

# KEEPING THE YOUNG ALIVE TO STIMULATE MILK PRODUCTION? DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CATTLE AND SMALL STOCK

Marie BALASSE\*

## Summary

Opinions diverge on how milk exploitation in prehistoric times should be reflected in mortality profiles of dairy species. The debate has focused on whether the slaughter of the offspring would have enhanced or reduced milk availability for human consumption. This article aims at explaining why, due to differences in the physiology of lactation, the answer may be different for cattle and caprines. The fraction of cisternal milk, available by simple pressure on the udder, compared to alveolar milk, which has to be actively expelled by induction of the ejection reflex, is considerably higher in caprines than in cattle. Induction of milk let down is primordial in cattle to insure both the quantity and quality of milk production, and to maintain lactation, whereas consequences on milk production of inhibition of milk let down are less important in caprines. Moreover, stimulation of caprine females requires considerably less effort than stimulation of a cow, in which the presence of the calf is still necessary in modern poorly improved breeds to initiate milk ejection. This suggests that removal of the young would have seriously compromised the milking of cattle, whereas it would not have precluded it in caprines.

## Key Words

Milking, Cattle, Caprines, Cisternal/alveolar milk, Milk ejection reflex.

Archaeozoological recognition of milk exploitation in the mortality pattern of dairy species has been forcefully debated. A question most frequently raised is whether the slaughter of the young would have enhanced or reduced milk availability for human consumption. Payne's mortality model for optimized milk production in sheep and goat (Payne, 1973), based on the assumption that the young, who competes with the herder for milk consumption,

## Résumé

Maintenir le jeune en vie pour stimuler la production laitière? Différences entre les bovins et les caprinés.

Les opinions divergent sur les indices témoignant de l'exploitation du lait à la Préhistoire, dans les profils de mortalité des espèces laitières. La question se pose particulièrement de savoir si l'abattage du jeune aurait augmenté ou au contraire réduit la part du lait disponible pour la consommation humaine. Cet article tente d'expliquer pourquoi, étant donné des différences dans leur physiologie de lactation, il se peut que la réponse à cette question soit différente pour les bovins et les caprinés. La part du lait cisternal, disponible par simple pression du pis, par rapport au lait alvéolaire, qui doit être expulsé par déclenchement du réflexe d'éjection, est considérablement plus grande chez les caprinés que chez les bovins. Le déclenchement de la descente du lait est primordial chez la vache pour assurer à la fois la quantité et la qualité de la production de lait, et pour maintenir la lactation, tandis que les conséquences sur la production laitière de l'inhibition du réflexe d'éjection du lait sont moindres chez les caprinés. Par ailleurs, la stimulation des femelles de caprinés demande considérablement moins d'effort que celle de la vache, chez laquelle la présence du veau est encore nécessaire de nos jours chez les races rustiques pour initier le réflexe d'éjection du lait. Tout cela suggère que l'enlèvement du jeune aurait sérieusement compromis la traite de la vache, tandis qu'il n'aurait pas empêché celle des caprinés.

## Mots clés

Traite, Bovins, Caprinés, Lait cisternal/alvéolaire, Réflexe d'éjection du lait.

should not be kept alive, has been widely applied not only to caprines, but also to cattle. Against application of this model to cattle, it has been argued that in primitive breeds, the slaughter of the young might have seriously compromised removal of milk by the herder, due to inhibition of milk let down (Clutton-Brock, 1981, 1989; Entwistle & Grant, 1989; McCormick, 1992; Peske, 1994; Tresset, 1996; Balasse *et al.*, 2000).

Manuscrit reçu le 3 février 2003, accepté le 12 avril 2003.

\* CNRS ESA-8045, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Département Écologie et Gestion de la Biodiversité, bâtiments d'Anatomie comparée, 55 rue Buffon, 75005 Paris, France.

The negative effect of removal of the young immediately after birth on establishment of lactation has been observed by physiologists and herders (Halstead, 1998; Marnet & McKusick, 2001): rupture of the mother-young bond has a very strong effect on regulation of hormones involved in lactation. The necessity of preserving this bond at least for a short period after birth is widely acknowledged, although the duration of this period is still debated (Halstead, 1998). The necessity of keeping the young once lactation has been established remains questioned (Halstead, 1998). It is striking to observe that a clear distinction has not been made between the three dairy species most frequently involved in the debate: cow, sheep and goat. The consequences of early slaughter of the young on milk production might not be the same for cattle and small stock, whose physiology of lactation, especially the mechanisms of storage of milk in the mammary gland, differs.

