balance sheet – of the material means used for a gain through the exchange [...].

Weber's correlation of calculation and exchange is relevant to our understanding of the herders' hired pastures, means of transport, and hired labor in terms of "commodities". To be mutually convertible, as well as to favor further conversions on the urban market, these pastoral commodities must fulfill an exchange property. What process makes this possible? Our theoretical interest consists of explaining why and how the market orientation promotes some pastoral resources to the rank of commodities, in lieu of using them simply in the self-reproduction of the village household. This is, we believe, the point where the Weberian criterion of the (patrimonial) opposition between the capitalist enterprise and the rural household does not explain the trading potential of peasant husbandry. To accurately define this process we could resort to the classic distinction between the use-value and the exchange-value of commodities. Indeed, there is an economic difference between the village plots of pastoralists (used as a rule, for small farming activities to produce for domestic consumption) and the pastures they hire in the mountains or on the plain, which are primarily meant to sustain the pastoral production and exchange. Similarly, the use of domestic animals for traction is not the same as the use of pickup trucks or trains, which is an investment for easier access to plain pastures and to urban marketplaces. Last, the labor done by family members and their kinsmen in the framework of the village household is opposed to the hired labor of employed shepherds, which is a commodity due to being bought and utilized as such.³⁴ By doing so, does this make transhumance less a pattern of subsistence and more a process for the conversion of the pastoral "means of production" and items into market benefits? Probably. The physical distance from the native village (which is counted, as seen, in several hundred kilometers, and usually explained in the ecological definition of transhumance) is also used as a strategy among herdsmen and their partners to create demand and "scarcity" for their goods on remote urban marketplaces. This is the case in Bucharest (for Transylvanian herders), Athens (for the traders of Sarakatsan cheese, see Campbell 1964: 248), and Marseilles (for the meat market of the Pyrenean herders, see Baticle 1974: 492).³⁵ Scarcity is (according to Gregory 1995: 916) that which enhances the "marketability" of goods, through their transformation from a use value, to an exchange one.

Labor and property relationships

We have seen how Paine discusses “herd management” (1971: 158) in relation to “the control” that herdsmen exercise over “the reproductive value” of their livestock. According to Braudel (1966: 77, 83), it was “capitalists” and “specialized shepherds” who managed the transhumant economy in sixteenth century Southern France, Spain, and Italy. On the other hand, criticism of this view sustains that what in fact pastoralists are doing is “self-production” in nature (Ingold 1980: 224), as they are only engaged in a “family enterprise”, with no redistribution for community needs (Boonzayer Flaes 1981: 91). Similarly, that what Goldschmidt (1972: 198) found to be “differential cattle ownership”, since not all the Sebei herdsmen had a “capitalistic orientation”, is seen by Boonzayer Flaes (1981: 92) as a “centralization of [pastoral] surplus” and “beginning of stratification”. Such assertions about (the existence of) pastoral production and social differentiation raises the issue of the work-and-property relationships among the transhumant herders of Europe. Does this method of herding serve simply to graze the sheep? And, if so, are the pastoralists only “gathering” what “nature” offers them? If so, ownership would be equally “natural” to achieve. However, to conclude that stratification is consequently a “natural” process is to obliterate both the complexity of transhumance as a productive (as seen) system on a competitive ground, and the role that specialization plays in wealth and status differentiation. The ethnographic data of contemporary transhumance in Europe illustrate how the pastoral production we have described above is particularly dependent on the social organization of herding as well the economic practices of making and keeping ownership among the herdsmen.

According to transhumant herders from the village of Tilisca (Southern Transylvania), they do the winter transhumance in Dobroudja [Southeastern Romania] in associations of 4 or 5 shareholders. Hired shepherds graze the common livestock of 1,500-1,600 sheep. However, never do the associate herd owners leave their livestock under the shepherds’ control only, but oversee it by alternating two by two, especially during the birth of the lambs. Nowadays, some of the Transylvanian herders breed the lambs up to June, rather than milking the ewes in May, as the lambs are in highest demand today. Other herders, however, prefer to begin the milking of their ewes in May. From the revenues from his herd of 300 sheep, herder I. B. and his father own three villas in Tilisca built from bricks and tiles for a family group with six members. (Constantin, field information, 2004)

[Among Aromanian herders in the Pindos] Milking [herds of 250-600 ewes] may be done by husband and wife, or by partners. (Chang, Tourtellotte 1993: 255)

We observed [...] that those herders who hired Albanians with no livestock experience did not allow the hired herders to milk the animals; instead, they relied upon household labor for milking to ensure the quality of milk production. Individual herders prefer to monitor the daily production of each lactating animal as a direct indication of daily grazing conditions and the physical well-being of individual livestock [...]. The profits made from the products of shepherding can be used to purchase a wide range of goods which make a herder's life more 'modern' and convenient. [...] The transhumant shepherd woman who no longer has to milk her flock twice a day, but can entertain foreign visitors and other guests during the leisurely afternoons in her husband's (home) village, has risen in the social standing in the eyes of the community. Her husband, who has become a *tselingas*, is now an employer and has moved up the class ladder. (Chang 1997: 132-5)

Il s'agit d'un éleveur de [...] Ariège [Eastern Pyrenees]; il a 43 ans et possède 180 bêtes. [...] A partir de 1952, il transporta son troupeau à l'aide d'un petit camion et il utilise aujourd'hui un camion à double plate-forme capable de porter une soixantaine d'animaux à chaque voyage. [...] Depuis 1967, [...] il est devenu propriétaire d'un hôtel à Saint-Lary qu'il a acheté 50 000 francs en vendant 70 brebis mères, en mobilisant son épargne et en empruntant à la banque, grâce à garantie que représentait le reste de son troupeau. [...] Pour les 120 bêtes qui hivernent en bas, l'éleveur doit trouver plusieurs fermes [...]; il descend visiter quatre ou cinq fois son troupeau pendant l'hivernage, car le propriétaire des bêtes [...] n'est jamais sûr qu'elles seront bien entretenues et il tient à faire le compte de ses effectifs et s'assurer de leur bonne santé. (Rinschede 1977: 402)

For all the herdsmen we have mentioned here, labor is a "resource" *per se*, as it cannot be limited to grazing, but does imply many tasks and roles which one has to manage in the framework of sheepfold husbandry. Making the productive choice for lambs, and not for milk, private labor rather than hired labor when milking, the risk of guaranteeing a bank loan with one's livestock – all of these are parts of the economic pattern of transhumance, not of another type of rural enterprise. It is especially significant that pastoralists concerned appear to be very careful with the direct supervision of their production of lambs, milk, and whatever else. This is the source of their property, where there is nothing to concede or entrust. Hired labor begins with what is to exchange, namely with what

is assumed as commodity from property. However the extent to which pastoral property will become marketable or will remain domestic patrimony is the transhumant herder's private strategy.³⁶ This is the sense of distinction between labor division and hired labor in the practice of transhumance in Europe today. Labor division, as an "allocation of responsibilities and tasks" (Ortiz 1995: 899), takes places within the pastoral household and (as seen before) usually occurs during the summer transhumance, along with the hired labor. Instead, it is the hired labor that is mainly used in doing the winter transhumance. The only "Natural" part (perhaps) in this case is the kinship framework of summer transhumance, while the hired labor is entirely a cultural-made device. According to Ortiz (1995: 905-6),

De-skilling has to be considered as part of the rationalization process employed by capitalists to reduce the costs of production. [...] They had to rely on a supply of workers who were socially rejected by the core industries: above all [...] members of ethnic minorities. This process of differentiation differs from the division of labor in that it does not categorize prestige, quality of work and payment by the type of the task, but by the type of firm and the social type of laborer it prefers to recruit. It has been given a new label: the segmentation of labor markets.

The transhumance of Southern Transylvania, Northern Greece, and Southern France, relies heavily on shepherds coming from other regions or from abroad, such as the Moldavians (in the Carpathians), the Albanians (in the Pindos), and the Spaniards (in the Pyrenees). This is, as a rule, cheap labor; to the extent in which the employed shepherds have no or too little experience, the herder's supervision is needed. At the same time, the herd owners make use of some of their co-villagers in the work of pastoral transhumance. The result is that, despite some types of pastoral associations or "syndicates", transhumance does not build up a common welfare of the herding communities concerned. Ethnographic literature also refers to the distinction between "rich" and "poor" villagers for all our case studies. Rather than "stratification", however, this wealth inequality provides grounds for contractual arrangements not to equate with simply foreign cheap labor. Such arrangements are, first of all, based on the low-income villagers' technical knowledge and skills in performing pastoralism.³⁷ Thus the poor villagers in the Carpathians work for the herdsmen in exchange for money but also for livestock (Vuia 1964: 152), while in Central Pyrenees, payment of the winter grazing (through the

“gazailhe” system) is made in shares of lamb and wool for the poorer mountaineers (Rinschede 1977: 394). Similarly, in the Pindos, the poor Sarakatsan shepherds were given the opportunity to make their own small flocks once the *tselingas*, for whom they had worked in exchange for a wage, needed to reduce his livestock due to the lack of winter pastures (Campbell 1964: 17-8). Although also hired labor, poor co-villagers’ work is obviously another “segmentation” of the pastoral “labor market”: through the social mobility it enables, this work encourages competition and new local configurations of property.

