



Fundația de Tineret „Euro Est”

“Euro Est” Youth Foundation

4A Dr. Clujet Street, Sector 5, 050527 Bucharest, ROMANIA

U-CARE
Urban Culture Against Racism in
Europe

**W1: Exchange of Good Practice and
Curriculum Development**

1. Exchange Seminar in Liverpool, focus on History of Colonialism and Slave Trade in Europe

2. Exchange Seminar in Budapest, focus on Right Wing populism, Anti-Roma-Racism and Anti-European resentiments

3. Exchange Seminar in Florence, focus on Migration and anti-migrant stereotypes

BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO ROMA SLAVERY HISTORY IN ROMANIA

First documented presence of Roma slaves in Romania dates back to 1385 when Dan 1st, Prince of Wallachia (one of three historical regions in Romania) awards one of the monasteries with 40 gipsy families along with other goods and possessions.

The abolition of Roma slavery dating in the 19th century is marked by a census (1859) revealing a number of more than 250.000 emancipated slaves in Wallachia and Moldova. Based on those numbers, a rough estimate of the labour value for 5 centuries of slavery is of 247,249,700,235 EUR. That would be approximately 183 Billion pounds sterling, making it the double of Romania's GDP in 2010.

The origin of Roma slavery in Romania lies between two hypotheses, although none proved yet:

- The Ottoman empire brings Roma slaves along during the invasion
- The Roma were enslaved by the local boyars with the legal support of the Prince in order to cut back on the costs of specialized labour needed to pay the taxes demanded by the Ottoman empire

The legal status of Roma slaves remained unwritten for a long time. However, in Wallachia, the Penal Code included the following articles related to slaves:

- Gypsies are born slaves.
- Everyone born from a slave mother is also a slave.
- Every owner is entitled to sell or give his slaves as presents.
- Every gypsy without any owner is a slave of the Prince.

Roma shared a similar status in both Romanian Principalities. The civil code of Moldova in 1833 states:

- Legal marriages cannot be organized between freemen and slaves.
- Marriages between slaves cannot be done without the consent of the owner.
- The price of the slave should be determined by a tribunal according to age, condition and profession.
- If anyone cohabits with a woman slave, she shall become free after his death; if he has children from her, they too shall be free.

In present days, the division of Roma in subgroups and clans is a direct effect of the slavery period. The process of splitting Roma into different production groups based on economic needs of that time was a necessity for the slave-owners and had a permanent impact on Roma community. Nowadays, the Roma community is structured on clan identity as: blacksmiths (fierari), coppersmiths (kaldarash), wood workers (rudari), musicians (lautari), bear handlers (ursari) etc. The relationship between the clans' members are limited and, sometimes, controversial.

The emancipation of the slaves was one of the most important principles of the modernization of Romania although no social policies regarding the inclusion of former slaves were put in place. In this way, former slaves were assimilated to taxpaying peasants immediately. Roma were the poorest of the poorest, uneducated, without a culture of property and struggled to be accepted as human beings not only juridical, but social as well.

The reminiscences of the slavery period still reflect today into the ghettoization of some Roma communities, discrimination on public services, social exclusion and marginality.

The cost of Roma slavery

“The slave has an unfavorable eye for the virtues of the powerful; he has a skepticism and distrust, a refinement of distrust of everything “good” that is there honored—he would fain persuade himself that the very happiness there is not genuine. On the other hand, those qualities which serve to alleviate the existence of sufferers are brought into prominence and flooded with light; it is here that sympathy, the kind, helping hand, the warm heart, patience, diligence, humility, and friendliness attain to honor; for here these are the most useful qualities, and almost the only means of supporting the burden of existence. Slave-morality is essentially the morality of utility” (Friedrich Nietzsche)

Abstract

This article is about the voluntary or involuntary contribution of Roma through the history to the economical and social development in Romanian space. Over the centuries, Roma have suffered social exclusion, discrimination, slavery and deportations in Nazi camps and, less documented, they have managed to survive over the centuries as an ethnic group, being in some certain fields also privileged. They had the privilege of handicraft workers in an agrarian cultural space, army tools providers, famous musicians and appreciated entertainers, privilege of being from a different culture and speaking another language. Therefore, this article is part of a series of analyses of Roma contribution to economic and social development of the societies that they live in, focusing on Romania – the home for the largest population of Roma in Europe¹. I have decided to start with “the slavery” because of two reasons: first of all, Roma were mentioned for the first time into Romanian history as slaves and second, the role of the slaves in Romanian Principalities and their economic contribution it is highly relevant for the current situation of the Romanian Roma. This articles it is basing on available literature on slavery of Roma ethnic groups in Romanian Principalities and, as well, other materials related to Roma history, anthropological and sociological researches.

a. About the slaves in the Romanian Principalities

Romania is composed by tree historical principalities - Walachia, Moldova and Transylvania. According to the historians, Roma were slaves only in Walachia and Moldova for five centuries. First record on Roma in Walachia comes from the fourteen century from a donation document:

“the earliest written information about the presence of the Gypsies on the territory of Romania dates from 1385. In a deed issued in that year, Dan I, the prince of Wallachia, amongst other things awards to the Tismana monastery the possessions previously belonging to the Vodița monastery, which had been given to the latter by the Prince Wladislav I: among the possessions in question are forty families of Gypsies (ațigani)” (Achim, 2004, p.13).

The origins of the slavery in Romania is still under debate. Some historians believe that Roma were introduced as slaves into Romanian Principalities by Ottoman army. This hypothesis was for the first time proposed by the most known Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga (Iorga, 1930, p. 22-23) and admitted for a long period of time by other historians (until now, there have not been provided relevant proves for this hypothesis). On the other hand, P.N Panaitescu, Romanian historian of economy, believes that the economical changes produced by Ottoman invasion, the need of skilled handicraft works and resources to pay the pressuring debts, turned Roma into slaves, theory supported as well by sociologist Nicolae Gheorghe in the “Origin of Roma’s Slavery in the Romanian Principalities” that:

“On my opinion the cause of bringing Roma into slavery in Romanian Principalities has not his origin in the hazard of their migration in Romanian Principalities and not in certain ethnical inferior” characteristic, as is mentioned and argued in prejudice based theories. Un contrary, the dependence status of Roma and later the status of slavery in this country is tide connected to the power structure and nobles process and the establishment of social structure in Romanian medieval society. To present this whole process is beyond this paper intention. I can only mention that according to social historians which studied Romanian historical issues regarding landless peasants and slaves, which initially lived as free people in villagers, but they have been fiscally exploited by the groups of nobles, represented by the local prince” (Gheorghe, 1983).

