

Konvalinka, Nancy. 2009. When Equal-Part Inheritance Is Not Equivalent: Gender and the Value of Land in a Spanish Village. In Olsson, P. and Ruotsala, H. (eds.). *Gendered Rural Space*. Helsinki: The Finnish Literary Society. Pp. 87-98.

When equal-part inheritance is not equivalent: gender and the value of land in a Spanish village¹

Introduction

This article will study gender-linked uses of land throughout the 20th century in a Spanish village and their effects on men's and women's positioning in the village's social space today. Two aspects of Bourdieu's theoretical framework, the social field and how people position themselves in it and the reproduction of the *habitus*, will be put into play to interpret the resulting situation.² This study also follows more recent theoretical and practical uses and developments of value theory along the lines traced by Bourdieu.³ The analysis of an empirical example will show how changes that affect the positioning of the social entities in the social field affect the reproduction of the *habitus* and that, as a result, this reproduction is neither exact nor automatic and can be diverse.

The fieldwork on which this analysis is based was carried out between 1988 and 2001, with greatest intensity in the period from 1996 to 2000, to produce material for my doctoral thesis.⁴ The field site is a small village near the city of Leon in northwestern Spain, a small village that currently has fewer than 200 inhabitants. Work was also done in other nearby villages, for the purpose of comparison.

The fieldwork was of the commuting type, as personal circumstances made it impossible for me to live on a constant basis in the village. However, the long-term nature of the study enabled me to be present in the village in all periods of the year, both festive and non-festive, several times over the years. In fact, the length of the fieldwork made it possible for me to observe processes that would have been impossible to appreciate in a more traditional, one-year or two-year ethnographic study.

All of the classic ethnographic techniques were employed: observation, participant observation, discussion groups, interviews, innumerable informal conversations. In addition, work with documents such as municipal residency lists and church records was indispensable for producing information about the first half of the century, which then was used to elicit information about households, their members, and the changes they underwent. This dialogue between the people of the village and their past situations and decisions

allowed me to follow the processes of household formation and dissolution and the destinies of individual members, resulting in a household-by-household file of the village's inhabitants throughout a large part of the 20th century.

Problem to be analyzed

The origin of this research was my surprise at the situation I encountered in this small village, which I shall call "San Julián" (a fictitious name) in the 1980s. Whereas many young men had decided to terminate their educations as early as possible and remain in the village, combining dairy farming and agriculture focused on the needs of the cows, young women tended to remain in school somewhat longer and later leave to live, work and marry in large towns or cities. The explanation for this phenomenon that was popularly repeated in the village was that men "liked" living and working in the village but women "did not like" it. An explanation which did not, in fact, explain. On one hand, it was not really true, as many young women expressed the desire to live in their small village. On the other hand, it raised a very important question: Why did men and women, at this point in time, have such apparently contrasting preferences?⁵

In order to answer this question and determine the extent to which the situation at that moment was new and different with regard to previous moments, it was necessary to analyze the decisions of men and women in the past, their "values" or the positions they occupied in the social field, as well as the configuration of that social field and the changes that it had undergone.⁶ In the ensuing research, a picture emerged in which the development of certain main axes of organization, such as the *casa* as a social entity, gender differences as they are culturally defined in this context, and land inheritance as the main means of production and reproduction combined with a broad context of changing circumstances, such as emigration, mechanization, and economic prosperity and economic crisis, to cause men and women to situate themselves in non-compatible and non-coinciding positions in the social field, positions which point them in very different directions, when it comes to making decisions about the future.

Although this is not a "story" with a beginning, development and complications, and resolution, we must start somewhere, and that somewhere will be the general situation of the organization of people, property, and work in households or *casas*, the organization of work according to gender, and the inheritance and use of property. We will then see how the changing conditions interacted with these main axes of organization to produce new positionings of men and women.⁷

The casa as a social entity and framework of decision

The word *casa* in this area is a multi-layered term with meanings that range from the actual building people inhabit, through the house-coral area and the feminine work that takes place there, to the entire complex of property – land, buildings, animals, tools – and people who live on it, work it, and have rights and obligations regarding the property and one another. In this article, I will mainly use it in this last sense: the *casa* is a social entity of production, consumption, and reproduction, which comprehends property and people who live together and work this property in order to make a living.

