

"TIV TRADE & MARKETS"

by

Paul Bohannan

- Ch. I. The Tiv and the anthropological approach to their economy. p. 1.
- Ch. II. The market: Internal organization. p. 12
- Ch. III. (cont.) p. 50
- Ch. IV. The network of markets: The event sequence. p. 79
- Ch. V. The network of markets: The material culture. p. 97
- Ch. VI. The relationship between man & things: The value system. p. 115
- Ch. VII. The impact of Western economy and the spread of the market. p. 112

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter I - pp. 1-11

It is very useful that "the aim of anthropology" is mentioned prominently. Indeed, this should be done even more emphatically. For unless "economic anthropology" is clearly related to the general aims of anthropology the reader loses sight of anthropological theory to which this essay is designed to contribute.

"Ethno-economics" (a new term?) does not improve matters. It is a variant of "economics" so that it can hardly be expected to relate to anthropology in the same way as to economics. If you decide for "ethno-economics" and the related term "ethno-economy," a definition of the term should be given. "The categories of thought and language, the ideas, the principles of action in terms of which a peoples proceed to institutionalize their getting a living" doesn't sound like "economics" but rather like the cultural aspect of anthropology, which is defined differently on the same page.

The diagram is good and clear, but it has ethno-economy "X" boxed above economic theory to parallel it. I suppose it should be "ethno-economics".

Finally: The chapter seems to me excellent and a very great advance over the manuscript of yore.

pp. 6-12: Human wants are satisfied by material means (the distinction from politics, art, friendship etc etc)

Chapter II - p. 12 ff.

"Kasoa" was presumably derived from the Hausa kasuwa yet "Tiv markets resemble those of their southern neighbors as much as they resemble the markets of the Hausa" I remember your saying that "Kasoa" was supposedly Swaheli. I remarked this would make the word "market" an importation of the long-distance traders of the region among whom the Swaheli of the East coast were outstanding. You have noted yourself that the presence of Hausa traders in a place was a sign of bigger markets. On the other hand, the Tiv type of markets spread to a much larger area than the spread of the Hausa. The Tiv themselves were supposed to have come from the East. All this

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter II (cont.)

leads probability to the assumption that the introduction of the market institutions was due to long-distance traders' influence radiating from the East. I am of course biased, since "Tr. & Mkt." established the distinctness of trade and market. In your paper they are used indiscriminately (which every time gives me a pang), though the long-distance trading of the men, as contrasted with the sauce-markets of the women is very conspicuous. Consequently I tried to read into the material a separation of trade and market, I confess, with moderate success. Nevertheless, the origin of the market (may) in this area still be credited to Eastern traders. (It argues against me that Dahomey which is teeming with markets is isolated from the Hausa region and even more from the ~~the~~ East. Having admitted this I wish to remind you of the indubitable flow of ^a ~~Bombara~~ gold ^{ Niger Sources } to the East ports of Africa which was at least partly an achievement of the Swaheli, who along among Africans, traded in the ~~early~~ M.A. to the Indian Ocean.

Chapter II pp. 25 ff.

"Many fewer women than men go to market empty-handed." This fits in with the trade & market distinction. The inference is that women are sellers, men are buyers. Those who sell display their goods in the market (to) and exert no sales pressure; they wait for the buyer to come forth. Traders are on the whole bulk buyers and wholesalers. They carry the goods over long distances. Would it not be worthwhile to collect the references differentiating the sex roles and correlating them to trade and market? I admit that there is some artificiality about it while at the same time it would throw new light on some of the culture values involved.

Chapter II pp. 26 ff.

