free and natural lifestyle of Andalusian Gypsies. In the 1960s and 1970s, some,
such as Lilian Polhemus, and Merrill McAnes, engaged in long-term stays that
allowed them to have intimate knowledge of some Gypsies and their families.
Most importantly, ethnomelists and anthropologists started to do systematic,
problem-oriented fieldwork and to publish their results, for example, Bertha
Quintana and Lois Floyd’s monograph on the Gypsies of Granada (1971). By
the second half of the twentieth century, according to Charron-Deutsch,
the literature on Spanish Gypsies by non-Spaniards became ‘more refined, less
ecstatic, and more probing and seemingly objective’ (p. 165).

Chapter 5 describes the late development of Spain’s interest in the remnants
of Calo, the Spanish Gypsy language, as well as the increasing presence of
Gypsy figures in fiction and art, a trend that did not peak until the beginning of
the twentieth century, when it was out of fashion in other countries. Especially
relevant and complete is her review of the ‘flamenco wars’, the hotly debated
genealogy of Flamenco song and dance between gitanistas, those who recognized
a crucial Gypsy role in the development of Flamenco music and dance, and
andalucistas who emphasized the Andalusian content of this art, and the
artificial character of the Gypsy construct and even of Gypsy ethnicity.

Finally, the author reviews the works by historians, sociologists and anthrop-
ologists in the second half of the twentieth century. Her usual probing does
not seem to work well here, and her understanding of the knowledge at hand
and its limitations is rather cursory and uncritical. These works, however, offer
the only knowledge based on contrastable evidence that we have about the
Gypsies of Spain, their social organisation, their ways of life, and the demo-
graphic, migratory and cultural changes they have experienced. But perhaps
the techniques of literary criticism are not enough for a critique of historical,
sociological and anthropological knowledge.

The author ends by contrasting the exclusion and oppression of real Gypsies
with the inclusion of their distorted image (primarily a gendered one) in the
core of modern European literature, music and art. She then concludes that this
irony or paradox is ‘key to understanding the long and tragic history of Payo-
Roma in Europe’ (p. 239). This is perhaps the weakest line of her argument
and the source of an ambiguity that permeates the whole effort. The author says
that this is not a book about real Gypsies, but inevitably there are many assumptions
about this people and their history in the roots of this cultural critique. In order
to qualify a representation as a stereotype one has to have a factual point of
comparison to a living community. Her knowledge of this community appears
at best superficial. What has been the relationship between the living, historical
Gypsies (that she calls ‘Spanish Roma’, using a term that Gitanos and Gitanas
do not use to refer to themselves, even in private matters) with the myths that
use them as pretext? How have they contributed as agents in the construction

of their representations by non-Gypsies and by themselves? How have these
representations affected their lives and their relationships with their neighbors
and society at large? The fact is that we do not know, and literary sources alone
cannot answer these questions.

If we are to relate adequately the artistic representation with the ‘factual’
representation offered by history, anthropology, epidemiology, demography,
et., we need another type of research, necessarily interdisciplinary. By offering
such a dense and detailed review of literary and artistic products, this book
contributes, even if one-sidedly, to this project. I encourage those interested in
Romani studies to read it.
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Banjaši na Balkanu: Identitet etničke zajednice/The Bayash of the Balkans:
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Reviewed by Victor A. Friedman

Gypsy groups that do not have Romani as their first language represent a
special challenge with regard to questions of identity, ethnicity, and history.
They also provide interesting material for linguists, especially dialectologists
and sociolinguists. It is worthy of note that complete language shift with
maintenance of separate identity in the case of formerly Romani-speaking
groups is arguably a Balkan phenomenon, in that the languages involved are
from the Balkans. Such is the case of the Albanian- and Macedonian-speaking
Egipkijani of Macedonia, the Albanian-speaking Ashkali, Magiup, and Kovači
of Kosovo, Albania, and Macedonia, the Greek-speaking Yiftoi of Greece,
the Turkish-speaking Millet in Bulgaria, Macedonia, Greece, and Serbia, and
others (see Hunt 1999, Marushiakova et al. 2001, and references therein).