At the end of the slavery period, in 1859 a census took place and showed that more than 250.000 slaves were emancipated, more than 7% from the Wallachia and Moldova population (Achim: 2005). The slaves were classified in three groups – State slaves (robi domenesti), Monasteries and Orthodox Church slaves (romi manastiresti) and landlords slaves (robi boieresti). Roma, as today, were divided as well in different professional groups, some of them nomads, other sedentary, sharing the same social status - slaves at that time, language and origins. According to Mihai Kogălniceanu, slaves were classified by their way of living, sedentary or nomadic and by their main occupations

(Kogalniceanu, 1837). The nomad slaves were supposed to pay twice a year a tax to the state, up to 5 kg of gold/year, depending on their profession and skills.

From a social perspective, Roma from Romania faced a similar type of treatment as African slaves from United States of America, as suggested by Mihaela Mudure (2003). They were called with a given name synonym with slave (nigger vs. (a)tigan), the slave-owner had all the rights related to the life of slaves (except dead), the “good” slaves (in productive sense) were used for procreation and multiplication of the slaves able to work, slaves were subject of trade, no matter of family relations:

"The boyars had a special Penal Code for Gypsies; beating on the soles of the feet until the flesh hung in shreds... When the runaway was caught, his neck was placed in an iron band lined with sharp points so that he could neither move his head nor lie down to rest. The boyars had no right to kill their slaves, by there was nothing said about slowly torturing them to death. No law forbade the boyar to take the most beautiful girls as his mistresses, or to separate wives from husbands, and children from parents." (Hancock, 1987, p. 20)

According to the anthropologists Elena Marushiakova and Veselin Popov, quoting authors like Viorel Achim, George Potra, Mihail Kogălniceanu and others, the juridical situation of Roma slaves had been unwritten for a long time. However, in Wallachia, the Penal Code included the following articles related to slaves:

“Art. 2 Gypsies are born slaves.

Art.3 Everyone born from a slave mother is also a slave.

Art. 5 Every owner is entitled to sell or give his slaves as presents.

Art. 6 Every gypsy without any owner is a slave of the Prince”. (Khanatskii apud. Marushiakova and Popov, 2009, p. 20)

From juridical perspective, Roma shared a similar status in both Romanian Principalities. The two anthropologists also refer to the reforms in the Moldova legislation from 1833 and, in the civil code, the following articles refers to the status of slaves:

II.154 Legal marriages cannot be organized between freemen and slaves.

II.162 Marriages between slaves cannot be done without the consent of the owner.

II. 174 The price of the slave should be determined by a tribunal according to age, condition and profession.

II. 176 If anyone cohabits with a woman slave, she shall become free after his death; if he has children from her, they too shall be free. (Regulamentele Organice apud. Marushiakova and Popov 2009:20)

Viorel Achim, one of the most important contemporary historians on Roma studies from Romania, supported the idea that in the social hierarchy in Romanian Principalities, slaves represented one of the lowest category, similar at some extents with local serfs (*rumâni* in Wallachia, *vecini* in Moldavia and *iobagi* in Transylvania), but even lower since they had no legal status of person (Achim, 1998, p. 38).

The process of slavery abolition in the Romanian Principalities started in the first half on XVIII century and lasted two decades. It was an uneasy process while some of the slaves-owners, including Orthodox Church, did not wanted to renounce to this facilities. A solution was identified and slaves-owners were paid to free their slaves. As well, there were cases that some Roma did not accepted the new condition of a free man and tax payer, therefore they preferred to stay as much as possible under the old status. The process of slavery abolition in Romanian Principalities ended at the beginning, first decade, of the second half of the XVIII century (Achim, 2004, p. 103-112).

One of the key figure, in the struggle of abolition of slavery and emancipation of Roma, was Mihail Kogalniceanu, politician, author of the first study on Roma from Romania in 1837, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sous le nom de Bohémians*. In the year of his death, 1891, Kogalniceanu sustains a discourseⁱⁱ in front of the Romanian Academy (as Senior Member) about the act of slavery of Roma and the abolition of such phenomena from Romanian space. He mentions the abuse of the slave-owners, inhuman treatment of this people, children separated by their families traded in different places: “*Neither humanity, neither religion, neither civil law did not protect the unlucky souls. It was a impressive show, outrageous. That is the reason, driven by the spirit of the century, by the humanity laws, a number of old and young landlords took actions to wash the shame of their country, the shame of slavery*”¹ (Kogalniceanu, 1891). On the other hand, the sociologist Nicolae Gheorghe, considers that the not all the slaves suffered humiliation and refers to the state slaves, as their

¹ This is an unprofessional translation from Romanian language into English the original document of the Romanian Academy (1891).

slavery was strictly related to the economy and social structure – feudal – of Romanian societies at that time:

“The situation which we defined as slavery in this case of Roma groups belonging to the prince, representing in fact, I repeat, just a sort of administrative and fiscal dependence, involved less (or even not at all) personal humiliating dependence known as slavery. Even more, Roma’s daily life was better, from certain aspects, then that of Romanian peasants living in the same area, because these were more bounded to the land and stronger exploited, while the nomad Roma were free to move all around the country and their skills were good evaluated. Roma, which truly lived in slavery, were those that belonged to land owners: nobles and monasteries (Gheorghe:1983)

Kogalniceanu mentions within his speech, as well, the highly economic importance of the slavery for the development of Romania, stresses along others that “they constitute a great income for the state budget” (Kogalniceanu, 1891), which conduct us to the following analyze.

b. Cost of the slaves work

247.249.700.235 Euro - rough calculation of the Romanian state debts to Roma during slavery.

This is an estimative, rough calculation, of the unpaid work of Roma slaves during five centuries. This calculation is not based on economic methodology of calculation, do not takes into consideration the inflation or economic values of services over the time or any other economic aspects. As well, the surviving costs of the slaves are not calculated as the cost investment of the slaves-owners – if this should be accounted and considered. The counting bellow is an illustration of a potential direct contribution of Roma over the centuries as slaves, analyze that needs to be carried further by economists or other scholars interested in the subject.

$266.335 \text{ (slaves)} \times 471 \text{ (years)} \times 365 \text{ (days)} \times 5.4 \text{ Euro (minimum per day)} = 247.249.700.235 \text{ Euro.}$

The figures within the economical counting exercise of the human resources under the slavery are based on the following facts:

Number of Roma under slavery – in the article published by Venera Achim (2005) on statistic on Roma from Romanian Principalities between 1830 and 1860, at the abolition of slavery, the number of Roma inhabitants, due to official data and estimation, was approximate 266.335 persons (Walachia 166.335 Roma and aproximate 100.000 Roma in Moldova).