I think your unpedantic handling of the terms "price" and "equivalent" is the common sense solution. Nevertheless I felt too little was said about the origins and the changes of prices. Even slight references to custom and tradition on the

R.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter II pp. 26 ff. (cont.)

one hand, institutional fixation, whether local or professional, on the other would be of interest. In Dahomey we found that many different groupings of participants in the market were responsible for the fixing of prices. For instance the first woman in the market might be fixing the price for the day. Similarly different kinds of producers' groups, craft guilds or other units may fix the price. However, I should avoid the term "fixing" if what is meant is merely that there is a price at which sales are made. "Fixing" should be reserved I think, to prices that have in some way or another been 'set' or 'established'. Please do not take me to mean that I doubt your important observation of prices being often bargained. However, you yourself do not seem to wish to imply that every individual deal was supposed to be thus bargained. The presence of bargained prices together with routine prices is in itself exceptional. It raises questions of behavior that are on the whole not at all usual and therefore worth a closer description. Also the case of customary prices raises the question of how such prices are occasionally changed. Do prices of the main staples fluctuate as easily as those of condiments of small account? etc. At least in a neighborhood circle staples would be expected to have the same prices.

Chapter II p. 36.

Treaties of safe conduct to markets and "peace of the market" are ^{of} the kind of the ancient Greek amphictyones which represented neighboring territorial groupings related to such shrines as Delphi and some other famous temples. However such confederations never referred to access to markets but only to sanctuaries. In regard to markets bi-lateral treaties between cities (A & B) are on record mainly protecting their citizens from being arrested by creditors belonging to third cities (C, D etc.) in the markets of either (A & B).

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter II p. 47.

The agora of Athens had of course a structural organization of some sort (rules of the market, hours, stalls, fees, limits, controllers) yet the agora was merely a place in the polis, the individual level of which was distinctly lower than that of the Kasoa. The latter is essentially a weekly fair (Arensberg comes into his own!) which is fully institutionalized. Only quite exceptionally (in the Northwest?) Do you mention town markets which can be credited with stimulating the growth of a city? Undoubtedly the Kasoa is not an agora nor related to the Western European markets of the Middle Ages. This fact fits in well with the strikingly different culture patterns of the regions in question. The Kasoa are not adjuncts of a castle or manor or temple as in the Middle Ages in Europe. You nowhere mention the ecological or climatic factors conditioning perishable staple foods.

Another sharp contrast to the agora lies in the political significance and function of Kasoa which is completely absent with the agora. The Berber markets are of eminent political importance, the Kasoa are of some, the agora of none.

Chapter III p. 62.

The seating order of the visiting women in the Kasoa reflects the political background of the Kasoa. Dahomey was an empire with an "imperial peace". ~~Other~~ Otherwise the widely spread markets there seem to resemble Tiv markets before the Dahoman conquest. However, many reservations would have to be made (for D. has villages and big land owners. Tiv has neither of these but an ideal social equality. You are quite right in not calling them peasants, since there are no manors.)

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter III. p. 65

Your distinction of isolated markets and neighborhood cycle, the first being instituted, the latter not draws attention to the fact that the single market was not a spreading institution. In a sense this raises the problem of disengagement. Why not put together the hints which you make at the institutional mechanism which causes the non-spreading of markets (pp. 73, 75, 79, 80, 89, 96)

Instituting: criteria 70, 78-9. Value system 74, material goods 74, event ~~map~~ sequence 77.

Criteria of instituting: social organization, material objects, event sequence and values (pp. 8, 70, 78,).

Chapter III. p. 104

Trading (yamen a yam) and "spreading things out in the market" (teen kasoa) are here operationally distinguished. See also for separation of trade & market, p. 98, 101-2, 104-6

Chapter V. p. 99

From the economists point of view you present an interesting connection between women's retailing of salt or cakes in the market, handling the bag of salt or the basket of cakes very much like capital of which one can make a living by putting it to use. The woman sells off the salt or the cake as snacks in the market. She thus collects "interest" on her capital which is of course used up in the process. An economist might say that such a use of the accumulated goods falls in between her retailing of a stock and the use of her stock for insuring an income over a time. p. 99, 100, 101.

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter V. pp. 105 ff.

The "fully primitive" Tiv have significantly more inland trade than the fully stratified Dahomans. While Dahomey has^a developed foreign trade based on ports of trade and central administration, Tiv-land has no foreign trade proper and no central administration while possessing a teeming inland trade. Dahomey has practically no trade of this kind at all. Hence primitive Tiv appears on a much higher level of trade development than the Dahoman empire. While the Tiv are domestic traders and only rarely trade abroad, the Ibo who are foreigners trade into and across the Tiv with no one to stop them. This is the reverse side of non-spreading markets in a primitive society.

