



Introduction

Gypsy Economy

MICOL BRAZZABENI, MANUELA IVONE CUNHA
AND MARTIN FOTTA

The question of Gypsy economic practices and their relation to the economies of societies in which Gypsies live lies at the heart of many anthropological descriptions of Gypsy distinctiveness, resilience and even resistance, whether these studies focus on the social organisation of economic activities, on cosmologies of wealth and prodigality or on subjective orientations. Although examining the economic practices of various Gypsy populations ethnographically can enrich our understanding of the changing interrelations between the market and the state, the contribution of this ethnography has generally only been implied and its theoretical significance rarely explored. This shortcoming is at least partially due to a lack of works that put observations about Gypsy economic strategies in comparative terms (but see Reyniers 1998).¹

Taken together, the chapters in this volume argue that Gypsy economy is fully embedded in markets, that is, in a commercial economy mediated by money. Its existence illustrates the fact that despite modern intellectual, political and economic efforts employed to create 'the' market (e.g. Polanyi 1944; Hart 2000) and certain convergences of existing markets with the vision of 'the' market (Callon 2007: 349), the so-called market economy is best approached as a milieu of cracks, interstices and fissures on which people confer specific dimensions and characteristics through their creative actions. Ethnographies of Roma and Gypsy² communities are of particular heuristic significance because they describe a type of economy that is embedded in the modern economic system and created in relation to a milieu from which it cannot be dissociated, but which nevertheless cannot be fully characterised with reference to the modern economic system alone (such as being 'outside' it) without looking at the material processes that in each instance went into its fabrication. Since

such an analysis might disclose worlds different from those that scholars associate with the 'economic' (Çalışkan and Callon 2009), it forces anthropologists to think through the nature of major economic processes and categories used to analyse them.

Over the past thirty or so years, anthropologists have highlighted the specificities of the economic practices of various Roma and Gypsy populations (Vlach Roma, English Gypsies, Mānuš and so on), which have given rise to some important themes and debates (discussed further below). For instance, Judith Okely (1983) and Aparna Rao (1987), among others, described Gypsies as nomadic or peripatetic service providers and entertainers who make a living by exploiting opportunities not covered by the mainstream provision of goods and services. These authors also showed how to this end Gypsies manipulate stereotypes and impressions others hold about 'Gypsies'. The Gypsy preference for autonomy and self-employment has also been noted. Leonardo Piasere (1985), for instance, stressed that the refusal to engage in wage labour underpinned processes of identity construction, implying that their full absorption into the labour market could lead to their assimilation. Qualifying this view somewhat, Michael Stewart (1997) showed that even in socialist Hungary, where Vlach Rom were employed in factories, Rom gave an ideological preference to so-called *Romani butji* (Rom work), connoting deals in the marketplace that showed one's acumen and through which men constantly recreated themselves as Rom. This focus on personhood and the creation of proper social relationships (see especially Gay y Blasco 1999) highlighted the need for researchers to pay attention not only to the description of ways in which Gypsies deal with non-Gypsies and how this becomes a source of their ethnic distinctiveness, but also to the various ways that Gypsies conceptualise articulations between gender, money, work, ethnic belonging and even their relationship to the dead, as Patrick Williams (1993) and Elisabeth Tauber (2008) have demonstrated.

These analytical developments raised two sorts of question. First, how is the social reproduction of Gypsies ensured in the face of broader socio-economic changes? Second, how does a description of economic practices recognise the position of individual Roma and Gypsy communities within societies they live in, a position that includes racism and poverty, while leaving the possibility for acknowledging a 'cosmological choice' – a choice not in the narrow sense of volition but as a self-defining capacity to determine for oneself a posture vis-à-vis the workings of states, markets, money, bureaucracies, and so on within modern societies – through which each community seeks to guarantee its continuity? As the contributors to this volume consistently attest, such characterisations should emerge from ethnography, not as a preconceived idea.

Gypsy Economy

In a variety of ways, the ethnographic studies presented in this volume try to tackle the questions raised above, building on insights gained over the past three decades.³ The chapters not only describe different contextually specific ways of making money; they also take seriously Gypsies' frames of reference and motivations for their activities, while placing these activities firmly in the context of recent shifts in the nature of market societies – from the economic boom and expansion of third-generation welfare in Brazil, to the consequences of the economic crisis and the dismantlement of the welfare state across the Atlantic in Portugal. The concept of 'Gypsy economy', then, has to be seen in this double sense. On the one hand, it is a term that covers the economic practices and orientations of people belonging to various Roma and Gypsy populations (Gabori Roma, Brazilian Calon, Portuguese Ciganos, and so on) that for a set of reasons have been referred to and often refer to themselves as 'Gypsies'. On the other hand, it is also an interpretive lens through which to investigate how people position themselves in relation to the current economic system and to the changing nature of the roles of states, markets and finance, as well as of interrelationships between these, creating more or less viable modes of living (see Hart, this volume).

According to Keith Hart, the twentieth century saw a general experiment in impersonal society. Whether it took the guise of West European social democracies, state socialism or developmental states, Hart argues, its 'forms were anchored in national bureaucracy, in centralised states and laws carrying the threat of punishment. The dominant economic forms were also bureaucratic and closely linked to the state as the source of universal law. Conventionally these were divided according to principles of ownership into "public" and "private" sectors' (Hart 2012). Centralised bureaucracy, financial interests and (social) science, then, aligned to create a social world run according to impersonal principles (Hart 2000, 2005), sometimes referred to as the 'formal sector'.

As Hart (2006, 2012) notes, the concept of informal economy was coined to cover all economic activities that did not conform to these impersonal norms and the order they created. For those acquainted with the literature on Gypsy communities, it also is clear that many studies have described Gypsies as those who have somehow been excluded from impersonal societies' greatest achievements, including formal wage labour. Although the reasons given for this differ according to their proponents' theoretical orientations, they parallel those used to explain the existence

of the 'informal economy'. For example, anthropologists have described Gypsies as those who 'did not want in' (Gmelch 1986), who refused to be proletarianised (Okely 1983), who used economic strategies developed in rural areas to adapt to a life in urban centres (Gmelch 1977), who rejected the totalisation of the modern bourgeois order (Münzel and Streck 1981), who filled in the 'spaces in between' (*Zwischenräume*), which, although found in all complex societies, were seen as more problematic within modern ones (Streck 2008). On the other side of the Iron Curtain, meanwhile, socialist planners and researchers saw in Gypsies residues of the past, but also as people who through correct approaches could be turned into modern socialist workers (see Stewart 1993).

As Hart observes, today the twentieth-century experiment in organising societies impersonally is becoming compromised. The money system has reached such proportions that no state is able to control it anymore. The world economy has become more informal, with deregulation leading to more extreme and pervasive informalisation. In different spheres, the reduction of formal regulations has expanded economic relations and social welfare based on family and community relationships as opposed to those based on contract or entitlement. In this light, social relations have come to be valued as assets, and the notion of 'social capital' as a 'resource' has made its way into the discourses of governments and agencies, which promote the increasing displacement of regulations from the legal field to the moral field of personal ties.⁴ Ethnographers have provided evidence about the tensions and ambiguities that surround this 'resource' (e.g., Narotzky 2006; Cunha 2013) and how it can also compound inequality, domination and exploitation (Portes 1998; Smart 2008). These social relations are nevertheless critically important in what Loïc Wacquant (2008) calls the 'society of advanced insecurity'. The current economic crisis has increased the size of the population who are at risk of poverty, which has now reached the middle class. Shrinking job opportunities, declining state benefits, failing credit and short-term and casualised employment have also expanded uncertainty. Precarity is no longer a marginal condition, in the same way that uncertainty is no longer a particular aspect of specific ways of life (such as that of peasants); it is becoming institutionalised both as a fact and a project, a handmaiden of the entrepreneurial spirit, self-employment, flexibility. The notion of 'precariat' captures both the unstable conditions of transient labour and the states of anxiety, dislocation and risk that go with it (Standing 2011).

As far as instability, transience and elusive resources go, it can be said that this is 'the time of the Gypsies', to use the title of Michael Stewart's (1997) book. Permanent precarity – which one might associate with the

current state of ‘crisis’ – has been a normal situation for many Roma and Gypsy communities described in this volume for decades. This raises several questions. What are the material conditions and ideational elaborations (such as with respect to notions of scarcity or abundance, value, time, insecurity) involved in their resilience? Which creative economic strategies (formal and informal) do they employ to make a living? In which aspects of existence do they invest? How do they mobilise social, cultural and economic resources in contexts of vulnerability, indebtedness and financial volatility? How do tangible and intangible assets circulate both among them and between them and non-Gypsies? And, finally, departing from approaches that reduce them to a socially excluded and marginalised population, what do they have – as opposed to what do they lack – in this respect?