Slavery period - 1385 – 1856 = 471 years

Cost of the working day – According to the Romanian Government, Ministry of Finances², in 2012, the minimum wage is 162 Euro/month, which divided to 30 days (since slaves had no vacation or free days) makes 5.4 Euro per day as acceptable for survival. For sure these data are inaccurate and subjective, used only for a social representation of the impressive contribution of Roma to the development of Romania. Moreover, this figure – 5.4 Euro/working-day represents subject of analyze with specialized economic methodology of evaluation of the costs on services of some centuries ago.

However, if we agree with this imaginary exercise and accept the final figure – the cost of human resources as 247.249.700.235 Euro - we can easily notice that this amount is double than Gross Domestic Product of Romania from 2010, which, according to INS (The National Institute of Statistic, Romania), is 122.000.000.000 Euro. Although the total amount calculated with noneconomic methods is not accurate, at this stage it can give us the dimension of the contribution of Roma to modern Romania, with their own hands and skills. In fact, nowadays, according to the World Bank Report “Economic Costs of Roma Exclusion” (2010), if states with a large population of Roma like Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia etc would make efforts to include Roma on the labor markets, the economic growth would be visible in present and, as well, will ensure the future labor, as Roma population is one of the youngest in Europe. Therefore, the report estimates that, if Roma would be on the labor market, Europe will have a:

“lower bound estimates of annual productivity losses range from 231 million Euro in Serbia, 367 million Euro in the Czech Republic, 526 million Euro in Bulgaria, to 887 million Euro in Romania. Lower bound annual fiscal losses range from 58 million Euro in Serbia, 202 million Euro in Romania, 233 million Euro in the Czech Republic, and 370 million Euros in Bulgaria. Using other Roma population estimates (UNDP, 2006), the economic losses for the

² <http://static.anaf.ro/static/10/Vrancea/Preciz-sal-min-2012.pdf>

four countries combined are as much as 5.7 billion Euros annually, and the fiscal losses 2 billion Euros annually” (WorldBank, 2010, p.1).

c. The cultural impact of slavery

Roma were slaves de facto and juridical only in the Romanian Principalities. As I have already mentioned, the origins of the slavery are still a matter to be discussed and supported by documents or any other evidence. As well, at the moment we do not have data about Roma social structures and identities before enslaving process (not known as well). The information on the origins of Roma is relying exclusively on linguistic studies. In Romania, the contemporary Roma are divided in subgroups, clans in the anthropological sense, by their ancestral profession. The most relevant element of identification of Roma as being part of a group is related to the clan (professional subgroup), even that most of them are not practicing their traditional professions anymore. According to the study coordinated by Ana Ivasiuc, Ana Chiritoiu and Ciprian Necula, unpublished yet, for most of the Roma the traditional profession does not mean only an occupation, but a cultural code unique to that clan. Nea Ion, a Roma blacksmith from south Romania told us, during an interview from 2010, the following: “My dad died in 1947 after an injury from the Second World Word killed him. He was fighting for Romania and left behind a family of 4 children. I was the older one, so I took the responsibility of supporting my family. I went for 3 years in a blacksmith workshop to learn better the profession and I manage to become one of the appreciated blacksmiths in my village. Then, my mother decided that I should marry and have my own family. So, I went to a blacksmith family from another village and I took a test supervised by my future father-in-law in a blacksmith workshop, showing what I am able to do. Then, after I passed the test, I could see and talk to Maria – my actual wife” (Nea Ion, Roma blacksmith, 2010). This extract from an interview with a Roma blacksmith shows the relevance of the profession within Roma communities. Having the same profession as his father-in-law and proving that he knows the techniques, allowed him to get married as he demonstrated his capacity to support a family. Nea Ion, as he stated, did not wanted to marry a Roma from other group and, moreover, he believed that he would not be accepted”: “how to demonstrate that I am skilled to a woodworker?” (Nea Ion, Roma blacksmith, 2010). The division of Roma in subgroups is a direct effect of the slavery and the way they are divided today could be an effect of how they were organized by the

slave owners. The classification of the Roma slaves only by the type of ownership is not enough to explain how this period and social status affected the identity of Roma community. Therefore, we should understand the way slaves were organized in subgroups and clans, serving the interests of their owners. As historian Viorel Achim noticed as well:

“classifying the Gypsies according to which of the three categories of feudal masters they served tells us little about the occupational and cultural diversity of this population. The Gypsies were far from constituting a homogeneous group. The tableau presented by the Gypsy population during the Middle Ages was particularly varied. Spread throughout the country in relatively large numbers, the Gypsies formed distinct groups that were specialized in certain occupations, with their own cultural and ethnographical characteristics and sometimes even speaking their own separate dialects” (Achim, 2004, p. 33).

Therefore, this occupational division and occupational identity of Roma from Romania is one of the strongest characteristic of the Roma individuals. And, the fact that this division is a phenomenon only in the case of the Romanian Roma, has to do with local history of Roma groups, slaves belonging to different owners. The process of splitting Roma into different production groups based on economic needs of that time was a necessity for the slave-owners and had a permanent impact on Roma community.

“(…) this gradual slaving process affected in different degree the divers occupational categories of groups of Roma. Yet, the domestic Gypsies (royal Gypsies), were more free than those that belong to monasteries and nobles. Also, the monasteries’ Gypsies were exploitated and treated worst than the nobles’Gypsies, because the monasteries had less local peasants to work their fields. Among nobles’Gypsies, those how worked in agriculture (field Gypsies) had an worst life than the nobles “servant Gypsies”(court Gypsies). Among those of the last category were many traders, which were generally better treated, etc. A large number of Roma lived in cities, having there for an easier access to urban resources, than the rural areas living population. And certain Roma groups became sedentary by slavery’s force, even if their largest part kept the nomad way of life. All this differences influenced in a significant way the social concrete dynamic and the culture of different groups of Roma. What is extraordinary in Roma’s history in Romanian Principalities is the fact that, in spite of the hard conditions of life, they managed to maintain, to reproduce and to enrich their cultural heritage and distinctive identity. But, of course, there were variations from one group to an other concerning their distinct cultural customs and the intensity of

their identification as Roma. Part of these variations may be attributed to their ancestors experience as slaves, to which we have prior referred” (Gheorghe: 1983)

The impressive diversity of Roma groups, the fact that Roma members are closely related to the clan members, but not all Roma member, the fact that marriages are organized mostly inside of the clans are the effects of a long history of separation. During the slavery period, different Roma groups developed different cultures, different linguistic dialects, different social organization and different principles and values, in a way that today for Roma social and political activists is impossible to refer to Roma community as being a single one. Slavery managed to split Roma from Romania in divers communities that share some cultural characteristics, but not enough for political or any other type of solidarity. Between the groups, Roma individuals tend to develop especially *commercium* relationships, less *commensalitas* and, very few of *connubium* relationships. As a reaction to the diversity and social distance between Roma groups, Roma elits developed so called „The Romaniphen”, a series of principles that intends to unify Roma within a single group – the Roma nation. In other words, one of the preoccupations of Roma social and political movment is to recover the status of Roma before the slavery period, at European level. Therefore, the European Roma and Travellers Forum, an international representative organization of Roma at European level, gives a definition of what Roma is in its Charter of the Rights of the Roma (2009): “who avows oneself to the common historical Indo-Greek origin, who avows oneself to the common language of Romanes, who avows oneself to the common cultural heritage of the Romanipe” (ERTF: 2009). In this way, Romanipeⁱⁱⁱ plays an important role in the European construction of Roma nation, eliminating the cultural differences between Roma groups and promoting commune principles of all Roma groups. More information on Romanipen is available in annexes.