Transhumance in the Carpathians: from socialism to the market economy

In a study concerning pastoral life in the Romanian Carpathians after World War II, B. Kopczyńska-Jaworska describes two “types” of association among herders and land owners, as well as the sheepfold management by a shepherd chosen from among the rest of the livestock owners. The associated herders were provided with a labor supply according to individual contribution to the common flock. It was their leader (the *gazda de turmă*, the “host of the herd”, or the *baci*) that employed the shepherds, coordinated the herding work, supervised the cheese distribution etc. The sheepfold leader (the *baci*) is seen as a “professional administrator” and even as an “entrepreneur”, given his prerogatives in employing and paying the shepherds, weighing the milk etc. (cf. Kopczyńska-Jaworska 1963: 85-6). These forms of herding association are traditional in Romanian pastoralism (see Herseni 1941: 76-80; 132-42). Even though some of them will survive in the post-war period (cf. Geană 1970; Pandrea 1993), new types of sheepfold were created once the communist regime was established in Romania. Between March 3 and 5, 1949, the Resolution of Romanian Workers’ Party Plenary Meeting established the legislative framework for reorganizing pastoralism in Romania on socialist principles in terms of “the co-operative sheepfolds”, “village herding companies and associations”, “collective farms”, and “State farms” (Vuia 1964: 222).

The co-operative sheepfolds were associations of the herders, led by a committee chosen in their villages. Such associations were intended, among other things, “to exclude the possibilities of exploiting the sheep owners by professional *baci* or by the sheepfold holders”. The people’

council provided the required pastures and a “commodity fund” was made for common expenses through collecting the sheepfold products. The village herding companies and associations (similarly led by committees chosen by the herders’ general meeting) would foresee the possibility of common herding during both the summer and winter grazing seasons. The livestock sector of the collective farms would benefit from governmental credits for building animal shelters, concrete stables and silos, and milk centers near the stables. The state farms would provide “specialists in animal farming”, as well as “pastures rationally exploited” (pastures with a given fodder concentration).

In 1958, the secretary of Romanian Workers’ Party considered that

Ovine herding is the most developed animal branch in the [Romanian] socialist sector. The collective farms own 829,700 sheep, of which there are 50 sheep per 100 hectares of farming land. More than 75% of the sheep in communal ownership of the collective farms have their wool refined and half-refined, while wool production in 1957 was over 2 kilograms on average per each sheep. (*apud* Vuia 1964: 224)³⁸

During the ethnographic research I conducted in Tilișca village in 1997 and 1999, I got to know herders who had worked for the *Cooperativa Agricolă de Producție* (CAP, the socialist Co-operative for Agriculture Production), as well as herders who had succeeded in performing private herding before 1989. The CAP herders worked mostly for socialist co-operatives in the Banat region, where the state provided them with pastures and flocks up to the size of 2,000 heads. It was local herding. The Transylvanian herdsmen were allowed to include their own animals (small livestock of 50-150 heads) in the communal flock. They were also free to employ (at their own expense) shepherds in order to help them with the sheepfold work. From the CAP the Tilișcan herders received money and corn; and their seniority was officially recognized as a basis for pension retirement. The private herdsmen were to continue (with larger flocks) the practice of transhumance. They resorted to the transportation of sheep by railway, paying 3,000 lei for one wagon. The contracts for winter grazing were concluded with local CAP presidents or with state farm engineers. Given the Romanian food shortage in the 1980s, the cheese made in Southern Transylvania was in great demand. Similarly, the transhumant herders concluded highly advantageous contracts with the state, according to which they would sell their wool for 120 lei per

kilogram. With money from the sale of wool, some of them claim to have been able to buy personal cars which they used for their sheepfold needs or to buy fodder to winter their sheep at home.

After 1989 this type of contract with the state ceased. Wool lost much of its value, although it is now in demand among Turkish merchants. Exporting pastoral products is particularly profitable in the case of *berbecuți* (lamb), bought, as seen before, by a Greek farmer. Transhumance is still practiced, but now faces new problems caused by the land and forest appropriation or restitution. Transportation of herds by railway has been abandoned today since the National Railway Transport Company (SNCFR) charges an inflated price of 10 million lei per wagon. The price of *telemea* cheese is now of 80,000-100,000 lei per kilogram, but the herders are now coping with difficulties in terms of finding or maintaining a market position. Transylvanian herders are in particular need of a private association to represent their interests (for instance, in the direct sale of lamb or wool to foreign clients). Sometimes aid from the state is still expected (such as the building of winter shelters for the sheep, but also in regulating the market commerce against specialized traders). Romanian transhumance is currently regulated within the legislative framework of the Ministry for Agriculture and Public Administration (order no. 235/2003). It is stipulated that “specialists from the General Direction for Agriculture and Food Industry, as well as local councils, should organize ovine transhumance in terms of transporting and receiving sheep in transhumance and establishing the number of animals to be accepted for grazing”. Other articles refer to issues like the transhumant route, health certificates for animals, “anti-parasitical treatments”, delimitation of grazing areas, protection of land cultures, and (where necessary) compensation for damage incurred by farmers.

According to the Romanian Minister of Agriculture, transhumance is

[...] An extensive system of production, economically efficient, and practiced by herders who own livestock of 500-2000 heads. In the past, some herders owned over 20,000 heads. Transhumance is the movement of ovine herds, followed by a few mules, goats, horses, and cows, which travel in summer to highland pastures, and in winter to lowland regions, meadows, and pastures, placed often hundreds of kilometers away. It appeared and developed as an economic necessity for those herders who lack sufficient fodder resources in their native regions in order to breed and exploit the ovine livestock.

(cf. site <http://www.avocatnet.ro/legislatie/comentata/article172.html>)³⁹

EEC legislation on transhumance in the Pindos and Pyrenees

Greece's entry into the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1982 had important implications for Aromanian transhumance in the Pindos Mountains. EEC Directive no. 1672/1985 deals with "les modalités d'application de l'aide pour la transhumance d'ovines, de caprines et de bovins en Grèce". According to this document, a minimum of eight "unités de gros bétail" are required in order to apply for EEC assistance; and a distance of at least 50 kilometers is established to cover by truck or train transportation of flocks. Herders are expected to declare their livestock and type of pastoralism; and funding is granted for a single transportation "à partir des pâturages d'hiver jusqu'au pâturages d'été ou vice versa" (cf. site http://admi.net/eur/loi/leg_euro/fr-_385R1672.html). In the framework of ethnoarchaeological research in the Grevena region (1988-1992), Claudia Chang assessed the economic results of EEC assistance in terms of social insurance, subsidies, and credits for the Aromanian communities of herders. The local herders were given the opportunity to buy small trucks, which they used for the daily transportation to and from their sheepfolds. Investments in local infrastructure substantially modified the material culture of transhumance by building paved roads, concrete watering troughs and springs, concrete animal shelters and folds, sorting and loading platforms for transporting the animals etc. (cf. Chang 1993: 688; Chang and Tourtellotte 1993: 255). Price supports will be added for the marketing of products, as well as incentives for improved veterinary care (Chang 1997: 127). At the same time, Chang believes that the European Community will never succeed in controlling the kinship and patronage ties that the Aromanian mountain herders develop with the plain farmers in order to hire pasture for their winter transhumance.

For example, if a herder were to give a product such as cheese to a landowner in exchange for pasture, he could undercut the price value of the cheese on the market and bypass the market altogether; [...]. yet for the local player, his astuteness at being able to benefit from the state subsidies of the European Community while using his own personal patronage relations to function outside the formal market allows him to live in the best of all possible worlds. (Chang 1997: 136)

The same situation in Central Pyrenees, on the other hand, is not quite the same. In this case, transhumant herders have to cope with European

meat policy (1980), which proves to be disadvantageous to them while competing with English products (with lower prices by 25%), and also Spanish and Italian ones (cf. Barrué-Pastor 1992: 150-4). As a result, imports of ovine meat increased by up to 33%. Coping with such a “dictat de la grande distribution”, the Pyrenean herders look to diverse solutions (the genetic improvement of the “Tarasconese” sheep race; the promotion of an “intercommunal syndicate” in Vallée d’Oueil in order to unify the local herding management) without building up a “real marketing policy”, however. As concerns the sheep bonuses offered through the Politique Agricole Commune, they do indeed promote the increasing of local livestock (700 sheep), but not the quality of the ovine products (Barrué-Pastor 1992: 154-6, 162-3). According to Barrué-Pastor,

Miser sur une augmentation des effectifs de quelques gros éleveurs, alors que les autres disparaîtront, va se traduire par un hivernage systématique en plaine et par la regression de l’entretien de l’espace montagnard. C’est aussi la fin d’une certaine pratique du métier d’éleveur, basée sur une grande maîtrise de la gestion de son troupeau et de son territoire [...]. Comment produire dans ces conditions les agneaux de qualité préconisés par la Réforme de la PAC [Politique Agricole Commune]? Le plan ovin se termine en 1993. Après? C’est le grand inconnu. (Barrué-Pastor 1992: 162)⁴⁰

While the programs of financial assistance are meant to unify European market, the EEC legislation recognizes and stipulates (Directive no. 2081/1992) the origin and denomination of a farming or food product, which is to include it in “the register of protected marks and geographic indications”. In January 1994, the Greek authorities applied to register *feta* cheese as an “appellation d’origine protégée”. For many years, some countries (Great Britain, Denmark and Germany) were to reject this demand, claiming that *feta* is a “terme générique” since they had produced this type of cheese for several decades in the past. In June 2002, the European Commission in Bruxelles agreed to register *feta* as a mark of Greek origin. The European document mentions that

Le pâturage extensif et la transhumance, pierres angulaire de l’élevage des brebis et des chèvres appelées à fournir la matière première du fromage « Feta », sont le fruit d’une tradition ancestrale permettant de s’adapter aux variations climatiques et à leurs conséquences sur la végétation disponible. (Règlement du Conseil de la Commission des Communautés Européennes, 14 Juin 2002, 314)

This decision modified the annex to EEC directive no. 1107/1996, which also deals with some registered marks of Pyrenean cheese: *Ossau-Iraty-Brebis Pyrénées*, *Roquefort*, and *Tomme de Pyrénées*.

