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While American Romanies live a notoriously secretive cultural existence, their
grae locations and memorial stones offer accessible inferential lore and knowledge
about their active on-going communities. Building upon earlier observations in the field
reported by Dr. David J. Nemeth, this methodological piece outlines how to gather and
analyze Romany cemetery data without necessitating the exhausting and intrusive task of
first locating and building rapport with local Romany informants. My case study
identifies Romanichal and Rom memorial sites located in Toledo, Ohio’s Historic
Woodlawn Memorial Park and Calvary Cemetery, respectively. I gathered my data after
devising a qualitative ranking system to accompany my efforts to quantitatively
categorize the grave sites, which I also spatially cataloged using a GPS device.
Additionally, I collected genealogical data on the families whenever available. This
allowed me to build a social network to analyze via social network analysis (SNA) tools.
The network was also spatialized using GIS software to visualize family relations across
the earth’s surface. The results of the coupling of social network theory with the gathered spatial data reveal promising evidential connections between the nature and location of an individual’s grave site and local family and community structure. I also applied GIS-driven spatial statistics techniques to the dataset to highlight the potential for promoting spatial-quantitative Romany research. My case study and mixed methodology exemplify the value of Romany memorial site and monument data as an effective source for discovering heretofore deliberately obfuscated spatial/social relationships among local Romany populations. My discoveries have the potential to advance Romany studies as I have demonstrated—by applying modern analytic tools, including GPS, GIS and SNA hardware and software to reveal hidden knowledge.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

While American Romanies live notoriously secretive lifestyles, their grave locations and memorial stones offer accessible, inferential lore and knowledge about their communities. Building upon earlier observations in the field by Dr. David J. Nemeth and several other Romany scholars, my thesis outlines an innovative methodology on how to gather and analyze Romany cemetery data without the exhausting and intrusive task of locating and building rapport with local Romany informants. My primary case study identifies Romanichal memorial sites located in Toledo, Ohio’s Historic Woodlawn Memorial Park, but also includes an analysis of a smaller collection of Rom memorial sites in a nearby Catholic Cemetery.

I gathered my data after devising a qualitative ranking system to accompany my efforts to quantitatively categorize the memorial sites, which I also spatially cataloged using a GPS device. Additionally, I collected extensive genealogical data on the Romanichal families, which enabled me to experiment with social network analysis (SNA) in my primary case study. The coupling of social network theory with the gathered spatial data revealed promising connections between the nature and location of an individual’s grave site and local family and community structure. GIS-driven spatial
statistics techniques were also applied to both datasets, highlighting the potential for promoting spatial-quantitative Romany research.

My case studies and methodology reveal the value of Romany memorial stone and monument data as an effective source for discovering their local hidden spatial and social relationships. By applying modern analytic tools, including GPS, GIS, SNA hardware and software, my discoveries have the potential to reveal hidden knowledge and advance the field of Romany studies.

1.1 Literature Review: Interpreting Romany Culture

Romanies, also known as Gypsies, are an ethnic people of European descent whose members now comprise a loose collective of related and widely distributed groups and sub-groups. The shared ancestry of the Romany people (proto-Romanies) probably originates in Northeastern India, circa 1000 A.D. (Salo 1991; Fraser 1992). One mainstream theory of Romany ancestral origin involves the migration of their nomadic ancestors northeast through Asia Minor, and into Europe sometime during the 14th Century, and then to the Americas (Gropper 1975). Their history, however, is still being constructed and reconstructed by both Romany scholars and activists. Related theories have traced their history as camp-followers, as wide-ranging peripatetic outcasts, and/or as remnants of an army of defeated Indian warriors (see Matras 2004).

Romanies have historically been both excluded and banished in and from their respective country of occupancy (see Gropper 1975, Hancock 2002, and Sutherland 1986). They survived as “service nomads” and have often adapted to market gaps and become “interim masters of imperfect markets,” filling market niches in fields such as re-

Though the population figures of Romanies are difficult to estimate, approximations are possible. Dr. Ian Hancock, a renowned Romany scholar and activist, speculates the world’s ethnic Romany population is between 6-12 million; however, the venerable Gypsy Lore Society places the number far lower at around 2-6 million (Hancock 2002, Erwin 1993). North American figures have been even more difficult to ascertain, with population counts ranging from 20,000 to 1.5 million (Erwin 1993, Hancock 1987, and Lonergan 1994).

Toledo, Ohio has hosted a Romany population since the 1850s, and the city was acknowledged as a Romany hub in a 1951 UPI report which deemed Toledo the “unofficial headquarters of the Gypsy tribes” (Noe 2008). The city is home to several Romany ethnic groups, including the “Hunagarian Gypsies” or Bashalde, the Rom, and Romanichals, in addition to non-Romany Irish and Scottish Traveler populations (Gypsies in Toledo). Unfortunately, little has been written on Toledo’s Romanies outside of the occasional city newspaper obituary confirming an individual’s Romany identity. Toledo is home to Romany royalty as well, with two “kings” and one “queen” of the Miller familia/kumpania, a basic multi-generational family economic organization (Toledo Blade January 9, 1962 and November 12, 1981, “Gypsy Queen Buried,” Sutherland 1985, 183).
This thesis examines gravesites of two ethnic Romany groups—the Romanichals and the Rom. Romany ethnicities are distinct due to the effects of their groups’ historical/geographical experiences with social isolation, in addition to the persistence of certain prejudices and animosities that have long existed between their groups (see Salo 1979). In spite of their differences, all Romany sub-groups feature three baseline cultural traits: enforced purity laws, a maintained social distance from the gadje (non-Roma), and the spoken Romani (Rromanes) language.

Purity laws are the most essential means of maintaining and upholding Romany culture. They serve as a universal means of social regulation among the Romany groups, and are largely concerned with the ritual maintenance of separation of upper (clean) and lower (dirty) lower body parts, which extends to food and health issues as well (Sutherland 1986, 268-9). Acceptable personal hygiene is indispensable in avoiding a marime, or polluted status; in the Rom’nes (“Way” of the Romanichals, also known as Romneychelle), an “unclean status is known as moxadi. Among the ethnic Rom Romanies (or “Vlach”), upper and lower parts of the body are washed separately, with two different bars of soap. The head is the most important part of the body, as it is the locus of power within a person; and much care is taken to keep one’s hair and face clean (Sutherland 1986, 265). The lower half of the body, especially a woman’s genital region, is considered marime for the duration one’s sexual life. Conversely, children and the elderly are considered wuzho, or pure in physical and moral nature (Sutherland 1986, 258).

Food is specially prepared to ensure it is not contaminated before consumption. Food is not to come into contact with any marime areas of the body. Meats are bought on the bone and vegetables by the crate to avoid any handling by the gadje. Additionally,
feasts are generally cooked by Romany men to avoid the myriad opportunities for female contamination (Sutherland 1986, 273).

The deceased, and those suffering from maladies such as epilepsy, mental, retardation, and physical deformities are also marime or prikaza (shameful) and polluted. The dead are considered so because of the traditional belief in the mulo, or ghost, implying a restless, lingering spirit that can confer bad luck upon an individual (Okley 2003, 154; Salo 1991, 306).

The fear of the mulo also has cultural implications for burial rituals. Romanies are always buried, never cremated, for they fear that if the body is gone and the displaced and restive mulo will curse the living. Incongruous to the Romany lifestyle, the body, and thus the mulo, of a Romany “must be pinned down in space, in fact become settled or sedentarized like the Gadzo” (Okley 2003, 157-8). Because of this cultural trait, non-Romanies are at least able to easily and reliably visit and observe the Romany population in this landscape.

While Romany culture is rich in folklore, music, and unique mores (see Pickett 1970 and Sanford 2000), this thesis takes into account only three facets of Romany culture relevant to the proposed subject matter: marriage customs, occupations and economic organization, in addition to death and burial customs. Romanies are endogamous; therefore, inter-family marriages are important bridges between Romany families and social groups (McLaughlin 2005). Occupations and economic organization are essential in understanding Romany social network structure and spatial distribution, so much so, that prominent Romany Scholar, Irving Brown suggested they are the best method of classifying Romanies (Nemeth 1982, 52).
1.1.1 Romanichals

The primary case study identifies a large group of Romanichals, or ethnic English Romanies. The Romanichals, whose name is alternately spelled Romanichel, are related to the Eastern European Rom, but have been heavily influenced by English culture, and have adopted an English grammar into Romani to create their distinctive dialect known as Anglo-Romani (Salo, M. 1987).

Despite longstanding assimilation pressures, Romanichals have maintained a level of cultural integrity in the United States. Romanichals so strictly adhere to purity laws that several Rom have claimed the Romanichals are stricter than their own people in observing them (Salo 1987). Romanichals marry in a variety of ceremony types (see Juvalomurch 1909), but elopement has been the most cited method of courtship (Juvalomursh 1909, Salo 1991, Wood 1973). Although Romanichals do not advocate exogamous marriage, gadje men who marry Romanichal women have been occasionally integrated into the Romanichal community.

Romanichals, like most Romanies, are peripatetic “interim masters of imperfect markets,” although some do become sedentary if they find a significant economic advantage in controlling a specific, lucrative territory (Nemeth 2002, 51-2). For Romanichals, territoriality was connected to the ownership of horse stables near urban centers (e.g. Toledo) and control over the horse trade--the Romanichal historical male occupation of choice (Salo, Matt & Shelia 1982, 303; Salo 1991, 304). The Romanichals took advantage of their mobility, attitudes, skills and family-based social organizations to achieve supremacy over the horse trading market niche (Salo, Matt & Shelia 1982, 306).
In fact, 77 percent of Romanichal men described themselves as a part of the horse and livestock business in the 1910 Census (ibid). Horse-trading became the American Romanichal’s “badge of ethnicity,” as turn-of-the-century newspapers reported on their colorful wagons (vardo) used to advertise the arrival of their travelling stables (ibid).

Despite their success, the permanent decline of the horse trade in the 1920s due the mechanization farming and urban areas forced Romanichal men to adapt new survival strategies. The immediate adaptive strategy was a return to traditional basket making and woodworking crafts, or wage labor (Salo, Matt & Shelia 1982, 307). From about 1930 to 1950, Romanichal women took over the earning burden by fortune telling or peddling crafts until the men carved new, more generalized, niches as asphalt pavers, car salesmen, and home repair tradesmen (Salo 1991, 304).