Chapter VI. pp. 115-141.

This chapter would bear some re-writing in order to make the various groups of concepts more clearly distinguishable. There is some inevitable difficulty about the use of the terms "distribution" and "exchange".

The difficulty lies I suppose in the wealth and importance of your conclusions for anthropology in general and economic anthropology in particular.

Chapter VII

* In the past the Tiv practiced a multi-centric economy. The system was one in which many institutions were integrated in terms of a modern hierarchy: by idea system not accompanied by a social or material cultural system. ~~Subsistence~~ Subsistence, prestige and kinship institutions were linked by a single set of values and by a goal for action which, in carefully controlled ways, disengaged material items from one of these institutions and placed them into another. With the introductions of the fourth sphere - currency and imported goods - Tiv sought to interrelate it with the other three spheres on the same principle of moral ranking. However, the method of disengagement of material items, i.e., of conveyance - was affected by money. When the shatteringly simple idea of general purpose money

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

was plunged into the multi-centric economy, a compelling new force was created toward a unicentric economy."

The question is where to place the important results attained in your economic anthropology between these anthropological results and those of ethn-economics in the sense of an application of economics to ethnographical material.

You propose to do this with the help of the "Man-thing unit" (in which as you know I believe) But there are two difficulties that obstruct your way of dealing with it. The one is the ~~perph~~ periph^{ic} reference to property, the other is the category of "Distribution". The latter is an ~~ancient~~ heirloom of classical economics which has its uses as long as it is employed loosely (For instance describing the economy as "production and distribution") Beyond this it means either distribution of the income which is no use to you at all or of the distribution of status, power, etc. which takes you into the darkest jungle of sociology. Nevertheless the term 'distribution' is quite harmless compared with a trusting use of the word "exchange". At this point I was not really able to follow your distinctions although I am sure that they are quite clear to yourself.

Hence my feeling that you were unable to do justice to your most important and strikingly useful discoveries in regard a) the instituting of single markets as against the non-instituting of the market system. b) the ranking of monies and the principle of moral conversion underlying it.

I am not sure at all whether these hints at the character of my difficulties are much use. However, the slightest encouragement will make me, and gladly, return to the subject.

Copy: K.P.'s comments

Paul Edmanson: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter I - pp. 1-11 incl.

What is the status of ec. anthropology? Is it identical with a) ethno-economics? Or only with b) ethno-economics generalized? Or with c) either (a) or (b) plus economics applied where applicable? Also: is economic anthropology a branch of anthropology, contributing to the general job of anthropology?

The excursus on 'market', 'money' and "services", as well as on "economy" (and 'economic')

p. 6: The definition of the 'substantive economy' is basic (but: adding "by material means")

Or: is "an institutional mechanism..."

p. 7: not clear: "theory" and "data" relationship

p. 8: a) economy: "the different uses of scarce items"

b) markets: { a locus of price formation

{ a physical place: a place plus an institution

c) money: O.K. (by the back door)

d) services: introduce as "production and exchange" as the definition of the economy! (the "economist" was the commodity fiction - prohibited to the author.)

Chapter II - pp. 12-49 incl.

Definitional:

p. 12: 'institutions of production' - Is a form not an inst. of production.

'exchange' mentioned for the first time.

'trade' made synonymous with market.

Do you need "internal"?

Chapter III - pp. 50-79 incl.

pp. 72-4: Very useful listing of meanings

This is a very good chapter.

K.P.'s comments

Paul Boharman: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter V.-pp. 97-114

TRADERS

The Tiv Trader may very well be an exceptional figure. He is a domestic figure, actually a farmer occasionally (as over 'short periods') engaging in neighborhood or ^{in the} longer distance trade inside the country.