Conclusion

To reiterate here the debate on capital formation in pastoral societies, one might conclude that transhumance is a form of peasant market economy. It is not a subsistence orientation since the transhumant herders in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees conceive their husbandry as a farm organization and a market enterprise. Kinship structures and relationships appear not to be particularly incompatible with the market development of transhumance since they usually participate in labor division and social networks of pastoral production and distribution. Transhumant peasants are not poor, even though they face hardships and uncertainties in the course of their work. To be more precise, a herdsman's social status and fortune in Central Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France seems to be consistent with their trading involvement, which is high in each of the three cases. However, as Raymond Firth notices (1964), in order to identify any capitalist specialization, such as entrepreneurship, at the level of peasant economy, one needs to approach it "in a wider cultural and institutional framework". If "market orientation" can be inferred for pastoral transhumance in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees during the second half of the twentieth century, then it is equally certain that differences of macro-economic context occur between the three cases. Given that Romanian transhumance was performed within the socialist economy and in Northern Greece on the fringes of European Economic Community (EEC), can we speak any more of "pastoral capitalism" in such instances? The period examined – 1950 to 2000 – is essentially that of the making and enlarging of the EEC, practically a "new world-economy" when compared with concept of "économie-monde" proposed by Fernand Braudel (1989 [1979]) for the Mediterranean world of the sixteenth century.⁴¹ European legislation and funds are currently engaged in building a new framework for transhumant herders and their livestock. As seen before, starting with the 1970s in France, the 1980s in Greece, and probably with 2007 in Romania, transhumance is increasingly becoming less traditional and more "top-down" administrated, mainly in terms of production and distribution.

This fact – transhumance as a “registered mark”, not as “tradition to preserve” – is particularly significant when interpreting it from the perspective of the contemporary market economy. In view of this historical process, which perspectives can we envisage for pastoralism in Europe today? In other words, what is the future of the ethnographic peculiarities such as the Pyrenean “syndicates”, the Aromanian “patronage”, and the Romanian *îtovărășiri* (herding companies) among herdsmen? And, to return to Eric Wolf’s notion of “peasant ecotype”, to what extent can we identify the pastoral economies with localized, “eco-systematized”, or self-contained countryside?⁴² After the fall of communism in Eastern Europe and the launch of “Politique Agricole Commune”, authorship is probably the major concern of “European” pastoralism. In so far as a herding product becomes a subject of government policy and debate in international trade, it is expected that transhumance be adjusted accordingly. In fact, in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees, pastoral ecotypes are being replaced by “pastoral market types”, under the new regime of competition patronized by the EEC. According to current ethnographic data, a market type in the practice of transhumance depends not only on local resources and variations in climate, but also on particular niches of distribution in Southern and Western Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France respectively. However, while external competition for Pyrenean herding is high (from Spanish, Italian, and English pastoral products), it is decreasingly weak in Northern Greece and Romania. In these conditions, while EEC legislation and financial assistance is looking to foster a unified market for herding products, the battle for “protected geographical denomination” reflects the interests of the pastoral market types in defending their regional niches and trading networks.

NOTES

- 1 In his play *King Oedipus*, represented in Athens between 430-420 BC, Sophocles mentions two shepherds who spend six months (from mid March to mid September) at the pastures of the Cytheron Mountain. During the winter, the two shepherds graze their sheep either in the lowlands of Corinth or in the plain of Theba (*apud* Brun 1996: 34). One millenium and half later, in the second half of the eleventh century, Kekaumenos describes in his *Strategikon* (1075-1076) the “Vlachoi” (the Aromanians) from “Megale-Vlahia” (in Thessaly). According to Kekaumenos, “From April to September, their [the Aromanians’] habit is to live with their beasts and families in the high mountains and in very cold places.” (*apud* Elian, Tanaşoca 1975: 31-3).
- 2 According to the English traveler Henry Holland, in 1812-1813 the herdsmen in the Pindos were followed on the mountain by their families; horses, tools, and huts were also carried to the highlands, which is interpreted in terms of “nomadism” by Fernand Braudel (1966: 91). In analyzing the “reciprocal animal theft” among the herdsmen in Crete, Michael Herzfeld discovers that “in order to succeed as a shepherd [...] one must necessarily also be a successful animal thief”, to be eventually associated with values like “bravery” and “friendship”. The resolution of such a series of reciprocal theft is to conclude a spiritual kinship, the *sindeknia*. The thief is ideologically associated in Crete with the *klefts*, the Greek rebels against Turkish rule at the beginning of the nineteenth century (cf. Herzfeld 1983: 47-50).
- 3 According to Ryder (1994: 3), the seasonal movement of livestock between summer and winter pastures is a means of controlling the “variations in climate”. Several Romanian authors (Veress 1927: 4; Ghelase 1944: 30; Prodan 1944: 126-7) claim that orientation of Transylvanian transhumance to Wallachia and Moldavia would also depend on the sunlit mountainsides of South and East Carpathians.
- 4 For the kinship structures and relationships in Tilişca village, see Constantin (2000). Some issues on the village history of Tilişca are discussed in Constantin (2002). See also Constantin (2003a) for a comparative approach to pastoralism in the village communities of Tilişca and Montailou, as well as Constantin (2003b) with regard to ecology and economy of Tilişcan pastoralism. Vasile Caramelea provides (1961) demographic data on the village of Tilişca, while Boris Zderciuc deals (1963) with Tilişcan folk artisanship.
- 5 Ion Donat (1966: 293) supplies the number of about 80 new villages that Transylvanian herders founded in Southeastern Carpathians during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; such villages were usually called “Ungureni”, namely “people coming from the former kingdom of Hungary [including Transylvania up to 1541]”. A “Company” of herdsmen from the Bârsa County (Southeastern Transylvania) was founded in 1803 (cf. Veress

- 1927: 9). The registers of custom-houses in Wallachia indicate a number of 1,317,106 transhumant sheep of Transylvanian herders in 1836 (cf. Constantinescu-Mircești 1976: 67).
- 6 Of the pastoral terms with general circulation in Southeastern Europe, *stâna* (sheepfold) is equally attested in Romania, Hungary, Poland, Serbia, and Bulgaria (Vuia 1964: 60), as well as in Aromanian and Sarakatsan pastoralism (Campbell 1964: 17; Nandris 1985: 258). Another example is that of *strunga* (milking pen), which is in use among herdsmen in Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Serbia, and Bulgaria (Vuia 1964: 60), but also among the Sarakatsans (Campbell 1964: 22) and Aromanians (Sivignon 1968: 16; Chang 1992: 76).
- 7 Campbell (1964: 12) mentions the business travels of some Sarakatsani from Zagori to the “prosperous towns of [...] Romania”, during the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. For the Aromanian herders and merchants’ penetration to Southern Romania in the nineteenth century, see Capidan (1942: 96, 119). Today, some mass-media reports point out the market competition between Transylvanian and Aromanian herders in Bucharest (see the newspaper *Evenimentul Zilei*, July 3, 2004).
- 8 The geographer Emmanuel de Martonne identified (1912: 125) a certain analogy between the contractual arrangements of winter transhumance in the Carpathians and the Pyrenees. For a comparative approach of Carpathian and Pyrenean transhumance, see Constantin (2003a).
- 9 The available field data reflect the presence of homogamy among the transhumant communities in Southeastern Europe. Homogamy, defined as “the tendency to marry someone socially similar (of comparable socioeconomic and educational status)” (Kottak 1991: 435), was also reported among the peasant *neamuri* (in this case, *neam* is a high-status lineage) in the region of Maramureș (Northern Transylvania). For ethnographic data on the marriage and homogamy in an agro-pastoral village of Maramureș, see Kligman (1998 [1988]: 30-2).
- 10 The main difference between the forms of pastoral associations in Eastern and Western Europe consists of the persistence of kinship networks in herding among Romanians, Aromanians, and Sarakatsans, on the one hand, and the development of juridical structures among French herders, on the other. However, it also notices the changes that took place within peasant social organization in Eastern Europe. Among Romanian transhumant herders, the traditional *obște* as a close village group, with shared land ownership (cf. H. H. Stahl 1959: 9), has disappeared today despite local pastoral *obști* still being reported in socialist Romania as in Șirnea-Brașov (Geană 1970) and Boișoara-Vâlcea (Pandrea 1993). Similarly, the current ethnography of Aromanian or Sarakatsan herders makes no mention whatsoever of the *fălcare*-, namely the traditional reunion of 50 to 200 families under the leadership of the *tselingas* (for the *fălcare* organization, see Capidan 1926).

