

Nominal Assimilation: The Ethnic and National Identities of the Gitanos or *Calé* of Spain as Shown by their Surnames in the 1783–1785 Census

JUAN F. GAMELLA

Universidad de Granada, Spain

ANTONIO GÓMEZ ALFARO

Independent Scholar, Spain

JUAN PÉREZ PÉREZ

Universidad de Granada, Spain

*Antonio Torres Heredia
hijo y nieto de Camborios
con una vara de mimbre
va a Sevilla a ver los toros.
(Federico García Lorca,
Romancero Gitano)¹*

In 1783, the King of Spain Carlos III enacted the last Royal Order for the control and assimilation of Gitanos or *Calé*. The law required that local authorities listed the Gitanos living in their counties. The resulting census is the most important document on the Spanish Romani written during the *ancien régime*. Unfortunately, its data has never been studied in depth. This paper analyzes the surnames of the 12,037 Gitano persons identified in the census and finds 567 different heritable family names. Interestingly, 10% of these surnames identified 75% of the Gitano population. The analysis shows that Gitanos already had the same names they have today, and that it is possible to trace personal genealogies linking Gitano people from this census with people alive now, some fourteen generations later. Gitano surnames were all Hispanic and many of them of aristocratic origin. Some were common to all Gitano groups, but most followed regional patterns and were differentiated by region and even by province. Baptism, mixed marriages, and imitation of neighbors were the most likely sources for the adoption of

these surnames. Gitanos also used personal and family nicknames in their communities, but their official names were a crucial part of their personal and collective identity. Resistance, opposition, and contrasting cultural strategies should not ignore the hybridizing and creative adaptations of the Romani peoples.

KEYWORDS family names, Roma/Gypsies, Spain, ethnicity, enlightenment, corpus linguistics

Introduction

There is a group of Europeans who has been relegated everywhere to the margins of both social life and scholarly knowledge: the *Roma*, *Sinti*, *Gitanos*² . . . that archipelago of Romani peoples who have become salient minorities of most European countries in the modern age. Many questions about these groups have never been properly addressed and, until recently, there has been a substantial lack of reliable data concerning most of the situations they experience and the forms in which they react to such experiences.

One crucial aspect of the identity of Romani groups concerns the personal and family names they adopted in their interaction with their host societies. Onomastics has rarely been of interest for historians of the Roma. Perhaps this derives from the fact that Romani people everywhere seemed to adopt the surnames “common to the non-Roma among whom they live” (Bakker *et al.*, 2001: 63). In England, for instance, *Boswell*, *Lee*, *Smith*, *Wood*, and *Young* are common Romani surnames. Bakker and his collaborators explain: “East European Kalderash are often called Demeter while in Sweden the Taikons prevail. The name Horvath is also common, both among Roma and non-Roma” and “Stoika is one of the most typical Lovari surnames” (2001: 63). Trevisan states that the Italian Sinti “nearly always had Italian surnames, similar to those of non-Gypsies” (2013: 149). Thus, official forenames and surnames seem to tell nothing of the cultural difference or identity of Romani peoples.³

Moreover, most authors who have dealt with this topic minimize the relevance of family names for Romani peoples themselves, and assume they only seek to accommodate the pressures of state bureaucracies (see, for instance, Lee, 2001: 198–199). Describing the Roma of California, Anne Sutherland confirmed that they have only one true Romani name (*nav romano*) but several non-Romani surnames that they choose from a pool of names used by relatives “over and over again, since they do not matter anyway” (1975/1986: 26). Hence, there does not seem to be a regular pattern of surname transmission. And this seems to be a constant of these people, regardless of time or place. A quarter of a century after her initial fieldwork, Sutherland restated that “Gypsies, organized around traditions suitable for a nomadic people, frequently borrow each other’s ‘American’ names and social security numbers, viewing them as a kind of corporate property of their kin group (the *vitsa*)” (Sutherland, 2001: 235).

Judith Okely, in her ethnography of “Gypsy-Travellers” in England, also described the impermanence of surnames and the inconsistency in surname transmission by acknowledging that “an individual does not automatically assume the surname of his

or her father, nor does a wife necessarily assume the surname of her husband. A woman may use her mother's 'surname', rejecting both that of her father and husband, especially where there are political advantages. The name may also be changed, depending on which area the family is travelling in" (1983: 173). In sum, "the names which Travellers may offer for Gorgio birth, marriage and death certificates do not reflect their cognatic identity, nor do they reveal that an individual is merely one piece in a genealogical jigsaw" (1983: 174–175).

In sum, if official names mean little to Romani people and they do not reflect their identity or their relevant family lines, it makes little sense to spend time recording them, their frequencies, and their changes. As a consequence, there seems to be a notable lack of published databases on Roma names and naming practices.

The history of Spanish Gitanos indicates a rather different development. Today, the over half a million Gitanos living in all regions of Spain follow a naming system that coincides with the rest of Spaniards (mostly in rural areas), although it shows a stronger stress on nicknames and on descent categories and groups. Among Gitanos we usually find a five-element naming system including a first name given at birth or at baptism (traditionally known as *nombre de pila*), two surnames inherited both from the father's and the mother's line, a personal alias or nickname, and a lineage or family nickname that denotes a descent group or category. The family nickname usually derives from the personal nickname of the eponymous ancestor that founded the descent branch: the *raza* or *familia*. In the example of Garcia Lorca's poem quoted in the beginning, *Antonio* was the personal birth name, *Torres* and *Heredia* the father's and mother's surnames, and *Camborio* the descent line that included at least three generations ("son and grandson of *Camborios*"). His second surname was tragically important in the poetic world of the *Romancero*. Antonio's death is sung in a subsequent poem at the hands of his maternal cousins, the envious *Heredias*. The personal nickname of Antonio was not cited. It might have derived from his birth name, and thus be "Antoñito," "Toño," or "Toñito." This pattern is not uncommon among Gitanos.

These five naming elements reflect a set of social and family relations as they are culturally interpreted and experienced by Gitanos. They resemble the "four-layered" naming system described by Sarah Phillips (1997: 27–38) for the Roma Kalderash and Machvaia in North America, although there are crucial differences between both systems. The central one here is the importance, continuity, and permanence of surnames among Gitanos and their historical construction as "Gitano" names. In fact, the adoption of Spanish names seems to be one of the first long-term changes experienced by the *Calé* after their arrival to Spain. The first documents concerning this group described Gitanos as a foreign population coming from a far-away country (Pym, 2007; Leblon, 1985). Hence, it is important to know when and how Gitanos adopted the official names that ultimately transformed a crucial aspect of their intercultural identity. Are there historical records through which the personal and family names of Gitanos can be studied? Have Gitanos maintained these same names over time? Are the heritable names of Gitano people of little relevance and continuity?

In this paper we will use data from the most important historical database on Spanish Gitanos: the Census taken after the Royal Order of 1783. We have published a systematic review of the surnames it contains (Gamella et al., 2012). Here we will

use that database to address an important matter. Precisely, the official inheritable names of Gitanos were one of the first signs of their transformation into a special class of *vecinos* or “neighbors,” and *naturales* or “natives,” of Spain (Herzog, 2003). This integration, however, was precarious, rarely granting the *Calé* the full rights of the “Old Castellians,” the dominant members of their communities. In fact, as Herzog has argued, until at least the late eighteenth century, the idea persisted that “Gypsies were both ordinary (although badly behaved) natives and foreigners,” and this “duality explained why ‘well-behaved’ Gypsies were nevertheless considered Gypsies and why Gypsy residence — like all other foreign residence — was ‘tolerated’ rather than permitted’ (2003: 133). Our argument here is that the personal and family names of Gitanos have historically reflected the ambivalence of their social status and the complex patterns of Gitano agency in their adaptation to Spanish local life.