Personally, I have not come across such a type in the Western Sudan material. Trade is there definitely external. The trader is a foreigner. He may belong to a trading people like the Mandingo, the Dwaala, the Fulbe (in some regions); he may be a partial trader (over a several months period); or a short visit trader (a few weeks). He comes from an organized center; sojourns in a ward of the bigger places; he is accompanied by his wife, and carriers. They travel on foot. This is not a caravan. The latter has a diplomatic status, a military accompaniment and uses transport animals with conventional loads. Usually the staples carried vice-versa are exchanged according to equivalencies. The caravan meets the head of the guild of brokers, before he meets the ~~guildsmen~~ guildsmen (after satisfying the ruler who has the 'first refusal'). Clearly the Tiv, type of trading assumes a 'democratic' society in a densely populated area on a primitive material level. I wonder how wide-spread such conditions are in Nigeria today).

Chapter VI - pp. 115-141

The use of 'trade' so as to include 'marketing' (woman's retailing; cooked food retail; selling off a big store of salt; or of prepared cakes for snacks etc.), causes
p. 115 a lack of clarity in the breaking down of 'exchange'!

Since the general relationship between men and things is proposed as a frame of reference. The main distinction is between property and distribution (the juridical and the economic). This constitutes an ambiguity in regard to "distribution" which cannot be remedied. Physically goods move (transportation), local exchange without transportation); but they are also exchanged i.e., move vice-versa. These utterly different meanings are a crux of economics. Should you not have got rid

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter VI - pp. 115-141 incl. (cont.)

of it, instead of infecting your sanitary nursery with this plague? (True, your original definition of the economy as 'production and distribution' comes home to roost). Quite apart from the three levels of exchange (Tr. & Mkt. p. 254) there are the sociological variants (Tr. & Mkt. p. 276) recently aggravated by Smelser's "exchange systems" consequently the reader hesitates to decide what exactly to take it to mean in the subsequent - important - argument. Eventually, it is made to lead up to "conveyance" vs. "conversion", a truly most valuable distinction.

SERVICES

The Kimbi-nambe dictionary should ~~be~~ get the publicity it deserves as a semantic device for the tackling of the "service" problem. (Its treatment in Chapter I is meant to be preliminary, of course).

Another peripheric observation. In my Alalakh paper I definitely concluded that silver shekel in 19th. cty. B.C. Alalakh there used for accountancy referred to the prestige sphere only. This is precisely the result you give for the brass rods of Tivland. I do hope you did not yet know of my correction of Wiseman on Alalakh - he had contended that the silver shekel was "general currency". But even if you did this would be the second case of the restricting of a money use to the prestige sphere! (Admittedly, the Alalakh case is limited to accountancy, and is therefore not as vital as the Tiv case which occurs in a primitive society.)

Incidentally, do you remember Arensberg's mention of the tally use of money in Honganiville, where it is employed to keep the exchange marriage, girls account straight over generations. (The "money" consists of a kind of necklace that goes with the girl and is returned with the exchange for her)?

Chapter VII - pp. 142-155 incl.

THE MEANING OF 'ECONOMIC'

Your paper raises fundamental questions of substance and method in regard to "economic anthropology". That's why the question of basic clarity unavoidably comes up.

K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannon: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter VII - pp. 112-155 incl. (cont.)

Don't let us shirk it, since at the crucial points it bursts the seams of the argument. You have, it seems to me, avoided the definition of the economy. Yet your results lose most of their meaning once the conceptual grounding is found to be missing. Once or twice you fall back on "production and distribution"; once or twice on "livelihood". On page on "the satisfaction of human of wants" without any restriction to material means. In discussing 'services' you fall back on "production and exchange". Economic exchange -- like "economic behavior" -- leaves the meaning of economic open. Of course, the "substantive economy" is meant. But the mere mention of a 'formal economy' seems to me to leave the question unanswered. I firmly believe that a) the two meanings of economics should be plainly stated b) 'services' should not be included in the economy (no "goods and services"); c) "economic behavior" should be banned; d) "labor" should be defined as a matter of the way services are instituted.

Copy: K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter I - pp. 1-11 incl.