Extreme caution is nevertheless necessary in order to avoid creating a Gypsy comparative bubble that neglects taking into account how various other people act in similar circumstances, or, related to this, as Keith Hart points out in his Afterword, losing sight of historical situatedness. Furthermore, it is also necessary to avoid producing a free-floating comparison dangerously near to essentialism that focuses on cultural principles and worldviews detached from historical processes or structural conditions. Living for the moment, as Day, Stewart and Papataxiarchis (1999) have rightly pointed out, may be a cosmological choice that constitutes an active response to marginalisation and social exclusion. It is also true that among various people, Gypsies and non-Gypsies alike, a total lack of resources may hinder the very possibility of projecting a future and render acts of sharing or other efforts to engage properly in social relations a more secure and reliable investment than trust in economic returns (Cunha 2002; see also de l’Estoile 2014). Indeed, rather than denote a short-term orientation, this engagement can also be as much oriented to the future as other kinds of investments. Moreover, as Elliot Liebow contended almost half a century ago, living in the present may actually express less a present-time orientation than a realistic awareness of a particular historical future – a future ridden with uncertainty or loaded with trouble: ‘There is no mystically intrinsic connection between “present-time” orientation and [the poor]. Whenever people of whatever class have been uncertain, sceptical or downright pessimistic about the future this is one characteristic response’ (Liebow 1967: 69). We may add that this is what Horace’s famous injunction *carpe diem* actually meant: ‘seize the day’ – for the future cannot be trusted.

The two meanings of the term ‘Gypsy economy’, as we use it in this volume mirror Stewart’s double sense of the expression ‘time of the Gyp-

sies'. First, Stewart used it as a shorthand for Vlach Rom practices and ideologies – for instance, swaps and loans of things that expressed equality, or communal consumption through merrymaking that recreated the brotherly ideal – through which the Rom managed to remain Rom. Second, through it Stewart tried to capture the mood characteristic of the socio-economic conditions at a particular historical juncture (see Hart, this volume): In the socialist Hungary of the 1980s, the promise of a society run on impersonal 'scientific' principles had been exhausted. Hungarians became convinced that nothing could be attained by adhering to official procedures, and that their social reproduction increasingly depended on personal ties, on dealing and hustling. They felt that theirs was 'the land of the Gypsies' (Stewart 1997: 237).⁵

Undoubtedly, the attitudes of non-Roma Hungarians in the late 1980s also conveyed a dissatisfaction with these shifts in their lifestyle, for which Gypsies served as emblematic and convenient scapegoats. Today, too, crises of bureaucratic legitimacy, especially of the European Union (EU), of political representation and of economy, which are related to shifts in state–market relations, feed particularly aggressive anti-Gypsy populism (see e.g. Stewart 2012c). It is precisely because of these ambiguities apparent in the concept of Gypsy economy that we feel that understanding Gypsy economies – that is, how individuals belonging to various communities seen as Gypsies earn a living and make sense of their activities – could shed light on the predicament and strategies of an increasing number of people in present-day economies who have experienced state withdrawal, a repersonalisation of economic practices, presentist orientations, informal employment and even life-long precarity. In what follows, therefore, we discuss the questions of niches, marginality and personhood – the three main themes that repeatedly crop up in ethnographic descriptions of economic practices found among various communities of people seen as 'Gypsies'.

Interstitial Economy

To capture the character of Gypsies as economic agents, some scholars have used categories such as 'commercial nomads' or 'service nomads' (e.g. Hayden 1979; Gmelch and Gmelch 1987; Marushiakova et al. 2005). If they found any of the existing terms too exclusive, they have resorted to more descriptive terms, such as 'artisan, trader, and entertainer minorities' (Gmelch 1986), a label that also covered forms of scavenging, such as scrap collection. All of these categories have in common a focus on the

specialist role of Gypsies within the economy, and normally they appear alongside ecological concepts of 'niche' and 'adaptation'.

The concept of 'niche' highlighted Gypsy-specific insertion into the majority economy, within which they covered recognisable, albeit variously stable, economic specialisations. People were said to 'occupy' a niche, a result of their adaptation to the character of or changes in surrounding conditions (e.g. Gmelch 1977). In this usage, niche was seen as referring to 'mutable demands for goods and/or services that other communities consider inaccessible or cannot, or will not, support on a permanent basis' (Berland and Rao 2004: 4, emphasis removed). Similarly, Judith Okely (1979, 1983) understood the 'niche' of the English Gypsies to be the employment of skills to exploit a broad range of opportunities found in an environment where demand was irregular. In sum, scholars often portrayed Gypsy economic activities as occurring within pre-existent 'in-between spaces' (*Zwischenräume*) of dominant socio-economic orders (Streck 2008), with Gypsies 'adapting' to the surrounding society by finding, occupying, covering or exploiting such niches.

In the anthropological literature, such 'niche occupation' was related to the specific social organisation of Roma and Gypsy populations, as apparent, for instance, in the central position of households, the flexibility of bilateral kinship, and gender relations (Gmelch 1986). Its most systematic elaboration is found in the concept of 'a peripatetic niche', applied to non-sedentary populations of service providers (e.g. Berland and Salo 1986; Rao 1987). This term refers to a 'specialised mode of subsistence' or of 'resource exploitation', where mobile communities provide for geographically dispersed customers. In the words of Aparna Rao, 'the peripatetic strategy consists basically of combining spatial mobility and non-subsistent commercialism at the economic level with endogamy at the social level' (Rao 1987: 3).

Referring specifically to the concept of 'peripatetics', Leonardo Piasere recently observed that, like other concepts developed by social scientists to capture the character of Gypsy populations, squaring this concept with observable realities became difficult: Gypsies turned out to behave as sociological tricksters, escaping the category as soon as it was forged (Piasere 2011: 77). On the one hand, criteria used to define it (mobility, endogamy, symbiosis, marginality) had to be treated as continuums to accommodate internal variety (Rao 1987; see also Gmelch 1986). This raised questions about the usefulness of 'peripatetic' as a category. On the other hand, as Piasere argued as early as the mid 1980s, such approaches reduced Gypsy adaptation to economic and ecological determinants without exploring the meanings and social organisation that lay behind any 'peripatetic niche' (e.g. Piasere 1986).

This 1980s debate is telling, because it reveals one problem with existing approaches to understanding the specificities of Gypsy economic strategies. Terms such as ‘niche’ and ‘adaptation’ focus on the ‘demand side’ (that is, on consumers and gaps in the mainstream provision of goods and services). Studies starting with these conceptualisations take non-Gypsies as the point of departure, although they might document Gypsy awareness and the manipulation of stereotypes non-Gypsies might hold of Gypsies (e.g. Okely 1979). Rather than focusing on the majority ‘setting’ and Gypsies’ adaptation to it, Piasere (1992) proposes exploring the varying conceptualisations and forms of sociality found among Roma and Gypsy communities. His work, which described, among other things, different modalities of exchange and circulation among the *Slovénsko Roma* in Italy, and between these Roma and the *Ga e*,⁶ is one example of this kind of analysis (Piasere 1985). Another is Michael Stewart’s ethnography of the *Vlach Rom* in Hungary, the most detailed analysis of Gypsy economy to date, which showed how dealing among the *Ga os* in the marketplace was linked to the ways in which the Rom conceptualise the relationship between gender, fertility, money and work (Stewart 1997; see also Stewart 1994).

The contributors to this volume, while not ignoring the context (that is, the socio-economic conditions and ideologies of the non-Gypsies in specific countries), focus on, as it were, the ‘supply’ side of the niche: the conceptual apparatus and social relations behind economic practices. They try to understand economic activities in Gypsies’ own terms, aware that these might be radically different from those of the non-Gypsies. Our understanding of the concept of niche economy is therefore close to Jane Guyer’s elaboration of the term (Guyer 1997). Guyer sees any economic niche as a ‘specialist production’, with its product definitions and standardisations, expertise and replication, and as something fully grounded in a commercial economy; it is ‘a recognisable social form’ (Guyer 2004: 177). In fact, taken as a whole, the chapters show that if anything like a recognisable niche exists, even for a limited period of time, it has to be constantly recreated – what proponents of a performativity approach might refer to as framing and maintenance (e.g.  alıřkan and Callon 2010) – by the Gypsies.