Victor A. Friedman is member of the Editorial Board of Romani Studies and Professor of
Slavic and Balkan Linguistics, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University
of Chicago, 1130 East 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, USA. Email: vfriedm@uchicago.edu

Sometimes these groups do not identify themselves as Gypsies (Tsigani, etc.) but are so identified by others. On the other hand, at least as recently as the 1970s, there were Romanian-speaking groups in rural Hungary that identified as Gypsies, call their language 'Gypsy' (using the root tšigan-), and were unaware that what they were speaking is Romanian and not Romani (my own field observation). In western Europe and the Caucasus, on the other hand, linguistically assimilated Gypsy groups often maintain a Romani lexicon, as is the case in such para-Romani varieties as Calo, Anglo-Romani, and Bosha. Of all the non-Romani languages maintained by Gypsy groups, Romanian is probably the most widespread. As Sikimić (7) points out in her introduction to the book under review here, Romanian-speaking Gypsies, known as Banjaši, Bejaši, Bejiši, Rudari, Koritari, Karavlas, Rumuni, Rumunski/Vlaksi Cigan (as well as Ceri Vlasi, Selski Vlasi, Cinciari, Kalajdži, Čančari, Lingurari, Ursari, Ludari, Mečkari, Kopanari, Majmunari, etc.) live in Romania, Hungary, Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Serbia, Bulgaria, as well as small groups in Macedonia and Greece (and, we can add, Albania, cf. Weigand 1895: 78). The book under consideration here comprises eleven articles plus an introduction (7–12), based on recent (2001-2005) fieldwork in Serbia (nine articles: five based on work done in the Morava Valley in central Serbia—in Trešnjivica, Stržižlo, and Prčilovica—two in Mehmoves in northwest Serbia (Sava and Danube valleys), and one in Marinkova Bara near Belgrade) and Bulgaria (one article), with one article based on previously unpublished material from Bonis collected in the 1950s. The articles are all in Serbian (five in Cyrillic, five in the Latin alphabet) with resumés in English and Romanian. There are notes and contact information for the authors (321–2) and a table of contents (5–6) that also gives English translations of the titles, which I have modified slightly in a few instances.

In her introduction, Sikimić reviews the literature, sets the context, and gives a list of the 177 Bayash settlements in six regions of Serbia, with the 33 settlements visited by the team 2001–2005 in bold type.

O. Hedešan’s Jedan terem: Trešnjivica u Dolini Morave ‘A field site: Trešnjivica in the Morava Valley’ (13–106) gives a detailed account of the field site, with lengthy excerpts in the original Romanian and Serbian translation of the Bayash speaking for themselves about what it means to be ‘Romanian’ (Ruman) or ‘Gypsy’ (Tšigan) as well as about facets of the life cycle and ‘the repair of time.’ The author also gives a careful and thorough analysis of the linguistic evidence and concludes that these Rudari originated in western Oltenia and Muntenia and arrived via the Banat 1790–1815.

S. Miloradović’s Skica za etnolingvistička istraživanje podjurovskih pomoravskih sel (Trešnjivica) ‘Draft for ethnolinguistic research on the Morava villages at the foot of Mt. Juhor (Trešnjivica)’ (107–20) discusses the mixed Torlak-type Serbian dialect and ethnolinguistic material organized thematically around the celebration of Christian holidays. The material serves the dual purpose of describing life-cycle events and giving illustrative dialectological materials in the villagers’ own words. The author also makes the point that the Gypsies and Serbs live well together, and that the village preserves a tradition that a Serb saved the Gypsies from extermination by the Nazis and prevented their deportation by declaring them to be Orthodox and thus Serbs.

M. Ilić’s Izgubljeno u prevodu: Romi u diskursi Srb za Trešnjivce ‘‘Lost in translation’: Roma in the discourse of Serbs from Trešnjivica’ (121–44) discusses the differentiation of Bayash and Serb. The author refers to the former as Roma Banjaši, and makes the point that the Serbs refer to them with terms based on the root tšigan- but refer to the language as rumanski ‘Romanian’. The article discusses both actual differences in Gypsy and Serbian ritual practices and perceived differences, which are not always the same. Thus, for example, the ritual buying of the bride is seen as a typically Gypsy custom, although it could be seen rather as a more general archaism, since it was also practiced by Serbs (and, we can add, Macedonians and others) until recently. The theoretical ‘translation’ of Romani culture into Serbian, of the establishment of the ‘we-they’ boundaries, is identified and described, but the translation in the other direction is left for Romologists.

P. Radić’s Filološke beleške o bilingvalnom selu Stržižlo u centralnoj Srbiji ‘Philological notes on the bilingual village of Stržižlo in Central Serbia’ (145–74) adds ‘on the basis of folkloric material’ as a subtitle in the English. This article publishes nineteen texts in Serbian written by fifth-grade pupils with the help of parents and grandparents during 1985–86 school year with some detailed analysis of the phonology, morphology, morphosyntax, syntax, derivation, lexicon, and phraseology of the local Serbian dialect as produced by Romanian-speaking bilinguals.