(1) What is the status of ^{economic} anthropology? Is it identical with a) ^{specific} ethno-economics? Or ~~only~~ with b) (ethno-economics generalized)? Or with c) ~~either~~ (a) or (b) plus traditional economics ~~where applicable~~? ~~Also, is economic anthropology a branch of anthropology, contributing to the general job of anthropology?~~

(2) ^{(on 'economy', and} the excursus on 'market', 'money' ~~and~~ "services" ~~as well as on 'economy' (and 'economic'))~~

p. 6: The definition of the 'substantive economy' is basic (but: adding "by material means")

Or: is "an institutional mechanism..."

p. 7: not clear "theory" and "data" relationship

p. 8: a) economy: "the different uses of scarce items" (in the absence of alternative uses)

b) markets: { a locus of price formation (econ. theory)
a physical place: a place plus an institution (anthrop.)

c) money: O.K. (in the background)

d) services: introduces "production and exchange" as the definition of the economy! (The "economist" ^{uses here} ~~was~~ the commodity fiction (prohibited to the anthropologist))

which is anthropologist

Chapter II - pp. 12-49 incl.

(3) Definitional:

p. 12: 'institutions of production' - ^{is a} ~~is~~ ^{farm} ~~not~~ ^{institution} an inst. of production?

'exchange' mentioned ^{here} for the first time.

'trade' ^{here} ~~is~~ synonymous with market.

Do you need "internal" ?

Chapter III - pp. 50-79 incl.

pp. 72-4: Very useful listing of meanings

This is a very good chapter.

Copy: K.P.'s comments

Bohannon: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter II - pp. 12-49 incl. (cont.)

PRICES:

p. 27: Binger (1892) has at least a dozen lists of prices for the Niger bend.

For Dahomey ^{several} ~~most~~ all travelers produced such lists.

Some of the prices are traditional and stood unchanged for generations. e.g. Gallina means ^{both} cock and "200 cowries". *Maybe only centralized empires had stable prices!*

However ^{both} the Niger bend and Dahomey have centralized administrations (up to a point), ^{while} you mean of course tribal regions.

Your own price lists seem to me nearer to customary or ~~xxxx~~ somehow accepted prices than to ~~completely~~ fluctuating ones. The excessive and obsessive bargaining of the bazaar ^{is} ~~seems to be~~ not practiced here. "Market luck" ^{too, is} ~~appears to be~~ a rather restrictive term.

I suspect some informal practices ^{keeping} ~~are~~ helping prices of ordinary staples ^{to} ~~be~~ stable, while ^{allowing} ~~accepting~~ relatively slight changes ^{according to} ~~in~~ supply situations.

However, such ^{adjustments} ~~adjustments~~ might again be limited by custom. Essentially the agora and the ~~Roman~~ ^{such a} ~~form~~ offer ~~the~~ picture, ~~but~~ officially ~~created~~ by the agoranomoi and the aediles, respectively.

Some ARCHAIC INSTITUTIONS ~~HERE~~ ABSENT WITH TIV:

- No debt bondage
- No pledge
- No interest
- No trade association
- No commission fee
- No apprenticeship
- No gambling
- No domestic slavery
- No mercenary service
- No selfhelp
- No selfenslavement
- No pawning of children

ARCHAIC GREECE

- Greek oath was selfexecuting (à la fetish)
- " no safe conduct, except amphictyony
- " agora merely economic (no politics)
- " Piraeus a port of trade (for foreign commerce)
- " some seafaring (Hesiod)
- " no neighborhood trade at all (*only middle distance trade*)
- " no cycle of markets

Copy: K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannan: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter II - pp. 12-49 incl. (cont.)

ARCHAIC GREECE (cont.)

Greek; metric status wide spread

- " aristocracy was anti-market
- " no general trading of farmers
- " ~~sale of subsistence of farmers~~
- " ~~purchase of some necessities~~
- " no middle distance trading, no overland
- " big landowners did not buy in market
- " " " " " sell " "
- " // market luck - unknown
- " no haggling
- " no barter

Chapter III - pp. 50-78 incl.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION:

p. 78: Four criteria: of these systematizing features social organization (role differentiation) is crucial.

- Not decisive features: sequence of events
- material culture
- value system

The market ^{as such} system is not instituted.

