

Giuseppe Beluschi Fabeni

Roma Korturare, “kaj žanas le vurdonenca”: Some ethnographic answers to the Romani Dialectological Survey

The Roma *Korturare*¹ are a Romani group in the region of Transylvania. Since 1990, they have experienced stays of varying duration abroad. I will depict some of the cultural and social characteristics I witnessed during my field study of a community of this group living as immigrants in Granada, Spain. The text aims to answer some ethnographic questions submitted in the Romani Dialectological Survey, coordinated by Dr. Yaron Matras of the University of Manchester, England. I will also describe how elements of internal social organisation, such as *raca* subdivisions, can play a central role in the categorisation of the circumstantial social context, in spite of, but also together with, the wider linguistic context that relates to the particular Northern Vlax dialect.

Keywords: Transylvania, Cortorari, kinship, marriage, identity, migrations, Banat, ethnolinguistics, autonomous law-making, Northern Vlax.

1 Introduction

In this paper I will present some ethnographic notes about a Romanian Romani community residing in Granada, whose Vlax Romani dialect has been studied with the use of the Romani Dialectological Questionnaire (Matras et al. 2001) in December 2005.

Two of three informants, 16 and 18 years old, identified themselves as members of the *raca Piculesč*, a social group whose members acknowledge a common ancestor called ‘Piculo’. The third informant, 27 years old, also identified himself as *Piculesč*, but placed his own genealogy in the wider category of *Roma Korturare*, including, as he said, all the kinship groups speaking the same Romani dialect I was studying.²

However, identifying this dialect or its own community with the latter term presents some difficulties: it originates from the Romanian *Gaže*³ society, to name a number of itinerant “gypsy” groups, linguistically and culturally heterogeneous. It can be used by the Roma to identify themselves, as in this case, but even among them it does not lose the more general meaning of ‘people with tents’, referring to other, different itinerant groups. Moreover, it is not much used in my informants’ daily discourse and does not seem to be of great practical importance. The relevance of the use of the term *korturare* resides in the narrative context in which it is inserted: it describes a past based on itinerant practices, with tent-carts, and which contains mythical elements referring to the figures of *gulibaša* (old respected men), who are presented as the founders of modern-day *raca* (patrilineal groups) and the dispensers of justice through the institution of the *kris* (the internal institution for

1 Both forms, *Korturari*, a Romanian plural, and *Korturare*, a Romani plural, are used by my informants in free variation.

2 On the use of the term *korturari*, see, e.g., Achim (1998) and Voiculescu (2002).

3 All ‘non-gypsies’ are called ‘*gaže*’, when the opposition is between ‘gypsy’ vs. ‘non-gypsy’ categories; but when these Roma distinguish between national non-gypsies categories, ‘*Gaže*’ is used just for Romanians.

the administration of justice). These figures exemplify the dialectics between the autonomy of each *raca* and the participation to a broader community of *race*, to which they assign the function of moral authority.

Moreover, in my fieldwork I was able to observe that for my informants the social identities related to the *raca* filiation are of central importance in the processes of social categorisation. Therefore, it happens that they use the term *Piculesč* not only as a *raca*-category in opposition to other *raca*-identities but also as a category distinguishing them from other Gypsy groups. Based on these observations, I will describe some features of the group's social organisation, which should clarify the reasons for the centrality of the *raca* as a social identity and at the same time explain some aspects of the social structure pertaining to the *Korturare* category and reflected in the myth of *gulibaša*.

2 *Raca* and the community of *race*

As I noted above, the *raca* refers to a kinship group, with up to 400 individuals, whose members acknowledge a common ancestor. Each group (i.e. each *raca*) is tied to others through marriage at every generational level and altogether constitute a social network residing in different places, spread throughout a region included within the cities of Timișoara and Hunedoara, Tirgu Mureș and Satu Mare. In this zone, the members of each *raca* tend to reside in the same locality: consequently, two or more *race* can be represented in the same urban neighbourhood or rural town, but hardly any families of the same *raca* reside in more than one place.