Naming systems are institutions that indicate social identity in a unique form, and naming practices reflect the ways in which bundles of social relations are culturally organized (Phillips, 1997; Goodenough, 1966). Individually, the person’s name is a crucial element of personal identity as it is dialogically constructed (Carbaugh, 1996: 113). Names affect how others react to us and hence they affect our self-appraisal as well as our individual sense of ourselves (Twenge, 1997: 418). Bureaucracies increasingly demand unambiguous, permanent personal identification. All governments want their subjects to be named (and numbered), hence names have become an essential element of modern governance. On the other hand, inheritable names are also used as “cultural markers of coancestry” by geneticists and physical anthropologists, and today there is a renewed interest in surnames in the study of inheritance, inbreeding and population genetics (King and Jobling, 2009: 351). Hence, the naming practices of Romani groups and their historical variation are a crucial area of research.

Surnames in Spain

In Spain the use of family names was “well established by the twelfth century, mostly as patronymics that changed with each generation” (Mateos and Tucker, 2008: 165). At least since the fifteenth century both personal and family names experienced an intense process of Castilianization, as Castile became the hegemonic kingdom in the country and Castilian the dominant language in a growing empire. Castilianization was mixed with imposed Christianization, itself supported by the State and violently enforced by the Inquisition (Mateos and Tucker, 2008: 166).

The custom of using two surnames from both the father’s and the mother’s side, so typical of Spanish-speaking countries, seems to have begun in the sixteenth century (Mateos and Tucker, 2008: 166–167). However, it took some time until the intergenerational transmission of two surnames was regularized. Among the aristocracy, siblings often used different surnames, as titles and states were often linked to singular surnames. The end of this “anarchic period” is usually situated in the enlightened reign of Carlos III (1759–1788). It would become definitively fixed with the creation of the Civil Register in 1871. The Civil Registration Act required parents to register births and use two hereditary surnames, forbidding any change in their spelling. These measures tried to “make sure that paternity and maternity of a child

was always clear, as well as to identify brothers and sisters of the same marriage. This had important implications in legal issues, for example in hereditary disputes” (Mateos and Tucker, 2008: 167). As shown in civil register records, Gitanos have been using the three-component name as rest of Spaniards at least since the mid-nineteenth century.

This registration system somehow stopped the Castilianization of surnames, but that of forenames continued and was reinforced during the Franco dictatorship (1939–1975), when Castilian was the only official language. The restoration of democracy in 1975 brought back into official records many Galician, Catalan, and Basque names (Mateos and Tucker, 2008: 167; Kohlheim, 1999). It also opened the way to a larger and cosmopolitan variety of personal names popularized in films, sports, television, or politics. Often we heard different people refer to children born in the 1980s as the “Ivan and Vanessa generation,” as those names embody the novel names that became popular in Spain.

The Gitanos of Spain

On the Iberian Peninsula the earliest reference to groups of travelers known as “Egyptanos” dates from the early fifteenth century. Similar groups “knocked at the gates of western Europe in the guise of pilgrims” doing penance for their apostasy of the Christian faith, and “aroused intense curiosity” (Fraser, 1992: 1, 79). Most historical reconstructions consider these immigrant groups to be the ancestors of present day *Gitanos*, *Ciganos*, *Romanchiels*, *Sinti*, *Manouches*, and so on, who live as minorities in all countries of Western Europe. These groups in turn are related to the other Romani peoples of Central-Eastern Europe and America (Fraser, 1992; Matras, 2002).

In Spain little is known about these first wandering groups, although it seems that they enjoyed the hospitality of the lords of the land, who respected their hierarchies, customs and legal autonomy. In 1499, however, the first royal edict directed at the Gitanos forced them to work and settle with seigneurs or suffer severe punishments. Later, during the economic, social, and demographic crisis of imperial Spain from 1588 to 1700, the *Calé* became an easy scapegoat. In this period there was a gradual shift in the representation of Gitanos from a group of foreign, exotic travelers to a local group of vagabonds, deserters, and criminals (see Leblon, 1985; Sánchez Ortega, 1988). By the end of this period, it seems that elites were convinced that “Spain’s Gypsies, far from being ethnically distinct, were in fact nothing more than a domestic underclass, recalcitrantly delinquent, to be sure, but emphatically home-grown” (Pym, 2007: 30). The long period of persecution and forced assimilation culminated in a genocidal attempt in 1749, when thousands of Gitano families were arrested all over Spain, and men and women sent to separate prisons with the declared purpose of ending the collective life of the *Calé* people (see Gómez Alfaro, 1993).

In this period of forced assimilation, the Gitanos seem to have lost their original language, most likely an inflected variety of Romani. The *Calé* incorporated some of their Romani lexicon into Castilian (or Basque, Portuguese, or Catalan) grammar and generated a mixed language known as *Caló* or *Romanó*. State authorities looked down upon this language as a criminal jargon and thus persecuted its use (see Buzek,

2011; Gamella *et al.*, 2011; 2012; Bakker, 1995). The adoption of Spanish personal and family names may have also contributed to this view of Gitanos as a deviant part of the native underclass.

Nevertheless, as Herzog has convincingly shown, this view of “Gypsiness” as a perverted way of life voluntarily adopted by people “born on the peninsula as vassals of the king” who “nevertheless chose to behave in an antisocial and illegal manner” (2003: 129–130) obscured a deep-seated ambivalence about the nature of Gitanos. Even those *Calé* who lived “exemplary lives” were rarely, if ever, considered “neighbors” or “full members of the community” (2003: 131). “Gypsiness” was a category defined by descent as well and not just a way of life. Hence it contained many of the elements of a racial category in the modern sense, as also happened with the perception of “Jewishness” in the same period and later (see Herzog, 2003: 125).

Even the 1783 Royal Order, the last of all the *Pragmáticas* addressed specifically to the *Cale* and the first to offer a measure of equality to this minority, insisted that Gitanos did not have a different “nature” nor did they originate from “any sort of infected root.” However, this royal order also demanded that Gitanos stopped using their “jargon or language,” their distinctive attire, and their itinerant trades and distinctive customs (see the 1783 Royal Order in Gómez Alfaro, 2009: 279–289).

Interestingly, the year of 1783, so important legally for Spanish Gitanos, also marks the start of a paradigmatic change in the intellectual representation of Romani groups in Europe. It was in this year that Heinrich Grellmann published a book that became one of the most influential depictions of Gypsies. This book popularized the theory of the Indian origin of the Romani language, which had been developed by Rüdiger, Marsden, and other scholars. This theory, in turn, provided the clearest (often the only) evidence of a common origin of all “Gypsy” groups. This new conception “supplied a common ethnic base to Gypsy groups living scattered from each other by characterizing them extensively as a group with a static culture and way of life” and a shared descent akin to “Jews in the Diaspora” (Willems, 1997: 295). Increasingly, Spanish Gitanos would become an object of observation for nineteenth-century scholars (and Romantic travelers) who focused on the remnants of Romani in their speech as a crucial part of their identity. In Spain these ideas took many decades to permeate to the intellectual world, and did not enter the public discourse of Gitano leaders until the second half of the twentieth century.