For instance, money-making possibilities through migration often depend on the existence of specific regulations and formalities (such as EU citizenship) and do not represent simple ‘arbitrage’ across distances. Their specific form is therefore often temporary, but nevertheless connected with a recognisable conceptual apparatus, as Jan Grill’s contribution attests. Marco Solimene’s chapter shows how scrap-metal collection among

Xoraxané Romá in Rome depends on a constant circulation through the city by means of which ties with the Rome's inhabitants are maintained and differentiation from the recently arrived Roma from Romania are established. As these and other chapters show, movement and spatiality are important aspects of economic practices, albeit in more complex ways than the theory of peripatetic communities suggests. This is true even of those communities whose mode of living seems to be captured by the theory the best. Thus, drawing on her fieldwork among the Portuguese Ciganos who are known as ambulant horse traders, Sara Sama Acedo argues that it is productive to analyse Cigano economic activities as interstitial: while any Cigano interstice belongs to the socio-economic system that limits opportunities or codes territories, it emerges through concrete processes via which Ciganos confer on it specific dimensions, stability and consistency through, for instance, repetition and historical sedimentation or the naming and standardising of specific productive relations.

Marginal Economy

The authors in this volume are uneasy about describing the Roma and Gypsy populations and their economic practices as marginal in essence. While several authors describe Central European Roma living in extreme poverty in geographically peripheral communities or ghettos, they insist on each individual situation being assessed ethnographically without foreclosing the conclusions. This is particularly true today, when changing interrelations between formality and informality, the repersonalisation of economic practices and the replacement of regular employment with precarious forms, call for a reconceptualisation of what the rule or standard of organising society is (e.g. Hart 2000).

The chapters therefore focus on forms of social action to which Gypsies subscribe. They do not limit themselves to denunciations or to appeals to state and non-state institutions, and they avoid describing the economic strategies of Gypsies as the inevitable by-products of age-old discrimination. Such denunciations, which have proliferated in recent decades, especially in the form of expert policy assessments, while laudable and important, are successful only to a limited extent. Moreover, they limit the political potential of anthropology (cf. Turner 1979). Put simply, an adequate political response to the problems that Roma and Gypsy populations face should not result in treating people as passive victims by denying them their creativity and capacity for struggle in their

own terms. As a result of their primary focus on anti-Gypsyism, denunciations turn away from (functionally) positive ethnographic accounts, making anthropology itself politically irrelevant. They do not adequately reflect ethnographic research that consistently shows the range of economic strategies employed by individual communities to varying levels of success. For instance, while Hrustič's chapter describes chronic indebtedness and extreme levels of poverty among the Roma in Slovakia, who are uneasy with being categorised as 'Gypsies' by the non-Roma, Olivera's chapter suggests that Gabori in Romania are not 'poor' in locally relative terms, and that they embrace and 'reinvent' their Gypsiness.

Having made these observations, it is undeniable that the present volume comes out at a particularly difficult period for European Romanies (as well as for non-Romani Gypsies). In the last few years, Romanian Roma have been deported from both Italy and France, raising questions about the limits of the EU project, while Roma from the former Yugoslavia, who fled the region during the Yugoslav wars, have been deported from Sweden, Finland and Germany. In the past decade, Europe has seen the legitimisation of 'reasonable anti-Gypsyism' that condones policies and police practices targeting Roma (van Baar 2014) and, not unrelated to it, the rise of increasingly violent forms of anti-Gypsyist populism, which for the first time in modern history treats Gypsies as a 'fundamental source of national woe' (Stewart 2012a: xviii). As Stewart (2012b) points out, this anti-Gypsyism has to be seen in the context of the enlargement of the EU, where crises of legitimacy combine with democratic forms of engagement and identity politics.

At the same time, for most Roma, the restructuring of the economy in Central and Eastern Europe over the past two decades has meant the loss of employment, educational segregation and dependency on welfare payments. Several chapters in this volume describe the economic strategies of people living within such segregated communities and the dynamics of debt at the interface of state welfare and poverty (see Durst, Grill, Hrustič, Pulay, this volume). To be sure, the roots of the present situation, including low educational levels, have to be looked for in former socialist economies (Stewart 2002). For instance, as early as the late 1970s, Charta 77, an informal civic movement in Czechoslovakia noted that:

in the current situation, the powers-that-be need the Romani minority to remain in a position that it is now: uneducated, without clear prospects, and ready to move from one end of the republic to the other in search of unskilled work without knowing where they are going to live ... The demand for unskilled labour will then fall, threatening the Roma with massive unemployment which will expose this ruthlessly urbanized minority

to extreme pressures, and fuse their social ostracism and material oppression with a new ethnic consciousness, all the stronger and the more cruelly it is today suppressed. (quoted in Guy 1998: 32)

When investigating the position of specific Roma and Gypsy populations, it is therefore crucial to bear in mind the historical context of each country and region (see esp. Sama Acedo, Grill, this volume). Individual communities are integrated into the majority society in different ways (see e.g. Ries 2008). Speaking about Central and Eastern Europe, Stewart observes that '[t]he diverse forms of Romany integration in different parts of Europe mean that problems arising between Roma and non-Roma vary hugely' (Stewart 2012a: xxxv). The chapters in this volume attest to such diversity, which arises from different ideas about issues such as the meaning of work, the relationship between formality and informality, the nature of race and ethnic relations, and so on (see Stewart 2001).

Besides this contextual dimension, underlying our comparative effort is the understanding that the different characters of sociality found among Gypsy populations also play a role in the style of their integration. Individual Gypsy populations interact with non-Gypsies in different ways, a feature that, as Piasere (1999) has shown, is both a mechanism of their self-fashioning and a source of differentiation between them (see also Olivera 2012; Marushiakova and Popov 2013). This influences the ways they 'assimilate the Gadje', so to say; that is, how individual communities refract socio-economic changes instigated by non-Gypsies in the midst of whom they live and to whom these communities relate in distinct ways, and how through such assimilation they remain Roma or Gypsies. In terms of anthropological politics, this means, paraphrasing Terence Turner (1979: 5), that in opposing the absolute dehumanisation of current forms of anti-Gypsyism, we find it necessary to take positive account of the humanity of the Gypsies, that is, their forms of self-ascription and the capacity for action (from economic to cultural) related to these. These may or may not be identical to the hegemonic view of what ethnic emancipation should look like (see also Stewart 2013).

Here we build on a specific strand of anthropological enquiry. Alongside Stewart's description of how Vlach Roma 'domesticated' communist factory work, we find that several other studies have also demonstrated how Gypsy refractions of any given context can vary. Leonardo Piasere (1992), for example, showed that three populations – Xoraxané Romá, Slovénsko Roma and Italian Sinti – living among the same non-Gypsies resort to three distinct modes of 'resource exploitation'. In another study he analysed how the organisation of production and provision of services

can differ within a single Gypsy population residing in a single country (Piasere 1987; see also Ries and Jacobs 2009; Grill 2011). Patrick Williams, for his part, described the development of different modes of social and economic organisation within one Kalderaš Rom community network that ended up living in two cities (Paris and New York) in two different countries (Williams 1985).

As Judith Okely (1994) has maintained, if Gypsies are made into 'outsiders' at the same time as they differentiate themselves from the societies in which they live, then specificities have to be assessed ethnographically. Their perceived 'outsider' position can be seen as a limiting factor and as a result of discrimination, but it can also be embraced. Stewart (2001), for instance, has suggested that a lack of social belonging, coupled with the concomitant mistrust of authorities and of social norms, can become a source of liberty for those making a living within the informal economy, as it allows arbitrage across domains that the state, with its formal arrangements, and the majority society, with its notions of propriety, try to keep separate. Similarly, in a discussion about some of the chapters of the present volume, Radu Umbres noted that 'marginality', taken broadly as a positioning in relation to the state and 'formality', opens a space for entrepreneurship.⁷

Umbres also pointed out structural similarities between the activities of financial speculators and those of at least some Gypsies. Both groups of men (and the actors in this volume are predominantly male),⁸ work in a borderland between the official and the illicit, and are generally suspicious of bureaucracy and formal propriety. Both see themselves as especially attuned to their idea of a market, which they view as uncertain and as a totality largely beyond their control, but which is also a (conceptual) space of generalised opportunities for gain. Demonstrations of one's skill in specific transactions, then, become crucial. Risk turns out to be productive at several levels: it brings rewards 'in money, status, the elaboration of the social space of markets, and the construction of a masculine self' (Zaloom 2006: 93; see also Gropper 1991; Berta 2010). It comes not as a surprise, then, that, like Stewart's Rom horse traders (Stewart 1997), the financial speculators in Chicago and London described by Zaloom are 'in it' not solely for the gain, but also for the thrill that comes with it (Zaloom 2006: 105).