Definitely, the structure of the Roma community from Romania, the largest in Europe, has been affected by the slavery period, transforming over the years a culture in other divers cultures. This is the cultural cost paid by Roma for the slavery period – diversity.

d. The social cost of slavery – marginality and social gap

The emancipation of the slaves was one of the most important principles of the modernization of Romania. The process of modernization had a price paid by slaves and state for the freedom of the “*tigani*”. The slaves obtained the status of free people and nothing else, as other priorities, like dealing with the peasants, were more important for the Romanian elite at that time. As Viorel Achim states:

“The laws that enacted the emancipation of the enslaved Gypsies secured the legal status of freemen for their beneficiaries and settled the issue of the compensation that their erstwhile owners were to receive from the State Treasury” (Achim: 2004: p 112).

A high number of Roma did not know what to do with their freedom and continued to work for previous owners in their traditional occupations or agriculture. From economical perspective, they became assimilated taxpayers to the peasants. The settling of the Roma became one of the main preoccupations in both Principalities: “the main goal of the law was in fact to settle (sedentarise) this category of population. The policy of settling Gypsies in villages and houses actually preceded the legislation abolishing slavery. In the 1840s and ’50s, the governments of the two principalities and the county and district authorities adopted a series of measures to this end. In this way, there was particular interest in the settlement in villages of Gypsy blacksmiths” (Achim: 2004, p 113). Other Roma groups kept a nomadic lifestyle inside the boundaries of Walachia and Moldova or abroad (especially Kaldarash). Some Roma entered in possession of lands and settled down at the margins of villages and formed small communities, usually people belonging from the same subgroup. However, the situation of Roma did not change considerably once with abolition of slavery in the Romanian Principalities. Roma managed to get the juridical status of a human being and taxpayer, which, in fact, ironically turned Roma into deeply unfavorable condition than before. Roma were the poorest of the poorest, uneducated, without a culture of property and struggled to be accepted as human beings not only juridical, but social as well:

“The fact that the Gypsies lived at the edge of the village, and that they buried their dead at the edge of the cemetery is indicative of the position they occupied in the respective community and in society as a whole. It was at this time that the marginalization of the Gypsies in Romania from a social point of view took place. Romania entered the modern era with this social component present as a relic of its past” (Achim: 2004, p119)

The way that the slaves' emancipation took place in the XIX century had an important fingerprint in the social evolution of Roma in the following centuries. The marginal communities established in mid-nineteen century can be identified today, some of them living in poverty and facing social exclusion:

“Emancipation from slavery in the mid-nineteenth century did not secure their complete integration into modern Romanian society, due to the nature of the conditions in which it took place. They have continued to occupy, even until the present day, a marginal social position” (Achim: 2004, p1).

And, moreover, the reminiscences of the slavery period still reflect today into the ghettoisation of some Roma communities, discrimination on public services, social exclusion and marginality. Even the name given to this group and the presence of a continuous debates on this subject, including some parliamentary initiatives, shows that the social perception of Roma of the Romanian population, especially public servants, did not abolished as in the case peasants of rumuni, the local peasants from Walachia, as Nicolae Gheorghe states:

Their ethnic derogatory name-Gypsy had the social significance of slave, a subordinate and inferior social category. Something similar was true, also, for the local slaves, whom ethnic name “ruman” designated in Romanian Country the dependent peasants with no land, while the land owner class, from the same ethnic package, was identificated with the political elite foreign from the Turks, or with their cosmopolitan, Greek, civil servants. Later the name of “ruman” transformed in Romanian (Gheorghe:1983)

Therefore, the social condition of some Roma groups, social exclusion and marginality find some of its origins one and a half century ago, once with the abolition of slavery and lack of a coherent program of social integration of the slaves.

e. Conclusion

Involuntary, Roma contributed to the development of Romania from economical and technological perspective. Their contribution during the slavery period is not publically known since the existence of general information on slavery in Romania seems a taboo subject still. The illustrative counting presented above, in the chapter b - *Cost of the slaves work* - shows that Roma, from their inferior positions for five centuries, provided an important economical development of the two principalities, as human resource and

technology. Roma were never compensated for the slavery period, neither financial, neither moral as in Romania we do not have institutions of memory related to the episode of Roma slavery (museum of Roma history in Romania, Roma presence into history manuals it is insignificant, monuments, public commemoration or other).

The cultural impact of the slavery period is the one that determines social dynamics of the contemporary Roma. There is no possibility to talk about Roma culture, but Roma cultures. The strongest identity of a Roma individual is related to the clan culture and values, ethnicity, being relative. Therefore, nowadays, Roma community is structured on clans identity as: blacksmiths (fierari), coppersmiths (kaldarash), wood workers (rudari), musicians (lautari), bear handlers (ursari), etc. The relationship between the clans' members are limited and, sometimes, controversial. Roma clans have different values, traditions and principles and are unified only by acknowledgement of the same origins, language (but using different dialects) and the perception of the "others". The direct link to the slavery period for the current cultural diversity of Roma is that this situation is a phenomenon existent only in Romania, the only space where Roma community was enslaved and the only country with such a high diversity of this ethnic group. Roma communities did not share the same experiences during slavery, occupations and local history impact on the lifestyle principles of each group. The cultural diversity of Roma has the origins in the slavery period of these people.