The original English translation of A. Soresku-Markinović’s Napolitanci iz Mehovine ‘The Neapolitans of Mehovina’ (175–200) uses the term ‘Napolitans’, which misses the ethnonymic pun, which is a play on Serbian pola ‘half’ and Napolitanac ‘inhabitant of Naples’. (Moreover, napolitanka refers to a chocolate covered sugar wafer that can be compared to the Oreo cookie.) This article surveys different types of relationships among Bayash and local non-Bayash (Serbian, Romanian, Roman) communities, pointing out that in various communities Bayash identify with Serbs, Romanians, or Roms depending on local conditions. The author cites one village, Berilje, near Prokuplje, where the Serbian population is bilingual with Romanian and consider the local Bayash ‘pure’ Romanians. The majority of Bayash in Mehovina declared as Serbs in the 2002 census, a few as Roms, and none as Romanians. The author’s chief consultant, born in 1961, is one of the last Romanian-speakers in the village, where the
Banyash have assimilated linguistically to Serbian. The article contains parallel texts in Romanian and Serbian from this consultant discussing the founding of the village, questions of identity, and of language.

The same consultant is the source of the ethnolinguistic texts in Serbian in D. Rašković's Razgovor na groblju: Jezik Svetog Stankovića 'Conversation in the graveyard: The language of Sveta Stanković' (201–18), which ranges over a variety of topics of anthropological interest. This article includes preliminary linguistic analysis at the end.

S. Ćirković's Od Karkazda do Banjice: Mečkari 'From the Caucasus to Banjica: Bear tammers' (219–48) gives excerpts from the life history of a bear tamer living in Marinkova Bara, near Belgrade, who was born in the Caucasus. The narratives give much evidence concerning work practices and also experiences of the Holocaust. For this Bayash 'Romanian' and 'Gypsy' are interchangeable ethnonyms.

In Banjaši u Srbiji 'The Bayash of Serbia' (249–76), B. Sikimić provides an excellent survey of terminology, ethnic identity, linguistic identity, traditional occupations, exogamic communities, and various regional 'continuities' (Danubian, Vojvodinian, and Central Balkan Karavlah) discussing families and rituals. She concludes with the observation that given current marriage and migration patterns, classical dialectology is virtually impossible and one must rely on studying idiolects. Different Bayash communities have very different linguistic histories. She also notes that current Bayash areal distribution reflects the older Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman periods. She closes with interesting comparisons to other formerly nomadic Balkan peoples, especially the Aromanians, and, with a nod in the direction of ethnolinguistic reconstructions of traditional culture such as that being pursued by the Small Linguistic Atlas of the Balkan Languages project that the University of Marburg, makes the valuable observation that such an investigation of the Romani dialects whose speakers lived or still live in Romania also need to be investigated.

M. Slavkova's Rudari u istočnoj Bugarskoj i jevandjeojski pokret 'The Rudari of eastern Bulgaria and the Evangelical movement' (277–94) is a fascinating study of how some groups of Rudari have adapted evangelical Protestantism into a means of preserving traditional identity while at the same time opening up new avenues of achieving independent status.

A. Kostić and J. Nedeljković use advances in our understanding of universal versus culture-specific psychological phenomena in their Kultura i emocija—Cigani Rumuni i opažanje emocija 'Culture and emotion: Gypsy Romanians and the perception of emotion' (295–310). The original English translation reads 'Romanian Gypsies', but I have chosen to keep the substantial oppositional structure of the original, which renders more precisely the subtle difference, viz. Rumunski Tsigari 'Romanian Gypsies' connotes Gypsies who are from Romania, while Gypsy Romanians is more likely to suggest people who consider themselves Romanians (e.g. on the basis of first language) but happen to be of Gypsy origin, as is the case of many Bayash groups in Serbia. Using a standard set of photographs of faces displaying what have been determined to be the six cross-culturally relevant emotions (joy, sadness, fear, anger, surprise, disgust), the authors found that the group scored 100% in identification of the first three emotions, then 93.9%, 81.8%, and 75.8%, respectively, in identifying second three. The experiment demonstrated that the Gypsies in the group, Bayash from Prćilovci who are bilingual in Romanian and Serbian shared the same cross-cultural recognition of the emotions, but gave culture-specific interpretations of the reasons for those emotions, which in turn gives insights into their attitudes, experiences, and way of life.

D. Drlića's Čipuljčke Kalajdžije 'The Tinsmiths of Cipuljč' (311–20) is basically a historical record. The original translation uses the term tinkers, but as this term is sometimes used for the completely unrelated Travellers of the British Isles and North America (for whom it is often considered pejorative), I have chosen the slightly more modern 'tinsmith', which reflects the fact that kalajdžija is a profession whose ethnic connotations are strictly contextual. This material was collected in 1930 and documents a community that has since disappeared. It includes a discussion of Romanian elements in their secret language.

This is a remarkably useful collection, of interest to scholars in a wide range of fields that relate to anthropology and linguistics. The studies are careful, thoughtful, and reflective. The ethnographies, though of necessity brief, are thick with data and at the same time provide cogent analyses. The abundant narratives make the work of great value to linguists as well as ethnographers. Thanks to the English resumés, this work should be consulted by any scholar of Gypsy identity.
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