Zaloom also identifies four methods that make up what she calls the 'discipline' of a commodity-futures trader: the separation of actions on the trading floor from (their lives) outside; the control of the impact of loss; the discontinuity 'between past, present and future trades by dismantling narratives of success or failure'; and maintenance of 'acute

alertness in the present moment' (ibid.: 128). These parallel some of the socio-cultural mechanisms described for various Roma and Gypsy communities, mechanisms that can be seen as pointing to some common characteristics of Gypsy economies: living for the moment and being attuned to one's surroundings; separation between the 'outside', imagined as a given and dominated by non-Gypsies, which becomes a source of opportunities, and the 'inside', with morality linked to gender and sexuality; different modalities of circulation and exchange, distinct framing of actors and their relationships in transactions, and even distinct kinds of money and valuables that mark separations between one's family and immediate community, those strangers recognised as equals (and fellow Gypsies), and the non-Gypsies (e.g. Piasere 1985; Stewart 1994, 1997; Reyniers 1998; Day, Papataxiarchis and Stewart 1999; Fotta 2012; Tesár 2012).

Of course, we do not want to overdo the comparison between Gypsies and traders in financial institutions. We would just reiterate our earlier claim that in order to understand Gypsy economy one has to pay attention to the dynamics between the state and the market, formal rules guaranteed by laws, and informal arrangements. At the same time, as in the case of the futures traders described by Zaloom, the economic activities of Gypsies are intimately linked to the creation of gendered social persons. Here, the meanings, motivations and organisation of productive activities cannot be discerned solely from the nature of the economic system, but are informed by values and meanings arising from within Gypsy sociality.

To move away from men, take the case of Sinti in South Tyrol described by Elisabeth Tauber (2006). Among these Sinti, respect (*rispetto, era*) towards the dead structures social relationships and encompasses all activities, including economic ones. Sinti women specialise in begging and selling (*manghel*), an occupation through which they provide food for their families (Tauber 2008). Although some women are proud that because they earn enough money this way their men do not have to work, *manghel* cannot be reduced to its monetary aspect. Rather, through this activity and the memories it engenders, the women forge a link between themselves and their female ancestors, and recreate their feminine respect. The centrality of respect also explains why even Sinti women who are married to non-Gypsies and who have attained a higher level of education decide to 'go *manghel*' themselves.

Tauber's analysis, which holds that 'Gypsiness' is something to be continuously performed, embodied, is consistent with the observations of several other anthropologists. As Gay y Blasco recently observed, ethnographers have 'emphasized the performative character of Gypsy/Roma

identity, the fact that it is the person who, by his or her actions, enables the conceptualization of “us” as a group. Their work points, across a variety of geographic contexts, to a metonymic understanding of the relationship between the person and the community, and of the place of both in the world’ (Gay y Blasco 2011: 446). In the following section, we explore how such ‘metonymic understanding’ underlies economic practices and their meaning.

Performative Economy

The concept of ‘performance’ has been employed by different scholars in the anthropology of Gypsies for different purposes. As an analytical tool and an entry point it has been used to describe and interpret a variety of phenomena, such as relations between Gypsies and non-Gypsies and the ways the former (re)present themselves to the latter, the Gypsy manner of being-in-the-world, and the way in which individuals seek to remain Gypsies and forge themselves as proper social persons. Besides the ethnographies that have focused explicitly on performance arts, such as music, song, theatre and dance (e.g. Pasqualino 1998; Van de Port 1998; Lemon 2000; Stoichiță 2008; Theodosiou 2011; Silverman 2012), they have mirrored two principal developments within social sciences: on the one hand, they have described social life as a drama whose focus is the way in which social actors enact and represent their lives; on the other, they have treated performance as an ‘event’ and a ‘process’, showing how people and cultures produce their specific and constitutive performances.

The focus on performance in the context of Gypsy economic practices can be traced to the pioneering work of Judith Okely (1979, 1983). She described techniques adopted by English Gypsies that were fundamental in allowing them to master and become successful in their economic activities, namely, ‘knowing the local economy and the local people; manual dexterity; mechanical ingenuity; highly developed memory; salesmanship and bargaining skills’ (Okely 1979: 23). She also highlighted Gypsy ‘opportunism and ingenuity in choice of occupation, and their *flexibility in role-playing*’, through which they related themselves to *Gorgios* (non-Gypsies) in the economic and political domains (ibid.: 23, emphasis added). In these economic interactions, the Gypsies variously hid or advertised their Gypsiness, and just as scholars saw Gypsies as ‘adapting’ themselves somewhat to pre-existing economic contexts, they also described Gypsies’ skill in fitting into – and even internalising – stereotypes produced by non-Gypsies (e.g. Lemon 2000).⁹ Gypsies were seen as manipulating

non-Gypsy stereotypes, more or less tactically and creatively according to occasions, contexts and needs. A discontinuity is always implied between, on the one hand, Gypsies' representation of themselves to non-Gypsies through manipulating portrayals and attributes of 'ethnicity' and, on the other hand, the 'real' Roma or Gypsy way of being and living consistent with their 'ethnic identity', which differs from this presentation and impression management (e.g. Okely 1979: 33; Silverman 1982). Such a Goffmanesque perspective posits an analogy between everyday life and theatrical performance. At the same time, it is important to note that this approach makes a solid case for recognising the effects of social performances, which allow an individual to accomplish a certain task as well as to convey, manage and maintain desired impressions of the self in front of others.

A different approach to performance stresses the relational nature of the construction of personhood in an attempt to overcome the division between frontstage and backstage. It is inspired primarily by Judith Butler (1999), who analysed the construction of gender identities as embodied practices. Butler argued that the 'essence or identity that they [embodied practices] otherwise purport to express are *fabrications* manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means. That the gendered body is performative suggests that it has no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality' (ibid.: 173, original emphasis). Paloma Gay y Blasco explored the construction of Gypsy personhood in this manner (see also Ferrari 2010). According to her, 'Gitanos link Gypsiness to actions or performances rather than stressing essences or substances' (Gay y Blasco 1999: 14). The Gitanos of Madrid she described forged their identity around moral principles that were relational – ethnicised, gendered and aged – and their existence as a community depended on their 'ongoing enactment' by each person. Since Gitanos downplayed any disregard of the direct role of the past in the construction of identity, Gay y Blasco suggested looking at gendered identities here and now. Her aim was to describe and analyse the process of identification by which difference is generated (rather than merely expressed), a process that is inseparable from the content of Gitano values and the ways that these are objectified in the attributes of social persons (see esp. Fotta, Manrique, Olivera, Pulay, Tesār, this volume).

Micol Brazzabeni's recent study on the shouts and calls used by Cigano traders to promote their goods in open-air markets in Lisbon points to yet another dimension of performance (Brazzabeni 2015). Through shouting, Cigano vendors 'trade [common] stereotypes' (Okely 1979) about themselves, but also about their seemingly paradoxical op-

posite: the traders convey the idea that they are supporters of national identity and belonging during a period of economic recession. These stereotypes, however, also ‘do things’. Through such enactments, Ciganos place themselves in the world, handling a specific agency, as if this economic sector were a privileged and legitimate space within which to participate and make a statement. They act upon the world, with shouts and calls becoming ‘active objects’ capable of fabricating a ‘reality’ – in this case, a kind of ‘moral economy’ – about the local economic crisis, and suggest a proper response to it. Enactments, then, cannot be separated from what they do and from the environment within which they circulate (see esp. Ferrari, Solimene, this volume). In other words, for performances to have the desired effects, materialities – in the case of Brazzabeni’s Cigano vendors, the organisation of the marketplace, the impact of economic recession, the predominance of Chinese goods on the market and so on – matter.

These observations bring our vision of performance close to its meaning within the performativity paradigm (e.g. Callon 1998, 2007). Identities are constructed through and in the acts of individuals and depend on the materialities within which they take place, but they are never stable, only more or less successfully maintained and repeated over time. Where does all of this leave Gypsy economy? We have argued above that any Gypsy specialisation, as a Simmelian social form, arises through the replication, standardisation or repetition of activities and through a production of conceptual apparatuses related to this specialisation that allows for the interpretation of activities or for the establishment of causal relations. Many chapters in this volume demonstrate how, for instance, different activities are defined and fabricated by Gypsies, how they are named and how they come with specific criteria of success.