These new specializations applied not only to their traditional horse trading market area in and around city settings, but to rural and urban markets as well. This adaptation further diversified and strengthened the ability for the Romanichals to survive as a culture and not sink into urban poverty. This strategy was so effective that foremost Romany scholars Matt and Sheila Salo deemed this approach a product of the Romanichal’s “culture of competence” (1982, 310)

Romanichal death and burial customs were spectacular in the recent past, but have since been toned down. In the 19th and early 20th century, great numbers of Romanichals gathered for funerals of their “kings” and “queens” or their tribe; there were a reported 20,000 Romanies in attendance of Matilda Stanley’s funeral in Meridian, Mississippi (“Burial of a Gypsy Queen”). Romanichals, like all Romanies, are interred at preferred
cemeteries, usually in large cities (Habenstein et al. 1963, 722). In Toledo, Woodlawn Cemetery is a favored cemetery of the Romanichals.

Peculiarities have been observed at Romanichal burial services. According to a Woodlawn Cemetery customer service associate, the Romanichals have been seen throwing coins and keepsakes into the graves at ceremonies, in keeping with a Romany tradition, before they are covered (Sway 1988, 51). The Romanichals spare no expense on memorials and often request special landscaping and flower arrangements for their sites. The Woodlawn associate mentioned the cemetery has gone so far as to allow the Romanichal families to place food and gifts at the gravesites, though it was against policy, likely rationalizing it as good for business (personal interview with author, Feb. 15, 2010).

1.1.2 Rom

The second case study is centered on Rom memorial sites. Rom are Eastern European Romanies (characterized by their Wallachian- or “Vlach” dialects of Romani) whose ancestors settled in Serbian and Romanian-speaking areas of the Balkans after migrating into Europe from Anatolia (Salo 1991, 303-4). In North America, they are divided into two main tribes, the Kalderash and the Machvaya, both of which speak a Vlach dialect of Romani containing a heavy Russian and/or Greek influence (Salo 2005). The first large group arrival of Rom in North America occurred in 1881, but the majority of the first wave immigrated between 1895 and 1914, with other major waves occurring in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1990s (Salo 1991, 303-4). The Rom are physically distinct from
Romanichals, with a characteristically darker complexion as opposed to the lighter skinned, *gadje*-looking Romanichals (Lonergan 1994, 215).

Marriage is typically arranged between a young man and woman by their families. The young man’s parents choose an appealing bride to purchase based on health and earning potential, which usually relates to her earning potential as a specialist in the fortune-telling trade (Greenfield 1977, 69-70). Though the Rom are endogamous, *gadje* brides are begrudgingly allowed, granted they assimilate into Rom culture. And marriages, generally used as a basis for economic alliances between families, are also occasionally the source of feuds (Salo 1991, 304-5).

Rom death and burial customs vary somewhat from the Romanichals’. The dying are never left alone; though once deceased, the body cannot be touched, as corpses are considered *marime* (Greenfield 1977, 80). Funerals are attended by the entire extended family and attract crowds of spectators and mourners, sometimes numbering up to a thousand, especially if the deceased was a “king” (Toledo Blade January 9, 1962 and November 12, 1981; “Gypsy King Laid to Rest in Toledo”). Curiously, the color red is not uncommonly worn at Rom funerals because of its symbolic protective power to ward off the evil spirits of the dead (Berry 1947, 173-4). Rom are usually buried in their favorite outfit, while their coffins are often repositories for jewelry and requested or favorite items, like cigarettes or coffee. Similar to the Romanichals’ practice, coins are thrown in the grave before the casket is covered to assist the deceased “on the way” (Sway 1988, 51).

The Rom, like the Romanichals, are considered “commercial nomads” or “service nomads,” historically specializing in metalworking, animal trading, and fortune-telling
(Nemeth 2002). Often, the largest classification of Rom economic territoriality is known as the *kumpania*. The *kumpania* is an alliance of different Rom *familias* (multi-generational family groups) that collectively control access to and exploit a given market (Sutherland 1986, 63). For this case study, it is assumed all Rom belong to the *kumpania* that controls the Toledo market area. It is further assumed the *kumpania* is “semi-sedentary” due to the small size of the Rom population and metropolitan market (McLaughlin’s 1977, 16).

A separate organizing unit, the *vitsa* or “tribe,” serves as the basis for group identification and social association (Fraser 1992, 239). Despite the great geographic distances separating members of a *vitsa*, they regularly keep in touch and are expected to attend all weddings and death feasts, or *pomanas* (Greenfield 1977, 29). The *vitsa* also functions as a political unit, with members having the authority to regulate “moral, social, and political behavior” (Sutherland 1986, 32-3). Kinship within a *vitsa* is structured along sibling lines, with each one being allegedly descended from a mystical or legendary, ancestor (Greenfield 1977, 29; Sutherland 1986, 183). Consequently, the limited genealogical data inhibits a reliably confident assessment of the respective *vitsas* involved in the Memorial Park case study.

Rom, like all Romanies, can be considered “service nomads,” opportunistically filling in market “gaps” or niches (Nemeth 2002, 51-3). They especially excel at gap-filling due to their extended-family labor and communication network established by a separate social and economic organization (Leibenstien 1968, 81; cited from Nemeth 2002, 54). Moreover, Rom remain stationed residents in a lucrative regional market as
long as it is financially viable; however, like the Romanichals, the Rom move on when faced with an exhausted market or problems from authority (Nemeth 2002, 60-1).

Male Rom belonging to the Kalderash tribe have traditionally worked as tin-platers (see Nemeth 1970 and 2002) and coppersmiths, while the Machvaya men traded animals, primarily horses, in the United States. Women are the family’s breadwinners and usually work as fortune tellers. As chief providers, women also serve as family treasurers (Gropper 1975). Mass production and technological advances have put most men out of work, forcing many to adopt other trades in auto body repair, seal-coating, and used car sales. Some of these trades, however, were not held to the high standards of metal-work, and devolved into unscrupulous scams (see Gropper 1975, Lonergan 1994, Morris 1994, Pickett 1970, and Sanford 2000).

1.1.3 Concluding Thoughts

In spite of their various sub-groups, misrepresentations and stereotyping done by outsiders via popular media (film, television, and magazines) most Romanies remain authentic bearers of traditional European Romany trait-complexes, values and lifestyles.

Despite their ethnic differences, all Romany ethnic subgroups speak a variant of the Romani language, practice ritual purity laws, and maintain social distance from non-Romanies. This thesis examines and analyzes selected aspects of the cultural artifacts and landscape of two ethnic Romany groups--the English Romanichals and the Eastern European Vlach Rom.

With a comprehensive knowledge of both groups’ cultural peculiarities and similarities, the gathered gravesite and genealogy data can effectively be represented and
analyzed using a comprehensive methodological approach. While cemetery and genealogy data-driven methodology should not serve as a replacement for ethnographic field work, it offers a rational base for dialogue and speculation on the Romanies’ obscured and beclouded socio-economic structure and burial arrangement practices.

1.2 Problem Statement

This thesis seeks to validate three research questions on the nature of Romany gravesites using a multi-faceted methodology. All research questions expand on Warner’s (1959) claim that “[the] social and status structure which organize living community are reflected and expressed in the forms and arrangement of cemetery’s cultural landscape (Francis 2003, 223). That being said, this project is a hybrid meld of both necrogeography and Romany Studies. As such, theories pertaining to both fields will be explored and integrated when feasible.

My principal hypothesis presupposes the spatial arrangement of Romany gravesites mirrors the social arrangement of their real-life social network. Mainly to avoid outsider attention, Romanies in the United States avoid concentrating their domiciles cheek-to-jowl, and instead reside relatively dispersed within their territories, usually as nuclear families. They can easily gather for social or economic reasons within this secretive spatial arrangement. A “Gypsy Town,” or ethnic village similar to a Chinatown or Little Italy, therefore, is impractical from a Romany-American perspective. (Nemeth 2002; Stephens 2003, 80). The cemetery is the sole visible manifestation of a past or current Romany population, with the only exception being an occasional established fortune-telling parlor.
Despite their high degree of spatial separation, Romanies (while living) remain close to one another through social events and celebrations, like weddings. This supposition reflects Michel Foucault’s idea of the cemetery as “a kind of effectively enacted utopia...a heterotopia,” a manifestation of utopia existing only in the mirror of that “placeless place” (Foucault 1998, 239). From this, one might conjecture, as I do here, that their separation in life is reduced or eliminated in death by their clustered burial site arrangements within favored cemeteries, creating a “heterotopia” in the memorial park.

A sub-research question based on the initial hypothesis seeks to quantitatively prove the long-standing empirical assertion that Romanies are widely interred in scattered family clusters amidst others of their respective ethnic community (see Nemeth 1970, Nemeth 2002, Stephens 2003, Habenstein and Lamers 1963, Williams 2003). I will verify this assertion using location analysis tools.

For the secondary hypothesis, I posit Romanies and Romany families who build elaborate monuments, especially on the most desirable plots, rank among the wealthiest in their population, which matches Kephart’s (1950) finding:

“Traditionally, class distinctions within the cemetery were based on size of lot and size of memorial or mausoleum. Historically, the rich man’s grave was marked by a large memorial or mausoleum, the poor man’s grave by a small head or footstone, or perhaps by the absence of a stone” (642; also cited in Fracaviglia 1970).

Romanies’ earning potential is based on territorial control and effective kin-based networks to provide work personnel and opportunities (Salo 1981, 96). Those who head the largest or most influential families are therefore likely to be the wealthiest. Furthermore, high levels of social network centrality are a reflection of Romany’s respective economic standing and thus affect the majesty of their gravesites.
1.3 **Objectives**

1. Locate Romany gravesites in Toledo and obtain genealogy data for the interred.

2. Establish a qualitative methodology for assessing gravesites and create metrics for the memorial site.

3. Select relevant quantitative/spatial methodologies to analyze the qualitatively-derived metrics.

4. Gather data in the field, organize the data, and then prepare it for use in ArcMap.

5. Run the selected processes on the data.

6. Qualitatively assess the gravesites and gather further insight by interviewing memorial park workers and reading the obituaries of the individuals in the case study.