Gitanos’ surnames: early evidence

Yet by the sixteenth century there is evidence that Gitanos were acquiring the forenames and surnames that they have kept until today. For example, Helena Sánchez Ortega, in her book *La inquisición y los gitanos* (1988) offers a list of the Gitano children baptized in the Santa Ana parish of Triana, Seville, in this century. Between 1559 and 1594, Sanchez Ortega documents 35 baptisms of children whose parents were identified as Gitanos; in 61 cases (out of 70), their names and surnames are listed. Most of these are Castilian surnames that have become common among Gitanos, such as *Hernandez* (17 cases, 28% of all), *Bustamante* (10 cases, 16%), *Heredia* (7 cases, 12%), and others (Sánchez Ortega, 1988: 393–394). Some surnames seem to indicate the *Cale*’s presumed origin, as those of *Greciano* or *de Grecia* (from

Greece) that may refer to an alternative ethnic label given to some Gypsies at the time (Pym, 2007). These parish entries also show that some surnames, especially women's, were not fixed. For instance, a couple who registered the baptism of three children in a decade is recognized by the constancy of the father's name and the first name of the mother. But the surnames of the mother vary in the three entries (see Gamella et al., 2012 for an extended analysis of these data).

The 1783 *Pragmática* and the census of Gitanos

Two centuries later we find a much larger sample of names in the census taken following the Royal Order of 1783. The order required that all local authorities listed the Gitanos living in their counties. By mid-1785 a complete census had been collected with data on 12,540 persons identified as Gitanos. Most of these listings contained information on the people's names, occupations, ages, family relations, neighborhood, and often their physical traits. Many entries were very detailed. For instance, in Arcos de la Frontera, a town in the province of Cadiz, the list sent to Madrid included this family:

Juan de Dios Navarro, 44 years, born in Jerez, "gray, thick beard, chestnut hair, brown eyes," with his wife, also from Jerez, *Leonor Monje*, 37, "brunette, black hair and eyebrows, a mole near the left one, black eyes and another mole on her left cheek." And their six children, all born in Jerez: *Sebastiana*, 22, "light skin, brown eyes, hair and eyebrows"; *José*, 21, "white, with black hair and eyebrows, thin beard, pockmarks in his face, blind in the right eye"; *Ana*, 17, "brunette, black hair and eyebrows, brown eyes"; *Lorenzo*, 17, "light skin, brown hair and eyebrows, with a mark near the right ear"; *Juan de Dios*, 10, "light skin, white hair and eyebrows, brown eyes"; and *Manuel*, 4, "light brown skin, blond hair, brown eyes." (AHN, *Consejo*, Legajo 525 and AGS, *Gracia y Justicia*, Legajo 1,005)

The listings provided data on 3089 domestic families or households in 644 localities all over Spain. They were completed just one year before the beginning of the Census of Floridablanca, one of the earliest modern censuses that established the Spanish population at about 10.4 million (Livi-Bacci, 1990: 35). Therefore the census of Gitanos agreed with the statistical paradigm and the "populationist sensibility of Spanish Enlightened Despotism" (Dopico and Rowland, 1990: 592). According to this ideology, the population was a crucial resource of the state and thus a privileged object of knowledge and control (Foucault, 2004).

Despite the "proto-statistical" character of these listings and their repressive and assimilatory purpose, they provide the most complete and detailed portrait of this minority in the *ancien régime*. Obviously there are gaps,⁴ but the information they contain is rich and detailed; and, when compared to contemporary sources of data such as parish records, the data appear reliable and exhaustive. Almost all localities of the surveyed provinces were listed.

These registers, however, have never been analyzed in a systematic way. Some historians have used this source of data in their specialized studies of regional Gitano populations (Gómez Alfaro, 2010); or the role of the *Calé* in the origins of Flamenco (Leblon, 2003); or when studying the history of professional groups such as the

Gitano blacksmiths of Seville (Pérez Guzmán, 1982). However, there is a lack of an integrated analysis of all data contained in these censuses concerning aspects like demography, settlement patterns, family and household structure, occupations, health, and so on. One of the primary elements of these censuses is the personal and family names used to identify the registered persons. What surnames did Gitanos use in that complex historical moment? Were those names Romani in origin? How did these names vary by region and locality? By addressing the question of the official names of Gitanos, their origin, and regional variation, we consider the permanence and relevance of these names in the process of national and ethnic identification.

Materials and methods

We have processed all the listings sent to Madrid by local authorities between 1783 and 1785.⁵ These listings include data on 12,540 persons, of whom 774 had died. In 12,037 cases (95%) the surname was recorded. Our count does not include the names of the non-Gypsy spouses in cases of intermarriage. There are 128 of such mixed marriages, or 4.8% of all the 2687 couples that were identified. Our analysis of surnames also excludes the children of such unions when the father was a non-Gypsy. Here, the analysis is limited to the first surname.

Patrification was the dominant form of first surname transmission in all regions. Women, as is customary in Spain, did not change their surnames upon marriage. In Catalonia, however, wives sometimes took their husband's surname, using also, in second place, their father's surname. However, this was not a generalized practice as 21% of all Catalan couples (43 of 209) share their first surnames, compared to 6% for the total of Spain. If the surnames of a couple's children were not included we assume they took their father's. This is confirmed in the hundreds of cases in which there are references to deceased parents.

In 229 cases, the entries recorded two surnames; the father's and mother's. There are also around 50 cases that show irregularities in the intergenerational transmission of surnames. They may be due to the fact that the subjects used any of the surnames available in the family. Also, it might have happened that children born from parents who were married according to Gitano "law," but not officially, were registered with the name of the mother. Personal and family nicknames were also included in a few dozen cases, seemingly by a confusion of the local registrars taking the census.

We have also analyzed separately the frequency of the surnames of each couple included in the census without attending to the children. There are not significant differences in results shown in this paper regarding the relative frequency of surnames.

Our analysis preserved the small variations present in the spelling of some surnames, such as *Ximenez*, *Jiménez*, and *Gimenez*; *Maya* and *Malla*; *Barrull*, *Barrul*, *Barrulla*, *Barulla*, *Borrull*, and, perhaps, *Borrut*, surnames of Catalan origin. We have also counted as different the Catalan and Castilian version of the same names, such as *Escuder* and *Escudero*, *Gargol* and *Caracol*, *Cantarell* and *Cantarel*.

To check the validity and reliability of these censuses we have studied independent sources, both in local or regional archives, and in the parish and civil registers of some of the localities where Gitanos lived in 1783 (see Gamella *et al.*, 2012).

Results: the surnames in the censuses

Hispanic surnames

All Spanish Gitanos listed in 1785 had Spanish surnames. The most popular Gitano surnames were of two types. The first type consists of patronymics common among Spaniards at large, such as those ended in *-ez*, like *Fernández* and *Ximénez*, the most frequent names in the entire census, shared by 14% of the *Calé* population. Other common patronymics such as *Muñoz*, *Rodríguez*, and *García* were also frequent. The second type is made up of Castilian surnames, sometimes of aristocratic origin, that are today strongly associated with Gitano identity, such as: *Heredia*, *Vargas*, *Cortés*, *Reyes*, *Montoya*, *Moreno*, *Santiago*, *Flores*, *Torres*, and *Malla* or *Maya* (see Faure et al., 2001, and Gamella et al., 2012 for the etymology of these names).

The patrilineal transmission of the first surname was the norm, as in the rest of the Spanish population. Moreover, it seems that the Spanish custom of using two surnames from the father's and mother's line was increasingly common among Gitanos and would consolidate in the following decades as shown by the entries of the civil registers consulted in Andalusia (Gamella and Martín, 2008).

There are 567 different Gitano surnames that identified 12,037 persons. However, this diversity of heritable names is misleading. Most surnames identified a handful of people, while about 55 names (10% of all names) identified three-quarters of the whole population. As can be seen in Table 1, the 10 most common surnames include 40% of the population and the 20 most common include half (53%) of the population. This is a higher concentration than found in the Spanish population at large (Mateos and Tucker, 2008; Scalpoli et al., 2007). In their surname distribution, Spanish Gitanos have experienced the effects of their preferred marriage patterns, especially those concerning endogamy and high fertility (Martín and Gamella, 2005; Gamella, 2011).