Michael Stewart’s well-known analysis of the Vlach Rom horse trade in socialist Hungary (Stewart 1997) is helpful for illustrating our conception of specialisation. He argued that for Rom a horse market is not a distinct sphere, but is instead subsumed under the idea of *foro* (marketplace, town) as a concept covering ‘generalised possibilities’ for dealing and for gain from the *Gažos*. The Rom frame exchanges in specific ways: they treat horses as commodities, and see themselves as able through their skills of speech to convince and dominate the *Gažos*. A deal is successful when they achieve a price that is good enough (that is, that allows them to at least buy a new horse). This success ultimately proves a Rom to be ‘lucky’ (*baxtale*). Stewart shows, however, that it is not possible to understand the success of the Vlach Rom in recreating themselves as ‘sons of the market’ with recourse solely to the criteria of neoclassical economics. Vlach Rom

see their efficacy or luck (*baxt*) as depending on their righteous behaviour prior to coming to the market place. They also distinguish 'selling' to *Gažos* from 'swapping' with other Rom that occurs after the *Gažos* leave the market and before the police arrive; in the acts of swapping, horses are not mere commodities with a price tag, but are symbolically equated with Gypsy women. In addition, one's ease of making money is objectified in one's willingness to spend money freely with one's brothers. In other words, a Rom is 'lucky' – which is essentially a Rom criterion for success – if he constantly reformats himself as a true Gypsy. Statements to the effect that true Gypsies are 'lucky' open the ethnographic enquiry to life-worlds that should not be constrained by ideas about the nature of the market or the economy. These statements reflect the Rom view of the world and organise behaviour. The statements are 'true' within the niche of the Hungarian horse market as framed by the Rom and within which they circulate – an arrangement that Michel Callon calls a 'sociotechnical *agencement*' (Callon 2007: 319).

Stewart made it clear, however, that this niche includes social and political features beyond Rom control (but on which they might nevertheless try to impose their own meaning): for instance, the Rom prefer the trade in horses to that in other animals because of its symbolism in relation to the historically constructed inequality between Gypsies and peasants; Rom men's participation in the trade was made possible thanks to money from state-sanctioned factory work; and they had little power over the organisation of the market (such as opening hours). This prompts a fundamental question: what happens when the existing Gypsy vision of, and statements about, the world, accompanied by a specific framing of agents, goods, prices, money-making situations and so on, fails to be successful, or when material characteristics change? Chapters in this volume provide some case studies. Contrary to his expectations about the Roma in Central and Eastern Europe, Grill did not find a concept of *Romani butji* explicitly articulated in everyday discourse among the Slovak Roma (see also Olivera, Solimene, this volume). Instead, elements that characterise the concept were incorporated in certain actions and dispositions in a way that made it possible to use factory work and the Roma interaction with authorities during the socialist era as events for recreating Gypsyhood. In his chapter, Fotta shows a process of negotiation of the content of core values among Calon in Bahia, which arose because today Calon money is made on 'the street' primarily through individualised moneylending and often hidden in banks from the demands of one's kin, possibilities that are ultimately linked to economic growth and to the financialisation of the hinterland of Bahia, Brazil.

Such an analysis of the economic activities of individual communities is consistent with what Leonardo Piasere called the ‘circumstance approach’ (*approccio della circostanza*), which characterises Gypsies as the ‘people of circumstance’ (*gente di circostanza*) (Piasere 1995: 22). In this sense, Gypsies could be seen as being involved in an incessant process of self-creation within the milieu they find themselves in with the ‘only fixed imperative to create themselves as different’ (ibid.: 22). For Piasere, this approach is best illustrated by Patrick Williams’s work on the Mānuš of the Central Massif, France (Williams 1993). Williams explored Mānuš inventiveness, initiative and imagination, and the related possibility of change and innovation (see also Williams 2011). Given the position of Roma and Gypsy communities in the societies in which they live, and non-Gypsies’ ignorance of the full meaning behind specific practices, the former are rarely able to impose and maintain their definition of economic interactions. Gypsy specialisations are therefore ‘open’, and unexpected events and situations might demand novel arrangements. This view of the forging of Gypsiness in economic performances goes some way to explaining the diversity of modes of social organisation, economic practice and related concepts found among the communities presented in the volume.

About This Book

While the importance of economic practices is well documented, works on Romani (as well as non-Romani) Gypsy groups tend to be monographs or collections of articles covering a range of topics and written by authors from diverse disciplines. To date, there has been little sustained effort to produce a comparative anthropology of Gypsy economy. Reflecting different traditions in the anthropology of Roma and Gypsies, the chapters in this volume look at the organisation of a variety of contemporary economic practices from different regions and countries.¹⁰ They are based on intensive fieldwork conducted during the past decade; as such, beyond any ‘data’ they might provide, they hopefully also convey the experiential aspect of living together that characterise anthropological ethnographies in particular (see Hart, this volume). They describe forms of sociality and the meanings behind varied economic practices, as well as the ways in which they contribute to the social reproduction of specific communities.

The volume is loosely organised around four prominent themes (see Hart, this volume): monetary flows; economic strategies and market

interactions; performance; and understandings of wealth and value. It opens with two chapters on usury among Roma in Central Europe, many of whom often depend on welfare payments for survival. In Chapter 1, Tomáš Hrustič contends that for many Roma living in segregated settlements in peripheral regions of east Slovakia, moneylending has become the only viable way out of poverty. Most Roma become at different times borrowers and lenders, using any cash at hand to tap into official flows of money. Lending and borrowing money, ranging from small cash loans between relatives to usury, plays a central role in personal financial life and social reproduction in these settlements, with the matrix of usury pervading the entire social system. Contrary to the non-Roma majority's moralistic representation of usury in the Romani settlements of Slovakia, Hrustič shows how, in a situation with virtually no possibilities of social mobility, usury can be advantageous for lenders as well as borrowers, although, admittedly, in the long term it opens possibilities for economic strategising and improvement only for a few, while severely limiting the financial possibilities of others.

In Chapter 2, Judit Durst deals with a challenging question: how does one explain the emergence of usurious moneylenders within a Rom community where communal life used to be based, in ideology at least, on egalitarian ethics (according to Michael Stewart), with people open to each other's demands? Her Graeberian answer is that mutual help can easily slip into hierarchy without anybody noticing it. In other words, usury in an impoverished ghetto satisfies a role of a hierarchical redistribution by means of which money that originates with the state (such as welfare) is spread out in time and made to last longer. Moneylenders are seen as part of the moral community because they 'help' when somebody is in 'need', and conflicts arise primarily when somebody tries to shun personalism and redefine usurious loans as impersonal business.

The next two chapters reflect on the historical dynamics that gave rise to specific economic activities. In Chapter 3, Sara Sama Acedo discusses how economic interstices created and maintained by travelling Portuguese Ciganos who continue to be involved in the horse trade can only be understood by taking into account the actions of the state and its ideological underpinnings, the history of interactions between various Cigano communities, and the dynamics of territorial exclusion and appropriation based on Cigano notions of relatedness. At the end of her chapter, describing the 'Nomads' Camp' in Évora, Sama Acedo shows how interactions between various pressures and interests can give rise to novel economic practices within novel geographical locations. In Chapter 4, Jan Grill also focuses on activities dependent on geographical movement,

this time across state borders, describing the oscillation between ‘hard work’ and ‘fixing up’ money practised by Roma from the east Slovak village of Tarkovce who have migrated to the United Kingdom. The chapter calls attention to a fact that is often overlooked in the anthropology of Gypsies, namely, that ‘hard work’, such as factory labour, is not contrary to Gypsiness. The case study also shows a level of historical continuity: the Tarkovce Roma were relatively successful economically and socially during the socialist era and, in comparison with other Roma in eastern Slovakia, were also successful in navigating novel socio-economic and geo-political arrangements after its fall.

Contrary to the Tarkovce Roma, who do not foreground the concept of *Romani butji* ideologically, Xoraxané Romá, who emigrated from the former Yugoslavia to Italy in the 1970s, mobilise this concept, which allows them to bypass the current biopolitical regime that turns Gypsies into Agamben’s *homo sacer*. In Chapter 5, Marco Solimene shows how ‘going for iron’ (that is, collecting scrap metal), as a practice encompassed by the concept of *Romani butji*, becomes a way to confirm Romá independence from the Italians and their difference from recently migrated Romanian Roma. The chapter describes how this activity, success in which is interpreted as proof of one’s ‘luck’ and of ‘divine favour’, depends on the constant working of specific territories and the construction of good relations with the Italians living therein. Still focusing on the centrality of space, in Chapter 6, Gergö Pulay draws attention to how Romanian Spoitari Roma who live in the most notorious ghetto in Bucharest navigate their social world in order to avoid becoming ‘dupes’. They achieve this by gaining material and symbolic value in managing ‘traffic’ and by becoming ‘businessmen’. Pulay goes on to discuss the values that give meaning to economic practices, and focuses on two types of exchanges: what the male ‘hang-out groups’ call ‘collaborations’ and ‘combinations’. Through the former they constantly recreate themselves as a community, while through the latter the rules and definitions of exchange are up for negotiation; as a result, combinations are more eventful, but also fraught with tensions.