In this paper I would like to address the following questions: (1) why is it important to induce the milk ejection reflex, *i.e.* what would be the consequences for milk production of inhibition of the reflex, and *would the consequences be the same in cow, sheep and goat?* (2) How easy is it to induce milk let down when the young has been removed, *and is it equally easy in cow, sheep and goat?*

### **Storage of milk in the mammary gland: the cisternal and alveolar fractions of milk**

Full understanding of the importance of induction of the milk ejection reflex implies basic knowledge of the mechanisms of storage of milk in the mammary gland. The secretory unit of the mammary gland, the alveolus, consists of a cluster of lactocyte cells specialized in milk synthesis, surrounding a cavity, the lumen, in which milk is temporarily stored before transfer to larger storage regions near the teat (Labussière, 1999; Caja *et al.*, 2000). Transfer of milk via the lactiferous ducts occurs only during suckling in certain species like rat, rabbit or pig, whereas in species with large cisterns, including ewe, goat and cow, transfer occurs also between suckling or milking sessions and can be stored in the teat (Labussière, 1999). Milk stored in the lumen is referred to as alveolar milk. Milk stored in the gland and teat cisterns is referred to as cisternal milk.

Cisternal milk is obtainable immediately by action of suckling or milking. Alveolar milk is retained in the mammary gland by capillary forces and has to be actively expelled from the lumen by induction of the milk ejection reflex. In response to a nervous stimulus in the teat by the suckling of the offspring, or by milking, the hormone oxytocin is released and transported to the mammary gland, where it causes contraction of the cells surrounding the

alveoli. The alveolar lumen is flattened and milk is ejected to the cistern (Labussière, 1999; Lollivier *et al.*, 2002).

In the natural conditions of the feeding of the offspring, milk let down is induced by the suckling and butting action of the young. Visual and auditory contacts have also been shown to be important stimuli in the ewe and the cow (Labussière, 1999). Oxytocin release is highly influenced by environmental factors. Inhibition of the milk ejection reflex is observed in case of stress (fright). Adrenaline injection has been shown to cause suppression of oxytocin release and the milk ejection reflex in cows (Davis *et al.*, 1998).

### **Importance of induction of the milk ejection reflex for the quantity, quality and maintenance of milk production**

Failure to initiate milk ejection does not preclude collection of cisternal milk, but leads to the loss of the alveolar fraction of milk production. Partitioning of milk accumulation between alveolar and cisternal fractions, and the dynamics of the filling of the cisterns, have been the subject of intense research related to dairy production, in order to determine optimal milking intervals, and to improve the effectiveness of machine removal of milk (Peaker & Blatchford, 1988). From this research it emerged that there is a marked difference in milk partitioning between cows and caprines. The relative proportion of cisternal milk is higher than 75% in goats (Peaker & Blatchford, 1988; Marnet & McKusick, 2001), varies from 40 to 75% in ewes (Caja *et al.*, 1999; Rovai *et al.*, 2000; Marnet & McKusick, 2001; McKusick *et al.*, 2002), and is less than 20% in cows (Knight *et al.*, 1994; Bruckmaier *et al.*, 1994; Pfeilsticker *et al.*, 1996; Davis *et al.*, 1998). These figures, obtained on dairy breeds, vary with the breed (Rovai *et al.*, 2000) and lactation phase (Knight *et al.*, 1994), and get higher with lactation number (Bruckmaier *et al.*, 1994). Establishment of the milk ejection reflex is therefore of primordial importance especially in cattle, in which failure to collect the alveolar fraction of the milk would cause the loss of 80% of the total production. This loss would represent 25 to 60% of milk production in sheep and less than 25% in goat.

The partition between alveolar and cisternal milk also corresponds to a partition in milk quality. Alveolar milk is fatter than cisternal milk. As much as 70 to 75% of milk fat is contained in the alveolar fraction in small ruminants (Labussière, 1988; McKusick *et al.*, 2002). Alveolar milk has been shown to be three times as fat as cisternal milk in cattle (Davis *et al.*, 1998). However, partitioning does not affect the protein percentage of milk. The large fat glob-

ules have to be expelled actively from the alveoli, whereas the smaller casein micelles presumably pass freely to the cisterns (McKusick *et al.*, 2002). Non-removal of the alveolar fraction of milk production implies, therefore, the loss of an essential quality of milk: its lipid content.