During the first half of the century, the *casa* was a unit which joined the work of the members of the family of orientation⁸ on property owned by the parents to provide for the needs of these same members.⁹ Although the *casa* was not completely self-sufficient, in that there were many products that were acquired from outside, it was a self-contained unit in the sense that all the members worked for the benefit of the *casa* as a whole, and the production of the *casa* provided for the needs of these members.

The *casa* and its resources, both human and non-human, were thus the main framework within which the members made decisions. The relationship between the amount of property available to the *casa* and the number of members (and their age and gender distribution) defined the position of the *casa* in relation to the other *casas* in the village, and the positioning of its members with reference to other people from other *casas*.

As we shall see, young people, during the first half of the century and beyond, married and formed their own *casas* on the basis of property received from the *casa* they grew up in, starting out with a small amount of property and adding to it as they were able. Each *casa* reproduced itself in each of its children, who, together with a spouse, formed a new family farm, uniting both husband's and wife's property and labor. Thus, a *casa* with, for example, four children, eventually gave rise to four new *casas*. It should, of course, be noted that this multiplication of *casas* was possible for two reasons. The first reason is that, because a new *casa* united both spouses and property from different *casas* of the previous generation – and there was a notable tendency to marry within the village or within a group of three or four villages –, the growth was not as exponential as it might seem. The second reason is that there was, in fact, room for population growth during the first half of the century: the very small size of the population (203 inhabitants in 1900¹⁰) and the limitation of the land that a family could work to what its members could farm by hand made for a relative abundance of land.

A gendered division of work leads to a gendered use of land

The work carried out in the *casa* was shared out according to the culturally defined capacities for age and gender.¹¹ Gender is the axis that is most pertinent to my analysis here. The villagers' explanations of the tasks considered most appropriate to each gender reveal that men were consistently

adjudicated the work considered to have priority for the production necessary for the survival of the *casa*. During the first part of the 20th century, these tasks included all of the main agricultural tasks (plowing, planting, harvesting), especially those requiring the use of animal traction, as well as the care of these animals. Women, on the other hand, were assigned an auxiliary position in agriculture, helping with any of the tasks men do and carrying out the least skilled jobs (removing stones from the fields, weeding, helping to harvest), as well as all of the tasks related to the home and personal care of the family. When necessary, women could perform typically male tasks (plowing), but always under exceptional circumstances. Men could do the auxiliary agricultural tasks normally assigned to women, but almost never, and only in quite exceptional circumstances, did they substitute women in the tasks related to home and family.

Why do I say that this leads to a gendered use of land? Because young unmarried adult men, already accustomed to doing the main agricultural tasks, were often allowed to use a piece of land – often a piece of land that they would eventually inherit – to begin to work on their own, keeping their earnings on this piece of land and thus beginning to form the basis of their own future farm. Women were able to earn some money in other ways – selling chickens, eggs, home produce, sewing, etc. – but their auxiliary position with regard to agriculture effectively prevented them from starting to work a piece of land on their own and for their own benefit. In other words, men had a direct relationship with the land, which they could work on their own, while a woman's relationship with the land, *even when it was her own property*, was necessarily through a man – father, brother, husband – who was the main organizer and who carried out the principal tasks, defined as men's work, and who she helped with her auxiliary feminine labor. Even though a man, responsible for the main agricultural tasks, did in fact need a woman's auxiliary work in the fields and at home, a woman's auxiliary work could only be put into action through her relationship to a farmer: this use of land is clearly asymmetrical and this asymmetry is based on culturally defined gender roles.