In Chapter 7, Martin Olivera describes how the production and consumption of economic resources allows Gabori Roma in Transylvania to maintain and develop their material independence and symbolic autonomy from the non-Roma. Drawing on Sahlins’s model of the domestic mode of production, Olivera foregrounds the dynamics through which Gabori society manages to establish a logic of abundance and takes possession of the world. This is achieved by conceiving of men’s work as a *Romani butji*, which has consequences for Gabori conceptions of money:

unlike money from women's work, which is associated with daily subsistence, money from men's work is not treated as a means of exchange but appreciated for its use value. As such, money does not obey the logic of scarcity and becomes 'already spent' before it is actually earned.

While Olivera's chapter, like most here, focuses on men, Florencia Ferrari's contribution explores a female moneymaking activity that has fascinated non-Gypsies for centuries: palm-reading. In Chapter 8 she looks at how Calon women in the state of São Paulo, Brazil, conceive of this activity and manage interactions with their *Gaje* clients. By describing distinct levels of meaning and understanding, Ferrari unravels misapprehensions surrounding the palm-reading experience and traces assumptions rooted in different 'cosmologies'. The chapter argues that notions such as 'shame' and 'luck', or conceptions of time, are conceived differently by Calon and *Gaje*, which leads to tensions and misunderstandings about the meaning of fortune telling itself. Ironically, this turns the palm-reading event into an affectively intense encounter, affording it a potent symbolic efficacy.

The remaining three chapters connect Gypsy economic activities to their conceptions and circulation of worth and value. The Cortorari of Romania, for instance, who live scattered across several villages in Transylvania, invest in spectacularly large houses, built with money derived from economic activities facilitated by transnational mobility. In Chapter 9, Cătălina Tesăr takes up the question of the symbolism of Cortorari houses, and shows that for the outside world houses communicate Cortoraris' economic betterment and their quest for social recognition. For the inside world, however, houses participate in the symbolic construction of persons: they render their owners' achievements visible. Houses are associated with the most economically active generation – 'the youth' – and the seizing of new economic opportunities articulates with transformations of personhood across generational lines in relation to wealth.

Unlike the Central European Roma of the opening chapters for whom usurious practices are mainly internal to the communities, the Calon of Bahia, Brazil, make money primarily through lending money to non-Gypsies. Applying an anthropological theory of value, Martin Fotta shows in Chapter 10 that there are two major sources of social value that lie behind this practice. First, there is the 'shame, honour' (*vergonha*) that all Calon are supposed to have and that embodies their history as social persons. Second, there is the capability to create and control one's environment – one's 'strength'. Calon attain the attributes of social persons related to this value through creating self-other relations that are constantly traced in movements (of money, persons, households and so on); here, loaning

money is the major tool. Fotta shows that despite the Calon stress on autonomy and equality, values associated with Gypsiness are unequally distributed, and there is a constant struggle over their meaning.

Continuing with the theme of internal circulation and notions of personal worth, in Chapter 11 Nathalie Manrique provides a daring reinterpretation of Gitano society as structured by the logic of the gift. For the Gitanos of southern Spain, one's propensity to share wealth determines one's place within the hierarchy of living beings. The encompassment of interactions within the idiom of giving and receiving continuously confirms the ordering of individuals and groups into hierarchical categories, which, at the same time, are conceived of as 'natural'. Givers are held to be superior to receivers, and through such relations, statuses are periodically readjusted, wealth is rebalanced and equality among peers is confirmed. At the same time, this value dynamic, which prioritises generosity, undermines any attempt at personal accumulation and the hoarding of money.

Seen as a whole, then, this book attempts to provide snapshots from different angles of various responses to the current predicament faced by a population that has always maintained its specificity while being radically open to changes in the world around it. The authors are committed to shifting attention towards a Gypsy view of economic activities and they explore how changes in the societies in which they live are refracted according to the logic internal to Gypsy socio-cosmological orders. In this specific and limited way, the authors also hope to add to the knowledge of economic processes. This hope is clearly articulated in the Afterword by Keith Hart, which closes this volume. He argues that Gypsies can become a useful lens through which to explore 'the human predicament we all share at this time'. He also cautions that this is only possible if anthropologists refrain from studying Gypsies for their own sake, and instead remain conscious of the historical situatedness of their research and of their own ethnographic methodology.

It is our conviction that at the present time, when social scientists increasingly describe and advocate conscious economic experiments in order to create a more pluralistic and human economy (e.g. Callon 2007: 349–52; Hart, Laville and Catani 2010; Gibson-Graham, Cameron and Healy 2013), the anthropology of Roma and Gypsies – people seen by others (including scholars) as characterised by their economic practices and attitudes to exchange and money – highlights the fabrication of alternative life-worlds within modern societies, alternatives that are variously stable, but that may not draw a line around the 'economic' at all.

NOTES

1. We use the terms ‘Gypsy’ and its variations, as in the expression ‘Gypsy economy’, for the tensions the term entails, and we often shift between the views of specific Romani communities described here, of non-Gypsy majorities, and of social scientists. The term also recalls some earlier theorisations on the topic that were aimed at capturing specificities of the Gypsy incorporation into national economies (e.g. Reyniers 1998; Rao 2010). Certainly, we do not suggest that the concept of ‘Gypsy economy’ refers to the economic practices of each and every individual who identifies themselves as a Roma, Gypsy, Traveller or as belonging to any other Romani or non-Romani community sometimes categorised as ‘Gypsy’. Rather, it should be understood in a loose typological sense, as characterised by particular dynamics captured ethnographically in various ways by the chapters that follow. For the same reason, the term is used in the singular.
2. While the term ‘Gypsy economy’ aims to cover practices not only of the Roma, but also of Gypsies, Travellers and other populations, who often recognise that within their national settings they share similar niches and income-generating strategies (see footnote 1), all communities presented in this volume can be seen as ‘Romanies’ or ‘Romani people’ as they speak some form of Romani or Para-Romani. Currently, not all, however, identify themselves politically as Roma. While in some national contexts represented in this volume an equivalent of the English term ‘Gypsy’ has been rejected as derogatory (e.g. the countries of Eastern and Central Europe), in others it has been seen as less problematic and used as a term of political recognition and even of ethnic mobilisation (e.g. Brazil, Portugal and Spain). To capture this variety and to highlight that the politics of ethnicity matters on the ground, when talking about these groups collectively, we often use unwieldy ‘Roma and Gypsy’ communities (or populations, peoples and so on) in the plural and refer to their economic practices and strategies. The individual chapters in this volume use ethnonyms preferred by members of the communities they describe.
3. For a useful recent review, see Stewart (2013).
4. The sense of ‘social capital’ here follows Coleman (1988) and Putnam (2000) rather than Bourdieu (1977, 1980).
5. Similarly, Alaina Lemon (1998: 4) reports the words of a non-Gypsy Muscovite who commented about how he and his fellow intellectuals in Russia in the early 1990s – in the context of the rouble’s devaluation and the anxiety about value – were forced to turn to trade in order to secure dollars. ‘We are all becoming Gypsies’, the man said jokingly.
6. The term used by Piasere in the cited publication. A further note on terminology is needed here. Writing about the Slovénsko Roma in Italy, Zatta and Piasere observe: ‘For a Rom the Roma/Gaço distinction is the fundamental distinction; the Gaçe are the “outside” by definition. For a non-Gypsy, the Gypsy is an “other” among many, a “marginal man” among many, a bit of folklore among many; in our case, a thief among many. The perceptions are asymmetrical and they reflect the way of life of the Roma in respect to the Gaçe’ (Zatta and

Piasere 1990: 165). Put simply, while the non-Gypsies view ‘Gypsies’, ‘Roma’, ‘Gitanos’, ‘Cortorari’ and so on as permutations on the ethnic group theme, albeit of various levels of abstractness, for individual Roma and Gypsy communities the concept of “Gadje” and its variations is a categorical division of humanity, a specific figure of thought, a non-Gypsy alterity (see also Olivera 2012: 445–67). Although commonly translated as ‘a non-Gypsy’ (or non-Roma), from the point of view of individual communities, Gadje and its variants do not refer to a ‘group’ strictly speaking. Rather, it is analytically more appropriate to speak about Gadje as the ‘outside’ (Zatta and Piasere 1990) or a ‘given’ (Ferrari 2010), with ‘Gypsyess’ envisaged as fabricated, through a combination of various processes and techniques, in contradistinction against it (e.g. Williams 2011). How individual communities view this ‘outside’ depends on historical contingencies and each community’s unique socio-cosmological organisation (e.g. values and morality or the mechanisms through which the ‘inside’ is created). Thus, for instance, according to Stewart (1997), the *Gázos* (his spelling) of the Vlach Rom in Hungary of the 1980s had the attributes of a Hungarian peasant from the beginning of the twentieth century; clearly for the Calon of Bahia, a region dominated by sugar plantations and of slavery up to the end of the nineteenth century, *Gaje/Gajons* will have different connotations and will be related also to mechanisms through which the ‘inside’, the community boundary, is maintained. Because the ways individual Roma and Gypsy communities view Gadje matters for the shape of economic practices (e.g. by guiding interactions), the individual authors gathered in this volume use terms specific to any given community. These terms are in italics and spelt according to what the authors find the most appropriate. Similarly, whenever in this introductory chapter we quote other authors, we maintain their original spelling. The non-italicised term ‘Gadje’, as we use later in this introduction, is our construct-concept that refers to this non-Gypsy alterity in general.