Less frequent surnames

There are many surnames in the Census that identify just a few persons: 350 surnames identified fewer than five people. In some cases, these rare surnames are small variants of more common ones. For instance, *Borulla* appears also as *Borrull*, *Barrull*, and *Barulla*; *Cantarel* as *Cantarell*, *García* as *Garcías*. Some of these variations concern names of Catalan and Basque origin. For instance, the names *Echeverría*, *Cheverría*, *Chavarría*, which derive from the Basque surname *Etxeberria* ("New home"), were taken by immigrants in the Basque Country and Navarra.

Some of the rare surnames were generated by different transcriptions of more popular surnames. In most cases, however, Gitano people may have adopted the less common names more recently. Some of these rare surnames may have vanished from the Gitano minority. Others have become more frequent in the last two centuries.

Regional variation

As we can see in Tables 2 and 3, the distribution and frequency of *Calé* surnames varied considerably by region. We have grouped the data according to the "kingdoms" or historical territories of the time, from which today's provinces and regions derive. Thus, Andalusia appeared divided in four historical "kingdoms," the largest being that of Seville, followed by Granada, Córdoba, and Jaen. By 1785, most

TABLE 1

THE 70 MOST FREQUENT GITANO SURNAMES IN THE CENSUS OF 1783–1785. PERCENTAGES OF THE TOTAL GITANO POPULATION (N: 12,307)

Rank	Surname	F	%	Cum%	Rank	Surname	F	%	Cum%
1	<i>Fernández</i>	856	7.1	7.1	36	<i>Salguero</i>	73	0.6	64.1
2	<i>Ximénez</i>	745	6.2	13.3	37	<i>Díaz</i>	72	0.6	64.7
3	<i>Heredía</i>	628	5.2	18.5	38	<i>Acosta</i>	71	0.6	65.3
4	<i>Vargas</i>	624	5.2	23.7	38	<i>Bustamante</i>	71	0.6	65.9
5	<i>Cortés</i>	576	4.8	28.5	40	<i>Molina</i>	70	0.6	66.5
6	<i>Reyes</i>	367	3.0	31.5	40	<i>Silva</i>	70	0.6	67.1
7	<i>Montoya</i>	339	2.8	34.4	42	<i>Pubill</i>	67	0.6	67.6
8	<i>Moreno</i>	250	2.1	36.4	43	<i>Maldonado</i>	66	0.5	68.2
9	<i>García</i>	241	2.0	38.4	44	<i>Castellón</i>	64	0.5	68.7
10	<i>Santiago</i>	227	1.9	40.3	45	<i>Medrano</i>	63	0.5	69.2
11	<i>Malla</i>	209	1.7	42.1	46	<i>Ortiz</i>	63	0.5	69.8
12	<i>Monje</i>	168	1.4	43.4	47	<i>Bautista</i>	59	0.5	70.3
13	<i>Salazar</i>	159	1.3	44.8	48	<i>Saavedra</i>	58	0.5	70.7
14	<i>Martín</i>	157	1.3	46.1	49	<i>Peña</i>	57	0.5	71.2
15	<i>Navarro</i>	153	1.3	47.3	49	<i>Trigueros</i>	57	0.5	71.7
16	<i>Flores</i>	138	1.1	48.5	51	<i>Franco</i>	56	0.5	72.1
17	<i>Torres</i>	132	1.1	49.6	52	<i>Amador</i>	55	0.5	72.6
18	<i>Campos</i>	125	1.0	50.6	52	<i>Montes</i>	55	0.5	73.1
19	<i>Bermúdez</i>	120	1.0	51.6	54	<i>Losada</i>	54	0.4	73.5
20	<i>Gómez</i>	111	0.9	52.5	55	<i>Núñez</i>	53	0.4	73.9
20	<i>Hernández</i>	111	0.9	53.5	56	<i>Cabello</i>	52	0.4	74.4
22	<i>Castro</i>	100	0.8	54.3	57	<i>Serrano</i>	49	0.4	74.8
23	<i>Rodríguez</i>	96	0.8	55.1	58	<i>Carbonell</i>	46	0.4	75.2
24	<i>González</i>	95	0.8	55.9	59	<i>Vega</i>	42	0.3	75.5
25	<i>Carrillo</i>	93	0.8	56.7	60	<i>Morón</i>	40	0.3	75.8
26	<i>Gálvez</i>	89	0.7	57.4	61	<i>Carrasco</i>	39	0.3	76.2
27	<i>Escuder</i>	88	0.7	58.1	62	<i>Contreras</i>	39	0.3	76.5
28	<i>Muñoz</i>	87	0.7	58.9	62	<i>Garcés</i>	39	0.3	76.8
28	<i>Soto</i>	87	0.7	59.6	64	<i>Arroyo</i>	38	0.3	77.1
30	<i>Fajardo</i>	86	0.7	60.3	64	<i>Vicente</i>	38	0.3	77.5
31	<i>Cruz</i>	80	0.7	61.0	66	<i>Carmona</i>	37	0.3	77.8
31	<i>Maya</i>	80	0.7	61.6	66	<i>Junquera</i>	37	0.3	78.1
31	<i>Romero</i>	80	0.7	62.3	68	<i>Ramos</i>	35	0.3	78.4
34	<i>Suárez</i>	77	0.6	62.9	68	<i>Utrera</i>	35	0.3	78.6
35	<i>Escudero</i>	73	0.6	63.5	70	<i>Aguilera</i>	34	0.3	78.9

TABLE 2

THE 35 MOST COMMON GITANO SURNAMES IN THE KINGDOMS OF SEVILLE, GRANADA, AND THE PRINCIPALITY OF CATALONIA, 1783–1785. PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL REGIONAL POPULATIONS