Solidarity and economic cooperation are much stronger among members of the same *raca* than among members of different ones, and this is owing to two related phenomena: on the one hand, as I am going to describe, *the race* creates the particular structures of migratory groups, and on the other hand, it gives rise to social stratification between *race*, as a result of the redistribution of wealth among members of the same *raca*, far clearer whereas two or more *race* reside in the same locality.

The social organisation of migratory processes highlights the combination of cooperation and co-residence: the community of *Piculesč* that immigrated to Granada, for example, is formed by chains of male brothers and cousins living there with their families and who, during the past fifteen years, have followed the same route across Europe. In the early 1990s, they left Huedin (Cluj-Napoca, Romania) and went to Germany, and between 1995 and 1997 they moved through France, Belgium and Holland. They reached Spain in 1998 and settled in Granada in 1999. A second group of families of this *raca* settled, around 1997, in the outskirts of Dublin and a third in the surrounding areas of London. As regards Spain, a number of *race* have shown similar tendencies: some families of the *raca Huljesč*, from Turda have migrated to Jaén and Malaga, the *Gydesč* from Timișoara to Seville, and the *Lipiciresč* from Hunedoara to Murcia. At the same time, different *race* from Huedin have settled in Tarragona, following different routes.

During migration most income is derived from activities related to *mangajmo* (activities based on collecting goods), such as begging, fortune-telling, recycling discarded materials, from providing cleaning services in the houses, bars and restaurants of *Gaže*, and from temporary agricultural and construction work. Also, additional income is obtained from unofficial car-dealing and the sale of gold jewellery and small technological items such as cell phones and music players. In the search for and use of economic resources, inside the *raca*,

each family tends to be autonomous. Nevertheless, working in association with other Roma is common: the duration of such associations can vary and the resultant earnings are usually divided fairly among the participants.

Romanian native communities still represent the centre of social reference, as well as the place of remittance and consumption of gathered wealth. A great part of today's wealth comes from abroad, and it is the basis of new processes of social stratification.

Besides Romani, Romanian is the first contact language and is spoken fluently by all Roma, with the exception of young people who grew up abroad and developed a stronger command of the language of the immigration context. Some older people speak an elementary form of Hungarian, but they gradually forget this language during their life abroad. They acknowledge the Orthodox faith and respect the liturgical calendar. A priest takes part in funeral rites and christenings, but not in weddings.

The ideology and practices of viripatrilocality are predominant, and married sons, with their wives and children, remain in their own domestic group for a long period of time, while married daughters leave their domestic group and join their husband's. Virilocality is connected with patrilineal transmission of the *raca's* identity to the next generations and gradually to wives from different *race*. If instead the *žamutro*, son-in-law, joins his wife's nuclear group, this can be considered shameful for the man's entire family.

Marriage rules permit union between first cousins, and the totality of the *race* represents the context in which the choice of a partner is permitted. But one's own *raca* seems to be the favourite context for taking a bride; a preference both declared by informants and statistically confirmed, at least for the last three generations. At the same time inter-*raca* marriages, generation after generation, strengthen familiar ties, while fortifying and extending the network of alliances through the wider community.

The term *Roma* refers to all the members of this *race*-system, but it is also used as a transversal category referring to different Gypsy groups that, besides speaking Romani, are dressed according to the *porto romano*, the Romani style. This is often associated with the wearing of coloured full skirts by women, which expresses a particular moral perception, shared by my informants, wherein gender differences and power relations refer to a symbolic construction of the human body, related to the hygienic and moral concept of *marime* (impurity). Marriage with these *aver Roma*, 'other Roma', is generally rejected, but not really prohibited. Unions with *Bajaša* and *Gaže* are more strongly rejected (but not expressly forbidden): the *Bajaša* category includes all the Gypsy groups that speak Romanian, but also those who speak Romani and dress in the style of *Gaže*.⁴ The latter category includes all non-Gypsies in a general sense, but in a narrower sense it refers just to Romanians.