There was a definite tendency toward virilocal post-marital residence: in 1957, 62.9% of the married couples were composed of local men with local (32.3%) or non-local (30.6%) wives, while only 11.3% were composed of local women with non-local husbands and 25.8% of two non-local spouses.¹² This data clearly supports this interpretation of the gendered use of land; women tended to be more mobile, taking their auxiliary work, along with their property, to their husband's incipient farm, while men tended to be more stationary, investing their work where they grew up and planned to form their own family farm. In the first half of the century, men and women in the village tended to marry one another, so this virilocal tendency in residence was only visible in the marriages where one of the spouses was from another nearby village. However, people in the village clearly stated that the newly married couple tended to live wherever the majority of their property was, and on the few occasions when the husband went to live where his wife lived, they felt the need to explain this non-typical situation to the ethnographer.

Equal part inheritance that is not equivalent

The inheritance system in this area has been, as far as people's memory reaches, equal part inheritance for both male and female children.¹³ Additionally, both male and female children inherited all types of property – land, tools, animals, buildings, furniture, money, and anything else inheritable. This does not mean that every kind of property was divided among all the children; houses were not divided, tools and animals could not necessarily be divided, and some things like pigeon lofts for raising edible young pigeons were given as a whole to one child.

The main concern was to create equivalent lots. If there was a sufficient diversity of property, parents tried to leave each child what would be most useful to him or her: a piece of land that bordered land held by a son's or daughter's spouse, the house for a child who was in need of a place to live.

The gendered division of work previously discussed and its effects on men's and women's relationship with the land and with one another meant that inherited land did not signify exactly the same thing for men, who could exploit it directly, and for women, who could only exploit it through a man. The fact that agriculture (and to a much lesser extent, raising sheep) was really the only option for making a living, made this difference in the meaning of land for men and for women non-significant with regard to the formation of households.¹⁴ There was one main life trajectory, which included marrying someone from a farming family and forming one's own family farm. Men's property and women's property, men's work and women's work, were complementary and mutually necessary. The slight difference in the actual use of the land and the difference in tasks assigned to one gender and the other in fact ensured the reproduction of the *casa* through marriage and inheritance: men and women needed one another's property and work in order to survive. We shall see how this situation changes later and this "slight" difference in men's and women's relationship with the land becomes a gap that separates them.

Use rights and property rights

Rights over land were not of one single kind. Property rights and use rights can be distinguished from one another. The clearest case was when an owner retained property rights but rented out use rights to another person; another case would be that of parents who retained property rights but allowed a son to use a piece of land for himself. The strongest situation, as far as land rights goes, was when a person owned and worked the land. In the scenario we are discussing for the first half of the 20th century, when agriculture was basically the only option and the desired position to which everyone aspired, property and use rights went together in a general sense. Although in fact the couple by whose marriage the *casa* was formed held the property rights while both parents and children in the *casa* had use rights, the *casa* configuration emphasized the community of property and use rights, underlining parents'

and children's common interests as present and future property holders and users and de-emphasizing divisive conflicts that could exist. We shall see that, when emigration begins to remove people from the village, the difference between use rights and property rights comes to the fore, creating a potential for conflict among farmer and non-farmer descendants, a conflict which, because of the gendered use of property, may in the future shape up into a conflict between brothers who are farmers and sisters who are not.

*Changing conditions and changing reproduction:
emigration from the late 1950s to the 1970s*

Many changes were occurring in Spain in general as well as locally in San Julián at the end of the 1950s and throughout the decades of the sixties and the seventies. Industrialization offered new jobs outside of farming, while the mechanization of agriculture allowed one person to work more land. These two processes combined to reshape the social field and the positions people took on it.

The new options available allowed people to position themselves both inside and outside of the village, remaining in agriculture or moving away to urban industrial jobs. The decisions on whether to stay or to emigrate could be, and were, made at different points in people's lives: young single people, couples when they married, families already established in farming.¹⁵ The category of "preference" appears here, as a partial explanation for these decisions to emigrate or to stay, although the people also explained that it depended on a person's situation and expectations in the village.