7. Analyze results and draw conclusions.

1.4 **Study Area & Population**

Woodlawn Historic Cemetery and Calvary Catholic Cemetery in Toledo, Ohio were chosen as case study areas after extensive searches were conducted for Romany ancestral roots in Toledo’s most prominent cemeteries, including Toledo Memorial Park in Sylvania, which was omitted due to a dearth of Romany gravestones (there were only four), as compared to the 203 and 39 found at the aforementioned sites.

The bulk of local genealogical data pertained to the Romanichal population interred at Woodlawn Cemetery; because of this, only the Romanichal family network was reconstructed and analyzed. And though genealogical data had been prepared by others for the Calvary population, it was largely incomplete. My own attempts to expand
the dataset proved too expensive and time-consuming. Yet, the relatively large number of sites at Calvary Cemetery was sufficient for a meaningful application of appropriate spatial statistics processes and qualitative investigation.

![Figure 1-1. Map of Toledo Case Study Cemeteries.](image)

The most abundant memorial site data was gathered from Toledo, Ohio’s Historic Woodlawn Cemetery, located in central Toledo, northwest of downtown. Romanichal memorials were found in 14 of the cemetery’s 51 sections. Documentation of 203 known Romanichal sites was gathered, as well as 175 individual memorials and 28 family monuments. Unfortunately, only 150 individual sites were able to be spatially recorded due to the number of unmarked sites. Social relationship data was found for 160 of the 175 Romanichals, and 141 of them had both spatial and social data available. These 141
individuals comprised the sample used for generating all the quantitative calculations and spatial network maps.

My initial studies of local Romanichal families using memorial park data benefited from some previous family network investigations conducted by a local genealogist with family ties to the group, whose findings were available to the public online (http://www.interment.net/data/us/oh/lucas/woodlawn.htm). I was able to expound upon her data with my own additional field discoveries and fresh perspectives informed by my exhaustive studies of relevant secondary sources (for example, those found in the Romani studies literature). Additionally, another local genealogist graciously provided a comprehensive family tree of the Romanichal families, further increasing the original sample size.

I counted a total of 21 individual Romanichal family surnames from the collected field data. Romanichal surnames represent an extended family unit, typically referred to as a “clan” (Salo 2005). I will tentatively use the term “breed” on my maps of Woodlawn Cemetery as a synonym for the Romanichal “clan,” as some evidence indicates Scottish Travelers use “breed” when referring to sub-groups of ethnic Romanichals, Romanies and Travelers outside their own group (Nemeth and Gropper 2008:47).

After ascertaining the authenticity of each surname, primarily by using genealogist Sharon Stillers Floate’s (1999) guide to Romany family history, I confirmed thirteen surnames as verifiably Romanichal. I could not ascertain whether the remaining were Romanichal or another Romany ethnic group, leading me to believe these uncommon surnames were most likely the product of intermarriages with non-Romanies. Additionally, I presupposed each individual adhered to Romanichal lifestyle and culture,
although this presumption might prove untenable if spatial anomalies turn out to suggest social distance from, or lack of relation with, the local Romanichal population.

The earliest Romanichal burial at Woodlawn dates back to 1889, with the most recent being in 2010; the majority (56%) of the burials occurred in the second half of the 20th century. Table 1.1 presents a more detailed age distribution. The gender distribution of the population was nearly equal, with 88 females and 87 males as of the span between October 2010 and March 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range (Years Old)</th>
<th>&lt;5 yrs. old</th>
<th>6-20</th>
<th>21-35</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>51-65</th>
<th>&gt;65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Romanichals</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A local genealogist also encouraged and informed my research regarding the Toledo Vlach Rom families interred at Calvary Cemetery. She will remain anonymous as not to damage her ties with Toledo’s Romanies. In a February 2011 meeting, she gave me a tour of Calvary Cemetery’s Rom population, pointing out the Romanies’ memorial stones, and sharing insights into the lives of the individuals buried there. A feud among the Toledo Rom, which she brought to my attention, will be discussed in detail later. Genealogy data, though limited, was provided by her as well, and was used to supplement my own personal research in order to create the most complete social network possible.
Demographics for the studied Rom population are limited. An age distribution for the Rom population is impractical, as 32% of the individuals’ birth dates remain unknown. However, all years of death are known, with the earliest internment in 1943 and the oldest in 1999. The gender distribution was 56% female and 44% male. Seven surnames were confirmed as verifiably Vlach Rom, with the remainder being the product of intermarriages to a non-Romany buried at another cemetery (Toledo Blade, June 6, 1973). As with the Romanichals, it is assumed the families adhered to the traditional lifestyle and culture, which includes their maintaining traditional burial customs and habits, shared by Gypsy-Americans throughout the States as described in Romani studies literature (Sutherland 1975; Gropper 1975; Sway 1988; Nemeth 1970, 2002).
Chapter 2

Methodology

2.1 Field Data Collection

All memorial stones were qualitatively assessed, in addition to being spatially and visually documented. While the qualitative catalog contains essential information, including the individual lifespan, the values from the memorial stone ranking system I devised were of paramount importance. The memorial stone qualitative ranking system measures two essential features of the stones--the size of the memorial and its level of majesty. The exact specifications for each element’s values are listed in Table 2.1 and 2.2.
Table 2.1. “Level of Majesty” Ranking System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lvl.#</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unmarked memorial site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Symbolic marker (e.g. A piece of stone designating the location).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decorative marker (e.g. flowers, vase).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More elaborate decorative marker (e.g. bouquet, photos).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Simple ground-level memorial stone, no décor, just the name and a slab; non-polished rock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Average ground-level, polished headstone. Limited decorative engravings, and/or a small phrase. Includes elevated (1ft or less) headstones with no or minimal engraving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Above average ground-level, polished headstone. More than average engravings, and/or a longer phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Average monument. Approximately 3-4ft x 3-4ft. Includes family name and no-to-minimal engravings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Above average monument. Larger than an average monument, and/or features a greater amount of engravings; also includes spires less than 10ft in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Exceptional monument. Very ornate and complex, over 5ft in any or all dimensions; includes spires over 10 feet in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A majestic monument. Over 10x10ft. Examples include mausoleum or pyramid structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Memorial Stone Size Ranking System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unmarked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small. Simple symbolic marker (e.g. a flower pot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average. 8x18” flat headstone marker or small monument; under 12” in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large. Flat headstone over 22” long (usually for couples) or monument under 3ft in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Average Monument. 3-9ft in height by 3-5ft in width; or an obelisk under 10ft in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Large Monument. Monuments over 10x10ft, noticeably larger than a 4. Or spires over 10ft in height.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The spatial dataset consists of the cardinal direction and absolute location of each memorial stone. The cardinal direction was understood as the opposite direction one faces when viewing it head-on. The absolute locations of the memorial stones were acquired using Garmin Nüvi 255W and 265W personal GPS units. Coordinates were retrieved exclusively when the GPS unit indicated maximum satellite communication for accuracy purposes. Although Garmin does not disclose the approximate accuracy of the units, a University of Toledo faculty member Gavin Smith, who teaches GIS classes and is versed in GPS technology, assured me of its accuracy within a 30-foot radius.

Each coordinate was cross-checked using the precise virtual globe in Google Earth for verification. During the cross-checking process, several coordinates were adjusted to more accurately represent the locations of the memorial stones. This process was executed by paying heed to landmarks such as trees and shrubs around the sites, which I had become intimately aware of after spending significant durations of time at the memorial parks.

2.1.1 Genealogy Data

Genealogical data for the individuals was provided by a local genealogist, whose interest in Romany memorial sites are concomitant to my own and those of this project. Her data-gathering methodology includes an exhaustive favor-based exchange with a local Romanichal family, in which tidbits of information were exchanged for errands such as genealogy research for the family and the fulfillment of personal transportation requests (Personal interview with author, March 2011). This genealogist also utilized for-profit online genealogical databases for additional information.
Other means of ascertaining Romany genealogy data occurred to me along the way. Family ties explicitly stated on proximate memorial stones, such as “Mother” and “Son,” were made use of to establish genealogical links; and newspaper obituaries proved to be an invaluable genealogical source because of the extensive “survived by” family lists of siblings and children. This method proved more effective for the Romanichal population, as only the affluent and influential Rom were featured in the city paper. Additionally, city directories and newspapers were useful in providing longitudinal demographics, occupation titles and listings.

Genealogical information on the Rom population in Calvary Cemetery was also gathered, though the data proved to be both incomplete and unreliable. The same genealogist who provided me with the Romanichal data also shared her findings on the Rom population of Toledo. Her rudimentary discoveries, however, proved largely worthless, as Rom often share the same gadjonav, or name as the non-Romany. These names are chosen to blend in with those gadje of a given country of residence. In the United States and other English-speaking countries, the surnames Miller, Nicholas, and Marks and first names such as Frank, Joe, or Nick are often chosen to make tracking difficult.

This survival strategy is applicable to the realm of genealogy as well, often rendering family charts and ancestry databases incomprehensible. Despite lengthy sessions with family charts and newspaper obituaries (a great source for Romany relations), I repeatedly encountered multiple “Frank Millers,” and other common names among the Rom, all of whom lacked dates of birth or death, forcing me to speciously
choose the most likely individual. As such, the Rom social family network will, therefore, not be included due to the amount of guesswork this would have necessitated.

Additionally, informal interviews were spontaneously conducted with both memorial park maintenance workers and the front office staff about their experiences with and observations of Romanies.

2.2 Analysis Methods

The following methodology is decidedly mixed. The vast amount of cataloged and enumerated genealogic, qualitative, and spatial data were organized and prepared for display and analysis using social network analysis (SNA) and geographic information systems (GIS). Additional observations and anecdotes on Romanies and their memorial sites were gathered during my extensive field work and informal interviews with memorial park employees.