The matrimonial cycle can begin with a formal request for a bride (the *mangajmo*), but also through the bridal run (*našavel la*, lit. 'he runs her away'). In the first case, the family of a young man pays a visit to the bride's family to ask for her and offers them a

⁴ In the city of Timișoara, among Romani groups speaking Romanian as their second language, *Kalderaša*, *Bănăcane* and *Žymbaša* are identified as *Roma*, and in the province of Cluj-Napoca the *Fusari* is a group that my informants have contact with. Even *Romungri*, who speak Hungarian and Romani, are considered *Roma*, and among them the *Gabor* are the most known and also called *Bădenare*.

bottle of *palinka* (grape) adorned with a red ribbon. If her parents accept the proposal, the ribbon is interlaced in the bride's dress, symbolising her condition of *mangadi*, 'promised'.⁵

In the second case, the suitor 'steals' the girl: in reality the girl seems to cooperate somewhat in the elopement, but in the narrative reconstructions of my married informants, both male and female, the man is the one who plays the active role and deceitfully *našavel la*, or, literally, 'runs her away'. This can create a situation of temporary conflict between the families, but if the suitor's family agrees to the marriage, they will invite the girl's parents to reach an agreement, offering a table bountifully set with food and drinks.

The choice of whether to make a formal request for the bride or whether to elope depends on factors such as the kinship degree between the two families, the age of the partners, and the previous marital experience of the girl.⁶ But what seems to be decisive for increasing the likelihood that the bride will be stolen is that they belong to the same *raca*, even if it is an open and practised possibility between partners of different *race*.

When negotiating with the suitor's family, the girl's parents can demand payment of a 'bridewealth', which my informants interpreted as having the function of a 'guarantee': a pledge on the part of the groom's family to respect the new daughter-in-law, and to offer her a good home environment. Otherwise, the wife's parents have the right to retrieve her. The need for a guarantee increases with the social and geographical distance between the *xanamikuri* 'parents-in-law', and the bridewealth is almost always requested in inter-*race* marriages, even when the elopement of the bride has taken place.

It is the bride's family that requests the wedding celebration and fixes the date, while the groom's family is charged with covering the cost of the whole celebration, bridal gown, crown and jewels. The ceremony is held by the *nanaša*, the godfathers. Each family invites a couple of married people to play this role, offering them gifts, such as valuable clothing or items of gold. When the celebration has begun, the *nanaša* of the groom, also called *nanaša mare*, go with some musicians to the bride's house, where she and her family are waiting. Even if the repertory is less rich, during the celebration *strygaturi*, like the repertory studied by Kligman (1988), are sung. Then the *nanaša* take the bride to the wedding place, where she will dance with the attendants, but not with the groom. The four *nanaša* sit at the wedding couple's table and formalise the marriage by offering each other a ritual piece of bread. At the end of the celebration, the *nanaša* collect *darro* from everyone in attendance, a monetary donation to the groom's father. Then the bride returns to her parents' house, where, after some hours, but sometimes even after a couple of days, her husband's family

⁵ In any case, the female use of a red ribbon is common in hairdos even without this specific significance.

⁶ A woman's virginity is valued, but there is no manner of public demonstration of it: at a discursive level it is present in the imagery of the white nightdress stained red after marriage. Some informants maintain that it should be given to the bride's mother, but in reality I have never seen this to occur nor observed mothers to keep such proof. Moreover, among *Korturare* the use of a *dikhlo*, a coloured foulard that covers women's head, coincides ideally with entrance in marriage and the loss of virginity. A young woman (22 years old), who married when she was 15 years old, told me she was proud to have married as a *šejbari*, 'virgin'. She noted with disdain that 'today' Romani girls have more than one boyfriend before marriage, lose their virginity and yet continue to 'dress as *šie* ('unmarried girls'), with hair down, and they should have the *dikhlo* on their head as they aren't *šie* any more' (recollected in Huedin, Cluj-Napoca, in August 2006).

will call for her definitively. From that moment the bride's position of *bori* in her parents-in-law's domestic group will be her most salient social identity, and her parents lose any rights over her or her descendents, regaining it only in the case of divorce.