Inducing milk ejection is also important for maintenance of lactation. To avoid over-production, milk synthesis is regulated by milk removal. Prolonged absence of milk ejection, meaning prolonged incomplete removal of milk from the udder, can have a negative feedback action on milk secretion and eventually reduce milk production (Knight *et al.*, 1998; Marnet *et al.*, 2001; Lollivier *et al.*, 2002). Consistent absence of the reflex has been shown to induce a loss of 35% of total milk yield in ewes (Labussière, 1988). The consequences, however, are not as serious in small stock as in cattle, due to differences both in the relative size of cisternal versus alveolar compartments and in the dynamics of the filling of the cistern. In sheep and goat, non-ejected alveolar milk will soon be removed by passive transfer to the emptied cistern: Peaker & Blatchford (1988) have shown that, in the goat, cisternal filling occurs immediately after emptying. In the case of repeated non-ejection of milk, part of the production can be lost, but the risk of inhibition of secretion is less. In cattle, due to the high proportion of milk stored in the alveoli versus milk stored in the cistern (80: 20), only a small fraction of non-ejected milk will eventually be transferred to the cistern. Moreover transfer will not be really effective until 4 hours after emptying of the cistern (Knight *et al.*, 1994). Stagnation of milk in the alveoli will seriously disturb milk secretion, and eventually provoke cessation of secretion.


Inducing milk ejection is therefore of fundamental importance to insure both the quantity and the quality of milk production, and to maintain lactation. However, marked differences do exist between cattle and small stock. Failure to provoke milk ejection would seriously compromise exploitation of the milk of cattle, whereas the consequences would be more limited in small stock. In the former, the amount of milk available at milking would be dramatically reduced, and repeated incomplete emptying of the udder would even lead to cessation of milk secretion; in the latter, the proportion of production lost would be less, especially in goat, and might even be negligible compared to the part otherwise reserved for the raising of the young if this one was to be kept alive.

Even if they apply to a lesser extent to caprines, the negative consequences of inhibition of the milk let down cannot be denied. The question now arises of the herder's ability to induce the milk ejection reflex when the young has been removed.

### **Is the herder as good as the offspring in inducing milk ejection in cattle and small stock?**

In modern dairy breeds, the milk ejection may be facilitated by milking routine: the ejection reflex is conditioned by entry into the milking parlour, distribution of food, drinking, or the sound of buckets (Labussière, 1999). In these days of automated milking, however, physiologists are still working on the best way to assure maximum removal of milk from the udder and are facing some difficulties especially with cattle. Milking in unfamiliar surroundings has been shown to block oxytocin release in dairy cows (Bruckmaier *et al.*, 1994). Any change in the milking routine, including change in housing or pasture, or mixing with another herd, might provoke a considerable drop in milk yield in cattle (Labussière, 1999). This underlines how sensitive the environmental conditions are, in which removal of milk can be processed without the presence of the offspring. It is true that milking performance is related to housing and feeding conditions (Halstead, 1998). Rather than demonstrating how easy it is to initiate milk ejection when environmental conditions are good, however, this tends to show how much more difficult it can be when conditions are poor, even today with modern dairy breeds. Stimulation by allowing the calf to suckle before machine milking is still required in certain cases to induce milk let down, for example in *Bos indicus* x *Bos taurus* crossed breeds in the tropical American lowlands (Combellas *et al.*, 2003). Caprines more readily give their milk to the machine than cattle, which generally require a greater effort for stimulation (Marnet, pers. comm. 2003).

Automated milking may not be the best example of the herder-animal bond during milking. Traditional manual milking of poorly improved breeds is still performed in France. In the case of the Salers and Aubrac cattle breeds, it is simply impossible to get the milk without the presence of the calf (Bonal *et al.*, 1985; Bruhnes Delamare, 1987; Bouvier, 1993). The presence of the calf during milking of the cow is observed nowadays in Africa, Europe, Asia and South America (Balasse *et al.*, 2000). The practice has been described in great detail for African pastoral societies (Huntingford, 1953; Krige, 1957; Dupiré, 1962; Klima, 1970; Goldschmidt, 1976; Boutrais, 1978; Bernus, 1981; Touré & Arpaillange, 1986; Bernardet, 1988; Evans-Pritchard, 1994). Most of the time the calf is first allowed to suckle for a while, then visual contact between the female and offspring is maintained during milking (milk ejection is not complete with induction of the reflex at the start of milking; stimulation is required throughout the entire process to continue milk



**Fig. 1** : Morning milking of a cow by a Maasai woman in the Central Rift Valley of Kenya (Olengoluo, June 2001). Milking and suckling occur at the same time. Presence of the calf is required to initiate the milk ejection reflex (©Marie Balasse).