The combination SNA and GIS for necrogeography or Romany Studies research, to the author’s best knowledge, has not been previously utilized, though GIS has been used for cemetery mapping in the past. University of London’s Niki Alsford’s forthcoming study on port cemeteries in Taiwan plans to utilize GIS to map the growth of cemeteries to examine how time changes the stylistic tendencies of mortuary monuments (personal correspondence with author, 23 Jan. 2012). Löwenborg’s (2010) study of the evolution and eventual shift of burial ground in Sweden shows the potential of GIS for archaeologists. Additionally, Ambros’ (2010) investigation of the cultural history and spatial arrangement of pet graves and cemeteries in Japan also used computer-generated maps, though they were not GIS-produced.
The cultural landscape analysis portion of my methodology expounds upon past works in the field of necrogeography and anthropological cemetery studies research. Francaviglia’s (1971) necrogeographic research on the cultural significance of cemeteries in the Willamette Valley of Oregon, particularly his classification of memorial stones and discussion of their styling, mirrors my own investigation of the Romany cemetery landscape. My field observations and collected findings are also inspired by Erwin (1993) and Stephens (2003) anthropological cemetery studies research regarding Romany burial sites and monuments.

2.2.1 Social Network Analysis

I constructed and analyzed the families’ social network using Analytic Technologies’ UCINET/NetDraw social network analysis program (Borgatti, Everett, and Freeman 2005). The network was built by coding genealogical data into three relationship categories—spouse, sibling, and parent-of-child (directional tie). Using this coding system, an edgelist, or multi-line adjacency list, containing all the known relationships between the individuals was assembled. Family monuments, having no individual relation ties, were excluded from the network. Additionally, relation data was not obtainable for 15 of the 175 recorded individuals, leaving the final network at 160.

Social network analysis was implemented to both illustrate the nature of the relationships and ascertain the identities of the most powerful individuals. The fundamental empirical technique uses a simple visualization of the actor’s (node) attributes, providing insight into if and how the different clans (family groups) relate within an endogamous family network. Social network analysis can also mathematically
assess the structure of a network to discover the most powerful (important bridge relation for less-connected nodes to others) or influential (related to well-connected actors) individuals in the network. To locate these central actors, out-degree Bonacich’s Power centrality measures were used, and network maps created to display the network data.

### 2.2.2 Geographic Information Systems

ESRI’s GIS mapping software, ArcMap 9.3.1 was implemented to display and analyze the collected spatial data and social network. The network centrality measures were used to create the centrality attributes in the GIS dataset, spatially grounding the social network. Street shapefiles and drawn line borders around the study areas were used to clip the base satellite image to display the memorial parks independently. Individual memorial stone coordinates were exported into .dbf files, which were then imported into ArcGIS and projected onto the imagery. Location analysis of the sites was made using selected processes found in ArcMap’s spatial statistical toolbox. And the spatialization of the social network was achieved by manually-constructing shapefiles containing all the known relations among the 141 individuals.

A quantitative analysis of the memorial stones was made exploring the location and statistical patterns of the memorial stones. The GIS location analysis methods were drawn from ArcGIS’s “Spatial Statistics Tools” toolbox; and network centrality measures were used in conjunction with the collected attribute data as the basis for spatial statistic calculations. The measures calculated are as follows: attribute-weighted mean center and standard distance, band from neighbor count, average nearest neighbor calculation, spatial autocorrelation, high/low clustering, multi-distance spatial cluster analysis, and
hot/cold spot analysis distance. A Pearson’s product-moment coefficient correlation matrix was created to statistically investigate any aspatial correlations between the network centrality measures and the level of majesty.

2.2.3 Empirical Cartographic Interpretation

Maps were constructed using qualitative and genealogical data. The primary empirical visualization is the spatialized social network. This map grounds the abstract social network relations among the Romanies in space by representing them across Earth’s surface. With the Romanies’ memorial stones as nodes, the social relationships of individuals in life can be inferred by their physical arrangement in death. Other visuals include memorial sites labeled by family surname, presence of site landscaping, and physical damage.

The results of these methods are interpreted through both a quantitative and qualitative lens, reaffirming this piece’s commitment to a mixed/alternative methodological approach to Romany Studies. The GIS-produced qualitative maps and illustrated social networks are apt for critical visual inspection. Quantitatively, the spatial statistical practices and results have been heavily scrutinized for errors and implications. Field observations were filtered and understood using the knowledge gained from an assortment of primary and secondary texts on experiences with and observations of the Romany people.
Chapter 3

Analysis of the Romanichal population at Woodlawn Cemetery

3.1 Social Network Analysis

3.1.1 Background

The Romanichal families’ social network was comprised of collected genealogical data for most of Toledo’s known Romanichal families. Although this data does not represent the entirety of relationship ties among the Romanichals, the network is still valuable for its considerable sample size and reliable relation data. Network centrality measures were calculated and represented along with attribute data by node color, size, shape, and line color. Inferences made to support my hypotheses were drawn from visual examination of the juxtaposed illustrations.

The network centrality measures and Bonacich’s Power and out-degree, measure two distinct aspects of network centrality. An out-degree is a numeration of how many ties an individual directs toward another actor, including reciprocal ties (Hanneman & Riddle, 2005). Additionally, the centrality measures were essential elements for testing my level of majesty/wealth correlation hypothesis, and thus should be elucidated before the results are presented. The relations between actors, or ties, were based on a self-
defined coding system that acknowledged spousal sibling relations, and parent-of-child relations. Spousal and sibling ties are reciprocal, but the parent-of-child ties are not, as the directionality of the tie stems from the parent to the child, but not vice versa. This choice corresponds with my hypothesis that Romanies with large families are wealthier, and thus can afford more elaborate graves, because they have more income providers in their family.

Bonacich Power centrality measure is a measure of how well-connected an individual’s relations are. For example, an individual having ties with actors who are fairly isolated has significant power based upon the actors’ dependence on that individual, whereas an individual having ties with actors that also have many relations is deemed to be an influential individual because of his ability to reach many people. The Bonacich Power centrality measure calculates both the scope of influence and power using a positive or negative attenuation factor, or beta coefficient. Standard positive and negative betas of .5 and -.5 calculate influence and power, respectively (Hanneman & Riddle, 2005). Influence was chosen to be measured because in the context of the Romanichal network Bonacich Power centrality-influence signifies a well-connected and successful family. Furthermore, the network attributes were illustrated and juxtaposed with the centrality measures for visual detection of any correlations or anomalies.

3.1.2 Structural Analysis

The structural features of the network are first examined. The expansiveness of the main network illustrates the large number of connected families, although only 5.8% of the possible ties were made. The level of connectedness is unsurprising due of the
endogamous nature of Romany culture; for example, a brother cannot be directly tied to a brother-in-law (Sutherland 1986, 217).

Figure 3-1. Respective Romanichal Family Group Names and relations of Toledo Romanichals. Red ties represent a spousal relation, blue ties symbolize a sibling relation, and black ties signify a parent-to-child relation. Asterisks (*) indicate a non-Romany family name.

Isolate pairs, interconnected nodes lacking a tie to the larger network, are also prevalent. Of these Cooper and Smith were common Romanichal surnames. This curiosity suggests their isolation is likely a result of incomplete genealogical information or confusion with non-Romanies of the same surname by the genealogist (Floate 1999, 76-7). The other pair had a non-Romanichal surname—possibly the result of a genealogical error or an indication these individuals were non-Romanies loyal to the Romanichal families (Nemeth 2002, 70-74). The smaller, unconnected network located
below the main group was a confirmed Romanichal family whose lack of connection to the larger network is a probable consequence of incomplete genealogical data.

Structurally, familial relations can be discerned from SNA network structure terminology. Individual family units can be identified as the majority of the network’s *cliques*, which are subgroups with actors having ties to all other actors in that interconnected subgroup; in a clique there are no “null” ties (Hawe *et al.*, 2004). *Bridges*, or relations linking connected components, are likely indicators of inter-family marriages. The outward reach of the network is shown by the number of dependent (singular) ties on the periphery, revealing the temporal extent of the genealogical data.

In addition to understanding the structure of the network, I utilized a social network cohesion measure to validate my main hypothesis. I chose to use the E-I Index to calculate the homophily of 17 small clustered groups of memorial sites throughout Woodlawn Cemetery, and for comparison six much larger Romanichal enclaves (e.g. one or two sections of the memorial park). Using this measure, I hoped to ascertain at which spatial scale the memorial park mirrors the social network, that is, has the highest homophily.

Before covering the results, I will explain how E-I index is created. The index is created by first classifying all nodes in a network by attribute groups. In my case, the groups are created according to their spatial affiliation in a visually logical cluster, which on average contained 8 memorial sites and included isolates (isolated memorial sites) as individual groups. Enclaves were used to compare the effect of spatial scale on homophily, and included one or two sections of the memorial park.
Using a respective partition, the equation assesses and subtracts the number of external and internal connections of an individual, and then divides the difference by the total number of relations. Results range between -1 (perfect homophily) and +1 (perfect heterophily), and are also multiplied by a scale factor dependent on the number of groups created to calculate the final (“re-scaled”) E-I index.

The results of the final E-I index when used with the small group partition, indicated almost perfect homophily (-.986). Additionally, the E-I index was run with the small groups as attributes using the type of relation as the network input. The output values for sibling (-.978), parent-to-child (-.975), and spousal (-.958) relations indicate little difference from both the complete network and between the relations. The results with the enclave spatial scale did not show definite homophily or heterophily (-.06).

From the outputs, I infer more homophily can be found in a smaller spatial grouping of memorial sites than a large aggregation. More notably, the near-perfect homophily scores of the E-I index for the smaller grouping quantitatively validates my main hypothesis the spatial distribution of Romany memorial sites mirrors the arrangement of their social network, albeit on a higher spatial scale. This positivist evidence will be corroborated in my empirical analysis of the spatialized social network maps to further validate the hypothesis.

3.1.3 Memorial Site Majesty and Network Centrality

The hypothesized correlation between a memorial site’s level of majesty and an individual’s respective network centrality was investigated by empirically examining a
variety of network map outputs. Quantitative methods were also conducted to search for a correlation and will be discussed in Section 3.4.

The Figure 3-2 family network output primarily juxtaposes the out-degree and level of majesty of actors. Tie relations and those buried near the entrance of the memorial park are additionally represented. While no discernible correlation can be made between the level of majesty and out-degree (node color and shape), two of the largest nodes did have the highest rank of majesty. As expected, the center of the network featured the majority of high out-degree nodes, with the sizes tapering off toward the periphery of the network. This symbolization is not useful for finding observable correlations, as all actors have a fair amount of out-degree, rendering symbolic interrelationships relating to centrality difficult to visually detect.