3 *Gulibaša, Korturare and kris*

In spite of the greater prevalence of marriages within the same patrilineal group, marriage alliances between families of different *race* represent the most important system of social ties offering a sense of community. These alliances are renewed through the reciprocal involvement of families in the most important rites, such as funerals, weddings, birthdays and baptisms, where the guests may be invited merely to attend or they can play the roles of *nanaša*, *kirve* or prayer speaker. Most economic exchanges run through these rites, while there is little economic cooperation in the use of resources and little tendency to share the same territory.

Within this social system, the *kris* and the myth of *gulibaša Korturare* express a perception of a community of familiar groups that are politically independent from *Gaže* and the rest of the Gypsies. Moreover, the structure of the tribunal reflects the balance between the autonomy of each *raca* and its involvement in a wider social system.

If a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached in a dispute between two people, the person who feels more affected will call on the other to turn to his own *krisjonere*. The *krisjonere* can be relatives or even members of a different *raca*. They play the role of what we may call 'partial judges': complying with the 'truth of facts', each *krisjonere* investigates the mitigating circumstances of his own defendant or the rights he may claim against his adversary.

During the first part of the trial, which can take hours or even days, the *krisjonere* hear the plaintiffs' debate and witnesses' voices until they think that they have enough information to deliberate. They discuss privately and issue a *verdžito* or verdict. Neither side gets more money by agreement, and the costs of their service are fixed in advance.

The institution of the *kris* guarantees control not only over violence but also over divisions within the community that some disputes can generate, even without violence. Playing the roles of both defendant and plaintiff, the *krisjonere* are called to bring into question the application of equality criteria, while, as legitimate judges, they represent a guarantee that the verdict will be formally accepted by the whole community and every *kris*, as a public event, serves to transmit moral values.

In the narrative about the *Korturare* the *gulibaša* are at once the *krisjonere* and the founders of the modern-day *race*. In the long-ago generations of a mythical past the *gulibaša* were highly respected men, in some cases with biblical longevity. Their existence relates to a time when the Roma were *Korturare*: they did not have a stable place of residence and their lives were spent in tent-covered carts travelling from village to village. They worked in what are considered the group's traditional professions of the group: buying and selling horses, and the female practice of *drabarəl* or fortune-telling. *Korturare* were organised into familiar groups and each of them was led by a *gulibaš*, who administered justice both within a group of families and to other groups of families, each represented by a *gulibaš*. During the time of the *Korturare* the Roma separated and every *gulibaš* chose a territory where he established his own lineage.

Outside this narrative context, *gulibaš* is a term used in jest to show, with good humour, esteem towards an elderly Rom. But it is from among just elderly men that the *krisjonere* are chosen to celebrate a *kris*. In the case of a dispute that involves two families from two different *race*, the *krisjonere* will represent both of them, standing up for their own group's interests. Conversely, when the dispute is between members of the same *raca*, who could even be brothers, the choice of *krisjonere* can be made from within the same *raca*, but also outside it. The latter case occurs more often among communities that have migrated abroad, where the group of relatives is too narrow to provide sufficiently fair *krisjonere*. In such cases they are chosen from outside the group, among members of other *race* residing in nearby towns, whose kinship distance from the plaintiffs guarantees greater impartiality in the effort to reach an agreement.

4 Conclusions

Among the studies on the *Vlax* Romani groups that emigrated at the beginning of the twentieth century to Western Europe and North America, a debate has emerged over the interpretation of *raca* or *vica* in terms of lineage, and by extension in terms of how the wider community assumes the features of segments (Vaux de Foletier 1970; Cohn 1973, Liégeois 1976). There has been a growing tendency to abandon this model in the light of two complementary observations: first, the fact that each Gypsy community or group has to deal with the surrounding *Gaže* context, with its changes, and with the economic niches that it offers, and second, that the internal social organisation must respond to such adaptation's needs, offering individuals a range of social relations wide enough to allow them to be incorporated into more social categories than just the patrilineal group's identity, such as, to begin with, that of the matrilineal group (Çoker 1966; Gropper 1968; Cohn 1973; Sutherland 1975; Williams 1995). As Drue Phillips makes clear, this "exemplifies what Firth has called 'optative' descendent system" (Drue Philips 1997: 29).