A relatively "well-to-do" family was defined, according to the villagers, as a family that had enough land to provide sufficient food, new clothing and shoes occasionally, and the capacity to hire day laborers when necessary instead of hiring themselves out as day laborers. In one of these "well-to-do" families, which can serve as an example, six out of eight children who were making their decisions between approximately 1945 and 1965 remained in the village definitively working as farmers. A "poor" family was defined as having little land, barely sufficient food, and a need to work outside of the family farm, often as day laborers, to make ends meet. In one rather extreme case of a poor family, only one daughter out of the total of twelve children who were making their decisions between approximately 1950 and 1970 remained in the village, managing to concentrate all the property and, through marriage to a farmer, form a new *casa*. It is clear that the amount of land and the number of children it would be shared among was an important factor – perhaps the most important factor – in people's decisions, once again underlining the importance of the *casa* as the framework for people's life decisions. However, the category of "preference" is often used, at least in retrospect, to explain which siblings left and which stayed.

How did this new configuration of the social field interact with the processes we have discussed of the reproduction of the *casa*, the gendered division of work and gendered use of land, inheritance and rights over property? For the

moment, the *casa* as an entity of production, reproduction, and consumption continued to reproduce itself, albeit only in some of its children, the ones who remained in the village in farming. The emigrants, of course, formed their own homes and family units at their destination, but these homes, supported by salaried work, were no longer *casas* in the same sense.

The gendered division of work varied somewhat. Men continued to organize and carry out the main farming jobs, making the area of jobs done with farm machinery exclusively theirs. However, the use of mechanization in farm work, along with chemical weed control, eliminated certain tasks that had previously been done by hand and defined as women's auxiliary work. Women still helped in certain tasks, for example, cutting off the tops of the sugar beets once the machinery had dug them out, but there were fewer and fewer of these. The genders' different relationships with the land continued in vigor, with women's exclusion from the use of machinery reinforcing their need for a man who could work the land in order to establish themselves in farming.

Inheritance continued to be equal parts for all children, both men and women. Emigration, though, meant that there were a number of men and women who removed themselves from the social field of the village and did not require the early use of parental land to begin their own family farms. This redounded to the benefit of those who stayed and who, with their new machinery, were able to farm much larger amounts of land.

This did not mean that those who left were excluded from inheritance.¹⁶ The emigrants eventually inherited their equal shares, just like the non-emigrants. Increasing life expectancies contributed to pushing back the moment at which people did in fact inherit, and most emigrants were well-established by the time they inherited, making it less likely that they would require the use of the land.

The difference between property rights and use rights becomes very clear at this moment. The property belonging to the *casa*, or more properly to the married couple who originally formed the *casa*, is property to be used jointly by the members of the *casa*. Emigrants, when they left, renounced their use rights, at least until they returned to the village, something which seldom happened. Not so, as we have seen, with their property rights. In the interim between the emigrants' exit from village life and the moment of inheritance, the parents retain their property rights and the members of the *casa* have the use rights to the property. The emigrants' brothers and sisters are investing their work in, and receiving the production from, land to which they have use rights but some of which will eventually be inherited by the emigrants.

The potential conflict which could occur if the emigrants simply demanded their land inheritance or its monetary equivalent at the moment of their parents' deaths, pulling out a large portion – in many cases more than half – of the farmers' production base, was avoided by two tendencies which benefited the farmers. The first was the tendency to keep land in the family, which led to the emigrated heirs' usually being willing to sell or rent the land cheaply to their farmer siblings. In some cases, the farmers simply continued using the land after their parents passed away, with the final settlement coming ten

or twenty years later. The second was the tendency to consider the validity of use rights. The emigrants, by leaving, had given up their use rights and the farmers, by dint of using the land, had a certain claim to continue using it. In other words, when property and use rights did not coincide, it was understood that whoever had the use rights really ought to end up with the property rights, too. As the saying in this village, and in many others, goes, "The land belongs to whoever works it."