Trade can occur in the absence of markets. But for this ^{fact} ~~institution~~ trade, markets would have to be allowed to spread i.e., their spread would be institutionalized. This would however disrupt the lineages making women into traders.

^{in Western Europe, not} ~~but~~ before the high Middle Ages was trade inter-city trade. ^{long distance} General trading was caravan trading (unknown in Tivland)

There was no neighborhood trading à la Tiv. Trade fairs are non-spreading ^{markets} but permit neighborhood trade. ^{From isolated markets, as a rule no} market system develops, but trade without markets does. It is this latter ^{trade} which grows into specific long-distance trade, later on. Local intermarket trading does not grow into external trade (cf. Tiv with Ibo).

This is a very good chapter.

Copy: K.P.'s comments

Paul Bohannon: "Tiv Trade & Markets"

Chapter IV-pp. 79-96 incl.

CHAIN MAIL VS. MARKET NETWORK

Distinction between chain-mail pattern of market circles and market ~~network~~ network very illuminating.

p. 79: The effect of the first is a slight overlapping of neighborhoods; the effect p. 92-3 of the latter would be countrywide market trade.

The notion that "free choice" of markets is essential to the use of markets is contradicted by the market ^{Cycles} circles - an universal institution - as well as by the impediments of the spread ^{ing} of markets to a market system. Cf. also Berber markets, Greek agora; the Oriental bazaar etc.

The neighborhood not recognized as social units (See 'Def's of Berber...!)

The equalitarian social structure maintained by ranking of moneys - spheres of goods - which ^{also} imply disengagement of wealth, and thus prevents economic stratification. Exchange marriage had a similar effect. No accumulation of material wealth encouraged. Witchcraft sanction (ostracism)

Autarky of North West - Absence of trade except salt, palm oil, camwood.

Peddlers (à la Berber) supply farms. No caravan trade - the latter possible only as between centralized areas (empires) ^{since} military danger prohibitive. to natives

Trade & material culture - moves irrespective of markets. Although no redistributive system ^{is} present - no empire, polis etc - trade is not ^a market function. The movement of goods via markets is haphazard and un-institutionalized. Trade is ^{organization} structured through 1) tribes, 2) age groups, 3) routes, 4) transportation (trucks, railway) 5) ecological areas 6) money uses ("money trade"), and only incidentally through markets.

Dear Karl,

Herewith p 60. I have just returned from Evanston, Ill., where I bought a house, amidst much to-do. We are exhausted, but happy with the proposed move, which comes at the end of June. I shall be seeing you in New York in a few days.

Paul

no economic questions - indeed, aside from the destruction of property which made for a poverty-stricken season or two, it had no economic results. The economic changes had already taken place. The war was, for the Tiv, merely an attempt to maintain the new status quo. They thought that they won the war ~~because~~ since they were able to keep their market.

The reopening of Tsar market cast a new light on the political situation within MbaDuku. Chenge summed it up one day by saying that within MbaTyough, MbaNyam "ate the chiefship" and Mbaikyaa "ate the market" (see Figure 1.). He added that "Nyumamgbagh was different" - in this context, that Nyumamgbagh had its own market - Tottyar market, which had become Betse market (see Chapter 4).

Tsar consecrated his market with a proper ritual. A Hausa hunter at what would seem to be about the turn of the century, used Tsar's compound as his base of operations. He rewarded Tsar with the elephant's hind quarter which was necessary for the erection of a market fetish. The ritual of the consecration was attended by representatives not only of all the lineages within MbaDuku but of all the other lineages of Kunav equivalent to MbaDuku. There were also representatives from Shangev Ya and the Uge. Kyagba claimed that even the Utange Mba-Shaya were present at this ritual; when I asked the Utange about it at Easter of 1950 none of them knew anything about it.

With Tsar's death, some years after the "removal" of his market to Obudu, the fetish descended to his successor as compound head. Actually, since the market was no longer physically present, no one paid much attention to the fetish. Now, however, when the market was revived, the head of what had been Tsar's compound (though the descendants of most of its members were now living separately) was a man of about 50 named Wanshosho; because he was Tsar's grandson, he claimed