Drawing on these assumptions, Patrick Williams - in an article on which I have largely based this discussion - compares the social structure of the *Kalderaša/Čurara* community of the "Rom of Paris" he studied, settled in the outskirts of the city after the Second World War, with the one of *Mačvaja/Kalderaša* presented by Gropper (1968, 1975; quoted in Williams 1995), and living in several areas of New York since the 1930s. He points out that the emergence of two different organisation systems depends on the "nature of the dominant economic activity that bounds the Roma with non-Gypsy society" (Williams 1995: 310; my translation).

In both cities, different *vice* live in the same territory from which they draw the same resources. In Paris, the Roma work as craftsmen, in accordance with *Gaže* administration; two or three people join up together and pool the contribution of the one most expert in business deals with the one who excels in technical skills, and they divide their earnings fairly. These associations last as long as they are profitable, and they can dissolve any time. At the same time, marriage exchanges among *vice* follow the same tendency towards equality, creating a dense network of social ties. The redistribution of wealth among *vice* is assured by the basic tendency to share earnings from economic activities, but also by throwing parties and making monetary gifts. The intervention of the *kris* institution is only required when conflicts are deep and insoluble, otherwise reciprocity and social proximity enable the reciprocal accommodation of both sides through a day-to-day debate. This kind

of shared equality strengthens the stability of kinship groups and their tendency to maintain the traditional patrilineal pattern of filiation.

In New York, where the group's most common economic activity, fortune-telling, is considered illegal, privileged relations with *Gaže* authorities grant some families a position of territorial leadership and domination among the other families, which depend on the former for work. This leads to the seeking of alliances with dominant familiar groups, individuals implementing processes of self-identity manipulation, and the highlighting of certain social ties with others. The *kris* institution collapses under the influence of the leaders, and their economic power creates a situation of hypergamy. In the context of this competition for power and unequal redistribution of wealth and women, the social identity of *vica* becomes extremely flexible, less durable, and vague.

There are some similar features in the two communities. In Paris, there were no more than 1000 individuals in the entire *vice* in 1981, and as late as that time their residential mobility in the outskirts of the city was high, owing to both external pressures and internal needs, but it was still in the same area. The New York community, in 1975, lived in several neighbourhoods in the city, residential mobility was high, and periods of dispersion followed periods of concentration of the population (Williams 1995: 306). The picture that emerges is one where the units of social organisation, which can be either *vica* or extended families, inhabit the same territory and use the same economic resources. However, the results are diametrically opposed: in Paris the *vica*'s identities become stable and are part of a wider identity that the same Rom call "the Rom of Paris"; in New York the *vica*'s identity gives way under the favour or alliances with the dominant families that maintain territorial power through privileged relations with the *Gaže* authority, engendering a crisis in the structure of the traditional community (which would otherwise be like the community in Paris).

The system of *Korturare race* seems to differ from the two communities discussed here with regard to the latter aspects. The same kinship groups identified as *raca* can include up to 400 members each, in a modern-day trend of population growth. In Romania, they are dispersed in various remote locations, where no more than two *race* live together, but I did not find any *raca* represented in more than one area. These groups are characterised by low residential mobility: settled before the Second World War, and also before the First World War, as in the case of the Romani village of Huedin, they have remained stable until now, except for some partial and often seasonal itinerant activities limited to the Transylvanian region and constantly suppressed by the Romanian authorities. In the context of the Western migrants, the Romanian community is still its reference point and the social organisation of migratory groups follows the same territorial pattern that exists, at least, in the Spanish context: every *raca* occupies the area whose resources it makes use of, far from the other *race* areas, and the degree of intra-*raca* cooperation and co-residency continues to prevail over that between different *race*. There is no competition for territorial control or need for privileged relations with *Gaže* and occasional ingresses into the areas of others are tolerated.