Figure 3-2. Out-degree visualization of Toledo Romanichal network. Node (actor) size is determined by the total out-degree (directionally outward relations) of an individual. Tie (line) color symbolizes the nature of each actor’s relation to a related actor. Red ties represent a spousal relation; blue ties symbolize a sibling relation; and black ties signify a parent-to-child relation. Triangle-shaped nodes indicate individual memorial stones located near the entrance of the memorial park.
The second symbolized network, shown in Figure 3-3, mirrors the previously discussed network, excluding the node size symbolization, determined by the Bonacich Power centrality measure, which measures influence by measuring the degree actors are connected to well-connected actors. Influence equates to the extent of an actor’s lineage, which is hypothetically connected to the economic status of an actor. Visually, the Bonacich Power centrality measure better polarizes the actors, showing a cluster of influential actors in the center surrounded by less influential actors on the fringes.

As was the case in Figure 3-2, no definite correlation between the level of majesty and the network centrality measure can be ascertained. However, the three most influential actors were all found to be related; two being a “power couple” who had many children; the other one of their daughters married into a large and reasonably prominent family. Although many Romanichal families arrange marriages, the usual form of marriage is elopement, or “jumping the broomstick” (Wood 1973, 104-5). While this tradition separates the Romanichals from the Eastern European Rom who exclusively arrange marriages, extensive endogamy within both ethnic groups reflect the essential Romani institution of marrying within the race (Wood 1973 105). Intermarriages are economically beneficial as well; when two families merge, territoriality between them decreases, consolidating economic power by forging new and valuable business connections (Sutherland, 1984, 212-217). While Figure 3-3 is more suitable for examination, the visual shows no discernible pattern indicating a correlation between the level of majesty and an individual’s network centrality.
The networks of Figures 3-4 and 3-5 sought to remedy the issues of the previous networks by illustrating more specialized actor organization. Figure 3-4 shows the interconnectedness of patriarchs who built family monuments, along with the level of majesty of their monuments. Romanichal society is understood as being patriarchal, so patriarchs were chosen as the heads of the monuments (Wood 1973, 27). Patriarchs were distinguished as the oldest male buried at a family monument site.

Analysis of the Figure 3-4 network shows the majority of the selected patriarchs are related to one another, typically siblings. This finding reflects the importance
Romanichals place on blood ties as grounds for economic alliances, as the brothers likely start businesses together and embody their success in the form of family monuments (Wood 1973, 105). Unfortunately, like the previous two networks, no discernible correlation between the level of majesty of a memorial stone and an individual’s network centrality could be found.

Figure 3-4. Interconnectedness of Romanichal patriarchs connected to a family monument. Node (actor) size is determined by the Bonacich Power measurement, specifically influence. Node color is indicative of the “Level of Majesty.” Tie (line) color symbolizes the nature of each actor’s relation to a related actor. Red ties represent a spousal relation; blue ties symbolize a sibling relation; and black ties signify a parent-to-child relation.

Figure 3-5 changes the dynamic of the family network, placing the nodes (with ties) in a scatter-plot using attributes for the axes. The level of majesty was used as the y-
axis and the Bonacich Power centrality measure for the x-axis to illustrate the correlation between the level of majesty and Bonacich Power centrality measure.

The resulting network revealed most influential actors held average level of majesty rankings; and individuals with the highest level of majesty rankings were only somewhat influential within the family network, resulting in a distribution resembling a diminishing returns curve. The same operation with out-degree yielded a comparable result. Analogous to the previously discussed statistical correlation, the attribute-as-coordinates operation portends a weak absolute positive correlation between the two attributes, limiting the validity of my hypothesis that an individual’s level of majesty is positively correlated to their centrality within the network.

Figure 3-5. Attribute as Coordinates. This network is all the actors sorted in a scatter-plot, with the “level of majesty as the y-axis and the Bonacich Power centrality measure along the x-axis. The tie (line) color symbolizes the nature of each actor’s relation. Red ties represent a spousal relation; blue ties symbolize a sibling relation; and black ties signify a parent-to-child relation, though ties for this network graph may be difficult to discern due to the overlap of individuals with similar attributes.
3.2 Empirical Cartographic Analysis

3.2.1 Relative Location of Sites: The Spatialized Social Network

Romany memorial sites’ relative location to one another has long been said to reveal something of their family relations (Nemeth 1970, 66). The main hypothesis tested in this section posits the location of Romanichal family memorial sites mirrors their arrangement in a social network. As discussed in the SNA section, empirical observation of the spatialized social network will be conducted to validate the quantitative results that indicate the social network mirrors the memorial site distribution in small spatial clusters. GIS-produced thematic and network maps were used for the analysis, while a satellite image was used as the background layer to highlight the sites’ proximity to important physical features such as trees and roadways (Nemeth 2002, 68-9; Stephens 2003, 89).

The relationship indicated by the maps was twofold: Romanichals are typically buried within sections containing a significant number of Romanichals; and the location of individual family sites (small clusters) are determined by intra and inter-family relationships--specifically marriage. The critical role of individuals’ occupations and plot availability on the distribution of memorial sites will also be discussed.
The principal conclusion drawn from mere empirical observation of Figure 3-6 is that the Romanichals are buried in scattered enclaves throughout the memorial park. This finding contradicts Williams’ (2003) claim that “[Romany] tombs do not form enclaves; they are scattered in Gadzo [non-Romany] territory” (16). Admittedly, family clusters are indeed scattered all throughout the memorial park, barring two exceptions in the center of the memorial park—the Romanichals “own” portions of sections within the park. These portions included the entrance (south cluster), western cluster and eastern cluster of Woodlawn Cemetery. One does not have to walk too far away from a Romanichal memorial site to encounter another, granted one stays near the road, where they prefer to be buried, as Nemeth (2002) stated and I have observed in my field work. These sections
can be deemed Romany enclaves, but are also interconnected with other enclaves in the memorial park as shown in Figure 3-7.

Figure 3-7. Relations among Romanichal Enclaves in Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.

Less apparent family site intermixing was found to be linked to inter-familial relations, with intermarriages being the most common bridge connection. Figure 3-8 attempts to visualize the role of intermarriage. Daughters of the Rileys, Broadways, Lovells, and Smiths married Romanichal and non-Romany men also buried in this cluster. The two Riley daughters married a Birmingham (non-Romany) and a Lovell.
Their mother was a Broadway who married a Riley man. Additionally, a Broadway woman married a Lovell; a Smith woman married a Broadway man; and a Lovell woman married a Smith man—all in this small cluster!

Unsurprisingly, four of the six married women’s fathers were horse traders. This suggests intermarriages were alliances between the families, concomitant to the Romanichal custom of marrying into related or allied families (Wood 1973, 105-106). The purpose of alliances is for territorial and economic consolidation (Sutherland, 1984 [212-217]); in this case, the horse trade. A lack of marital ties between two families is thought to be an expression of hostility (Salo & Salo 1982).

![Figure 3-8. Romanichal inter-family marriages within a small cluster.](image)
The interconnectedness within small clusters is astonishing, and is a testament to the validity of their significant homophily using SNA. Figures 3-9 and 3-10 demonstrate this; every memorial site has a relation of some variety. The vast majority of the other clusters is also linked and is illustrated similarly to Figures 3-9 and 3-10. The genealogist who provided the data for the network also observed this phenomenon and used it to aid in the discovery of additional memorial stones. She demonstrated to me how this method was performed by scanning all nearby sites within a 360-degree radius of the known Romany memorial site; she then looked for Romany surnames or oddly placed memorial stones (personal interview with author, 10 March 2011). Stephens (2003) also cited this method (80).
Figure 3-9. Interconnectedness of Romanichal memorial sites within a small western cluster.
3.2.2 Isolated Sites and Clusters

Although most memorial sites and clusters are interconnected, socially and spatially isolated sites and groups were discovered. One instance of a lack of familial connection occurred between Romanichal family groups at entrance of the memorial park. I postulate this occurrence is the result of posturing for Romany dominance over the city. Spatially isolated memorial stones were another anomaly, and are thought to be the result of an outcaste status.
The entrance of Woodlawn Cemetery, which again is the most prestigious location for a memorial site in Romany culture, features two families—the Broadways and the Stanley’s. It is important to note, however, that all plots at Woodlawn Cemetery are the same price (Personal Interview with author, 12 Jan. 2012). This implies the Romanies who purchased plots near the entrance did so because they planned to build grandiose monuments to show off their prestige and wealth.

Even though the individual family groups have close relatives within their family plots, the Stanley’s and Broadways are not spatially contingent. The Broadways are split among three plots, two of which are adjacent: the father and only son to survive into adulthood, and across the pathway lay the patriarch’s only daughter to survive to maturity, alongside her husband.

The patriarchs of the two nearby conjoining Stanley plots are brothers, and are not immediately related to the neighboring Broadways. However, the Stanley brothers’ mother is a relative of the nearby Broadway; furthermore, she is the daughter of Broadway horse stable-owner. Despite the Stanley connection to the Broadways, a desire to signify dominance over Toledo is likely behind their ostentatious memorials.

The posturing hypothesis is also examined in temporal terms. There is no legal way to check when the Stanley’s bought their plots, so it is assumed the monuments were built at the death of the oldest patriarch. That in mind, the Stanley family built their monuments approximately sixteen years after the initial Broadway monument. The Broadway patriarch’s monument was built in 1958, when both Stanley brothers were middle-aged. Though the brothers were not past working age, it is important to note both were wealthy men. One brother “retired” from the “amusement circuit” as a
“concessionaire” in 1954 at the age of 42, suggesting financial success (Toledo Blade, December, 18, 1974). The elder brother owned a paving company at the time, and judging by the grandeur of his family monument, also did quite well financially (Toledo Blade, July 30, 1974).

It can only be supposed the Stanley’s saw the Broadway’s 20-foot obelisk as a declaration of Broadway dominance over Toledo. Being financially successful, they likely decided to secure the nearby plots and build comparably elaborate monuments to compete. This speculation is supported by the design of their monuments, one of which features their surname prominently displayed (shown in Figure 3-11).

Figure 3-11. Stanley family monument near the Woodlawn Memorial Park entrance. Photo by author.
Spatially isolated memorial stones and clusters challenge the relative location assertion previously made. The isolated family groups observed included the Lovell cluster in the west-center of the memorial park, along with the Stanley and Broadway remote clusters near the center. The isolated individual memorial stones recognized were the Lovell sites in the west and center-west, and the Swoaps situated in the extreme north.