Communism and the market economy specifically modified village social structuring in Romania and Greece respectively. In Romania, socialist herding farms were created in the 1950s (Vuia 1964: 220-2), while the Greek government decided in 1938 that Sarakatsan herders should choose a single village citizenship, either in the highlands, or in the plain, to benefit from grazing rights (Campbell 1964: 16). As to the Pyrenean pastoral associations and their technical structures, they seem to fit the theoretical model of “singlestranded [single interest] peasant coalitions” (Wolf 1966: 82-4), aimed at linking the local community to wider structures of power and interest. Thus, the Centre Régional d’Insemination [Artificielle] Ovine des Pyrénées Centrales (1985) connects local sheep owners and their interests to the governmental politics of regional development in France (Barrué-Pastor 1992: 155).

¹¹ Taking into account the involvement of kinfolk in the summer herding, the pastoral household is not everywhere the same as a “nuclear family”. While generally speaking of peasant households in Romania, Paul Henri Stahl prefers to speak of the “domestic group”, or *gospodărie*, which includes the married couple and its offspring together with grandparents. The members of a domestic group live together, have and pass on common property, and form a spiritual unit (cf. P. H. Stahl 1986: 9, 168). Particularities as regards elder brothers’ separation once married, as well as the transmission of property, lead to important differences between *gospodărie* and other domestic groups in Southeastern Europe, such as *kuča zadru•na* among the Southern Slavs, *shtepi* in Albania, *famelia* in Greece etc. (see Stahl 1986: 51-165). According to Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie (1992 [1975]: 87-97), the *ostal*, that is the domestic group in the pastoral village of Montailou (Eastern Pyrenees) from 1294 to 1324, similarly refers to nuclear family and unmarried children, as well as to rights of use in respect of communal pastures and forests.

¹² As seasonal management of animal resources, transhumance in Southern Transylvania could be related to Lipovenian fishing in Dobroudja (Southeastern Romania), which takes place in the Black Sea from April to July and in the lakes of Razelm and Sinoe from September to December (see Stahl, Constantin 2004: 91). Although both transhumance and fishing are traditional patterns of the peasant economy in Romania, they substantially differ in terms of private husbandry among most of the Transylvanian herders and state ownership of the fishing resources in Dobroudja. In terms of the labor market of Moldavian shepherds in Southern Transylvania, this seems to reflect the “complex of lowland poverty” in Romania, especially associated with factors of “agriculture as a low-revenue activity” and “reduced educational stock” in rural Moldavia (Sandu (2003: 154-6).

¹³ To the extent to which meat, cheese, and wool become market items beyond the consumption needs of the pastoral household, they represent a

- specialized production of transhumance as a local dominant economy. In other words, the herding resources in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees are invested in a “monocrop production”, namely a “system of production based on the cultivation of a single cash crop” (Kottak 1991: 239). With regard to “non-literate” or “non-machine” societies different from Euro-American economic organization, Melville Herskovitz remarks (1952 [1940]: 34, 152) that specialization in a given industry (e.g. pottery or hunting) is consistent with “personal identification with the finished product” and with “personal initiative”. In discussing the peasant “neotechnic ecotypes” in Europe, Eric Wolf refers (1966: 37) to the “balanced livestock and crop raising”, in which livestock is bred for the market, dairy products are “occasionally sold”, and crops are raised both for consumption and sale. While “balanced” by the market, monocrop productivity and specialization in European transhumance remains a peasant industry in the framework of which local private initiatives and resources are negotiated with national and macro-regional politics, and are not entirely shaped by them.
- 14 Commercialization of pastoral products is not a local or simply regional exchange of commodities, but a type of “vertical” trade (see Sidney Mintz 1959 *apud* Gregory 1995: 932) through which rural commodities are sold (usually by wholesalers) on the urban market. According to another theoretical model, the transhumant herders in Southern Transylvania, Northern Greece, and Southern France are not so much involved in “sectional”, as in “network” markets (see Wolf 1966: 40-8). The sectional markets gather peasant communities of diverse crafts or crop specialization in a closed regional system, with some price fluctuations but also freedom of choice. Instead, the characteristics of network markets are the individual, not traditional, decision; external price fluctuation and supply and demand; proliferation of services; and trading middlemen (Wolf 1966: 42-3, 46).
- 15 In relation to local resources, but also to network trade, transhumance is the dominant economy among the mountain villagers in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees. As such, it incorporates “secondary” traditional economies like agriculture and artisanship, or modern professions, like the veterinary surgery. Another example of a modern but also “secondary” industry is ecological tourism, equally reported for Southern Transylvania (Constantin 2003 b: 95), Northern Greece (Sivignon 1968: 28-9), and Southern France (Rinschede 1977: 402-3). It is to be noted that dominant economy of transhumance is not dependent on “traditional” or “modern” criteria, but on productive rotation of intensive and extensive work (i.e. the employment of shepherds and the renting of winter pastures).
- 16 From the point of view of social organization, a quite particular system of inheritance among the transhumant herders in Europe is given by that of Sarakatsani, the group of Greek-speaking pastoralists in Western Pindos. According to Champbell (1964), the extended family of Sarakatsan unmarried

brothers is a framework of herding cooperation, which implies common residence and joint flock; this domestic unit lasts after the brothers' marriage and even a few years after the birth of children. Division of the common livestock follows the separation of brothers as heads of distinct but virtually new extended families, but in theory it does not occur before the sisters' marriage and their endowment (Campbell 1964: 71-83). The Sarakatsan brotherly domestic group seems not to have similar ethnographic references in Europe today. To some extent, it presents some analogy with the organization of the "house of brothers" among the Jie transhumant herders in Uganda in terms of joint livestock and brothers' marriage and inheritance according to seniority (see Gulliver 1972 [1955]: 49-60). Differences, however, appear at the level of the Jie polygeny and common use of pastures (Gulliver 1972: 29).

¹⁷ Walter Goldschmidt includes (1972: 190) the "Pax Britannica" in Uganda (the British administration after the Great War) among the factors favorable to the local development of Sebei livestock husbandry. Nonetheless, it is also reported that while in the pre-British period transhumance involved the entire Jie population in Uganda, the British authorities were to restrict this in order to stabilize and control the local tribes (see Gulliver 1972: 18).

¹⁸ Tim Ingold summarizes his evolutionary perspective with the sentence: "Pastoralism could no more readily co-exist in the same environment with ranching as could hunting with pastoralism" (cf. Ingold 1980: 254). Economic anthropology of tribal people has, however, provided data on the coexistence of hunting with herding and even with agriculture, such as that for instance among the Bantu population in South and East Africa (see Isaac Schapera 1930 *apud* Herskovitz 1952: 344). Pastoral transhumance in Europe can also coexist with local forms of herding. Thus in the southern parts of the Romanian Carpathians, the transhumance of the "Ungureni" (pastoralists originated in Southern Transylvania) differs from the agro-pastoralism of the "Pământeni" (the local population)(cf. Vuia 1964: 179-83). Similarly, among the Kapatshari (Hellenised Aromanians) in the Lower Eastern Pindos, there exists "transhumant pastoralism and settled village pastoralism" with "mixed agricultural and pastoral production" (cf. Chang 1992: 82). This is another argument not to look only to ecological adaptation in explaining transhumance as an economic specialization.

¹⁹ According to R. Boonzayer Flaes there is no "technical" difference between transhumance and nomadism. Moreover, the development of livestock husbandry, even as a "modern booming sector", is seen as "the end of pastoral nomadism" (Boonzayer Flaes 1981: 88, 95). Pastoral mobility is sometimes described as contrasting with state politics in both socialist (cf. Nandris 1985: 266-7 in Romania) and capitalist contexts (cf. Baticle 1974: 501-2 in the French governmental directive against transhumance on foot). The Aromanian ethnic status of (unrecognized) minority in Greece is

associated with transhumance as a “mobility strategy” and an “‘ideological homeland’ in the mountains” (Chang 1993: 691, 697). On the other hand, however, the state authorities in Europe do support their transhumant communities through diverse programs of “modernization” or “development” (see below, note 38). To return to Boonzayer Flaes’s homology that “transhumance = nomadism”, it obviously ignores both the differences in residence patterns between the transhumant and nomad herders, and the farm organization of transhumance in times of market economy.

²⁰ In contrast to the Protestant ascetic morality, which Max Weber observed (1993 [1904]: 181) as an evolutionary phasis of Western capitalistic development, Paul Spencer believes (1984: 71) the Kenyan pastoral ethic of “rudimentary capitalism” would “probably persist for an indefinite period”. According to other viewpoints (Bonte et al. 1987), pastoral societies in Europe, Asia, and Africa, would increasingly undergo a process of “périphérisation” as they become part of new national structures. Despite the rapid development of “rapports marchands” among herdsmen, their production is “trop directement” exposed to modern types of pastoralism, such as ranching (cf. Bonte et al. 1987: 8). Perspectives of transhumance in Europe are sometimes described in similar skeptical terms (for the “decline” of transhumance in the Pyrenees, see Hourcade 1969: 257). Prediction of the herding evolution in Europe and beyond can, however, be altered by certain political and economic transformations, such as the enlargement of European Economic Community (for the EEC contribution to “revitalization” of transhumance in Northern Greece after 1982, see Chang 1993: 688-9).