**Fig. 2** : Milking of a goat by a Maasai woman in the Central Rift Valley of Kenya (Olengoluo, June 2002). Presence of the kid is not required to initiate the milk ejection reflex (©Marie Balasse).

ejection: Bruckmaier, 2001). The calf gets the part of the production reserved for its consumption at the end of milking. The calf and the milker may also share access to the udder and suckling and milking may occur at the same time (Figure 1). Iconographic and written sources indicate the presence of the calf during milking in historical and prehistoric times (Balasse *et al.*, 2000). Although this interpretation cannot be verified, it is highly probable that representation of the offspring on prehistoric milking scenes reflects the necessity of keeping the young to stimulate milk let down.

Ancient milking scenes without the presence of the calf have been reported (Balasse, 1999). In some of them, where milking is performed from the rear of the cow, what is represented might be initiation of the Ferguson reflex by insufflation in the vagina. The Ferguson reflex leads to oxytocin release and induces milk let down. This practice is mentioned historically and can still be observed in various parts of the world (Amoroso & Jewell, 1963; Lucas, 1989).

Other subterfuges might be used, which permit milking of a refractory cow when its calf has been removed: stimulation can be achieved by presenting to the female the skin of a calf, sometimes in the shape of a stuffed dummy, that might be sprinkled with urine or salted water (Lagercrantz, 1950; Dupiré, 1962; Thomas, 1966; Klima, 1970; Bernus, 1981; Evans-Pritchard, 1994). This practice has been frequently reported in the archaeozoological literature dealing with the debate over the keeping or not of the young. It is important to note that the use of a dummy calf only occurs in the case of accidental loss of the young, and in no way justifies deliberate slaughter of the offspring. In traditional pastoral economies, the loss of the young of a lactating cow is taken as a very serious event (Klima, 1970) and the effort put into avoiding the risk of cessation of milk secretion is considerable. The use of subterfuges to get milk in the case of the death of the calf, rather than demonstrating that milking is possible without the keeping of the offspring, shows how real the problem is of milking a cow without the calf.

The necessity to make use of that kind of subterfuge has only very rarely been reported for caprines, which suggests a greater ability for the herder to induce milk ejection in caprines. It is significant to note that in African tribes, where the calf is used to stimulate the cow during milking, the same practice is not applied to the milking of caprines. The Maasai of the Central Rift Valley of Kenya milk their cattle with the young (Figure 1), and use a dummy calf in case of accidental loss of the offspring, whereas their milking of goats – which are East African indigenous breeds – is not performed in the pres-

ence of the kid (Figure 2), simply because it is not required. Milking the cow with the calf is not a cultural choice, it is dictated by a real physiological need.

### Conclusion

Due to differences in the storage of milk in the mammary gland, failure to induce the milk ejection reflex does not have the same consequences for milk production in cattle and small stock. In cattle, inability to remove the alveolar fraction of milk may lead to the loss of 80% of the production and repeated incomplete emptying of the udder may provoke cessation of milk secretion. In caprines, the proportion of the production lost would be greatly reduced, especially in goats where it might even be negligible, and the risk of cessation of lactation is less. In both species, failure to induce milk let down entails the non-collection of the fraction of milk with the highest lipid content. Modern experiences with automated milking as well as traditional milking practices on primitive breeds suggest a greater facility in caprines than in cattle, for the herder to stimulate the female without presence of the offspring.

Serious consequences on milk production of failure to induce milk let down and considerable effort required to succeed without the presence of the young in cattle, versus minor consequences of failure and greater ability to succeed without the young in caprines, suggests that the answer to the question of whether or not the young must be retained to insure milk production may not be the same for cattle and small stock. Keeping the young may have been essential for milking cattle, whereas it may not have been a necessity for milking caprines.

This does not mean that exploitation of milk in caprines will necessarily be reflected in the slaughter of the young. The killing of infants would not *preclude* collection of milk in caprines, but milk exploitation does not *require* it. Killing or raising the young might have depended on the degree of specialization in milk production, and the size of the herd. In cattle, however, it is likely that killing the calf would have seriously compromised collection of the milk and so slaughter of the calf may have been deferred until towards the end of lactation (Peske, 1994).