Checking these isolated clusters within the spatialized social network, all family clusters were found to hold a connection to other Romanichals. In fact, Broadway and Stanley clusters were “founded” by horse traders, whose relations comprise the mainstay of the social network, as shown in Figure 3-16. The reasoning behind dispersal and occasional isolation of the clusters cannot be known for certain, though land availability or occupational legacies may have shaped these isolate clusters. This topic will be discussed in the following sections.

The isolated individual memorial stones suggest an outcaste status. Outcastes, or “half-breeds,” also known as Pikies in Anglo-Romani, comprise of Romanies deemed moxadi (polluted) and those considered “bad luck.” Outcastes or moxadi may include the police, informants for anthropologists, or suicide victims (Nemeth 2002, 68). Nemeth (2002) also explains Romanies prefer to keep a distance between themselves and outcastes in life as well as death (ibid).

The reasoning behind the Swoap’s isolation in the extreme north of the memorial park is likely linked with their limited Romanichal connection. Swoap is not a Romanichal surname, indicating the Romanichal woman (Baldwin) married outside the Romany ethnicity. While it is true other Romanichal women married non-Romanies and are buried in Romanichal plots, this case suggests Baldwin left the Romanichal way of
life, or *Romneychelle*; her husband was a foreman at the Toledo Jeep plant-an uncommon sort of Romany occupation (Toledo Blade, September 19, 1971). This apparently marginalized her from her biological family and other Romanichals.

Information was sought on the deaths of the remaining isolated individuals; however due to the obscurity of obituaries for the period, the author was unable to obtain hard data. Nevertheless, the ages of the individuals are known. The male Lovell was 4, and the female, 85 years old at the time of their passing. The female Lovell’s connection to the family network was not included in the genealogical data; and it remains unclear if she was a part of the Romanichal community; perhaps she too she married an outsider and left her Romanichal life. With no data to work with, further speculation is unnecessary.

Conversely, the young male Lovell is related to known Romanichals, making viable speculation possible as to why he might have been considered an outcaste. Bad luck surrounding the tragedy of a child’s death is first hypothesized. When tested, it was found that many Romanichal families in the sample buried their ill-fated young children in the family plots; passing on at such a young age is undoubtedly tragic, but that alone does not merit the title of outcaste. It is then logical to speculate his isolated location was the result of the nature of fatal affliction--mental retardation, epilepsy, or an accident perhaps (Sutherland 1986, 276). Though the exact reason for the boy’s death cannot be known for certain, he presumably passed away in a *moxadi* state.
3.2.3 Occupations

Romany occupations are, as Irving Brown claims (according to Gillat-Smith), “the best basis for [Romany] classification, geography the worst” (cited from Nemeth 1982, 52). The best way to trace the history of a Romany population and understand their social networks is to analyze their shifts in occupation over time. By examining the chronology and impact certain Romanichal occupations had and presently have, in conjunction with the spatialized social network, explanations for the distribution of memorial stones can be hypothesized with a fair degree of confidence.

Figure 3-12. Occupations among Romanichals interred at Woodlawn Cemetery.
The Romanichal patriarchs’ chief occupation in Woodlawn cemetery is horse trading. As one can see in Figure 3-12, most of the family plots are centered upon a horse trader. It is important to understand the history and structure of the Toledo Romanichal horse trade, as well as their subsequent occupations to fully appreciate macro and micro spatialized social network trends.

The first Romanichals to immigrate to the United States became horse traders; and horse trading became the key occupation for Romanichals from 1880 to 1930 (Salo & Salo 1982). The horse business was fixed around the stable, which was organized along ethnic and kinship ties. Only one kin-based group was permitted to own stables in any one market, rendering stables the sole object of territoriality among the Romanichals (ibid). The stable was typically operated by a man and his sons and sons-in-law, or a set of brothers (ibid).

John Broadway and his sons ran the stable controlling the Toledo horse trading market. The first Romanichal horse traders from England were John (pictured in Figure 3-12 with a horse) and Charles Broadway (Broadway Family England/USA). John was recorded in the 1912 Toledo City Directory as a stable owner, whereas Charles was listed as a horse-dealer, or horse salesman. The earliest recorded stable was [John] Broadway & Son [William] sales stable, listed in the 1912 city directory.

In 1913, John Broadway passed the business on to his son, William, who then ran it with his brother Edward. The 1913 Toledo City Directory lists Edward and William as the owners of the “Broadway Bros sales stable”--the only horse stable in Toledo, located downtown on South Superior Street. Despite the brothers’ commanding title, it is assumed all the men in the family were heavily involved in its operation as dealers or...
hostlers. In fact, seven of twelve Broadway men listed in the 1914 city directory are cited as involved in the horse business (Toledo City Directory, 1914).

The decline of horse trading in the 1930s was precipitous; no Broadway or other Romanichal were listed as involved in the horse or livestock business after 1938. As a result, Romanichals were forced to generalize their market niche. Romanichal men and women reverted to traditional trades, such as basket weaving and fortune telling wherever territorial Rom were not entrenched. In addition, some men took short-term blue-collar labor jobs.

The resolution of this niche collapse was a shift of Romanichal male occupations. Immediate replacement occupations mainly included short-term labor, ranging from basket-making to beer brewing to lamp-lighting (Toledo City Directory 1934-35). One Broadway was listed as a musician, likely a fiddler, in the 1934-35 city directory (Brown 1929, 149). There is evidence several Toledo Romanichals worked as amusement park concessionaires, including two former horse traders (Toledo City Directory, 1931; Toledo Blade, December 18, 1974). Romanichal women played a larger role in providing for the family during the transition period, reverting back to fortune telling, often under a moniker of Reader or Advisor. Sometimes fortune tellers would call themselves phrenologists because it was considered scientific rather than unlawful, thus creating less trouble with the authorities (Brown 1929, 159). Home repair, car and trailer sales, and paving eventually became Romanichal men’s new niche and primary means of livelihood. The majority of Romanichals still practice one of those trades today (Salo, Matt & Shelia 1982, 307).
This in mind, it is possible to make sense of the Romanichal connections between horse traders, as well as understand the occupation shift from horse trading to paving through study of the distribution of occupations among the entombed.

Figure 3-13. Inter-marriage and inclusion of Romany son-in-law into the horse trading business.
Figure 3-13 illustrates an instance of a Romany son-in-law joining an established Romanichal horse trading economic alliance via intermarriage. Salos (1982) mention Romany son-in-laws were indeed included into the family horse businesses as if they were blood relatives; however, they made no mention of whether non-Romany son-in-laws were included (303). Interestingly, the genealogy data denotes this Stanley’s parents as originating in Germany, indicating possible non-Romany or German Romany roots.

This suggests he belonged to such Romany ethnic groups as the Sinti or Chicanere, and perhaps held lineage to the first German Romany band in the U.S., formed in Pennsylvania in 1763 (Shoemaker 1929 181-2; Lonergan 2003, 23-4). It is recommended further genealogical research be taken to investigate this potential ethnic intermixture.

Like the other horse trader patriarchs, the Stanley son-in-law established his own family plot, which includes his wife, daughter, and son-in-law. His sons, Edward and Maurice, reared during the pinnacle of horse trading, but marriage-aged by its fall, went on to successfully carve out their own economic niches in paving and carnival concessions. Their sons became paving contractors and presently reside in Toledo.
The Stanley family’s occupational shift, representative of the overall Romanichal occupational shift, can be seen in Figure 3-14. The first male descendent in Toledo was a horse trader married into an established Romanichal horse trading family. His sons could not follow the trade due to its demise, so one became a concessionaire and the other two set up a paving business. The brothers’ sons all took up the paving trade in Toledo, suggesting the niche is lucrative in the city.
Empirical analysis of the horse traders’ spatialized social network confirms their centrality to the Romanichal population in Toledo. Figure 3-16 illustrates the gravity horse traders had on the Romanichal social network. From this map, one can visually discern the centrality of the horse traders within social network; their connections comprise the core of the network.
The horse traders’ indisputable centrality has tremendous implications for the primary hypothesis of this thesis. My foremost supposition is the spatial arrangement of Romany gravesites mirrors the social arrangement of their social network in life (see *Anthos: Cemeteries as Cultural Mirrors*, 1982). However, my occupation-based examination suggests, in the case of the Romanichal memorial sites, extended family clusters were established by patriarchs who followed characteristic Romanichal occupations such as horse trading and paving. The patriarchs who founded the family plots were relatively individualistic, as family plots are scattered throughout the memorial
park, creating multiple Romanichal enclaves. The social meaning and reasoning behind the distribution of the Romanichal family plot enclaves remains a mystery, but physical explanations for enclave arrangements, such as land availability, is open to research.

3.2.4 Land Availability Perspective

Land availability likely played a role in shaping the locations and distributions of Romanies in the memorial park. All Romanichal enclaves of Woodlawn Cemetery are densely populated with non-Romany memorial sites as well as their own. The families may have been forced to locate away from family members in order to secure a preferable plot near a tree or along a road (Nemeth 2002, 68-9). It is, therefore, essential to consider the temporal distribution of memorial sites, which is expected to be closely linked to land availability, when searching for the significance behind the geographic distribution of the Romanichal memorial site enclaves.

I have previously assumed a memorial monument was crafted and erected at the death of the oldest interred family member, as there is no way to legally acquire information regarding the purchasing timeframe. Figure 3-17 illustrates the temporal distribution of memorial stones based on the year of an individual’s passing. Inspection of memorial stone trends and their peculiarities should yield and validate genealogical data and lore.
Upon examination of the map, it is apparent families built monuments near the entrance did so at a time when their relatives were buried elsewhere, meaning many Romanichals actually preferred not to be buried close to the entrance. Perhaps this is because they could not afford to build a monument sufficiently ostentatious at the time? Also apparent is the far eastern cluster is the oldest in the park, followed by the large cluster further west in the same section. Overall, the eastern enclave is older than the western cluster.

Assessing the horse traders’ temporal distribution also produced valuable insights into their relative territoriality. As previously noticed, most of the first-generation horse
traders are located in the eastern side of the cemetery, whereas many of the second
generation moved to the western edge. Surrounding the horse trader or chief patriarch is
the immediate family, though in-laws may be interred as well.