	Seville	F	%	Cum%	Granada	F	%	Cum%	Catalonia	F	%	Cum%
1	<i>Ximénez</i>	376	8.8	8.8	<i>Fernández</i>	480	15.8	15.8	<i>Ximénez</i>	209	21.0	21.0
2	<i>Vargas</i>	361	8.5	17.3	<i>Heredia</i>	354	11.7	27.5	<i>Escuder</i>	88	8.8	29.8
3	<i>Reyes</i>	222	5.2	22.5	<i>Cortés</i>	336	11.1	38.6	<i>Pubill</i>	67	6.7	36.5
4	<i>García</i>	185	4.3	26.8	<i>Santiago</i>	170	5.6	44.2	<i>Malla</i>	66	6.6	43.2
5	<i>Heredia</i>	171	4.0	30.8	<i>Martín</i>	131	4.3	48.5	<i>Carbonell</i>	45	4.5	47.7
6	<i>Monje</i>	167	3.9	34.7	<i>Moreno</i>	100	3.3	51.8	<i>Reyes</i>	41	4.1	51.8
7	<i>Fernández</i>	157	3.7	38.4	<i>Montoya</i>	87	2.9	54.7	<i>Bautista</i>	36	3.6	55.4
8	<i>Moreno</i>	95	2.2	40.6	<i>Gómez</i>	79	2.6	57.3	<i>Hernández</i>	34	3.4	58.8
9	<i>Flores</i>	80	1.9	42.5	<i>Campos</i>	78	2.6	59.9	<i>Batista</i>	33	3.3	62.1
10	<i>Cruz</i>	75	1.8	44.3	<i>Fajardo</i>	60	2.0	61.9	<i>Cortés</i>	24	2.4	64.6
11	<i>Gálvez</i>	74	1.7	46.0	<i>Soto</i>	57	1.9	63.8	<i>Escudero</i>	22	2.2	66.8
12	<i>Montoya</i>	73	1.7	47.7	<i>Torres</i>	55	1.8	65.6	<i>Patrach</i>	20	2.0	68.8
13	<i>Navarro</i>	66	1.5	49.3	<i>Maldonado</i>	51	1.7	67.3	<i>Castro</i>	18	1.8	70.6
14	<i>Salguero</i>	60	1.4	50.7	<i>Malla</i>	47	1.6	68.8	<i>Giménez</i>	17	1.7	72.3
15	<i>Acosta</i>	59	1.4	52.1	<i>Trigueros</i>	42	1.4	70.2	<i>Berenguer</i>	16	1.6	73.9
16	<i>Carrillo</i>	58	1.4	53.4	<i>Amador</i>	39	1.3	71.5	<i>Soler</i>	15	1.5	75.4
16	<i>Cortés</i>	58	1.4	54.8	<i>Contreras</i>	39	1.3	72.8	<i>Serra</i>	14	1.4	76.8
18	<i>Peña</i>	57	1.3	56.1	<i>Maya</i>	36	1.2	74.0	<i>Vila</i>	14	1.4	78.2
19	<i>Bermúdez</i>	55	1.3	57.4	<i>Vargas</i>	35	1.2	75.1	<i>Ferrer</i>	13	1.3	79.5
20	<i>Suárez</i>	53	1.2	58.6	<i>Flores</i>	34	1.1	76.2	<i>Bustamante</i>	12	1.2	80.7
21	<i>Núñez</i>	44	1.0	59.7	<i>Carmona</i>	33	1.1	77.3	<i>Caragol</i>	12	1.2	81.9
22	<i>Santiago</i>	44	1.0	60.7	<i>Utrera</i>	31	1.0	78.3	<i>Espinas</i>	12	1.2	83.1
23	<i>Rodríguez</i>	42	1.0	61.7	<i>Rodríguez</i>	29	1.0	79.3	<i>Gomis</i>	11	1.1	84.2
24	<i>Romero</i>	42	1.0	62.7	<i>Ximénez</i>	28	0.9	80.2	<i>Gispert</i>	10	1.0	85.2
25	<i>Morón</i>	40	0.9	63.6	<i>Cabello</i>	27	0.9	81.1	<i>Bohigas</i>	9	0.9	86.1
26	<i>Carrasco</i>	39	0.9	64.5	<i>Muñoz</i>	27	0.9	82.0	<i>Castelló</i>	9	0.9	87.0
27	<i>Junquera</i>	37	0.9	65.4	<i>Reyes</i>	25	0.8	82.8	<i>Caracol</i>	7	0.7	87.8
28	<i>Medrano</i>	36	0.8	66.2	<i>Córdoba</i>	22	0.7	83.6	<i>Castellón</i>	7	0.7	88.5
29	<i>Las Heras</i>	34	0.8	67.0	<i>Medrano</i>	20	0.7	84.2	<i>García</i>	7	0.7	89.2
30	<i>Montes</i>	33	0.8	67.8	<i>Garcés</i>	19	0.6	84.9	<i>Puig</i>	7	0.7	89.9
31	<i>Ramos</i>	32	0.7	68.5	<i>Bermúdez</i>	18	0.6	85.4	<i>Gómez</i>	6	0.6	90.5
32	<i>Serrano</i>	32	0.7	69.3	<i>Román</i>	17	0.6	86.0	<i>Baptista</i>	5	0.5	91.0
33	<i>Torres</i>	32	0.7	70.0	<i>Torcuato</i>	17	0.6	86.6	<i>Rius</i>	5	0.5	91.5
34	<i>Ortega</i>	31	0.7	70.8	<i>Amaya</i>	16	0.5	87.1	<i>Valentín</i>	5	0.5	92.0
35	<i>Soto</i>	29	0.7	71.5	<i>Aguilera</i>	15	0.5	87.6	<i>Vidal</i>	5	0.5	92.5

TABLE 3

THE 35 MOST COMMON GITANO SURNAMES IN THE KINGDOMS OF MURCIA, EXTREMADURA, AND VALENCIA, 1783–1785. PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL REGIONAL POPULATIONS

Rank	Murcia	F	%	Cum%	Extremadura	F	%	Cum%	Valencia	F	%	Cum%
1	<i>Vargas</i>	98	12.4	12.4	<i>Silva</i>	67	10.7	10.7	<i>Vargas</i>	65	10.6	10.6
2	<i>Fernández</i>	88	11.2	23.6	<i>Salazar</i>	39	6.2	16.9	<i>Castellón</i>	55	9.0	19.6
3	<i>Montoya</i>	77	9.8	33.3	<i>Cortés</i>	33	5.3	22.1	<i>Hernández</i>	40	6.5	26.1
4	<i>Navarro</i>	59	7.5	40.8	<i>Saavedra</i>	31	4.9	27.1	<i>Montoya</i>	38	6.2	32.3
5	<i>Salazar</i>	43	5.4	46.3	<i>Ximénez</i>	30	4.8	31.8	<i>Díaz</i>	37	6.0	38.3
6	<i>Franco</i>	36	4.6	50.8	<i>Fernández</i>	26	4.1	36.0	<i>Salazar</i>	36	5.9	44.2
7	<i>Castro</i>	33	4.2	55.0	<i>Galindo</i>	25	4.0	40.0	<i>Bustamante</i>	33	5.4	49.6
8	<i>Redondo</i>	27	3.4	58.4	<i>Suárez</i>	20	3.2	43.2	<i>Ximénez</i>	31	5.1	54.6
9	<i>Heredía</i>	24	3.0	61.5	<i>Vega</i>	19	3.0	46.2	<i>Malla</i>	29	4.7	59.4
10	<i>Torres</i>	24	3.0	64.5	<i>Vargas</i>	18	2.9	49.0	<i>Escudero</i>	25	4.1	63.5
11	<i>Leandro</i>	23	2.9	67.4	<i>Rodríguez</i>	16	2.5	51.6	<i>Vicente</i>	24	3.9	67.4
12	<i>Bermúdez</i>	20	2.5	70.0	<i>Manzano</i>	13	2.1	53.7	<i>Fernández</i>	18	2.9	70.3
12	<i>Díaz</i>	20	2.5	72.5	<i>Molina</i>	11	1.8	55.4	<i>Gil</i>	18	2.9	73.2
12	<i>Ximénez</i>	20	2.5	75.0	<i>Montes</i>	11	1.8	57.2	<i>Cortés</i>	15	2.4	75.7
15	<i>Bautista</i>	15	1.9	76.9	<i>Acosta</i>	10	1.6	58.8	<i>Franco</i>	13	2.1	77.8
15	<i>Nieto</i>	15	1.9	78.8	<i>Gómez</i>	10	1.6	60.4	<i>Barrul</i>	8	1.3	79.1
17	<i>García</i>	14	1.8	80.6	<i>Laso</i>	10	1.6	61.9	<i>Barrull</i>	8	1.3	80.4
17	<i>Vicente</i>	14	1.8	82.4	<i>Moran</i>	10	1.6	63.5	<i>Bermúdez</i>	7	1.1	81.6
19	<i>Campos</i>	13	1.6	84.0	<i>Giles</i>	9	1.4	65.0	<i>Borrull</i>	6	1.0	82.5
20	<i>Baptista</i>	12	1.5	85.6	<i>Montañés</i>	9	1.4	66.4	<i>González</i>	6	1.0	83.5
20	<i>Pérez</i>	12	1.5	87.1	<i>Baena</i>	8	1.3	67.7	<i>Leandro</i>	6	1.0	84.5
22	<i>Amador</i>	10	1.3	88.3	<i>Lobato</i>	8	1.3	68.9	<i>Obejero</i>	6	1.0	85.5
23	<i>Muñoz</i>	7	0.9	89.2	<i>Vázquez</i>	8	1.3	70.2	<i>Ruano</i>	6	1.0	86.5
24	<i>Salomón</i>	6	0.8	90.0	<i>Flores</i>	7	1.1	71.3	<i>Campos</i>	5	0.8	87.3
25	<i>Maya</i>	5	0.6	90.6	<i>Galán</i>	7	1.1	72.5	<i>Parcelan</i>	5	0.8	88.1
26	<i>Cortés</i>	4	0.5	91.1	<i>Lazo</i>	7	1.1	73.6	<i>Velasco</i>	5	0.8	88.9
27	<i>Garrido</i>	4	0.5	91.6	<i>Maya</i>	7	1.1	74.7	<i>Bautista</i>	4	0.7	89.6
28	<i>González</i>	4	0.5	92.1	<i>Montano</i>	7	1.1	75.8	<i>Garcés</i>	4	0.7	90.2
29	<i>Malla</i>	4	0.5	92.6	<i>Quirós</i>	7	1.1	76.9	<i>Jiménez</i>	4	0.7	90.9
30	<i>Arjona</i>	3	0.4	93.0	<i>Montañesa</i>	6	1.0	77.9	<i>Martínez</i>	3	0.5	91.4
31	<i>Cuenca</i>	3	0.4	93.4	<i>Reyes</i>	6	1.0	78.8	<i>Matet</i>	3	0.5	91.8
32	<i>Gómez</i>	3	0.4	93.8	<i>Santiago</i>	6	1.0	79.8	<i>Moraga</i>	3	0.5	92.3
33	<i>Plantón</i>	3	0.4	94.2	<i>Sosa</i>	6	1.0	80.7	<i>Moreno</i>	3	0.5	92.8
34	<i>Pozo</i>	3	0.4	94.6	<i>Campos</i>	5	0.8	81.5	<i>Pedraza</i>	3	0.5	93.3
35	<i>Bustamante</i>	2	0.3	94.8	<i>Lozano</i>	5	0.8	82.3	<i>Almagro</i>	2	0.3	93.6