The social impact of the abolition of the slavery was mostly negative for nearly all of Roma groups since they had the legal status of a freeman, become taxpayers and without a coherent social integration program, a socially confused mass. Some of the Roma groups established settlements at the margins of rural or urban areas and, as well, some other groups decided to live a nomad lifestyle inside and abroad the Romanian Principalities. This situation is perpetuated up to now, relevant social changes occurred during the communist regime, but not enough for the elimination of social gap or to overcome the marginality of the Roma.

f. References

- Achim, Venera. *Statistica țiganilor în Principatele Române în perioada 1830-1860. Revista Istorică*, S.N., XIV (2005), 5-6, p. 97-122.
- Achim, V. *Tigani în istoria României*. București: Editura Enciclopedică, 1998. [II ed. - Achim, V. *The Roma in Romanian History*. Budapest - New York: Central European University Press, 2004.]
- Chelcea, I. *Tigani din România. Monografie etnografică*. București: Imprimeria Institutului Statistic, 1944.
- Crowe, D. "The Gypsy Historical Experience in Romania." - In: Crowe, D., Kolsti, J. (Eds.). *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1991.
- Crowe, D.
- Fraser, A. *The Gypsies*. Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell, 1992.
- Gaster, M. "Bill of Sale of Gypsy Slaves in Moldavia." - In: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Ser. 3, 1923, Vol. 2, No. 2; 1930, Vol. 9, No. 4.
- Gheorghe, N. "Origin of Roma's Slavery in the Romanian Principalities." - In: *Roma*, 1983, No. 7.
- Hancock, I. *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution*. Ann Arbor: Karoma, 1987.
- Hancock, I. *We are the Romani people. / Ame sam e Rromane džene*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2002.
- Iorga, N. "Originea lui Ștefan Răzvan." - In: *Analele Academiei Române*, S. III, T. XI, 1930.
- Kogălniceanu, M. *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des Cigains, connus en France sou le nom de Bohémians*. Berlin, 1837. [II ed. - In: *Opere* 1. București: Editura Academiei RSR, 1946.]
- Kogălniceanu, M. *Dezrobirea țiganilor. Stergerea privilegiilor boierești. Emanciparea Țăranilor. Discurs rostit în Academia Română*. București, 1891.
- Panaiteșcu, I. C. *Robii. Aspecte țiganești. Originea, viața, ocupațiunile, obiceiurile, datinile, moravurile și dezrobirea lor*. București, 1928.
- Panaiteșcu, P. N. "The Gypsies in Wallachia and Moldavia: A Chapter of Economic History." - In: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Ser. 3, T. 20, 2.

Potra, G. *Contributiuni la istoricul Tiganilor din România*. București: M. O. Imprimeria Nationala, 1939.

Annexes

ⁱ The official and estimated number of Roma (2012), Council of Europe (doc available at <http://hub.coe.int/web/coe-portal/roma/>)

Document prepared by the Support Team of the Special Representative of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe for Roma Issues							
Updated on 2 July 2012. Most estimates include both local Roma + Roma-related groups (Sinti, Travellers, etc.) & Roma migrants. See details in "Sources".							
Country	Total population (World Bank 2010)	Official number (self-declared)	Census year	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimate	Average estimate (CoE used figure)	Average estimate as a % of total population
Turkey	72.752.325	4.656	1945	500.000	5.000.000	2.750.000	3,78%
Romania	21.442.012	619.007	2011	1.200.000	2.500.000	1.850.000	8,63%
Russian Federation	141.750.000	205.007	2010	450.000	1.200.000	825.000	0,58%
Bulgaria	7.543.325	325.343	2011	700.000	800.000	750.000	9,94%
Hungary	10.008.703	190.046	2001	500.000	1.000.000	750.000	7,49%
Spain	46.081.574	No data available		500.000	1.000.000	750.000	1,63%
Serbia (excl. Kosovo *)	7.292.574	108.193	2002	400.000	800.000	600.000	8,23%
Slovak Republic	5.433.456	89.920	2001	380.000	600.000	490.000	9,02%
France	64.876.618	No data available		300.000	500.000	400.000	0,62%
Ukraine	45.870.700	47.917	2001	120.000	400.000	260.000	0,57%
United Kingdom	62.218.761	No data available		150.000	300.000	225.000	0,36%
Czech Republic	10.525.090	11.718	2001	150.000	250.000	200.000	1,90%
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia "	2.060.563	53.879	2002	134.000	260.000	197.000	9,56%
Greece	11.319.048	No data available		50.000	300.000	175.000	1,55%
Italy	60.483.521	No data available		120.000	180.000	150.000	0,25%
Albania	3.204.284	1.261	2001	80.000	150.000	115.000	3,59%
Republic of Moldova	3.562.062	12.271	2004	14.200	200.000	107.100	3,01%
Germany	81.702.329	No data available		70.000	140.000	105.000	0,13%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.760.149	8.864	1991	40.000	76.000	58.000	1,54%
Portugal	10.642.841	No data available		34.000	70.000	52.000	0,49%
Sweden	9.379.116	No data available		35.000	65.000	50.000	0,53%
Belarus	9.490.500	9.927	1999	25.000	70.000	47.500	0,50%
the Netherlands	16.612.213	No data available		32.000	48.000	40.000	0,24%
Ireland	4.481.430	22.435	2006	32.000	43.000	37.500	0,84%
Kosovo *	1.815.000	45.745	1991	25.000	50.000	37.500	2,07%
Austria	8.384.745	6.273	2001	20.000	50.000	35.000	0,42%
Croatia	4.424.161	9.463	2001	30.000	40.000	35.000	0,79%
Poland	38.187.488	12.731	2002	15.000	50.000	32.500	0,09%
Belgium	10.879.159	No data available		20.000	40.000	30.000	0,28%
Switzerland	7.825.243	No data available		25.000	35.000	30.000	0,38%
Montenegro	631.490	8.305	2011	15.000	25.000	20.000	3,17%
Country	Total population (World Bank 2010)	Official number (self-declared)	Census year	Minimum estimate	Maximum estimate	Average estimate (CoE used figure)	Average estimate as a % of total population
Latvia	2.242.916	8.517	2011	9.000	16.000	12.500	0,56%
Finland	5.363.624	No data available		10.000	12.000	11.000	0,21%
Norway	4.885.240	No data available		4.500	15.700	10.100	0,21%
Slovenia	2.052.821	3.246	2002	7.000	10.000	8.500	0,41%

<i>Lithuania</i>	3.320.656	2.571	2001	2.000	4.000	3.000	0,09%
<i>Denmark</i>	5.544.139	No data available		1.000	4.000	2.500	0,05%
<i>Armenia</i>	3.092.072	50	2004	2.000	2.000	2.000	0,06%
<i>Azerbaijan</i>	9.047.932	No data available		2.000	2.000	2.000	0,02%
<i>Georgia</i>	4.452.800	1.200	1989	1.500	2.500	2.000	0,04%
<i>Cyprus</i>	1.103.647	502	1960	1.000	1.500	1.250	0,11%
<i>Estonia</i>	1.339.646	584	2009	600	1.500	1.050	0,08%
<i>Luxembourg</i>	505.831	No data available		100	500	300	0,06%
<i>Malta</i>	412.961	No data available		0	0	0	0,00%
<i>Iceland</i>	317.398	No data available		0	0	0	0,00%
<i>Andorra</i>	84.864	No data available		0	0	0	0,00%
<i>Liechtenstein</i>	36.032	No data available		0	0	0	0,00%
<i>Monaco</i>	35.407	No data available		0	0	0	0,00%
<i>San Marino</i>	31.534	No data available		0	0	0	0,00%
Total in Europe	828.510.000	1.809.631		6.206.900	16.313.700	11.260.300	1,36%
Council of Europe (47)	817.204.500	1.753.959		6.156.900	16.193.700	11.175.300	1,37%
European Union (27)	502.087.670	1.292.893		4.338.700	7.985.500	6.162.100	1,18%

* All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

ii Extract from the Mihail Kogalniceanu discourse from 1891, Romanian Academy. “Contemporanii mei își aduc aminte, și aci am ca martor pe mai junele meu contemporan, pe colegul meu Alexandru Papadopol Calimach, își aduc aminte ce erau țiganii, sunt acum 50 de ani, chiar atunci când razele civilizațiunii moderne împlânzise moravurile în toate societățile Europei și când sclavia nu mai avea domiciliu decât în Rusia și din nenorocire și în România.