Figure 3-18. Temporal Distribution, Eastern Enclave/Large Cluster. Notice the first-
generation horse trader patriarchs surrounded by their immediate family.

Despite the fairly simple overall distribution, I found several outliers that do not
follow the east-to-west pattern, the most noticeable being the oldest horse trader in the
center of the memorial park. That horse trader, son of the first Toledo Broadway horse
trader, could have built his monument nearer to his father and brothers, but instead chose
a plot far away. The same scenario applies to another Broadway son, Edward, who is
interred in the western cluster, but whose family is located in the eastern cluster. Land
availability was certainly not an issue for Edward, so perhaps yet unrevealed intra-family
disputes are the motive behind his isolated memorial site.

William was the oldest son, and thus worked the closest with his father, John in
the horse trade. Together, they ran the Broadway and Son stable. When John passed on,
William and Edward ran the Broadway Bros. stable. William is interred across the
pathway from his father, whereas Edward is about 2000 feet away. Perhaps Edward felt
the need to establish his own territory, separate from his older brother and father?

This situation also arose with Northaniel Broadway, the horse trader near the
entrance. His father is located near Edward in the western cluster, far away from the
entrance. Northaniel could have built his monument near his father, as his brothers who
later died did, but he instead went on to build the largest monument among the Toledo
Romanichals. Conceivably, he wished to establish his own territory as well, but in a most
prominent location as a reminder to competitive Romanies visiting the memorial park
that Broadway Romanichals “owned” Toledo.

The Stanley family plots are yet another example of establishing territory in the
memorial park. As a son-in-law of the Broadways, it is difficult to expect the horse trader
Stanley, located in the center, to be situated near his in-laws, despite their adoption of
him as a fellow horse trader. His sons have also established their own territory near the
entrance, as was previously discussed. The temporal distribution of the Stanley sites is
peculiar because the brothers near the entrance passed away much later than the second-
generation horse traders. Why would the older horse traders pass on the entrance plots?
The dates of the Lovell family plots in the northeast corner of the western section suggest they chose to live apart from the rest of the Romanichal population. The initial Lovell family could have been buried in a desirable plot near other Lovells and Romanichals in the western cluster, but instead chose the other side of the section. The relatives of these Lovells followed and were buried nearby. After analyzing the genealogy data, those Lovells have an insignificant interrelationship with the Romanichal population, including the other Lovells, suggesting they assimilated into American society and no longer followed Romneychelle.

Figure 3-19. Temporal Distribution, Western Enclave/Large Cluster. Notice the prevalence of second-generation horse traders.
My analysis indicated land availability did have an effect on the distribution of memorial sites. Generally, first-generation horse traders were located in the eastern enclave, and the second generation chose the western enclave on the edge of the park due to crowded eastern sections. The entrance was another significant Romanichal cluster that, for as yet unknown reasons, was occupied relatively later than many of the other clusters. Naturally, there were exceptions to this overall trend, but without more intimate genealogical knowledge, or access to living family members, only educated guesses can be made at this time.

### 3.3 Quantitative Analysis

The spatial statistics calculations were all executed by the statistical tools available in ArcMap’s spatial statistics toolbox. The tools utilized were the following: attribute-weighted mean center and standard distance, spatial autocorrelation, high/low clustering, multi-distance spatial cluster analysis, hot/cold spot analysis, distance band from neighbor count, average nearest neighbor, and a Pearson’s product moment correlation calculation. Each tool’s output will be briefly discussed. Additional outputs from applicable tools can be found in the appendix.

#### 3.3.1 Spatial Statistics: General Measures and Cluster Assessment

Weighted mean center and weighted standard distance are common methods for calculating the concentration of point features. A weighted mean center is the center-point in which standard distance radii are drawn. This is a useful estimate of feature distribution; in this case the un-weighted point data and weighted attribute data’s
distribution of individual memorial sites. I found weighted standard distance specifically useful because ArcMap produces a feature class (visualization) that allows for a clear image of weight-specific trends.

The weighted standard distances and mean centers illustrated slightly different gravities among the attribute weights, the most conspicuous being the Bonacich Power mean center. The attribute’s gravity situates the mean center/standard distance toward the eastern cluster of memorial sites, relatively distant from the rest of the measurements. This is likely due to the intermixed and extensive Williams, Smith and Broadway families interred in the eastern and southern sections. Out-degree and “level of majesty” standard distances show a similar trend, potential evidence of a correlation between the level of majesty and network centrality.
Figure 3-20. Mean centers for memorial sites and various weights.
The next spatial statistics tool was distance band from neighbor count, which calculates the maximum, minimum, and average distance between all features and a specified (“n”) amount of neighbors (“Calculate Distance Band from Neighbor Count”). Initially, eight neighbors were chosen for the “n” value because, drawing from inferences gained from handling of the genealogical data, I found the average Toledo Romanichal family had approximately 3-5 children, in addition to close in-laws and siblings whom would be buried in or nearby the family plot. After taking into consideration the possibility of daughters marrying non-Romanies and leaving the Romanichal life (an act that constitutes exclusion from the Romanichal community) and the possibility of
siblings having their own individual family plots, an “n” of eight neighbors was chosen as a sound estimate. The proximity of neighbors is a measure of isolation in this application, for the family-group hypothesis claims Romanies are buried in family groups; quantitatively, an average distance of 5-8 feet between neighbors is expected to affirm this hypothesis.

Despite the educated prediction, the results were significantly higher than expected. A total distance of 102 feet was calculated for individual sites and 94 feet for all memorial sites. When the total distance is divided by the eight neighbor count for both variations, all memorial sites had an average of distance of 11.8 ft per neighbor and the individual sites, 12.8 ft per neighbor. The slight increase is due to the fewer number of individual sites. While the eight neighbor calculations reveal definite clustering of sites, they are considerably higher than the postulated average distance of 5-8 feet between neighbors.

These results lead to the conclusion the anticipated size of Romanichal family plots was overestimated. Subsequently, another distance band from neighbor count with an “n” of three neighbors was executed. The resulting figures were predictably smaller, though by an underwhelming margin. The data points were then analyzed for any potential causes for the higher than expected distances. The analysis pointed to a pair of memorial sites in the far northern extent of the cemetery. The social importance of the couple in the context of the family network was then assessed. It was found they were not central to the network, and held a non-Romanichal surname, Swoap. Although these points were included in the genealogical data, the outliers’ limited number (2), great spatial distance from other Romanichal memorial sites, weak Romanichal connection,
and absence of children connected to other Romanichals render these data points as insignificant and therefore acceptable to remove from the dataset.

With the two outliers excluded from the dataset, the distance band neighbor count was recalculated. The recalculation generated much lower mean neighbor distances, with the three neighbor calculations for individual and all memorial sites showing average distances per neighbor of 8.7 and 7.3 feet, falling within the higher range of the family plot hypothesis. The removal of relatively extraneous spatial and network outliers yielded results which affirmed the family plot hypothesis, valuable quantitative evidence for qualitative claims that Romanies are buried in clusters.

Table 3.1. Distance Band from Neighbor Count Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total and Average Distance of (n) Neighbors</th>
<th>All Memorial Sites</th>
<th>Individual Memorial Sites (no monuments)</th>
<th>All Memorial Sites - No Outliers</th>
<th>Individual Memorial Sites - No Outliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Distance of 8 Neighbors</td>
<td>94 ft</td>
<td>102 ft</td>
<td>82 ft</td>
<td>88 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance per Neighbor (n=8)</td>
<td>11.8 ft</td>
<td>12.8 ft</td>
<td>10.3 ft</td>
<td>11 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Distance of 3 Neighbors</td>
<td>32 ft</td>
<td>38 ft</td>
<td>22 ft</td>
<td>26 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance per Neighbor (n=3)</td>
<td>10.7 ft</td>
<td>12.7 ft</td>
<td>7.3 ft</td>
<td>8.7 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Average Distance to Nearest Neighbor Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Memorial Sites</th>
<th>Individual Memorial Sites (no monuments)</th>
<th>All Memorial Sites - No Outliers</th>
<th>Individual Memorial Sites - No Outliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.7 ft</td>
<td>10.4 ft</td>
<td>9.5 ft</td>
<td>10.5 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An average nearest neighbor calculation was also run with the memorial site data. The average nearest neighbor statistic measures the distance between each point and its nearest neighbor's location, and then averages all the nearest neighbor calculations. While this measure is similar to the average distance per neighbor computation derived from the distance band from neighbor count, the average nearest neighbor offers a more accurate, individual computation of neighbor proximity. The equation was calculated twice, once among all memorial sites and individual memorial sites, resulting in observed mean distances of 9.7 and 10.4 feet, respectively. However, like the initial distance band from the neighbor count results, the observed mean distances were higher than expected, so the same outliers were removed and the data was recalculated. The resultant figures produced a mean observed distance of 9.5 feet for all sites and 10.5 feet for individual sites. Notice the removal of outliers slightly increased the calculation for all memorial sites, while lowering observed mean distance for the individual sites. Although the adjusted average distance per neighbor figures lay slightly higher than the hypothesized distance between Romany memorial sites, the tool’s results quantitatively illustrate significant clustering of Romanichal memorial sites, further substantiating the family-cluster hypothesis.

Now that the clustering of the memorial sites has been validated, how the memorial sites cluster over distance can also be explored using multi-distance spatial cluster analysis. This statistical tool evaluates spatial patterns over incremental distances. The tool is based on Ripley’s k-function, which produces an expected, completely random k-value that is then compared to the observed (actual) k-value from the data. Because weights innately cluster the data, only the un-weighted results will be examined (“Multi-Distance Spatial Cluster Analysis”). Both the un-weighted graphic outputs, one
for individual memorials and one for all memorial sites and monuments, illustrate a
definite general clustering pattern. However, there is a strong difference between the
individual (115ft) and the comprehensive calculation (210ft). Statistically significant
clustering occurs over the course of the whole distance.