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Pr. Bernard Denis (Laboratoire d'Ethnozootechnie, École Nationale Vétérinaire de Nantes), who first pointed out to me this difference in storage of the milk between cattle and caprines. Discussion with Pr. Pierre-Guy Marnet (Département des Sciences et Productions Animales, ENSAR/INRA) greatly improved this paper.

## Bibliography

- AMOROSO E.C. & JEWELL P.A., 1963.— The exploitation of the milk-ejection reflex by primitive people. *In*: A.E. Maurant & F.E. Zeuner ed., *Man and cattle*. Royal Anthropological Institute Occasional Paper, 18: 126-138.
- BALASSE M., 1999.— *De l'exploitation du lait au Néolithique moyen, en Europe tempérée. Examen des modalités de sevrage des bovins, par l'analyse isotopique des ossements archéologiques*. Thèse de 3<sup>e</sup> cycle, Université Paris 6. Mémoire des Sciences de la Terre n° 9-26.
- BALASSE M., TRESSET A., BOCHERENS H., MARIOTTI A. & VIGNE J.-D., 2000.— Un abattage "post-lactation" sur des bovins domestiques néolithiques. Étude isotopique des restes osseux du site de Bercy (Paris, France). *In*: B. Bassano, G. Giacobini & V. Peracino eds., *La gestion démographique des animaux à travers le temps - Animal management and demography through the ages* (VI<sup>e</sup> Colloque international de l'association "L'Homme et l'Animal, Société de Recherche Interdisciplinaire", Turin, Italie, 16-18 September 1998). *Ibex J. Mt Ecol.*, 5 - *Anthropozoologica*, 31: 39-48.
- BERNARDET P., 1988.— *Vache de la houe, vache de la dot. Élevage bovin et rapports de production en Moyenne et Haute Côte d'Ivoire*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.
- BERNUS E., 1981.— *Touaregs nigériens. Unité culturelle et diversité régionale d'un peuple de pasteurs*. Paris: ORSTOM-L'Harmattan.
- BONAL A., BOUGLER J., DEL PORTO P. & HAVY A., 1985.— *La race Salers*. Aurillac: Vedreine Imprimeurs.
- BOUTRAIS J., 1978.— *Deux études sur l'élevage en zone tropicale humide (Cameroun)*. Travaux et Documents de l'ORSTOM n° 88. Paris: ORSTOM.
- BOUVIER C., 1993.— *Le lait, la nature et les hommes*. Baumes-les-Dames: Presses Pocket.
- BRUCKMAIER R. M., 2001.— Milk ejection during machine milking in dairy cows. *Livestock Production Science*, 70: 121-124.
- BRUCKMAIER R.M., ROTHENANGER E. & BLUM J.W., 1994.— Measurements of mammary gland cistern size and determination of the cisternal milk fraction in dairy cows. *Milchwissenschaft*, 49: 543-546.
- BRUHNES DELAMARE M.J., 1987.— *Techniques de production: l'élevage*. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des Musées nationaux.
- CAJA G., SUCH X., RIBERTE J., CARRETERO A. & NAVARRO M., 1999.— The use of ultrasonography in the study of mammary gland cisterns during lactation in sheep. *In*: F. Barillet & N.P. Zervas eds., *Milking and milk production of dairy sheep and goats*. EAAP Publication 95, Wageningen: Wageningen Pers., p. 91-93.
- CAJA G., SUCH X. & ROVAI M., 2000.— Udder morphology and machine milking ability in dairy sheep. *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> Great Lakes Dairy Sheep Symposium, November 2-4, Guelph, Ontario, Canada*. p. 17-40.
- CLUTTON-BROCK J., 1981.— Discussion. *In*: R. Mercer ed., *Farming practice in British prehistory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, p. 218-220.
- CLUTTON-BROCK J., 1989.— *A natural history of domesticated mammals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COMBELLAS J., TESORERO M. & GABALDON L., 2003.— Effect of calf stimulation during milking on milk yield and fat content of *Bos indicus* x *Bos taurus* cows. *Livestock production Science*, 79: 227-232.
- DAVIS S.R., FARR V.C., COPEMAN P.J.A., CARRUTHERS V.R., KNIGHT C.H. & STELWAGEN K., 1998.— Partitioning of milk accumulation between cisternal and alveolar compartments of the bovine udder: relationship to production loss during once daily milking. *Journal of Dairy Research*, 65: 1-8.
- DUPIRÉ M., 1962.— *Peuls nomades. Étude descriptive des Wodaabe du Sahel Nigérien*. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie de l'Université de Paris.
- ENTWISTLE R. & GRANT A., 1989.— The evidence for cereal cultivation and animal husbandry in the Southern British Neolithic and Bronze Age. *In*: A. Milles, D. Williams & N. Gardner eds., *The Beginnings of Agriculture*. British Archaeological Report, International Series, 496: 203-215.
- EVANS-PRITCHARD E., 1994.— *Les Nuer*. Saint-Amand: Gallimard.
- GOLDSCHMIDT W., 1976.— *Culture and behaviour of the Sebei. A study in continuity and adaptation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- HALSTEAD P., 1998.— Mortality models and milking: problems of uniformitarianism, optimality and equifinality reconsidered. *Anthropozoologica*, 27: 3-20.
- HUNTINGFORD G.W.B., 1953.— *The Southern Nilo-Hamites*. London: International African Institute.