Gitanos lived in southern and eastern Spain. Nine out of ten persons included in the census lived south of the Tajo river, and 70% in Andalusia. The largest concentrations of Gitano population were found in the kingdoms of Seville and Granada. Catalonia was the third region with a larger number of Gitanos.

In all regions we found the most common surnames such as *Ximenez*, *Fernández*, *Vargas*, or *Cortes*, although with variable frequency in each case. These common names may have been adopted earlier, even before some groups separated and migrated to other regions. But there are also surnames that appear exclusively in one region and have a clear regional origin. For instance, the Catalan surnames *Pubill*, *Escuder*, *Carbonell*, or *Patrach*, or the Galician-Portuguese *Silva* and *Saavedra*, very common in Extremadura. Finally, rare names are much more frequent in some regions and areas, crucially in those that show a greater prevalence of mixed marriages.

The variation in naming practices points to a separate history of Gitanos in the different regions and indicates that the Gitano population had strong local affiliations and a rather settled life already in the eighteenth century. The observed regional variation in inheritable names also indicates a variety of forms of integration of Gitano people to local and regional life. For instance, the higher proportion of rare (seemingly more recently adopted) surnames in the kingdom of Seville may correlate with the earlier and more intense cultural and familial mixing of the minority in this region. In several enclaves of the cities of Seville, Cadiz, Jerez, and others, there is much evidence of the secular acceptance of Gitano populations in local life, and a cultural hybridization that seems to have been more intense there than elsewhere in Spain (see Pasqualino, 1998 for an example).

Surname continuity

The surnames found in these censuses are the same that Gitanos still carry today. Some of these names are often associated with Gitano families, especially in certain regions. Their combination (in the Spanish system of father's and mother's surnames) generates patterns that allow for a measure of ethnic identification, although these are not totally reliable. Our research in the civil and parochial registers in Granada and Seville confirms that Gitano surnames are today the same names we found in 1783. This is also confirmed in the very few and limited studies on Gitano names available (Lermo et al., 2006; Manrique, 2010). The frequency of some surnames, however, seems to have increased greatly and some new names may have entered the minority.

Using our genealogical reconstitution of the Gitano population of twenty-two localities of Granada (Gamella and Martín, 2008; Martín and Gamella, 2005) it is possible to trace hundreds of genealogies linking living Gitanos and Gitanas with their ancestors in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. See the example of the person named Ramón Heredia, born in 1734, who has direct descendants carrying the same name today in the Guadix region (Gamella et al., 2012: 57–58). The historian Antón Carmona, a Gitano himself, also found a marked continuity in the history of his family, and he was able to trace his ancestors in the parish records of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries (2004). Nathalie Manrique also has established detailed long-term naming antecedents in the Gitano population of another Andalusian region (2010).

Interestingly, the transmission of Gitano surnames became more irregular with the development of the civil register in late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Thus, the patrilineal transmission of the first surnames was sometimes discontinued, as newborns had to be inscribed with the surname of the mother if legal marriage was not proven. Later, the couple involved might marry in church and have their marriage formalized, thereafter inscribing their children with the surnames of the father and the mother. This resulted in full siblings having different surnames. The whole process confused authorities and commoners about the declared kin relationships of Gitanos and helped to spread the idea that they all manipulated their names to escape crimes, taxes, or military conscription.

Personal names

In 1785, Gitanos also had very common Spanish birth names. Half of all Gitano men shared five of those: *Juan*, *Francisco*, *Antonio*, *José*, and *Manuel*, in this order. Together with another twenty common names, such as *Pedro*, *Diego*, *Luis*, *Miguel*, *Sebastián*, *Alonso*, *Cristobal*, *Ramón*, *Andrés*, and so on, these composed 80% of all first male names. The birth names of women were also typical Spanish names. Half of all Gitano women were named *María*, *Josefa*, *Antonia*, *Francisca*, *Juana*, *Ana*, or *Teresa*. Other popular first names for Gitano women were *Manuela*, *Isabel*, *Luisa*, *Rosa*, *Catalina*, *Ramona*, and *Rita*. Two-thirds of all women in the census had one of these fourteen birth names.

Discussion

By 1785, on the eve of the French Revolution, the Gitanos of Spain were completely hispanized in the set of personal and family names they used to deal with state and Church bureaucracies. Moreover, they already had the same official names they have today. In this restricted sense, their assimilation was complete. Although Gitano surnames varied by region and even by county, they were all Spanish. Some were typical Spanish patronyms, such as *Jiménez*, *Fernández*, and *Muñoz*, and some of the most distinctive Gitano family names were originally aristocratic: *Heredia*, *Cortés*, *Fajardo*, *Montoya*, *Córdoba*, and so on. When these names identified Gitanos, however, they were infused with new meanings, as they became tokens of ethnic identity and cultural distinction.

Considering its relatively small number, the Gitano population used a lot of different surnames; more than 500. However, most Gitanos shared a limited number of these surnames. In this manner, they followed similar naming patterns to the rest of Spaniards, as Spain shows a unique surname concentration (Mateos and Tucker, 2008: 182). Thus, in their study of over 26 million names in eight Western European countries, Scapoli and her colleagues found that the eight most frequent European surnames were all Spanish (*García*, *Fernández*, *López*, *Martínez*, etc.) and there were 39 Spanish surnames among the top 100 European surnames, while Spain accounted for only 13% of the population studied (2007: 42). This pattern of concentration may have been even higher among Gitanos due to their particular marriage practices, including consanguineous marriage and higher fertility (Gamella, 2000; Martín and Gamella, 2005; Gamella and Martín, 2008). Today it is common to find several Gitano persons with the same personal and family surnames in any large community.