²¹ According to Jean Hannyoyer and Jean-Pierre Thieck (1984), the pastoralists of the Raqqa region in Syria developed a series of “capitalistic” institutions in the field of local or nomadic sheep herding whereby market arrangements were concluded between sponsors, entrepreneurs, cheese-makers, and shepherds, for the urban sale of cheese. Similarly, “Associations of profit” invested funds in herding in order to breed lambs for the market. A governmental system of credit was built up to support farm herding. However, the Islamic moral, as well as some tribal traditions, restricted the local herders’ market economy, particularly affecting loans for interest (cf. Hannyoyer, Thieck 1984: 47-65). The question, then, is to what extent does Western capitalism really work in societies whose traditions are explicitly prohibitive to it? Or, perhaps, are “alternative types of capitalism”, such as “Islamic” ones, to be culturally recognized and theoretically defined?

²² In studying the open-air markets in Central and Eastern Europe before and after 1989, Endre Sik and Claire Wallace identified (1999: 707) a “continuum of informality” among the small-scale traders in the area. This means that Western market institutions, such as supply and demand, entrepreneurship, and negotiated price-making, had or still have to coexist with phenomena

like the lack of trade licenses (Sik and Wallace 1999), trading tourism (Thuen 1999), and ethnic and kinship networks on the market (Wallace, Shmulyar, and Bedizir 1999). *Mutatis mutandis*, we could infer that archaism and tradition in some forms of pastoralism do not exclude interference with external economic systems even though such exchanges or acculturation would reproduce neither that tradition's process, nor those economic systems' development.

23 Even in those situations in which some geographic and ecological isolation still allows for pastoral autarchy to a certain extent, the local herdsmen are not entirely autonomous and self-contained. According to Anne-Marie Brougère (1984), the owners of alpaca and llama herds in Sibayo (the Andes Mountains, 3,900 meters altitude) inhabit two ecological layers in the area, according to the seasons. They have familial rights of pasture ownership and they also mark their animals. Among the Sibayo natives, the animals they graze are believed to be mediators between the humans and gods. The Sibayo herders engage in barter relationships with agricultural communities from lower mountain levels by offering wool and meat in exchange for potatoes and fruits. Local barter is outside the market transactions. However, the Sibayo herders also participate in external market relationships by conceding the wool and meat to middlemen who impose their own prices on the herdsmen. Due to price increase and the difficulties of obtaining the necessary goods, Sibayo herders are preoccupied with forming their own trading association or restoring their traditional barter system (cf. Brougère 1984: 65-77).

24 Claudia Chang and Perry A. Tourtellotte cite (1993) several archaeologists (P. Halstead 1981, J. Lewthwaite 1981; A. G. Sherratt 1981, H. J. Greenfield 1988) who deal with the origin of pastoral transhumance in Europe during Neolithic and Medieval periods. While Sherratt associates transhumance of sheep, goats, and cattle with "the secondary products revolution" in Neolithic times, Greenfield correlates it to the conditions of markets and to climate differences between semi-arid and temperate areas during the post-Neolithic periods in the Balkan Peninsula. Halstead and Lewthwaite claim that transhumance probably has a Medieval origin, related to large-scale deforestation and then to the creation of grasslands in the Eastern and Western Mediterranean Sea (*apud* Chang and Tourtellotte 1993: 252).

25 In his monograph on the Occitan village of Montailou from 1294 to 1324, the historian Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie provides (1992 [1975]) information on the transhumance in Eastern Pyrenees which is particularly relevant to local pastoral husbandry in Medieval times. As "patrons" (*domini*), local herders owned flocks of several hundred sheep and private pastures. They worked in association or by using the hired labor of employed shepherds. Among local shepherds, pastoral apprenticeship was usually began at the age of 12-14. Herding on the mountain required the teamwork of eight local

shepherds. Montañonese transhumance took place in the lowlands of Aude and Catalonia. Wool was sold at prices ranging to a third of one herd's value. The local economy of transhumance is not subsistence, but a market economy (cf. Le Roy Ladurie 1992: 163-283).

²⁶ According to Romanian historical and ethnographic literature, Medieval transhumance in the Carpathian Mountains would have appeared as a commercial necessity of fourteenth century herders in Southeastern Transylvania. Thus herders from the Braşov area would sell their products in towns such as Brăila (a harbor on the River Danube, Eastern Wallachia), Chilia-Licostomo, and Cetatea Albă-Maurocastron (seaports on the Black Sea, Southern Moldavia)(cf. Panaitescu 1936). On the other hand, the herders from the Sibiu area developed their transhumance in connection with the textile industries in the towns of Sibiu and Braşov, also in the fourteenth century (cf. Bucur 1978). From this perspective, the Wallachian region between the Carpathian Mountains and the Black Sea would have hosted the market economy of Transylvanian herders in Medieval times. Through the Genoese and Venetian competitive trade on the Black Sea during the fourteenth century (Brătianu [1969] 1999: 369-70), Transylvanian transhumance could have been related to the West European economy (on the Genoese commerce at the fourteenth century Black Sea, see also Le Goff 1994 [1956]: 17-8).

²⁷ As already seen, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie (1992: 242) evokes the herding "patrons" of Montañon at the end of the thirteenth century. Romulus Vuia similarly evokes (1964: 156) the "scutar" role in seventeenth century herding in the Carpathians, namely "a kind of entrepreneur" who owned livestock but also gathered under his leadership other herders' flocks to graze them together with "his [employed] people". According to Theodor Capidan (1942: 73) the leading (pastoral but also military and juridical) role of the *teslingas* among the Aromanians in the Pindos has been reported in historical sources since the eleventh and twelfth centuries. However, none of these historical antecedents can account for the direct continuity of such economic roles with the market economy of individual transhumant herders in Europe today. Thus while the decline of *teslingat* as a traditional status is identified in Northern Greece for the postwar period (Campbell 1964: 17-19; Sivignon 1968: 18-19), *teslingas* as rich sheep owners and employers continue to be reported (see, for instance, Chang 1997: 135).

²⁸ As regards the individual but also social implications that the ethic of *Homo economicus* entails, Melville Herskovits writes (1952: 8) the following: "[...] we must not reject Economic Man only to substitute Society as an exclusive formula for understanding economic behavior [...]. The economic unit [...] is the individual operating as a member of his society in terms of the culture of his group". The herdsman as an entrepreneur, then, undertakes his *economic* specialization on behalf of his family's resources and interests,

but also according to the culture of his professional group, which in Central Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France, is equally a culture of pastoral husbandry. Religion is part of such culture, to be eventually understood as a “total social phenomenon”. In the terms of Marcel Mauss (1969 [1924]: 1), “In these *total* social phenomena [...], all kinds of institutions find simultaneous expression: religious, legal, moral, and economic.”

29 Against the existence of the supply and demand mechanism among herders, we can draw on the European Community policy to subsidize pastoral transhumance. Several kinds of bonuses are granted to herdsmen from the EEC, such as the bonus for sheep ownership (21 euros per capita), the bonus for commercializing ovine products (16.8 euros), and the bonus for performing transhumance (7 euros) (cf. [http://www.avocatnet.ro/legislatie/comentata/article 172.html](http://www.avocatnet.ro/legislatie/comentata/article%20172.html)). European funds are, however, targeted at building up a single market economy also for pastoral products – with one of reaction against this being that of “registered authorship” of local or national brands (see *supra*, the chapter on “The EEC legislation on the Transhumance in the Pindos and Pyrenees”). For the recent controversy over the national origins of *brânza* cheese (claimed by Slovakia as the “Slovak Bryndza”, but also made in Austria, Poland, and Romania), see *Rompress* news from May 17, 2004.

30 Management of time as a pastoral resource is not limited to the seasonal cycle of summer and winter transhumance. As different temporal frames shape the practice of transhumance, one could interpret it in terms of “time”, “timing”, “temporality”, and “tempo” according to a scale of time perception proposed by Adam (1995: 508-12). Thus “time” is what is strictly measured by clock and calendar, such as the weekly schedule of Transylvanian woman who sell in the marketplace. “Timing”, instead, refers to the “right time” when pastoral tasks should, or should not, be performed, or when they are expected to be better accomplished. By way of example we have the Pyrenean herder who relies on a “prolific [spring] season of several lambs at a birth” or on the selling season in the fall due to tourists. “Temporality” designates the life cycles or rhythms, for instance the winter and summer amounts of milk production in Margariti village. With regard to “tempo”, as it deals with “time intensity and speed”, it could be related to moments like milking the sheep or bad weather when grazing, which are reported equally in the three cases above (Constantin 2003b: 96; Sivignon 1968: 16; Hourcade 1969: 261-2).