Legea țării trata pe țigani de lucru, vândut și cumpărat ca lucru, deși prin deriziune numărul sau individul se califica de suflet: am atâtea suflete de țigani; în realitate, și mai ales stăpânii care aveau puțini țigani, îi tratau mai rău chiar decât prescripțiunile legii.

Chiar pe ulițele orașului Iași, în tinerețele mele am văzut ființe omenești purtând lanțuri în mâini sau la picioare, ba unii chiar coarne de fier animate de frunte și legate prin coloane împrejurul gâtului. Bătăi crude, osândiri la foame și la fum, închidere în închisori particulare, aruncați goi în zăpadă sau în râuri înghețate, iată soarta nenorociților țigani! Apoi disprețul pentru sfințenia și legăturile de familie. Femeia luată de la bărbat, fata răpită de la părinți, copiii ruți de la sânul născătorilor lor și răzlețiți și despărțiți unii de alții, și vânduți ca vitele la deosebiți cumpărători, în cele patru colțuri ale României. Nici umanitatea, nici religiunea, nici legea civilă nu aveau ocrotire pentru aceste nenorocite ființe; era un spectacol grozav, strigător la cer. De aceea, povățuiți de spiritul secolului, de legile omenirii, un număr de boieri bătrâni și tineri au întreprins de a spăla patria lor de rușinea sclaviei.

Înainte ca chestiunea dezrobirii țiganilor să fi intrat în consiliile, în planurile de reformă ale ocârmuitorilor, ea a început a se agita prin însăși inițiativa parțială a stăpânilor de țigani. Mulți din aceștia, și numărul lor din zi în zi sporea, ori în viață, ori mai ales la moarte, își dezrobeau, își iertau țiganii. Întrebuințez cuvântul de iertare, pe care îl găsim în toate actele de dezrobire; dar reforma era prea grea, ea jignea prea multe interese ca să se poată opera cu înlesnire. Erau țiganii domnești și foarte mulți; aceștia

constituiau un venit mare în bugetul statului; erau țiganii mănăstirești și ai așezămintelor publice, ale cărora servicii intrau în trebuințele zilnice ale acestor comunități; erau, în fine, țiganii particulari, țiganii boierești, care constituiau personalul de servitori în curțile boierești, bucătari, vizitii, rândași, feciori în casă, slujnice, bucătărese, cusătorițe. Boierii cei bogați aveau chiar capele de muzici sau tarafe de lăutari. Toate aceste funcțiuni se exercitau de țigani; dezrobirea lor era dar combătută de trebuințele zilnice și casnice ale vieții familiilor, de aceea emanciparea nu s-a putut face decât treptat și sub două domnii, atât în Moldova, cât și în Muntenia. Întâia lovire care s-a dat sclaviei a fost legea emancipării țiganilor statului și a mănăstirilor. Dezrobirea s-a făcut mai întâi în Moldova de către domnul Mihail Sturdza, prin două legi din 31 ianuarie 1844, iar în Țara Românească de către domnul Alexandru Ghica, prin o lege din 1845. Această emancipare, deși parțială, era hotărâtoare și pentru emanciparea țiganilor particulari, rămași încă în sclavie. Toate mințile prevăzătoare au înțeles că ora ștergerii sclaviei de pe pământul românesc sosise și că dezrobirea țiganilor particulari nu mai era decât o chestiune de timp. Entuziasmul Divanului ad-hoc era numai înaintemergătorul entuziasmului general ce pe atunci însufla toată România pentru viitoarea sa renaștere. Dovadă, sutele de proprietari care au respins orice despăgubire acordată lor de legiuirea emancipatoare. Numele acestora au fost publicate și aparține iubitelui nostru coleg, zelosul nostru cercetător și colecționar, d-nul Dimitrie Sturdza, să ne înprospăteze memoriei și istoriei contemporane numele acelor care, prin o generoasă renunțare, au expiat păcatele lor și ale părinților lor de a fi fost ani lungi stăpâni pe suflete de țigani. Cu o mica mândrie de moldovean, să-mi fie permis de a spune ianuarie 1844, iar în București în 1847; cea de a doua, în Iași, la 10 decembrie 1855, și în București la 8 februarie 1856.

Reforma emancipatrice a avut în curând efectele sale salutare: afară de țiganii lăieși, care încă trăiesc în parte sub șatră, și afară de ursari, care fac încă meseria de a domestici fiarele sălbatice, dar totuși se dau lucrului pământului, mai toți astăzi din celelalte clase de țigani s-au contopit în masa națiunii, și ei nu se mai cunosc decât prin fața lor smolită și asiatică și prin vivacitatea imaginațiunii lor; altmintrelea noi îi găsim în toate clasele societății noastre.

Deși de la proclamarea emancipațiunii nu sunt încă îndepliniți 50 de ani, țiganii ne-au dat industriași, artiști, ofițeri distinși, buni administratori, medici și chiar oratori parlamentari.

Mă opresc aici. Sunt sigur că părinții noștri, dacă s-ar scula din mormânt, văzând progresele ce au făcut sufletele țigănești emancipate de dânsii, nu s-ar căi de reforma umanitară proclamată de ei.”

ⁱⁱⁱ About Romanipen (source: <http://sc2218.wetpaint.com/page/The+Romani+Family+and+Kinship>, accessed at 12.08.2012)

The Romani Kinship

Treatment

We will now proceed to look at how it is practiced at a macro level- in terms of inclusion and exclusion in the community. To do so, we have to refer to the "historical treatment" of the Romani in Europe.

Migration of the Romani led to mass settlement in Europe. Hancock (2001) highlights the plight of Romani people where they were enslaved for five centuries in Wallachia and Moldavia until abolition in

1856. More subversive practices in other parts of Europe such as ethnic cleansing, abduction of their children and forced labor. England and France were the chief culprits of these atrocities as they hid under the guise of the Enlightenment to carry out a brutal “civilizing” process (BBC news, 2009).