The ties that connect the *race* are based on a network of marriage alliances. The redistribution of wealth, not only in the form of bridewealth, but also in the form of goods offered on the occasion of different kinds of rites, are largely based on these alliances, though cooperation in the use of resources is not. However, a marriage network, renewed from generation to generation, is enough to support the emergence of the perceived entity

of a super-community, to which is granted the moral authority to take part in solving conflicts.

But if in both of the systems presented by Williams one tends towards an egalitarian density of ties among different *race* and the other towards the emergence of dominant groups which affects choices about filiation, in the *Korturare* system we can witness the growing autonomy of sizeable patrilineal groups and the emersion of the *raca* identity as tout court a social identity of the individual.

This is the source of the confusion manifested by our informants when confronted with the request to give a name to the whole of groups that speak their dialect but with which they barely identify, as opposed to the filiation to their own *raca*, which, even if it does not include the entire *Korturare* dialect speaking community, represents for them a more meaningful category of self-adscription.

References

- Achim, Viorel 1998. *Țigani în istoria României* [The Roma in the Romanian History]. București: Editura enciclopedică.
- Çoker, Gilbun 1966. Romany Rye in Philadelphia: a sequel. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 22: 85–100.
- Cohn, Werner 1973. *The Gypsies*. Reading, Mass.: Adison Wesley.
- Drue Philips, Sarah 1997. Romani naming as multiple strategies. *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society, Fifth Series*, 7: 27–38.
- Gropper, Rena C. 1968. Urban Nomads. The Gypsies of New York City. *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences, Second Series*, 29: 1050–1056.
- Gropper, Rena C. 1975. *Gypsy in the city*. Pinceton: Darwin Press.
- Kligman, Gail 1988. *The wedding of the dead: Ritual, poetics and popular culture in Transylvania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liégeois, Jean P. 1976. *Mutation Tsigane* [Gypsy Change]. Bruxelles: Éd. Complexe.
- Matras, Yaron, Viktor Elšik, Katrin Hiietam, Christa Schubert, Barbara Schrammel & Irene Sechidou. 2001. *Romani Dialectological Questionnaire*. First Edition. Manchester: Romani Morpho-Syntactic (RMS) Database Project, University of Manchester.
- Sutherland, Anne 1975. *Gypsies: The hidden Americans*. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Vaux de Foletier, Françoise 1970. *Mille ans d'histoire des Tsiganes* [One thousand years of History of the Gypsies]. Paris: Fayard.
- Voiculescu, Cerasela 2002. Construcții identitare la rromii din Sângeorgiu de Mureș [Identity Constructions of the Roma of Sângeorgiu de Mureș]. *Sociologia Românească* 1–2: 100–125.
- Williams, Patrick 1995. Parigi – New York: L'organizzazione di due comunità zingare [Paris – New York: the organization of two Gypsy communities]. In: Piasere, Leonardo (ed.) *Comunità girovaghe, comunità zingare*. Napoli: Liguori. 295–314.

Appendix: Some quotes from one of the interviews collected in Granada

... kana sas pəl tympuri, andəl phurane, fie savo lelas peske žudeco, fie savo manuš phuro lelas peske žudeco. Ynceležis? Haj atunče kana... so ek data stabilinde pe kodo manuš, ne pesko žudeco, haj mules kodo manuš – ke na maj train akana kadala 'l phura – ynceležinen