Changing conditions and changing reproduction: economic crisis in the 1980s. Men use the land, women do not; men have a place in the village, women do not

The economic crisis of the 1980s slowed the flow of emigration to a mere trickle. Parents once again had to accumulate enough property to give their children a future in farming. We shall see, though, that this future in farming no longer involves the reproduction of the *casa* as a unit of production, reproduction, and consumption; the gender-differentiated relationship with the land results in men and women positioning themselves in such different positions in the social field that they are unlikely to find one another when it comes time to marry.

In the late seventies and early eighties, farmers began to switch their production to dairy farming and focus their agricultural production on products to feed the cows. At first, people had only a small number of cows and they were kept in the stable in the patio of the house, milked by hand or with a small portable type of milking machine. This work, carried out close to home and defined as "caring" work considered easier than farming, in contrast to the men's agricultural work done with machinery, was done to a great extent by women at first, by the same women who no longer had a place in agriculture due to the mechanization. As the economic crisis made successful emigration a very uncertain enterprise, many families made the dairy cows the main focus of their production, building up the family business to provide work for their sons. With this investment, the number of cows increased and new stables were built for them with milking rooms and new machinery for milking the cows. This work became, little by little, defined as men's work, although women, as always, helped.

Important changes were also occurring in formal education at this time. In 1970, a law was passed that made school attendance mandatory until the age of 14 and in 1990 this age was raised to 16. Whereas previously people had simply finished school when they were old enough to start to work on the family farm, and later made their decisions about whether to stay or to emigrate, now there was a specific institutionally-determined age at which young people had to make decisions.

It is at this point that the *habitus*, and the different relations it had shaped between men and property use and women and property use, resulted in men and women, from their different positions on the social field, making

quite different decisions. The options and choices were technically the same for young men and young women: to continue studying or to leave school and begin to work. However, these options appeared very different to the adolescents, depending upon whether they were boys or girls, from their different positions in the social field.

Young men, at the age of 14, and later 16, could try to find an unskilled job; however, with the economic crisis this was not too promising. They could continue studying and try to find a job outside of the village – an enterprise considered doubly uncertain, first, because of the uncertainty of success in higher education, and second, because of the high rates of unemployment. Or they could begin to work on the family farm, with their parents, as we have seen, investing in improving the family's dairy farming enterprise; these young men would begin to earn money right from the start and be investing their work in a business that would eventually be their own. It is not surprising that many of them chose to quit school and start to work with their families.

Young women could look for an unskilled job in the same unpromising conditions as young men, although the service sector provided them, perhaps, with more opportunities. They could continue studying, in order to eventually work outside of the village, with the same uncertainties regarding success as the young men. They could, conceivably, stay at home and help their mothers around the house, waiting to marry, but this was not a plan that many 14 or 16-year-olds considered, in a world where young people were marrying later and later. What young women could not, under any circumstances, do was begin to work *at the main agricultural tasks for a salary* on the family farm, even though they were candidates for inheritance just like their brothers. They could, in the best of cases, help their parents and brothers and, eventually, move their help to a husband's farming enterprise. But the decision to stay on the farm, in these conditions, would depend on a woman's being certain of marrying a farmer, something difficult to know at this age. So, at the age of 14 or 16, young women by default, really, tended to continue studying for at least a few more years.

The reconfiguration of the family farming enterprise also contributed to eliminate women from farming work. Whereas during the first half of the century and the early second half, the *casa* reproduced itself by dividing the property among the heirs who formed their own *casas* in the same conditions, as units of production, reproduction, and consumption, in the last part of the century, young men made a specific decision at an early age to join the family enterprise, leading to investment in improving and modernizing the enterprise and a new figure, the *sociedad*, which consolidates long-term collaboration between a father and his son. This occurs long before the young men consider marriage and requires a joint exploitation of the property among the men of the family of orientation that precludes the reproduction of the *casa*.