31 Pastoralists are sometimes claimed to live in “symbiosis” with their herds; symbiosis is even seen as an “obligatory interaction between humans and animals” (cf. Kottak 1991: 174). Through selective crossbreeding, however, herders seem to abandon their symbiotic relationships with animals, in favor of their client’s demands. It is generally inferred that “domestication entails control of an animal’s reproductive capacity” (Ellen 1995: 211), while

- herding “suppose [...] une transformation plus ou moins accentuée des caractères génétiques et des comportements sociaux de l’animal” (Bonte et al. 1987: 4). As seen before, qualitative crossbreeding is not associated with any type of pastoralism, but with ranching only (Ingold 1980: 239).
- 32 Status inequality based on livestock and pastures is reported among the pastoralists in Mongolia and Iran (Bonte et al. 1987: 7). However, the political centralization seems not to be a generalized process within the pastoral groups. According to Philip Burnham (1979: 353), except for the Nilo-Hamitic Maasai tribesmen, there is no evidence of any “autonomous tendency toward political centralization and class stratification” in African pastoralist literature. More precisely, “[...] the political fluidity characterizing mobile pastoral societies is a dominant and conservative structural feature which militates against autonomous tendencies toward centralization and class stratification” (Burnham 1979: 355). South Transylvanian transhumants in the seventeenth century lived like a “little republic” (cf. Nicholas Bethlen, 1662, *apud* Veress 1927: 18). Similarly, Aromanians in Northern Greece benefited from 1905 to 1912 of the *millet* status of ethnic and religious autonomy in the framework of the Ottoman Empire (Sivignon 1968: 30; Schein 1974: 91). Despite such ephemeral rights of autonomy, none of the above pastoral groups ever succeeded in founding its own political entity. Based on their social organization, the rich herdsmen in Europe did not build any hereditary class structure despite Capidan’s claims (1942: 72) that *tselingat* was hereditary “in the past”, whereas Ott (1993: 156) speaks of the inheritance of the pastoral rights within the syndicate of *olha*.
- 33 Clearly, such “autarchic”, meaning self-containing, villages are hard to find in post-socialist Romania. The rural problematic among the Romanian peasants today is centered around issues like agricultural decline, the delay of land restitution, and the unemployment of former urban workers (see Mihăilescu 1996: 3-24; Sandu 2003: 247-58; Verdery 2002: 5-33). Field research is thus preoccupied with identifying local “peasant types of strategies in the economic transition” (Mihăilescu, in Ialomița county, South Romania), “rebuilding sociability in depopulated village communities” (Sandu, in Sibiu-Brașov area, Transylvania), and “official obstructionism in the land restitution” (Verdery, Hunedoara county, Transylvania). “Autarchy”, then, if it is possible to identify, is here a euphemism for the relative socio-economic isolation of many peasant communities in contemporary Romania, which is not the case of transhumant villages in Southern Transylvania.
- 34 In analyzing the question of capitalization of resources in nonliterate societies, Melville Herskovitz focuses (1952: 299, 302) on the triad of “land, labor, and capital” to specify that “it should be evident that no society exists where all of the three – labor, land, and capital – are not found [...]”. In relation to concepts of land, labor, and capital, Herskovitz adds the “corresponding” triad of “rent, wages, and interest”. Could such a theoretic

scheme have any heuristic value with regard to pastoral transhumance in Europe? The three pastoral resources of above – pastures, transport, and labor – are first of all empirical field data on transhumance in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees. And, while “pastures” and “labor” seem to conform to Herskovits’s scheme, equivalency between “capital” and “means of transport” depends on the degree of pastoral investment. Correlation between “capital” and “interest” is equally relevant for “pastures”, “hired labor”, and “means of transport” since each asks for financial advance and expects profitability.

35 The herders’ market choice of urban clients suggests that the point of distribution is not simply “to sell” but also to allow for some “consumption” peculiarities. According to Susana Narotzky (1997: 103-38), consumption must be seen not only as “the termination of the economic process”, but also as “social consumption”, to be approached in terms of “consumption networks” (in lieu of “consumption units”). While engaged in “network trading” (see note 14 above), herders address not so much “target buyers” (as their market involvement is seasonal only), as a “client network”, which includes merchants, butchers, tourists, and so on.

36 Making and development of pastoral ownership in Central Romania, Northern Greece, and Southern France is a process of herding husbandry and market involvement as well. Breeding choices for some ovine races, such as *turcana* in Southern Transylvania (Vuia 1964: 156) or *merinos* in Eastern Pyrenees (Baticle 1974: 492-3), are thought of in terms of animal adaptation to transhumance. Similarly, the sheep division between milking ewes (*mânzâri*, in Romania, *zaguria* in Greece) and the sterile ewes (*sterpe*, in Romania, *sterfa* in Greece) is undertaken as a productive strategy (cf. Vuia 1964: 153; Campbell 1964: 19). The tendency of private appropriation of communal pastures in the Pindos (Sivignon 1968: 15) and Pyrenees (Rinschede 1977: 392) is nevertheless counter-balanced by local auctions for hiring the communal lands (see *supra*, “The Resources of Transhumant Economy”). Among the Romanian and Aromanian, and Sarakatsan transhumants in Southeastern Europe, circulation of pastoral ownership is still regulated by endogamy and patrilineal inheritance (see *supra*, “The Social Organization of Transhumance”). Beyond the kinship control or supervision of property, however, herders in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees do capitalize a part of their ownership, given the “marketability” of pastoral resources and products. With respect to the making of an entrepreneurial class within peasant societies, Raymond Firth speaks (1964: 28) of “[...] the ability of these entrepreneurs to utilize and aggregate the savings of their kinsfolk for profitable investment”.

37 As it is known, the contribution of Karl Marx to the theory of commodity is that of understanding labor also as a use and exchange value. He claims (1948 [1867]: 193) that “As the commodity itself is the unity of use and

exchange value, its production process must be the unity of the process of labor and of value formation". The worker, continues Marx, adds a new value to the object of his labor. Unlike the "constant capital" of "means of production", the labor power changes its value through the production process into the "variable capital" of the "surplus value", namely the labor surplus, which is appropriated or "alienated" by the "seller of labor power" (cf. Marx 1948: 199, 203, 211). As described above, the poor co-villagers of transhumant herders are wageworkers as are the foreign hired shepherds. However, while the shepherds' [seasonal, rather than permanent] labor can be seen in terms of "surplus value formation", this is not the case of co-villagers too. The labor "trade" is indeed at work in both situations, but the poor villagers' pastoral knowledge and mastery may be seen as another "capital", to be converted eventually into new labor and ownership arrangements, which cannot necessarily lead to "class" differentiation between "labor buyers" and "labor sellers".

38 The state involvement in modernizing pastoralism in Communist Romania may be compared with state investments in countries that now belong to the European Economic Community: in 1957 the Greek government supported the foundation of the wool artisanship factory in Samarina (Sivignon 1968: 22-3), while the French Ministry of Agriculture subsidized the building of pastoral facilities (such as stables) at below market prices from 1976 to 1982 in Central Pyrenees (Barrué-Pastor 1986: 109). However, such "top-down" national politics in herding assistance are quite rare as concerns the transhumance in the Carpathians, Pindos, and Pyrenees, unlike the basic development program of the "national parks" for Lapp herders in Finland (Aikio 1983: 72) and the protected grazing areas in Siria (Hannoyer, Thieck 1984: 58).

39 According to another authority of the Romanian Ministry of Agriculture, starting in 2007 (the year of Romania's scheduled accession to European Economic Community [EEC]), transhumant herders in Romania will benefit from the same subsidies as in EEC countries (see *supra*, note 29). While reported today in the areas of Sibiu, Braşov, Hunedoara (in Transylvania), and Gorj (in Wallachia), Romanian transhumance would be supported depending on minimum livestock owned, which ranges from 10 to 20 sheep (see the *Gardianul* newspaper on November 11 2003).

40 The increasing need for summer grazing pastures seems to be a major concern among the herders of the Pyrenees in the 1990s. A recent document (1998) entitled "Le contrat pastoral pyrénéen" aims at "tenir et entretenir un domaine pastoral collectif de haute altitude de 500.000 ha d'estive" and at "consolider ou créer 250 emplois salariés de bergers/vachers qualifiés". After the reforms of the Politique Agricole Commune in the 1990s, "[...] le pastoralisme montagnard de haut altitude se voit confronter à partager l'espace avec d'autres activités, par exemple de conservation (parcs naturels,

zone à ours, ...) ou récréatives (randonnées, chasse...). As a result, the document emphasizes the Pyrenean herders' development program of preserving or restoring "l'eau, l'air, l'espace, le patrimoine génétique et culturel, les produits de qualité, le travail et l'emploi" (see *Magazine Transhumance*, site http://www.apem.asso.fr/magazin/D1_30_98.htm).