ke kodo žudeco sar phenden mangə tu, o prešidinto, von sas fie savo ne pesko foro sas baro, vo komandilas, vo delas komanda, ynceležis? Haj von ašile sar, vo sas sar ek felo barə, žanes, sekretari variso, ne pesko foro. Anda amarə Roma, na anda əl gaže!:- Amen kerasas kris anda əl Roma, či žasas anda žudekata, kerasas amen əl Roma, haj vi akana keras kris. Ha' anda kode akarəl Hulesči, Petresči, Piculesči, Gydjesči, inceležis? Anda kade traba akarəl. Na 'i sar te akarel ame amen... dar normalo, kaj phenas amen, Kurturare, Ursare, Vujegare, Kelemidare, vi kade sy ek vorba; sostar əl Vujegare, kidenas vuježi, le rom; əl Korturare, phirenas vurdonjenca haj sas les sar o korto, opral, žanes? Kado Korturare, von sas sekon data dromesko, sekon data, len nas len khər. Von žanas po drom, cyrdenas pe maržina əl dromeski, krenas pengə o korto haj sovenas. Hačarəs? Kade ynsynil o manuš Korturare. Sar el Frančes 'i le xitanje, kaj sy len le karavanje, eksat kade 'i. Kadala phure, pala ek tympo, jek geles ando Huedino, jek gele Orostjie, jek geles Hunedora, jek geles Arado, jek geles Timișoara, hačarəs ma'? Fie savo geles kaj šajndes haj desporcinde pen le roma. O gulibaš, so vo delas komanda, kade ašelas, o gulibaš sas sar o prokororo.

Se kade, se pe kris žasas, amen kerasas kris... le bajaša či žan, le bajaša marən pe. Amen le Roma kaj ačarasas, kaj sy maj xarane, von te krenas variso, von žanas pe kris, ačarəs? Haj vi akana, te keres variso, keren kris. Haj pe kris kiden pe duj trin roma maj phurə haj von keren e kris, haj von phenen savo 'i o došalo, ačarəs? Či maj žal pe žudekata, te maj kerel žudekata, keren von kris maškar amen.

... dar amarə Piculesči von 'i le maj šukar, maj ašəžume, maj šukar. Ačarəs? Von sy len khəra... phenes ke palaturi, ynceležis? Khəra šukar. Amen samas asəžume, amen či plačal ame te keras, te maras ame, či plačal ame, amen plačal amen numa te das дума šukar, plačal ame pačju.

[Transl.: ...In former days, each one took his own jurisdiction, every old man took his own jurisdiction. Do you understand? And then when... insofar as that man settled in his own jurisdiction, - and he is dead now, those old men don't live anymore – it was established that [in] the jurisdiction, as you have said, the president was somebody who was important in his own town, he made decisions, he was the one who led.

So they remained as somebody in charge, you know, a kind of clerk in their own town. Among our Roma, not among the Gaže!:- We celebrated trials among the Roma, we didn't go to the court, we Roma celebrated it, and we still do it today. And from there they are called Hulesči, Petresči, Piculesč, Gydjesč, do you understand? Therefore they are called in this way. It's not the same as we are called... but, it's normal, when we call ourselves Korturare, Ursare, Vujegare, Kelemidare, also this is to name; because Vujegare, the Roma, used to collect bottles; Korturare, used to travel with carts and they had something like a tend on top, do you know? Those Korturare, they were always (travelling) on the road, always, they did not have houses. They used to travel on the road, than they swerved out of the way and put up their tent to sleep. Do you understand? This is the meaning of the 'Korturari men'. In the same way that French have Gitans ['xitanje', from Spanish 'gitano'] who have caravans, exactly the same! Those old men, at one time, one of them went to Huedin, another to Orăștie, another to Hunedoara, another went to Arad, another to Timișoara, do you understand me? Every one went wherever he could and the Roma dispersed. The gulibash, what he said, that was the way things had to be, the gulibash was a kind of attorney.

Always in this way, we always appealed to the kris... The Baiasha don't, they hit each other. But we, the Roma who understand, who are more intelligent, if somebody does something, we make a kris. In the kris, two or three older Roma gather and they celebrate the trial, do you understand? And still now, if you do something, they make a kris, and they establish who is guilty, do you understand? They don't go to the [gažikano] court; if they need to go to the Court, better they do the trial among us.

... but our Piculesč they are the most courteous, the most peace-loving, the most courteous. Do you understand? They have houses... houses like palaces [you would say palaces...], do you understand? Beautiful houses. We are peaceful, we don't like to do... to hit each other, we don't like it, we like to speak with honour, we like the respect.]

(Informant: Male, 28 y.o., Interview collected in Granada, Spain, in connection with the Romani Dialectological Survey coordinated by Dr Yaron Matras of the University of Manchester, England. December 2005)