Let us take a closer look, first, at how the *sociedad* works and then, at its consequences. When a family decides to form a *sociedad*, the parents "sell" part of the property to the children, often for a nominal amount, and then parents and children reunite the property they each own as property to be

exploited jointly by the *sociedad*. The father and the sons unite their labor to work this jointly used property and, as members of the *sociedad*, they assign salaries to themselves and reserve a certain amount of the benefits to reinvest in the enterprise. When the parents pass away, the part of the property that continued in their possession will be divided equally among all the heirs.

One of the main differences between the *sociedad* and the earlier *casa* is this joint use of the separately-owned property of the members of the family of orientation, rather than its division and separation among the sons' new families of procreation. This obviates the need for the sons to seek a wife who can contribute property to create a property basis for the new *casa*. The other main difference is the joint work of the men of the family of orientation. The number of men whose work is united in this fashion – usually the father and two or more sons – provides a labor base that is more than sufficient to take care of all the agricultural and dairy work. Apart from house and family care, women's work is no longer necessary for the production that provides for all the families involved. Thus, instead of separate *casas* for parents and each child's family, several households remain united, pooling their property and male-labor resources but forming separate units of consumption and reproduction. The *casa* as such has ceased to exist, and is replaced by households joined in a *sociedad*.

Conclusions

As we can see, several changes, all occurring on the basis of a gendered use of land, have come together to tie men to the farm and to push women away from it. Mechanization excluded women first from agricultural work and later from dairy work. The early decision moment of continuing to study or not provides young men with a relatively attractive option of joining the family farm enterprise, while pushing women, who cannot do this because their future in agro-dairy farming depends on a future agro-dairy farmer husband, to continue to study and later to work outside of the village, where they are not likely to encounter and marry a farmer. And the new organization of the *sociedad*, by pooling the property of the members of the family of orientation and pooling the work of the men in the family, ties men to the farm while excluding women from participation in farm work.

As a result, the *casa* as a unit of production, reproduction and consumption, no longer reproduces itself. Rather, these aspects become divided: the *sociedad* is the production unit, but the different nuclear families that form the *sociedad* are each a unit of consumption. The physical reproduction of persons takes place in the nuclear families, but the reproduction of the *sociedad* will be a matter for the future, if and when its members' children decide to stay and work with their families.

However, while the gendered use of land has prevented women from making a direct use of their property, the young men who have decided to remain in the village have faced another problem resulting from this gendered use of land which keeps them in the village and encourages women to continue

studying and to seek work outside of the village. When these young men reach the age of considering marriage and family formation, the young women of their village and the villages around them are long gone; most of them are actually physically gone, and the others are looking to a future outside of the village that does not contemplate marriage to a farmer. Thus, the very cultural definition of man and woman, what each does and their relationship to the land, the definition which for a long time made the men and women of the village need each other in terms of property and labor, now situates them on different sides of a growing gap, pointing them in different directions and preventing them from finding one another to marry and form families.

And so we see, in a longitudinal case study, how broad changes on the national level affect the way that men and women, within the framework of the *casa*, position themselves on the social field, which in turn affects the reproduction of the *casa*, resulting in a reproduction that is not only not exact, but truly different.