7. Radu Umbres, comments made during the European Science Foundation workshop ‘The Two Sides of the Coin: Gypsy Economies Between the State and the Market’, Lisbon, 20–23 September 2012.
8. This is more of a coincidence, and for each case the gender (and generation) dynamics in wealth creation, maintenance and circulation needs to be assessed ethnographically. For instance, while male economic activities are often presented by both scholars and their informants as underlying people’s identity as Roma, Gypsies, Travellers or other, in other cases it is female activities that take on this role (e.g. Andersen 1981; Tauber 2008; Ferrari, this volume). Anthropologists have also documented family-based economic activities among Romani and non-Romani Gypsy communities, and the important contribution of women and children to income-generation, which becomes also crucial for maintaining flexibility and providing long-term resilience (e.g. Gmelch 1986; Piasere 1987; Helleiner 2003; Tesăr, this volume). These, however, might sometimes be ideologically downplayed (e.g. Stewart 1997; Olivera, this volume).
9. Recently, Aspasia Theodosiou criticised what she called the ‘new Gypsy ethnography’, that is, studies influenced by Okely’s work, for implying a kind of

- strategic essentialism and for ‘treating the dynamics of social identification as nothing more than strategic’ (Theodosiou 2010: 344). In the case of Okely, who also analysed the roles that pollution beliefs, kinship and social organisation played in Travellers’ social reproduction, Theodosiou’s criticism seems somewhat unwarranted. Nevertheless, her overall take on performance seems to us to point in the right direction. Treating Gypsy distinctiveness as performative should not end up reducing this distinctiveness to a mere consequence of the opposition with non-Gypsies, regardless of ‘where they are’ (ibid.: 329).
10. The chapters are, however, concentrated on the Central and Eastern European Roma (sometimes as migrants in Western Europe) and on the Gypsies that can be related to the Iberian world broadly speaking (Portugal, Spain and Brazil). Western and Northern Europe, North America or the Middle East are, unfortunately, not covered.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, R. 1981. ‘Symbolism, Symbiosis, and Survival: Roles of Young Women of the Kalderasa in Philadelphia’, in M.T. Salo (ed.), *The American Kalderas: Gypsies in the New World*. Hackettstown, NJ: Chapter, Centenary College, pp.11–28.
- Berland, J.C., and A. Rao. 2004. ‘Unveiling The Stranger: A New Look at Peripatetic Peoples’, in J.C. Berland and A. Rao (eds), *Customary Strangers: New Perspectives on Peripatetic Peoples in the Middle East, Africa and Asia*. Westport, CT: Praeger, pp.1–29.
- Berland J.C., and M.T. Salo. 1986. ‘Peripathetic Communities: An Introduction’, *Nomadic Peoples* 21/22: 1–6.
- Berta, P. 2010. ‘Economic Action in Theory and Practice: Anthropological Investigations’, in D.C. Wood (ed.), *Research in Economic Anthropology*, Vol. 30. Bingley: Emerald Books, pp.277–309.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977 [1972]. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1980. ‘Le capital social. Notes provisoires’, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 31(1): 2–3.
- Brazzabeni, M. 2015. ‘Sounds of the Markets: Portuguese Cigano Vendors in Open-air Markets in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area’, in C. Evers and K. Seale (eds), *Informal Urban Street Markets: International Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp.51–61.
- Butler, J. 1999. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Çalışkan, K., and M. Callon. 2009. ‘Economization, Part 1: Shifting Attention from the Economy Towards Processes of Economization’, *Economy and Society* 38(3): 369–98.
- . 2010. Economization, Part 2: A Research Programme for the Study of Markets. *Economy and Society* 39(1): 1–32.
- Callon, M. 1998. ‘Introduction: The Embeddedness of Economic Markets in Economics’, in M. Callon (ed.), *The Laws of the Markets*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp.1–57.

- . 2007. 'What Does it Mean to Say that Economics is Performative?' in D.A. MacKenzie, F. Muniesa and L. Siu (eds), *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.311–57.
- Coleman, J.S. 1988. 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital', *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (supplement): 95–120.
- Cunha, M.P. da. 2002. *Entre o bairro e a prisão. Tráfico e trajectos*. Lisbon: Fim de Século.
- . 2013. 'The Changing Scale of Imprisonment and the Transformation of Care: The Erosion of the "Welfare Society" by the "Penal State" in Contemporary Portugal', in M. Schlecker and F. Fleischer (eds), *Ethnographies of Social Support*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp.81–101.
- Day, S., E. Papataxiarchis and M. Stewart. 1999. 'Consider the Lilies of the Field', in S. Day, E. Papataxiarchis and M. Stewart (eds), *Lilies of the Field: Marginal People Who Live for the Moment*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp.1–24.
- de l'Estoile, B. 2014. 'Money is Good But a Friend is Better: Uncertainty, Orientation to the Future, and "the Economy"', *Current Anthropology* 55(9): 62–73.
- Ferrari, F. 2010. 'O mundo passa. Uma etnografia dos Calon e suas relações com os brasileiros', Ph.D. diss. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Fotta, M. 2012. 'The Bankers of the Backlands: Financialisation and the Calon-Gypsies in Bahia', Ph.D. diss. London: Goldsmiths College, University of London.
- Gay y Blasco, P. 1999. *Gypsies in Madrid: Sex, Gender and the Performance of Identity*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- . 2011. 'Agata's Story: Singular Lives and the Reach of the "Gitano Law"', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17(3): 445–61.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K., J. Cameron and S. Healy. 2013. *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming Our Communities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gmelch G. 1977. 'Economic Strategies and Migrant Adaptation: The Case of Irish Tinkers', *Ethnos* 42(1/2): 22–37.
- Gmelch, G., and S.B. Gmelch. 1987. 'Commercial Nomadism: Occupation and Mobility among Travellers in England and Wales', in A. Rao (ed.), *The Other Nomads: Peripatetic Minorities in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, pp. 133–53.
- Gmelch, S.B. 1986. 'Groups that Don't Want In: Gypsies and Other Artisan, Trader, and Entertainer Minorities', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 307–30.
- Grill, J. 2011. 'From Street Busking in Switzerland to Meat Factories in the UK: A Comparative Study of Two Roma Migration Networks from Slovakia', in D. Kaneff and F. Pine (eds), *Emerging Inequalities in Europe: Poverty and Transnational Migration*. London: Anthem Press, pp.78–102.
- Gropper, R.C. 1991. 'Hedging the Bets: Risk Reduction among the Rom Gypsies', *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 1(1): 45–59.
- Guy, W. 1998. 'Ways of Looking at Roma: The Case of Czechoslovakia', in D. Tong (ed.), *Gypsies: An Interdisciplinary Reader*. New York: Garland, pp.13–68.
- Guyer, J.I. 1997. *An African Niche Economy: Farming to Feed Ibadan, 1968–88*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . 2004. 'Niches, Margins and Profits: Persisting with Heterogeneity', *African Economic History* 32: 173–91.