All this escalated into a genocide during World War II which was initiated by the Nazis. It can be argued that the Romani people were victimized as much as the Jewish during the period of the Holocaust. The intentions of the Nazi regime were outlined by Hancock. Hancock argues that the Romanis were a “racial” threat and it was the intention of Nazi leaders to exterminate them¹.

During the post-war period, more discriminatory practices continued.

The likelihood that the Romani had a common origin (with reference to its history), shows that it is possible that they had a common ground for culture diffusion which is independent of their migration. Literature on the Romanies has validated this claim by identifying a common Romani philosophy that pervades sub-ethnic groups. This will be elaborated later on by illustrating the nature of kinship between the Romani. The treatment of Romanies historically also resulted in the creation of centralized identity. Saul and Tebbutt illustrate this with the use of the national memory formation model. In the remaining sections of this page, we will be providing a description of the aforementioned issues and thus show the strong *inclusionary/exclusionary nature of Romani kinship*. We will also be highlighting *kinship practices* on a communal and family level.

The Philosophy of Kinship: Romanipen

Romanipen is a complex term of Romani philosophy, which is culturally constructed with reference to the historical discrimination, and prejudice that has been directed at the Romani people. Academics have traced the development of Romanipen back to the context of World War II, where it was a watershed event that accelerated the construction of Romanipen. The use of the holocaust of the Romani elite to create an imagined Romani history was to provoke a sense of ethnic solidarity across the Romani. The result was the invention of a tradition in which all Romani could identify with (Saul & Tebbutt, 2005, p. 219). Saul and Tebbutt the formation of Romanipen as a model of “national memory formation whereby there are three stages:

1. Construction of tradition by elites.
2. The creation of a rhetorical discourse related to this tradition which is directed at opponents.
3. The formation of an overall historical consciousness

Unfortunately, there has been much diversity in literature in defining what constitutes Romanipen, due it being an inherited framework of culture rather than a more concrete set of historically received rules. A kind of spirit, culture, laws and what it means to be a Romani are some of the strains ascribed to Romanipen. To reconcile all these descriptions, we will define Romanipen as a “way of life” which

embodies all these complexities.

As mentioned earlier, the Romani people are a fragmented ethnic group. Thus, it is erroneous to over-homogenize the entire population. Hancock cautions us from committing the fallacy of the latter, “two Romani groups may each deny that the other are ‘true’ Romanies” (Hancock, p. 20). Fortunately, Hancock offers us a hint in reconciling a form of similarity across the sub-ethnic Romani populations. He argues that there is a common awareness amongst Romanies of what they “are not”. Thus, an overarching attitude can be generalized to the Romani as a whole- there is a strong basis of inclusion and exclusion that is intrinsic to their philosophy. We will now examine how the Romani categorize themselves as *Romani* and *Gadze/Gadjo* (non-Romani people). These categories are based on their possession of Romanipen. In other words, non-ethnic people can be seen as part of the Romani community if they possess Romanipen. Likewise, ethnic-Romani are ascribed the Gadze identity if they do not possess the same philosophy.

Hancock describes this categorization as “an overriding factor of gypsiness”. Where the Romani perceive the world as a dichotomy based on the aforementioned categories. Gadze are framed negatively due to their lack of Romanipen. They are considered unclean because they do not observe the Romani way of “contact with other people or animals, the preparation of food, the washing of the body, crockery, or clothing, and so on”. As such, contact with Gadze is taboo to the Romani and only limited to business and television. In case of Gadze company, one’s balance must be restored with increasing contact with other Romani. Overall, there is a strong exclusion of Gadze within the Romani because gadzikanipe (non-Gypsy culture) is seen as a threat to Romanipe (Gypsiness).

Cultural Practices of the Romani (towards non-kin)

This conception of “gypsiness” results in the Romani having cultural practices and verbal reinforcement to maintain the boundary between the Romani and the Gadze. A way strong kinship bonds are perpetuated in most Romani communities is the duality of names which the Romani adopt. There is one unofficial secret Gypsy name and one official name for the avail of macro society (Mrushiakova & Popov, 1997; Hancock, 1991). There is a consensus in literature that the secret names function for the solidarity of Romani communities and are analogous to a form of kin names. These secret Romani names also serve to exclude non-Romani from their intimate social realm by denying them any potential access to the knowledge of their culture. Another example of this “shielding of the Romani population is the reinforcement of the stereotypical myths (literary images) by the Romani themselves. They prefer the idea of the Gadze believing in these stereotypes as attention is diverted from real Romani culture (Hancock, 1991, p.6). Having highlighted how kinship plays a role on a macro, societal scale, we will now be examining how kinship intersects with other cultural domains with its institutionalization in the family.

1. Nationhood

Albeit being dispersed throughout the world, the Romani people tend to have a sense of nationhood tied together by shared historical, cultural, linguistic ties, transcending physical territorial boundaries. The

Romani Nation is hence a non-geographical political, cultural and social symbol. Decisions affecting the Romani society are premised on consensus, even as age, gender, and kinship obligations also carry weight.

2. The Family

The family is a very important community and social network in a Romani child's life. The family and the extended kinship network serve as their primary socializing network. By including children in the daily activities of the community, they are inculcated with social skills and values as to how to respect one another. The family serves as a support system that is sustained through the life course, as a facilitator of marriage and as a platform through which the Romani education system functions.

2.1 Family as a Support System through the Life Course

2.1.1 Infancy

Babies are highly valued in the Romani society and are viewed as signs of prestige, blessing and good fortune to the family. Special exemptions and care are accorded to the baby during their first 6 weeks of life where they are considered to be ritually impure and vulnerable to illnesses. Until they receive baptism, which is a rite that is believed to remove their impurity, babies are kept away from adult men. Between age 5 and 12, children are also regarded as pure and innocent, unaffected by the Romani hygiene laws. The special care accorded to babies and young toddlers is reflective of the value placed on the new-borns in the Romanian society.

2.1.2 Childhood and Adolescence

At puberty, Romanian adolescents perform gender-related role. Romanian girls are expected to adhere to a series of socially responsible behaviors and norms. These behaviors are very much imposed by the family and are social expectations of the community. On the part of the family, the young girls are increasingly protected and certain strict and conservative measures are imposed to keep their girls unharmed. These measures include how they are no longer allowed to sleep with other children, let their hair down before men, remove their shoes before anyone, or even wash, hang out, or exchange their clothes with children or men. They are also expected to wear longer traditional Gypsy skirts. Romani men will place emphasis on respect and prestige that is earned through activities and performance of business skills, physical strength, loyalty, and sexual prowess. This is also seen later on, in adulthood, where fathers possessing the ultimate authority in the family. Fighting was also seen as a signifier of masculinity, through which status could be gained.