41 Fernand Braudel conceptualizes (1989 [1979]: 14) the "économie-monde" as a "[...] a fragment of the world, a part of Earth, economically autonomous and essentially able to satisfy itself, whose links and internal changes provides it with some stability". Braudel's concept seems, in our viewpoint, to fit the EEC policy of building a single market in Europe today. According to Ceccini Report (1988, *apud* Isachsen, Hamilton, and Gylfason 1992: 60): "The European Community is making rapid progress toward its goal of establishing a single market by the end of 1992. By that time, goods, services, capital, and labor will flow freely within the twelve countries of the Community. Their national borders will thus be effectively abolished. [...] First, each Community member will have access to less expansive goods, services, labor, and capital in a single European market than would be the case if each country were confined to its own domestic market. [...] Second, for some goods and services, production can be organized more efficiently, and less expansively, on a large scale in the Community as a whole than is possible in individual member countries."

42 In Eric Wolf's view, "The ecological adaptation of peasantry [...] consists of a set of food transfers and a set of devices used to harness inorganic sources of energy [wood, water, wind] to the productive process. Together, these two sets make up a system of energy transfers from the environment to man. Such a system of energy transfers we call an ecotype". From an ecological point of view, Wolf's definition of peasant ecotype is *mutatis mutandis* similar to the definition of pastoral transhumance according to European Economic Community (see *supra*, the chapter "EEC legislation on the Transhumance in the Pindos and Pyrenees").

REFERENCES

- ADAM, B. (1995 [1994]), "Perceptions of Time", in Tim Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, Routledge, London and New York, 503-26
- AIKIO, P. (1983), "National Parks and Lapish Reindeer Husbandry", in Pierre Bonte (éd.), *Production Pastorale et Société*, Bulletin de l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales, 12, 71-8
- BARRUÉ-PASTOR (1986), M., "Histoire et perspectives d'avenir du pastoralisme pyrénéen", in Pierre Bonte (éd.), *Production Pastorale et Société*, Bulletin de l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales, 18, 106-111
- BARRUÉ-PASTOR (1992), "Les processus de transformation et les perspectives de valorisation des élevages ovins de montagne entre PAC et spécificités locales. L'exemple des Pyrénées Centrales", *Revue de Géographie Alpine*, 4, 147-166
- BATICLE, Y. (1974), *L'élevage ovin dans les pays européens de la Méditerranée occidentale*, thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris VIII, Publications de l'Université de Dijon, XLVII, Société Les Belles Lettres, 95, Boulevard Raspail, Paris
- BRĂȚIANU, Gh. I. (1999 [1969]), *Marea Neagră de la origini până la cucerirea otomană*, Ed. Polirom, București
- BRAUDEL, F. (1966 [1949]), *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, Librairie Armand Colin, Paris
- BRAUDEL, F. (1989 [1979]), *Civilizație materială, economie și capitalism în secolele XV-XVIII* (Romanian translation of *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XV^e-XVIII^e siècle*, by Adrian Riza), *Timpul lumii* (vol. I), Ed. Meridiane, București
- BOAS, F. (1982 [1896]), "The Limitations of the Comparative Method of Anthropology", in *Race, Language and Culture*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 270-80
- BONTE, P., BRIANT, P., BISEBARRE, A.M., DIGARD, J.P., LEFEBVRE, Cl., LIZET, B., ROUE, M.M. (1987), "Quatorze années de recherches sur les sociétés pastorales", in Pierre Bonte (éd.), *Production Pastorale et Société*, Bulletin de l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales, 20, 3-8
- BOONZAYER FLAES, R.M. (1981), "Surplus Creation and Surplus Circulation in Pastoral Nomadism", in Philip Carl Salzman (ed.), *Contemporary Nomadic and Pastoral Peoples: Asia and the North*, Studies in the Third World Societies, no. 18, Williamsburg-Virginia, USA, 97-95
- BROUGERE, A.M. (1984), "Organisation sociale et organisation territoriale chez les éleveurs du Sud du Perou", in Pierre Bonte (éd.), *Production Pastorale et Société*, Bulletin de l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales, 14, 65-77
- BURNHAM, Ph. (1979), "Spatial mobility and political centralisation in pastoral societies", in *Pastoral production and society / Production pastorale et société* (edited by l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales,

- Cambridge University Press, Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, 349-360
- BRUN, J.P. (1996), "La grande transhumance à l'époque romaine. A propos des recherches sur la Crau d'Arles", *Anthropozoologica*, Bulletin de « L'Homme et l'Animal, Société de Recherche Interdisciplinaire », 24, 31-44
- BUCUR, C. (1978), "Direcții ale demografiei istorice românești: transhumanța pastorală", *Revista de Istorie*, 31 (12), 2285-2305
- CAMPBELL, J. K. (1964), *Honour, Family, and Patronage. A Study of Institutions and Moral Value in a Greek Mountain Community*, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford
- CAPIDAN, Th. (1926), *Românii nomazi*, Cluj
- CAPIDAN, Th. (1942) *Macedoromânii. Etnografie, istorie, limbă*, Fundația Regală pentru Artă și Literatură, București
- CARAMELEA, V. (1961)., "Considerații demografic-antropologice asupra migrațiunilor populației din Mărginimea Sibiului. Rezultatele cercetărilor din satul Tilișca", *Probleme de Antropologie*, 6, 157-78
- CHANG, Cl. (1992), "Archaeological Landscapes. The Ethnoarchaeology of Pastoral Land Use in the Grevena Province of Greece", in Jacqueline Rossignol and LuAnn Wandsnider (eds.), *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes*, Plenum Press, New York, 65-89
- CHANG, Cl. (1993), "Pastoral Transhumance in the Southern Balkans as a Social Ideology: Ethnoarchaeological Research in Northern Greece", *American Anthropologist* 95 (3), 687-703
- CHANG, Cl. (1997), "Greek Sheep, Albanian Shepherds: Hidden Economies in the European Community", in P. Nick Kadulas and Mark T. Shutes (eds.), *Aegean Strategies: Studies of Culture and Environment on the European Fringe*, Romman & Little Field Publishers, Inc., Lonham, 123-139
- CHANG, Cl., TOURTELLOTTE, P.A. (1993), "Ethnoarchaeological Survey of Pastoral Transhumance Sites in the Grevena Region, Greece", *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 20, 249-264
- CONSTANTIN, M. (2000), "Tableau pastoral de la parenté", *Annuaire Roumain d'Anthropologie*, 37, 103-10
- CONSTANTIN, M. (2002), "Rétrospective historique de la transhumance chez les Roumains, par rapport à la mémoire culturelle du village de Tilișca (en Transylvanie)", *Annuaire Roumain d'Anthropologie*, 39, 109-16
- CONSTANTIN, M. (2003a), "Montaillou – Tilișca. Analyse comparée du mode de vie pastoral", in Paul Henri Stahl (éd.), *Etudes et Documents Balkaniques et Méditerranéens*, 26, 15-22
- CONSTANTIN, M. (2003 b), "Despre transhumanță și economie de piață în satul Tilișca (sudul Transilvaniei)", *Sociologie Românească*, vol. 1 (3), 94-101
- CONSTANTIN, M. (2004), *Meșteșugarii țărani și atelierelor lor. O anchetă în cinci regiuni din România*, in Paul Henri Stahl (éd.), *Collection Sociétés Européennes*, 23, Paris, București

- CONSTANTINESCU-MIRCEȘTI, C. (1976), *Păstoritul transhumant și implicațiile lui în Transilvania și Țara Românească în secolele XVIII-XIX*, Ed. Academiei, București
- DONAT, I. (1966), "Păstoritul românesc și problemele sale", *Studii. Revistă de Istorie*, 19 (2), 282-99
- ELLEN, R. (1995 [1994]), "Modes of Subsistence: Hunting and Gathering to Agriculture and Pastoralism", in Tim Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, Routledge, London and New York, 197-225
- ELIAN, AL., TANAȘOCA, N.Ș. (eds.)(1975), *Fontes Historiae Daco-Romanie, III: Scriitori bizantini (secolele XI-XIV)*, Editura Academiei, București, 31-33
- FATSE, B. (1984), "Ethnic Solidarity and Identity Maintenance. Armân Ethnicity", in Paul Henri Stahl (éd.), *Etudes et Documents Balkaniques et Méditerranéens*, 7, 50-96
- FIRTH, R. (1964), "Capital, Saving and Credit in Peasant Societies: A Viewpoint from Economic Anthropology", in R. Firth and B.S. Yamey (eds.), *Capital, Saving and Credit in Peasant Societies. Studies from Asia, Oceania, The Caribbea and Middle America*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 15-34
- FOSTER, G. (1965), "Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good", *American Anthropologist*, 67, 293-315
- FOX, R. (2002), "The study of Historical Transformation in American Anthropology", in Fox, Richard G. and Gingrich, Andre (eds.), *Anthropology, by Comparison*, Routledge, London and New York, 167-84
- GEANĂ, Gh. (1970), "Mediul social și cultural în satul Șirnea", *Studii și Cercetări de Antropologie*, 7, 137-45
- GHELASSE, I. (1944), *Mocanii. Importanța și evoluția lor social-economică în România. Expansiunea lor în Câmpia Tisei, în Caucaz și Crimeea*, București
- GOLDSCHMIDT, W. (1971), "The Operations of a Sebei Capitalist: A Contribution to Economic Anthropology", *Ethnology*, XI (3), 187-201
- GREGORY, C. A. (1995 [1994]), "Exchange and Reciprocity", in Tim Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, Routledge, London and New York, 911-939
- GILBERT, L. (1975), "La transhumance, réalité économique", in *L'Homme et l'Animal*, Premier colloque national d'ethnozoologie, Institut national d'ethnoscience, Paris, 595-9
- GULLIVER, P.H. (1972 [1955]), *The Family Herds. A Study of Two Pastoral Tribes in East Africa. The Jie and Turkana*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London
- HANNOYER, J., THIECK, J.P. (1984), "Observations sur l'élevage et le commerce du mouton dans la région de Raqqa en Syrie", in Pierre Bonte (éd.), *Production Pastorale et Société*, Bulletin de l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales, 14, 47-65
- HERSENI, T. (1941), *Probleme de sociologie pastorală*, Editura Fundațiilor Regale, București