- Hart K. 2000. *The Memory Bank: Money in an Unequal World*. London: Profile Books.
- . 2005. *The Hitman's Dilemma: Or, Business, Personal and Impersonal*. Chicago, IL: Prickly Paradigm.
- . 2006. 'Bureaucratic Form and the Informal Economy', in B. Guha-Khasnobis, S.M.R. Kanbur and E. Ostrom (eds), *Linking the Formal and Informal Economies: Examples from Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.21–35.
- . 2012. 'The Informalization of the World Economy'. Paper presented at the Societa Italiana di Economia Pubblica conference 'Informal Economy, Tax Evasion and Corruption', Pavia, 24–25 September. Retrieved 1 April 2013 from: <http://thememorybank.co.uk/2012/10/17/the-informalization-of-the-world-economy/>.
- Hart, K., J.-L. Laville and A.D. Cattani. 2010. *The Human Economy: A Citizen's Guide*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hayden, R.M. 1979. 'The Cultural Ecology of Service Nomads', *Eastern Anthropologist* 32(4): 297–309.
- Helleiner, J. 2003. 'The Politics of Traveller "Child Begging" in Ireland', *Critique of Anthropology* 23(1): 17–33.
- Lemon, A. 1998. "'Your Eyes Are Green Like Dollars": Counterfeit Cash, National Substance, and Currency Apartheid in 1990s Russia', *Cultural Anthropology* 13(1): 22–55.
- . 2000. *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Postsocialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Liebow, E. 1967. *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Marushiakova, E., U. Mischek, V. Popov and B. Streck. 2005. *Dienstleistungsnomadismus am Schwarzen Meer. Zigeunergruppen zwischen Symbiose und Dissidenz*. Halle (Saale): Orientwissenschaftliches Zentrum der Martin-Luther-Universität.
- Marushiakova, E., and V. Popov. 2013. "'Gypsy" Groups in Eastern Europe: Ethnonyms vs. Professionyms', *Romani Studies* 23(1): 61–82.
- Münzel, M., and B. Streck (eds). 1981. *Kumpania und Kontrolle. Moderne Behinderungen zigeunerischen Lebens*. Giessen: Focus.
- Narotzky, S. 2006. 'Binding Labour and Capital: Moral Obligation and Forms of Regulation in a Regional Economy', *Etnográfica* 10(2): 337–54.
- Okely, J. 1979. 'Trading Stereotypes: The Case of English Gypsies', in S. Wallman (ed.), *Ethnicity at Work*. London: MacMillan, pp.16–33.
- . 1983. *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1994. 'Constructing Difference: Gypsies as "Other"', *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 3(2): 55–73.
- Olivera, M. 2012. *La tradition de l'intégration. Une ethnologie des Roms Gabori dans les années 2000*. Paris: Éditions Pétra.
- Pasqualino, C. 1998. *Dire le chant. Les Gitans flamencos d'Andalousie*. Paris: CNRS Éditions/Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de L'Homme.
- Piasere, L. 1985. *Mare Roma. Catégories humaines et structure sociale. Une contribution à l'ethnologie tsigane*. Paris: Paul H. Stahl.
- . 1986. 'Review of A. Rao, *Les Gorbat d'Afghanistan. Aspect économiques d'un groupe itinérant "Jat"*', *Newsletter of the Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter* 9(3): 1–4.
- . 1987. 'In Search of New Niches: The Productive Organization of the Peripatetic Xoraxané in Italy', in A. Rao (ed.), *The Other Nomads: Peripatetic Minorities in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Cologne: Böhlau, pp.111–32.

- . 1992. 'Roma and Romá in North Italy: Two Types of Territorial Behaviour in the Same Larger Territory', in M. Casmir and A. Rao (eds), *Mobility and Territoriality: Social and Spatial Boundaries among Foragers, Fishers, Pastoralists and Peripatetics*. Oxford: Berg, pp.279–291.
- . 1995. 'Introduzione', in L. Piasere (ed.), *Comunità girovaghe, comunità zingare*. Naples: Liguori Editore, pp.3–38.
- . 1999. *Un mondo di mondi. Antropologia delle culture rom*. Bari: L'Ankora.
- . 2011. 'Horror Infiniti. Die Zigeuner als Europas Trickster', *Behemoth* 4(1): 57–85.
- Polanyi, K. 1944. *The Great Transformation*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.
- Portes, A. 1998. 'Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology', *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1–24.
- Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rao, A. 1987. 'The Concept of Peripatetics: An Introduction', in A. Rao (ed.), *The Other Nomads: Peripatetic Minorities in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, pp.1–32.
- . 2010 [1996]. 'Gypsies', in A. Barnard and J. Spencer (eds), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp.340–41.
- Reyniers, A. 1998. 'Quelques jalons pour comprendre l'économie tsigane', *Études tsiganes* 12: 8–27.
- Ries, J. 2008. 'Writing (Different) Roma/Gypsies: Romani/Gypsy Studies and the Scientific Construction of Roma/Gypsies', in F. Jacobs and J. Ries (eds), *Roma/ Zigeunkulturen in Neuen Perspektiven, Romani/Gypsy Cultures in New Perspectives*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, pp.21–47.
- Ries, J., and F. Jacobs. 2009. 'Roma/Zigeuner in Relationen Ethnologische Anregungen für die vergleichende Minderheitenforschung', in E. Tschernokosheva and U. Mischek (eds), *Beziehungsgeflecht Minderheit. Zum Paradigmenwechsel in der Kulturforschung, Ethnologie Europas*. Munster: Waxman, pp.117–29.
- Silverman, C. 1982. 'Everyday Drama: Impression Management of Urban Gypsies', *Urban Anthropology* 11(3/4): 377–98.
- . 2012. *Romani Routes: Cultural Politics and Balkan Music in Diaspora*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smart, A. 2008. 'Social Capital', *Anthropologica* 50: 409–28.
- Standing, G. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Stewart, M. 1993. 'Gypsies, the Work Ethic, and Hungarian Socialism', in C. Hann (ed.), *Socialism: Ideals, Ideologies, and Local Practice*. London: Routledge, pp.187–204.
- . 1994. 'La passion de l'argent. Les ambiguïtés de la circulation monétaire chez les Tsiganes hongrois', *Terrain* 23: 45–62.
- . 1997. *The Time of the Gypsies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- . 2001. 'Conclusions: Spectres of the Underclass', in R.J. Emigh and I. Szelényi (eds), *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe during the Market Transition*. Westport, CT: Praeger, pp.191–203.
- . 2002. 'The Impoverished Roma', *Local Government Brief, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative/OSI Budapest*, Summer 2002: 16–19.
- . 2012a. 'New Forms of Anti-Gypsy Politics: A Challenge for Europe', in M. Stewart (ed.), *The Gypsy 'Menace': Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*. London: Hurst, pp.viii–xxxviii.

- . 2012b. 'Populism, Roma and the European Politics of Cultural Difference', in M. Stewart (ed.), *The Gypsy 'Menace': Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*. London: Hurst, pp.3–24.
- . 2013. 'Roma and Gypsy "Ethnicity" as a Subject of Anthropological Inquiry', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42: 415–32.
- Stewart, M. (ed.) 2012c. *The Gypsy 'Menace': Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*. London: Hurst.
- Stoichiță , V.A. 2008. *Fabricants d'émotion. Musique et malice dans un village tsigane de Roumanie*. Nanterre: Société d'Ethnologie.
- Streck, B. 2008. 'Kultur der Zwischenräume – Grundfragen der Tsiganologie', in F. Jacobs and J. Ries (eds), *Roma/Zigeunkulturen in Neuen Perspektiven*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, pp.21–48.
- Tauber, E. 2006. *Du Wirst keinen Ehemann Nehmen! Respekt, die Bedeutung der Toten und Fluchtheirat bei den Sinti Estraxaria*. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- . 2008. "'Do You Remember the Time When We Went Begging and Selling": The Ethnography of Transformation in Female Economic Activities and Its Narrative in the Context of Memory and Respect among the Sinti in North Italy', in J. Fabian and J. Ries (eds), *Romani/Gypsy Cultures in New Perspectives*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, pp.155–76.
- Tesăr, C. 2012. "'Women Married off to Chalices": Gender, Kinship and Wealth among Romanian Cortorari Gypsies', Ph.D. diss. London: University College London.
- Theodosiou, A. 2010. "'What Kind of People Do You Think We Are?" The Scenography of Gypsy Performances of Difference', *Identities* 17: 327–47.
- . 2011. *Authenticity, Ambiguity, Location: Gypsy Musicians on the Greek–Albanian Border*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag.
- Turner, T. 1979. 'Anthropology and the Politics of Indigenous People's Struggles', *Cambridge Anthropology* 5(1): 1–43.
- Van Baar, H. 2014. 'The Emergence of a Reasonable Anti-Gypsyism in Europe', in T. Agarin (ed.), *When Stereotype Meets Prejudice: Antiziganism in European Societies*. Stuttgart: Ibidem, pp.25–42.
- Van de Port, M. 1998. *Gypsies, Wars and Other Instances of the Wild: Civilization and its Discontents in a Serbian Town*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Wacquant, L. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Williams P. 1985. 'Paris – New York. L'organisation de deux communautés tsiganes', *L'Homme* 25(95): 121–40.
- . 1993. *Nous, on n'en parle pas. Les vivants et les morts chez les Manouches*. Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- . 2011. 'Ethnologie der Zigeuner. Von der Begegnung zur Theoriebildung', *Behemoth* 4(1): 43–56.
- Zaloom, C. 2006. *Out of the Pits: Traders and Technology from Chicago to London*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zatta, J.D., and L. Piasere. 1990. 'Stealing from the Gaço: Some Notes on Roma Ideology', *Études et documents balkaniques et méditerranéens* 15: 163–72.