2.1.3 Family and Old Age

The elderly in the Romani society are treated with respect and reverence. They are perceived as people of wisdom, experience and knowledge. This respect is reflected in the ways in which communal decisions

are made, as well as their role as mentors in the apprenticeship of the young. While decisions affecting the whole community are reached mainly by consensus, the elderly's opinion carries more weight. The elderly in the community thus have the final say, even as other variables, such as gender, are also taken into consideration. Apart from communal decision-making, the elderly are also the ones expected to pass knowledge down the generations orally, sharing insights and intelligence, having understood the traditional customs and ways of life in the Romani society. There also exists an apprenticeship relationship between the elderly and the young. Given that the Romani children are expected to learn the ropes of contributing to the economy from a young age, the elderly are similarly obliged to impart skills and knowledge in this area. The children are often asked to tag along with their elders to acquire the skills and engage in the economic realm. Elders in the Romani society are thus valued and treated with much respect. With the children of the Romani society contributing to the economy from an early age, the elderly can also retire and contribute lesser as they age.

2.2 Families and Kinship as a Template of the Education System

The Romani education system is maintained by the community. From young, children are exposed to the socialisation of the community which interacts with the Romani, inculcating life lessons, values and norms of the people. The Romani education system very much serves to emphasize the independence of Romani children, prepare the child for a smooth transition to different life stages, the importance of social cohesion, as well as their obligations in the economic realm.

2.2.1 Education and Independence

The Romani education system serves to emphasize the importance of independence in Romani children. The traditional Romani education is defined by community education, where children learn by observing the economic, social, linguistic, political and moral codes of the society. Such a people-orientated learning environment is a distinctive feature of the Romani education system. The Romani children are socialised and trained from a tender age to be independent. Rather than executing physical punishment, conformity is encouraged through 'joking' in order to make children feel silly. This enhances their sense of autonomy and further prepares them for independence. Given this early independence and exposure to the realities of the community, life transitions from infancy to childhood, to maturity are ambiguous and viewed with relatively little anxiety.

2.2.2 Education and Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication

Verbal communication also plays a key educative role in Romani communities. Romani children are exposed to verbal and non-verbal communications signals from the community. It is a channel through which wisdom and knowledge is passed on, often from the elderly who is aware of traditional customs and has a wealth of life experiences. A case in point would be the way in which story-telling is used as a tool to impart social and communication skills. A crucial aspect of verbal communication skills is story-telling.

From early infancy, story-telling is used as a tool to educate and entertain, as well as to impart certain moral and religious values. Verbal and non-verbal communication skills are therefore key features of the Romani education system and enable a smooth transition between different life stages of the life course.

2.2.3 Education and the Maintenance of Social Cohesion

Also, the Romani education system serves to inculcate values associated with the maintenance of social cohesion. This includes the important idea that the needs of the Romani community precede that of an individual's need for social mobility. Given the nomadic and mobile lifestyle of the Romani, such an extended kinship network is crucial in providing the children with a sense of security, permanency and self-esteem.

2.2.4 Education and Economic Contributions

Due to the early and significant economic contributions of the children, the Romani education system also serves to allow for the acquisition of work skills. Romani children are expected to take up economic responsibilities and often take after the economic activities of adults in the community. From a young age, they accompany their family members on jobs and learn very much on the job. They are brought up and socialised into believing in the significance of their real-life economic contributions to the community.

3. Kinship Terms

The Roma speak a mixture of two subdialects, i.e. *mativaia* 'from Maciva [in Serbia]' and *kalderas* 'coppersmith' and have no problem communicating with fellow Romani regardless of their geographic distribution, which shows the homogeneity of their language. The difference between English and Romani kinship terminology can be attributed to different social arrangements as will be elaborated on later. As with all languages, terms that exist in one do often carry no exact meaning in the other. For example, there is no general person like 'John Doe' in the Romani language, rather, one must specify whether the man is a Romani man (a *rom*), or an outsider man (a *gazo*), woman (a *gazi*), boy (a *rakloro*) or girl (a *rakliori*). These terms used by the Roma are by no means pejorative and are merely for descriptive purposes, as a "matter-of-fact". Although semantically similar to the English language, the kinship terminology greatly differs when it comes to affines. Kinship terms with English equivalents are listed as follows:

Papo – Grandfather

Mami – Grandmother

Dad – Father

Dei – Mother

Sokro – Father-in-law

Sokra – Mother-in-law

Kak – Uncle

Bibi – Aunt

Pral – Brother

Phei – Sister

Voro – Male cousin

Vara – Female cousin

It should be noted that Sokro and Sokra, are terms of reference and never used as forms of address. There is no direct English equivalent for ‘husband’, ‘son’, ‘wife’ or ‘daughter’ in Romani because the term used for them ‘rom’, ‘romni’, ‘sav’ and ‘sei’, are also used to address Romani people who are roughly of the same age as their aforementioned kins. The reason for the separation of “us” and “them” by the Roma is because of their culture of ritual purity that prevents them from mingling with non-Romani. They are forbidden from sharing food or cooking utensils from the outsiders and do not bother themselves with anything outside the community.

Earlier, we saw that while English tends to be more general, Romani is more specific. It is the on the contrary now as we move on to Roma kinship terminology not found in the English language due to “collapsed” terms. By collapsed terms, I mean that the Roma lump together terms that would otherwise require distinction in English. They are:

Nepoto – Grandson; Nephew

Nepata – Granddaughter; Niece

Xanamik – Co-parent-in-law

Zamutro – Son-in-law(Daughter’s husband); Brother-in-law(Sister’s husband)

Bori – Daughter-in-law(Son’s wife); Sister-in-law(Brother’s Wife)

Kumnato – Brother-in-law(Spouse’s brother)

Kumnata – Sister-in-law (Spouse’s sister)

The collapsing of kinship terminology Nepota and Nepata emphasize the Roma’s collectiveness as a family. The Roma are primarily responsible for the economic and moral welfare of their children, following which that of their younger generation relatives should their parents become incapacitated, so there is no need for them to have different set of terms.

The term Xanamik, Co-parent-in-law, rests on the tradition of dowry. Though rarely used by the Roma nowadays due to the urbanization - resulting in nuclear families, this term highlights the equal status of both the bride and groom’s parents. Both parents are deemed to have gained in the exchange – the bride’s parents, money, and the groom’s parents, a daughter-in-law, as women in the Roma culture are the source of financial stability (Romani women earn money through fortune-telling or pick-pocketing of their non-Roma clients). As for Bori, the lack of generational distinction between both daughter-in-law and sister-in-law because both are useful women were “acquired by marriage” to the patrilocal household. Similarly, Zamutro is the complementary term used for the men who “acquired” these women through marriage.