- HERSKOVITS, M. (1952 [1940]), *Economic Anthropology. The Economic Life of Primitive Peoples*, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York
- HERZFELD, M. (1983), "Reciprocal animal-theft in Crete: at the intercession of ideologies", in Pierre Bonte (éd.), *Production Pastorale et Société*, Bulletin de l'Equipe Ecologie et Anthropologie des Sociétés Pastorales, 13, MSH, Paris, 47-54
- HOURCADE, B. (1969), "La transhumance hivernale du bétail du Haut-Ossau", *Revue Géographique des Pyrénées et du Sud-Ouest*, 40 (3), 253-265
- INGOLD, T. (1995 [1994]), *Hunters, pastoralists and ranchers. Reindeer economies and their transformation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York
- ISACHSEN, A., HAMILTON, C., GYLFASON, Th (1992), *Understanding the Market Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York
- JACOBEIT, W. (1961), *Schafhaltung und Schäfer in Zentraleuropa bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin
- KAYSER, B. (1963), "Margariti. L'échec d'une colonisation spontanée", *Etudes Rurales. Revue trimestrielle d'histoire, géographie et économie des campagnes*, 11, 65-101
- KOTTAK, Ph. (1991 [1974]), *Anthropology. The Exploration of Human Diversity*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, London
- KOPCZYŃSKA-JAWORSKA, B. (1963), "La vie pastorale dans les Carpates", *Etudes Rurales. Revue trimestrielle d'histoire, géographie et économie des campagnes*, 9, 80-89
- KLIGMAN, G. (1998 [1988]), *Nunta mortului: ritual, poetică și cultură populară în Transilvania* (Romanian translation of *The Wedding of the Dead: Ritual, Poetics, and Popular Culture in Transylvania*, by Mircea Boari, Runa Petringeanu, Georgiana Farnoaga, West Paul Barbu), Ed. Polirom, Iași
- KÖBEN, A. (1973), "Comparativists and Non-Comparativists in Anthropology", in Narrol, Raoul and Cohen, Ronald (eds.), *A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology*, Columbia University Press, New York, London, 581-96
- LE GOFF, J. (1994 [1956]), *Negustorii și bancherii în Evul Mediu* (Romanian translation of *Marchands et banquiers du Moyen Age*, by Nicolae Ghimpețeanu), Ed. Meridiane, București
- LE ROY LADURIE, E. (1992 [1975]), *Montaillou, sat occitan de la 1294 până la 1324* (Romanian translation of *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324*, by Maria Carpov), vol. I, Ed. Meridiane, București
- LEWIS, O. (1980 [1965]), "The Culture of Poverty", in George Gmelch and Walter P. Zenner (eds.), *Urban Life. Readings in Urban Anthropology*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 263-72
- MARTONNE, E. de (1912), "Vieața păstorească în Carpații români", *Convorbiri Literare*, XLVI (2), 121-7
- MARX, K. (1948 [1867]), *Capitalul. Critica economiei politice* (Romanian translation of *Das Kapital. Kritik des politischen Oekonomie*), vol. I, Ed. Partidului Muncitoresc Român, București

- MAUSS, M. (1969 [1924]), *The Gift. Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies* (English translation of *Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques*, by Ian Cunnison), Routledge & Kegan Paul, London
- MIHĂILESCU, V. (1996), "Două sate în tranziție. Tipuri strategice dominante în lumea rurală", *Revista de Cercetări Sociale*, 3-24
- NANDRIS, J.G. (1985), "The Stina and the Katun: foundations of a research design in European Highland Zone ethnoarchaeology", *World Archaeology*, 17 (2), 256-6
- NAROTZKY, S. (1997), *New Directions in Economic Anthropology*, Pluto Press, London, Chicago
- OLAIZOLA A., MANRIQUE E., LÓPEZ P. (1999), "Organization Logics of Transhumance in Pyrenean Farming Systems", in Rubino R. and Mohrand-Fehr P. (eds.), *Systems of sheep and goat production: Organization of Husbandry and role of extension services*, Zaragoza, CIHEAM-IAMZ, 227-230
- ORTIZ, S. (1994 [1994]), "Work, The Division of Labour and Co-operation", in Tim Ingold (ed.), *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, Routledge, London, New York, 891-910
- OTT, S. (1979), "Aristotle among the Basques: The 'Cheese Analogy' of Conception", *Man*, 14, 699-711
- OTT, S. (1993 [1981]), *Le cercle des montagnes. Une communauté pastorale basque*, Ed. du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques, Paris
- PAINÉ, R. (1971), "Animals as Capital: Comparisons among Northern Nomadic Herders and Hunters", *Anthropological Quarterly / Comparative Studies of Nomadism and Pastoralism* (Special issue), 44 (3), 157-172
- PANAITEȘCU, P. N. (1936), "Însemnătatea economică a mocanilor în istoria Țării Românești", *Observatorul social-economic*, Cluj, 3-29
- PANDREA, A. (1993), "Oaia, ciobanul și brânza. Considerații etno-lingvistice", *Buletinul Bibliotecii Române. Studii și documente românești*, vol. XVII (XXI) – serie nouă, Institutul Român de Cercetări, Freiburg, Germania, 241-77
- POLANY, K. (1968 [1958]), "The Economy as Instituted Process", in Edward E. LeClaire, Jr., Harold K. Schneider (eds.), *Economic Anthropology. Reading in Theory and Analysis*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, London, 122-142
- PRODAN, D. (1944), *Teoria imigrației românilor din principatele române în Transilvania în veacul al XVIII-lea*, Cluj
- RINSCHÉDE, G. (1977), "Situation récente de la transhumance ovine dans les Pyrénées françaises", *Revue Géographique des Pyrénées et du Sud-Ouest*, 48 (4), 387-408
- RYDER, M. (1994), "Observations on Vlach Sheep-Milking and Milk-Processing in South-East Europe", *Anthropozoologica*, Bulletin de « l'Homme et l'Animal Société de Recherche Interdisciplinaire », 20, 3-10

- SANDU, D. (2003), *Sociabilitatea în spațiul dezvoltării*, Ed. Polirom, București
- SCHEIN, M. (1975), "When is an Ethnic Group? Ecology and Class Structure in Northern Greece", *Ethnology*, 14, 83-97
- SIK, E., WALLACE, Cl. (1999), "The Development of Open-air Markets in East-Central Europe", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), London, 697-713
- SIVIGNON, M. (1968), "Les pasteurs du Pinde Septentrional", *Revue de Géographie de Lyon*, 43 (1-4), 5-43
- SMITH, C. (1985), "How to Count Onions: Methods for a Regional Analysis of Markets", in Stuart Plattner (ed.), *Markets and Marketing*, Monographs in Economic Anthropology (4), Society for Economic Anthropology, University Press of America, Inc., New York, London
- SPENCER, P. (1984), "Pastoralists and the ghost of capitalism", in Pierre Bonte (éd), *Production pastorale et société*, 10, 61-76
- STAHL, H. H. (1959), *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*, vol. II: "Structura internă a satelor devălmașe libere", Ed. Academiei Române, București
- STAHL, P. H. (1986), *Household, Village and Village Confederation in Southeastern Europe*, Columbia University Press, New York
- STAHL, P. H., CONSTANTIN, M. (2004), *Meșterii țărani români*, Editura Tritonic, București
- THUEN, T. (1999), "The Significance of Borders in the East European Transition", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), London, 738-50
- TRIANAPHYLLOU, A. (1983), "Quelques observations sur la vie et l'économie du village Kalarytes", in Paul Henri Stahl (éd.), *Etudes et Documents Balkaniques et Méditerranéens*, 6, 153-165
- VERDERY, K. (2002), "Seeing like a mayor. Or, how local officials obstructed Romanian land restitution", *Ethnography*, 3 (1), 5-33
- VERESS, A. (1927), *Păstoritul ardelenilor în Moldova și Țara Românească (până la 1821)*, București
- VUIA, R. (1964), *Tipuri de păstorit la români*, Editura Academiei, București
- WALLACE, Cl., SHMULYAR, O., BEDSIR, V. (1999), "Investing in Social Capital: The case of Small-Scale, Cross-Border Traders in Post-Communist Central Europe", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), London, 751-70
- WEBER, M. (1993 [1904]), *Etica protestantă și spiritul capitalismului* (Romanian translation of *Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, by Ihor Lemnij), Ed. Humanitas, București
- WOLF, E. (1966), *Peasants*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- ZDERCIUC, B., *Tilișca. Un sat din Mărginimea Sibiului*, Publicațiile Muzeului Satului, București