NOTES

- 1 I would like to express my gratitude to the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology of the UNED for providing funding for attending the 9th SIEF Congress, 16–20 June 2008, at the Magee Campus, University of Ulster, in Derry, Northern Ireland, at which a shorter version of this paper was presented. I would also like to thank Dr. Helena Ruotsala, organizer of the 'Gendered Rural Spaces' panel, as well as the other panel participants, for providing a space for discussing the contents of this article.
- 2 Bourdieu (1977, 1988 [1979], 1988, 2004 [2002]).
- 3 Díaz de Rada 2007.
- 4 Defended at the UNED on June 13, 2008. The title is 'La transmisión de los valores en un pueblo leonés: agentes, procesos y resultados.'
- 5 This analysis of preferences based on positions in the social field builds on analyses by Bourdieu (1988[1979] and 2004 [2002]).
- 6 For a lucid discussion of 'value' as a differential relation and the resulting understanding of 'value' as a positioning on the social field (considering actions and declarations together as ways of positioning oneself), see Díaz de Rada (2007).
- 7 The processes described here can be fruitfully compared and contrasted with those described for Ireland by Guinnane (1989, 1992, 1997). Although in the conditions described by Guinnane in Ireland the sheer distance involved prevented the emigrants to America from making any claim to the inheritance, in both the Irish case and the Spanish case, the people who remained behind and actually used the land were able to concentrate the property in their own hands.
- 8 The family of orientation is the family in which a person grows up, that is, Ego, parents and siblings; as opposed to the family of procreation, which is the family a person forms in adulthood, that is Ego, spouse and children.
- 9 The material for this description comes from from villagers' memories and their explanations of archival material from municipal and church records. The main family configuration was, and continues to be at present, the nuclear family. Although additional members who are unable to form their own *casa* are added to this nuclear family when necessary, this is always considered somewhat exceptional and requiring explanation, so that I prefer to consider these families not as another 'type' of family (extended, multiple, etc.) but rather as a temporary opening up to needy relations of the long-term nuclear family configuration.

- 10 Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE Base, Cifras de población. Series históricas de población. www.ine.es.
- 11 Although I concentrate here on the gendered division of work, it should be remembered that the definition of capacities according to age – except perhaps for infants and the very elderly who are physically incapable of carrying out any work – is also a cultural construct.
- 12 *Status Animarum*, 1957. Parish records.
- 13 It should also be mentioned that, in the Spanish inheritance and property system, men and women retain separately the property each inherits; whereas property they acquire on their own after marriage may be jointly owned by the spouses, the property each inherits remains Under separate ownership. As a result, in a situation in which both the mother and father have property, the children will inherit, on one hand, their mother's property, which will be divided among them, and on the other, their father's property, which will also be divided among them. This brief, basic description does not, of course, do justice to the complexities, both in law and in practice, of the inheritance system.
- 14 In 1957, 84% of the adult male population (and it must be noted that at this moment in time, anyone over the age of 12 was classified as an adult) were either farmers or agricultural laborers. Women were sometimes listed with the same occupation as their husbands or as devoted to *their work* (*sus labores*), a classification more or less equivalent to *housewife*. However, the criteria for attaching one label or another to a woman in the *Status Animarum* is unclear.
- 15 This last decision moment, families that were already established in farming, was more frequent at the beginning of the period, when less land was available due to the population growth which peaked in 1960, becoming less frequent as the emigration of family members left more land for those who stayed behind.
- 16 One of the differences noted with respect to the Irish situation (Guinnane 1989, 1992, 1997).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bourdieu, Pierre 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1988 [1979]. *La distinción*. Madrid: Taurus.
- 1988. Espacio social y poder simbólico. In *Revista de Occidente* 81 (febrero 1988), 97–119.
- 2004 [2002]. *El baile de los solteros*. Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama.
- Díaz de Rada, Ángel. 2007. Valer y valor. Una exhumación de la teoría del valor para reflexionar sobre la desigualdad y la diferencia en relación con la escuela. In *Revista de Antropología Social* 16, 117–158.
- Guinnane, Timothy. 1989. Migration, Marriage, and Household Formation: The Irish the Turn of the Century. In *The Journal of Economic History* 49: 2 The Tasks of Economic History, 452–454.
- 1992. Age at Leaving Home in Rural Ireland, 1901–1911. In *The Journal of Economic History* 52(3), 651–674.
- 1997. *The Vanishing Irish. Households, Migration, and the Rural Economy in Ireland, 1850–1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE Base, Cifras de población. Series históricas de población. www.ine.es
- Status Animarum*, 1957. Parish records.