The origin of Gitano family names

Two complementary processes seem to have operated in the adoption of these Hispanic surnames by the *Calé*: baptism and intermarriage. The name given to a person at baptism is crucial in Christian cultures and, in Catholic Spain, to be baptized was a moral, spiritual, and social requirement.

The first known groups of Gitanos in Spain claimed to have renounced to the Christian faith forced by the Ottoman Turks. Therefore, many adults may have chosen to be baptized as well as to baptize their children. Most of the common Gypsy surnames may be those of godfathers and witnesses in baptism ceremonies. There is some evidence that Gitanos, like Spanish Jewish and Moorish Muslim converts (*conversos*), took the names and surnames of their godparents (*padrinos*) or the godparents of their children (*compadres*), and even those of witnesses of their baptisms, who often were of noble origin (De Luna, 1951). In historical records, often we find Gitanos with aristocratic surnames, typical of the lords of the lands in which they lived, such as *Fajardo*, *Córdoba*, *Heredia*, *Cortés*, *Montoya*, and so on.

Intermarriage may have also been a source of surnames for Gitanos. Although ethnic endogamy has been the norm in this group, mixed marriages were recorded in the sixteenth century, even with aristocrats (Gómez Alfaro, 1999). In the 1783 Census, 128 couples include a husband or wife labeled as “Castilian” or “Spaniard” or non-Gypsy. These are almost 5% of all couples. The proportion of mixed marriages was higher in the Andalusian kingdoms, especially in Córdoba (15%), and in some areas of the kingdom of Seville such as Medina Sidonia, near Cadiz, where half of the couples listed were interethnic. This process of intermarriage has continued and increased greatly in some regions in the last three decades.

In fewer cases, there was probably a process of imitation of local mores in the adoption of trade surnames such as that of *Ferrer* (blacksmith), or *Escuder-Escudero* (servant). These types of trade surnames were found more frequently in Catalonia.

The meaning of surnames for Gitanos

We can only speculate about what these names meant for their bearers in the eighteenth century. Nonetheless, Gitanos themselves provided these names to the civil authorities and to priests in parish registers and did this for many generations thereafter. Moreover, there are signs that the five-element naming system that is used today was already in operation centuries ago.

In fieldwork during the last decade we observed that Gitanos mostly use personal names and nicknames in their private, familiar interactions. Surnames are not commonly used as terms of address within families or local communities. Besides, when two unknown Gitano persons meet, they try to situate each other within family and descent networks using the eponymous nicknames that denote these networks. These family nicknames are the creations of Gitano groups and they rarely appear in public or official documents (see also San Román, 1976).

But surnames are in no way today alien to Gitanos' sense of self, nor are they excluded from their interaction with other Gitanos concerning labor, property, inheritance, and so on. In fact, Gitano surnames cannot be seen as non-Romani in the way Phillips described the naming system of Roma groups in the US (1997:

27–38). On the contrary, many of these names can be a marker of ethnicity, and a source of distinction in circumstances where Gitano identity is valued (as in Flamenco dancing and singing). However, they can also incorporate some stigma in circumstances where the *Calé* suffer from prejudice and discrimination.

In sum, the personal and family names of *Calé* have become relevant signs of both their ethnic, national, and regional identification. For centuries Romani peoples have become natives of different countries and regions and developed strong local affiliations. In this process they not only adopted local cultures, they contributed to their creation. Their cultural difference was often expressed through conceptions and institutions created by the local majorities, but the Romani transformed the dominant culture creatively when they appropriated or resisted it. In Spain the construction of Gitano identity was not only a process of passive acculturation, but a complex process of hybridization, mutual transformation, *détournement*, and the generation of rich intercultural forms — not only in performing arts and music but also in the expression of multilayered identities and local histories.

Acknowledgements

We thank Peter Bakker, Giuseppe Beluschi, Carmen Caballero Navas, Salud Domínguez, Fabian Jacobs, Elena Maruishikova, Veselin Popov, Teri Virostko, and two anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and corrections. The mistakes the paper may still contain are the exclusive responsibility of the authors. The final elaboration of this paper was helped by the Proyecto de Excelencia of the Junta de Andalucía, Spain, P11-SEJ-8286, and the MigROM12 Project, Seventh Framework Program of the European Union, Grant Agreement 319901.

Notes

¹ “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla,” *Romancero Gitano*, 2. *Obras completas*, 7th ed. (Madrid: Aguilar, 1964), p. 445.

² “Gitano” is the term most Spanish Romani people use to refer to themselves both in private and public settings. In Spain it is also the term most frequently used by minority leaders when naming public institutions such as the *Instituto de Cultura Gitana*. It derives from the term “Egiptano,” and thus from a misunderstanding of their origin from Egypt. In this sense the term is synonymous with the English term “Gypsy.” Many representatives of groups who were previously referred to as “Gypsies” reject this term as derogatory, and prefer to be identified by their own denominations, such as *Roma*, *Sinti*, *Kalé*, etc. In Spain, *Caló* (plural *Calé* or *Calós*) is also a term that many Gitanos use to refer to themselves, although less frequently.

³ The authors of the educational ROMBASE web page provide a more complex view of this issue in their entry “Names of Roma.” They state that: “many Slovak Roma have family names which are ‘pure’ romani.” They provide different examples of

what they consider “transparent” Romani surnames such as *Lolo*, *Banga*, *Kaleja*, *T(h)uleja*, and “un-transparent” or “Ancient Indian” surnames such as *Badi*, *Mirga*, or *Karela* (see <<http://romani.uni-graz.at/rombase/>>).

⁴ The Basque country, Navarre, and the court (the city of Madrid and the other royal sites) were not included, as Gitanos were forbidden to reside there. But there is evidence that there were Gitano families living in these three regions. This points to the inevitable gaps in the Census.

⁵ Those are preserved in the Archivo Histórico Nacional (AHN Consejo, Legajos 524 y 525). We have also used the summary of all listings made in 1788. This summary is kept at the Archivo General de Simancas (AGS, Gracia y Justicia, Legajos 1004 and 1005). Finally we have reviewed the accounting of all the listings that is kept in the Archivo Histórico Nacional (AHN, Consejo, Legajo 4036). Antonio Gómez Alfaro did most of the archival research and painstakingly produced a detailed review of all entries combining data from the different sources (see Gamella *et al.*, 2012 for details of the methods followed).