- KLIMA G.J., 1970.– *The Barabaig. East African Cattle-Herders*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- KNIGHT C.H., HIRST D. & DEWHURST R.J., 1994.– Milk accumulation and distribution in the bovine udder during the interval between milkings. *Journal of Dairy Research*, 61: 167-177.
- KNIGHT C.H., PEAKER M. & WILDE C.J., 1998.– Local control of mammary development and function. *Reviews of Reproduction*, 3: 104-112.
- KRIGE E.J., 1957.– *The social system of the Zulu*. Shuter & Shooter, Pietermaritzburg.
- LABUSSIÈRE J., 1988.– Review of physiological and anatomical factors influencing the milking ability of ewes and organization of milking. *Livestock Production Science*, 18: 253-274.
- LABUSSIÈRE J., 1999.– The physiology of milk ejection: consequences on milking techniques. In: J. Martinet, L.M. Houdebine & H. Herbert ed., *Biology of Lactation*. Paris: INRA, p. 307-333.
- LAGERCRANTZ S., 1950.– *Contribution to the ethnography of Africa*. Studia Ethnographica Upsaliensa 1. Upsalla: Hakan Ohlssons Bocktryckeri Lund.
- LOLLIVIER V., GUINARD-FLAMENT J., OLLIVIER-BOUSQUET M. & MARNET P.G., 2002.– Oxytocin and milk removal: two important sources of variation in milk production and milk quality during and between milkings. *Reproduction, Nutrition, Développement*, 42: 173-186.
- LUCAS A.T., 1989.– *Cattle in ancient Ireland*. Kilkenny: Boethius Press.
- MARNET P.G. & MCKUSICK B.C., 2001.– Regulation of milk ejection and milkability in small ruminants. *Livestock Production Science*, 70: 125-133.
- MCCORMICK F., 1992.– Early faunal evidence for dairying. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 11: 201-209.
- MCKUSICK B.C., THOMAS D.L., BERGER Y.M. & MARNET P.G., 2002.– Effect of milking interval on alveolar versus cisternal milk accumulation and milk production and composition in dairy ewes. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 85: 2197-2206.
- PAYNE S., 1973.– Kill-off patterns in sheep and goats: the mandibles of Asvan Kale. *Anatolian Studies*, 23: 281-303.
- PEAKER M. & BLATCHFORD D.R., 1988.– Distribution of milk in the goat mammary gland and its relation to the rate and control of milk secretion. *Journal of Dairy Research*, 55: 41-48.
- PESKE L., 1994.– Contribution to the beginning of milking in Prehistory. *Archeologische rozhledy*, 46: 97-104.
- PFEILSTICKER H.U., BRUCKMAIER R.M. & BLUM J.W., 1996.– Cisternal milk in the dairy cow during lactation and after preceding teat stimulation. *Journal of Dairy Research*, 63: 509-515.
- ROVAI M., SUCH X., CAJA G. & KNIGHT C.H., 2000.– Interbreed differences in cisternal and alveolar milk partitioning in the udder according to yield in dairy sheep. *Journal of Animal Science*, 78 Suppl 1 / *Journal of Dairy Science*, 83 Suppl.1: 166.
- THOMAS E.M., 1966.– *Warrior herdsman*. London: Secher & Warburg.
- TOURÉ O. & ARPAILLANGE J., 1986.– *Peuls du Ferlo*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- TRESSET A., 1996.– *Le rôle des relations homme/animal dans l'évolution économique et culturelle des sociétés des V<sup>e</sup>-IV<sup>e</sup> millénaires en Bassin Parisien*. Thèse de 3<sup>e</sup> cycle, Univ. Panthéon-Sorbonne (Paris I).
-