Bibliography

- Bakker, Peter, Milena Hubschmannova, Valdemar Kalinin, and Donald Kenrick. 2001. *What is the Romani Language*. Liverpool: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Bakker, Peter. 1995. "Notes on the Genesis of Caló and Other Iberian Para-Romani Varieties." In: *Romani in Contact with Other Languages*. Ed. Yaron Matras. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 125–150.
- Buzek, Ivo. 2011. *Historia crítica de la lexicografía gitana-española*. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita.
- Carbaugh, Donal. 1996. *Situating Selves. The Communication of Social Identities in American Scenes*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Carmona, Antón. 2004. *Historia de una familia gitana*. Granada: Romí.
- De Luna, Juan Carlos. 1951. *Gitanos de la Bética*. Madrid: Ediciones y Publicaciones Españolas.
- Dopico, Fausto and Robert Rowland. 1990. "Demografía del censo de Floridablanca. Una aproximación." *Revista de Historia Económica* 8: 591–618.
- Faure, Roberto, María Asunción Ribes, and Antonio García. 2001. *Diccionario de apellidos españoles*, Madrid: Espasa.
- Foucault, Michel. 2004. *Sécurité, Territoire, Population: Cours au Collège de France (1977–1978)*. Ed. M. Senellart. Paris: Gallimard.
- Fraser, Angus M. 1992. *The Gypsies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gamella, Juan Francisco. 2011. *Historias de éxito. Modelos para reducir el abandono escolar de la adolescencia gitana*. Madrid: IFIIE, Ministerio de Educación.
- Gamella, Juan Francisco. 2000. *Mujeres gitanas. Matrimonio y género en la cultura gitana de Andalucía*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- Gamella, Juan Francisco and Elisa Martín. 2008. "Vien avec moi cousine. Le mariage entre cousins germains chez le Gitans Andaloux." *Etudes Tsiganes* 30: 110–151.
- Gamella, Juan Francisco, Cayetano Fernández, Magdalena Nieto, and Ignasi-Xavier Adiego. 2011. "La agonía de una lengua. Lo que queda del caló en el habla de los gitanos. Parte 1. Métodos, fuentes y resultados generales." *Gazeta de Antropología* 27: 1–45.
- Gamella, Juan Francisco, Cayetano Fernández, Magdalena Nieto, and Ignasi-Xavier Adiego. 2012. "La agonía de una lengua. Lo que queda del caló en el habla de los gitanos. Parte 2. Un modelo de niveles de competencia y formas de aprendizaje. Voces y campos semánticos más conocidos." *Gazeta de Antropología* 28: 1–32.
- Gamella, Juan Francisco, Antonio Gómez Alfaro, and Juan Pérez. 2012. "Los apellidos de los gitanos españoles en los censos de 1783–85." *Revista de Humanidades* 19: 39–87.
- Goodenough, Ward Hunt. 1966. *Notes on Truk's Place Names*. Agana, Guam: College of Guam.
- Gómez Alfaro, Antonio. 1993. *The Great Gypsy Round-up. Spain: The General Imprisonment of Gypsies in 1749*. Madrid: Presencia Gitana.
- Gómez Alfaro, Antonio. 1999. "Tipologías. Matrimonios mixtos y mestizajes gitanos en los censos históricos andaluces." *Demófilo* 30: 30–52.
- Gómez Alfaro, Antonio. 2009. *Legislación histórica española dedicada a los gitanos*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Igualdad y Bienestar Social.
- Gómez Alfaro, Antonio. 2010. *Escritos sobre gitanos*. Barcelona: Asociación de Enseñantes con Gitanos.
- Herzog, Tamar. 2003. *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- King, Turi E. and Mark A. Jobling. 2009. "What's in a Name? Y Chromosomes, Surnames and the Genetic Genealogy Revolution." *Trends in Genetics* 25: 351–360.
- Kohlheim, Rosa. 1999. "The Change of Cultural Values as Reflected in Modern Name-giving in Catalonia." *Onoma* 34: 229–248.
- Leblon, Bernard. 1985. *Les Gitans d'Espagne, le prix de la différence*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Leblon, Bernard. 2003. *Gypsies and Flamenco: The Emergence of the Art of Flamenco in Andalusia*. New edition. Interface Collection. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Lee, Ronald. 2001. "The Rom-Vlach Gypsies and the *Kris-Romani*." In *Gypsy Law. Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, Ed. Walter O. Weyrauch. Berkeley: University of California Press, 188–230.
- Lermo, J., J. Román, María Dolores Marrodán, María Soledad Mesa. 2006. "Modelos de distribución de apellidos en la población gitana española." *Antropo* 13: 69–87.

- Livi-Bacci, Massimo. 1990. *Historia mínima de la población*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Manrique, Nathalie. 2010. "Des patronymes devenus gitans." *Études Tsiganes* 39–40: 96–111.
- Martin, Elisa and Juan Francisco Gamella. 2005. "Marriage Practices and Ethnic Differentiation: The Case of Spanish Gypsies (1870–2000)." *The History of the Family* 10: 45–63.
- Mateos, Pablo and Ken Tucker. 2008. "Forenames and Surnames in Spain." *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 56: 165–184.
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2010. *Romani in Britain. The Afterlife of a Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Okely, Judith. 1983. *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pasqualino, Caterina. 1998. *Dire le chant. Les Gitans flamencos d'Andalousie*. Paris: CNRS/Éditions de la maison des sciences de l'homme.
- Pérez de Guzmán, Torcuato. 1982. *Los gitanos herreros de Sevilla*. Sevilla: Biblioteca de temas sevillanos, Ayuntamiento de Sevilla.
- Phillips, Sarah Drue. 1997. "Romani Naming as Multiple Strategies." *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* 5: 27–38.
- Pym, Richard J. 2007. *The Gypsies of Early Modern Spain, 1425–1783*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rebollo, Miguel Angel. 1993. "El apodo y sus características." *Anuario de estudios filológicos* 16: 343–350.
- Rodríguez-Larralde, Alvaro, A. Gonzales-Martin, Chiara Scapoli, and Italo Barrai. 2003. "The Names of Spain: A Study of the Isonymy Structure of Spain." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 121: 280–292.
- Sánchez Ortega, Helena. 1988. *La Inquisición y los gitanos*. Madrid: Taurus.
- San Román, Teresa. 1976. *Vecinos gitanos*. Madrid: Akal.
- Scapoli Chiara, Elisabetta Mamolini, Alberto Carrieri, Alvaro Rodríguez-Larralde, and Italo Barrai. 2007. "Surnames in Western Europe: A Comparison of the Subcontinental Populations through Isonymy." *Theoretical Population Biology* 71: 37–48.
- Sutherland, Anne. 1975/1986. *Gypsies. The Hidden Americans*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.
- Sutherland, Anne. 2001. "Complexities of U.S. Law and Gypsy Identity." In *Gypsy Law. Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*. Ed. Walter O. Weyrauch. Berkeley: University of California Press, 231–242.
- Szaszdi León-Borja, István. 2005. "Consideraciones sobre las cartas de seguro húngaras e hispanas a favor de los egipcianos." *En la España Medieval* 28: 213–227.
- Trevisan, Paola. 2013. "The Internment of Italian Sinti in the Province of Modena During Fascism: From Ethnographic to Archival Research." *Romani Studies* 23: 139–160.
- Twenge, Jean M. 1997. "Mrs. His Name: Women's Preferences for Married Names." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21: 417–429.
- Willems, Wim. 1997. *In the Search of the True Gypsy: From Enlightenment to Final Solution*. London and Portland: Frank Cass.

Notes on contributors

Juan F. Gamella is an anthropologist, and Professor of Anthropology. Since 1994 he has studied Romani groups in Spain and southern France. He has published four books and over thirty scientific papers on education, kinship, marriage, and gender of the *Calé* and the Roma immigrants from Romania.

Correspondence to: Juan Francisco Gamella, Departamento de Antropología Social, Universidad de Granada, 18071 Granada, Spain. Email: gamella@ugr.es

Antonio Gómez Alfaro is an independent historian, noted for his important contributions to the history of Spanish Gypsies, such as the book: *The Great Gypsy Round-Up: Spain — The General Imprisonment of Gypsies in 1749* (Hatfield, Hertfordshire, 1993). Gómez Alfaro is retired and lives in Málaga, Spain.

Juán Pérez Pérez is a graduate student finishing his PhD on the historical demography of Andalusian Gitanos in the Department of Social Anthropology, Universidad de Granada.