Table 3.3. Distance Bands for Unweighted and Weighted Features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Un-weighted/Weighted Feature</th>
<th>Distance of Most Clustering (Maximum Differential between Observed and Expected Values as Calculated in the Multi-Distance Cluster Analysis Tool)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Memorial Sites and Monuments</td>
<td>210.3ft (64.11m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Sites-Individuals</td>
<td>114.7ft (34.97m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Majesty-Individuals</td>
<td>114.7ft (34.97m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Degree-Individuals</td>
<td>153ft (46.62m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonacich’s Power-Individuals</td>
<td>191.2ft (58.28m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual memorial sites clustered in a different way. While they also
clustered statistically significantly, the distribution flattened and fell into dispersion at
roughly the 145 meter increment. The leveling out may have been caused by the fewer
number of sites, which condensed the sample population, leaving the outlying memorial
sites to be construed as dispersed. This calculation more accurately represents the true
spatial distribution of the data, which consists of three large clusters and one small
cluster, with pockets of 2-6 memorial sites existing elsewhere, thus making this
calculation valuable in quantifiably supporting the assertion Romanies are buried in close
proximity to others of their ethnic group.
3.3.2 Advanced Spatial Statistics

A conceptualization of spatial relationships is essential for an accurate calculation of the more advanced spatial statistics utilized, which includes spatial autocorrelation (Morans I), high/low clustering (Getis-Ord General G), and hot/cold-spot analysis. The conceptualization of spatial relationships adds the spatial element to spatial statistics by defining how the features interact in space. Spatial relationships may be derived from preset models available in the software such as inverse distance squared or distance band, or by a user-defined spatial relationship, known as a spatial weights matrix. An example of a spatial relationship model is the fixed distance band, which imposes a rigid distance threshold within which the features are analyzed. This model is commonly used for static features, for instance, plant types (“Modeling Spatial Relationships”). Understandably, a distance band that defines the threshold must be delineated, and is recommended as being the distance at which features exhibit the most clustering (ibid).

Notwithstanding the wide and adequate array of spatial relationship models, a customized spatial weights matrix was constructed for the calculations for optimal realism. The spatial weights matrix was created using the relative distance matrix among all 141 individual’s memorial sites. According to this model, all individuals are spatially related because they exist in space with one another, rendering a relative distance between each and every individual. The Haversine distance equation was used to calculate the relative distance, as seen in Figure 3-22.
Figure 3-22. The Haversine distance equation. \( r \Delta \hat{\sigma} \) is the arc length distance in radians, multiplied by the radius of the Earth (6378.1km) for conversion purposes. \( \phi_s \) and \( \phi_f \) symbolize the “origin” and “destination” latitudes, respectively. \( \Delta \lambda \) represents the difference between the “origin” and “destination” longitudes (Veness).

The relative distance between each individual memorial site was converted into a weight by inverting the distance values (e.g. 10m would represented as 1/10). As a result, nearer features have a higher weight and influence than more distant features; concomitant to my hypothesis the spatiality of Romany memorial sites reflect the structure of Romanies’ social network. Admittedly, this method is similar to an inverse-distance model, but the calculated relative distance values are much more accurate than the inverse distance model because the inverse-distance results are an average distance of a given threshold, whereas evaluated distances are unique and precise values for each feature.

To assess the degree of similarity among weighted features, a spatial autocorrelation (Morans I) calculation was undertaken. Spatial autocorrelation is the statistical measure of the nature of features’ distribution across space. ArcMap’s spatial autocorrelation tool produces a Morans I statistic that ranges from -1 to 1, a z-score, with p-value for statistical confidence. Moran I values close to 1 indicate clustering and values close to -1 imply dispersion; values near zero are randomly distributed (“How Spatial Autocorrelation…”). Of course, one needs to take into account the z-score of the calculation for statistical significance. For review, a z-score is a measure of standard
deviation; a z-score of 1 equates to 1 standard deviation away from the mean, and p-value, the percent likelihood of a random pattern occurring.

Spatial autocorrelation values were found for the level of majesty, out-degree, and Bonacich centrality measures of the individual memorial sites. A high spatial autocorrelation of those memorial stone features indicate values are clustered spatially, which may be a sign memorial sites are arranged spatially based on social position.

The results of the calculations were not indicative of the previously described trend. The “level of majesty” results indicated a random distribution, generating a Moran’s I index of -.02 and a Z-score of -.32. The distribution of the out-degree centrality measure was also deemed random with a Moran’s I of .004 and a z-score of .33. However, the Bonacich Power results trended slightly toward a clustered distribution with a Moran’s I index of .08 and a z-score of 2.45, with a statistically significant p-value. This clustering is likely the result of the several extended families’ plots, which have abnormally high Bonacich Power values because the family members are deeply intertwined.

The next advanced spatial statistical tool was the high/low clustering (Getis Ord General G*). This tool measures the level of degree of clustering found in highest and lowest values of the data. Like the spatial autocorrelation tool, high/low clustering calculation outputs a General G index and an associated z-score and p-value (“How High/Low Clustering”). If the Z-Score is positive, high values are clustering, and if negative, low values are clustering. Scores closer to 0 indicate no clustering. ArcMap’s high/low clustering tool has a helpful optional graphic output that presents all the output.
information and automatically assesses the likelihood clustering or dispersal of the data is random.

The results of the high/low clustering mirrored the spatial autocorrelation. No clustering occurred for the level of majesty features with a z-score of -.8. The out-degree calculation also produced a random distribution, featuring a z-score within statistical significance (1.6). Clustering of high values was found for the Bonacich Power features, with a z-score of 2.82 and a statistically significant p-value of .004. The explanation behind the clustering of high Bonacich Power scores is analogous to the reason behind their spatial autocorrelation--large family plots full of intertwined relatives creates a cluster of high Bonacich Power values.

Spatial autocorrelation and high/low clustering are global statistics, meaning they evaluate for evidence of spatial patterns (clustering) for the whole dataset. Conversely, local statistics determine where values or high/low values cluster, creating visualizations of individual feature outliers that can be further investigated for explanations. One such local statistical tool is the hot/cold spot analysis (Getis-Ord Gi*), which is the final spatial statistical tool ran for the memorial site data.

Hot/cold spot analysis calculates and visualizes a Getis-Ord Gi*, that is, a z-score and p-value, for each feature in a dataset that determines the significance of a high or low value by contextualizing it among the features around it. The tool does not simply draw the highest values of a certain attribute; it draws the highest values of an attribute within the context of the surrounding events. Explicitly, high values are only “hot spots” if the high values occur in the context of other high values. The local sum of features is evaluated and compared to the sum of all features; if the deviation larger between the two
values is large enough to fall outside the accepted zones of statistical significant, the null hypothesis (there are not hot/cold spots) can be rejected (“How Hot Spot Analysis…”).

This purpose for using hot/cold spot analysis is to pinpoint the “hot” spots, which hypothetically represent the chief Romany community patriarchs and matriarchs of the network. Individuals with the highest centrality measure are the most connected and thus, the most apt to be in a position of wealth. Because of this assumption, all resultant hot spots are cross-checked with the level of majesty of the individual.

Before analyzing the results, contextual consideration of hot-spots is needed to obtain a more accurate assessment. For instance, hot spots located near the front of the memorial park are particularly worthy of investigation because entrances are the most desirable sites among Romanies. The entrance is where one frequently finds the most elaborate memorial stones and monuments. Due to the scarcity of these plots among non-Romanies and Romanies alike, and the desirability and status-symbol nature of an entrance plot, hot-spots near the entrance are “big fish in a big pond.” From this, I conjectured only the wealthiest and most central matriarchs and patriarchs claim them.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis was refuted by the results. Although the hot-spot near the entrance belonged to the wife of the man who built the largest recorded monument--an obelisk standing at approximately 20 feet tall--there was no discernable correlation between both centrality measures and a high level of majesty. Only one other monument--an “8” on the level of majesty--was calculated as a hot-spot. However, one unmarked memorial site--a “0” on the level of majesty--was listed as a hot-spot as well, providing definitive proof of an arbitrary correlation. From these findings, I concede my hypothesis as refuted, according to the evidence provided by the hot-spot analysis results.
While the advanced spatial statistical tools chosen were capable of answering the research question, the incompleteness of the genealogical data causes concern. The genealogical database is quite substantial given the resources my genealogist collaborator and I were able to acquire, but the family network remains largely incomplete. The network only extends three generations from the Romanichal immigrants from the United Kingdom, leaving many living family members of the third and fourth generation out. The individuals for whom genealogical data was gathered were often incomplete, potentially skewing the data with well-known individuals.

This profound lack of data deems the results of the advanced spatial statistics untrustworthy and should be examined with an emphasis on exploration. The spatial statistical investigation should be seen as a first step into quantifying Romany memorial
site data to draw extrapolations about their social structure in life. Although the results are by no means conclusive, a similar study using a more complete genealogical database would facilitate the maturity of the application, and allow for more concrete hypotheses regarding the location analysis of Romany memorial sites to be formed, thus potentially increasing the significance of quantitative methods in the realm of Romany Studies.

3.3.3 Statistical Correlation

The only non-spatialized quantitative analysis tool applied, statistical correlation, also proved unsuccessful in advancing my hypothesis Romany memorial stone grandeur is directly linked to an individual Romany’s centrality within the social network. Ideally, a linear regression would be used for quantitatively determining the relationships between variables, but due to the small number of available relevant variables and innate multicollinearity of the attribute data, a correlation matrix was chosen for exploratory purposes. Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient was chosen as the correlation technique because of the suspected linear relationship between the “level of majesty” and network centrality measures.

The correlation generated underwhelming results. Both independent variables furnished correlation coefficients under .2, signifying a weak correlation with the “level of majesty.” However, the independent variables exhibited positive correlations, which denoted a positive linear relationship between the centrality measures and the “level of majesty.” Although the Pearson’s correlation did not validate the connection between the network centrality measures and the “level of majesty,” the computation did produce a
strongly significant positive linear relationship between the two variables, which indicated the correlation is positive indeed.

Table 3.4. Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient, calculated between centrality measures and the “level of majesty” of memorial sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Level of Majesty</th>
<th>OutDegree</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Level of Majesty</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OutDegree</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>Level of Majesty</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OutDegree</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Level of Majesty</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OutDegree</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis aspect of the project examines the stylistic elements of the Romanichal memorial sites and stones. Stylistic aspects are important sources for insights into a culture because memorials are “[an] eternal symbolic object made safe by tradition and the sanctions of religion” (Warner 1975, 281). By keenly observing the traditional elements of the memorial stone or site, such as inscriptions etched into memorial stones, non-Romanies can get a glimpse into the secretive lives of Romanies.

3.4.1 Inscriptions

For the most part, Romanichal memorial sites appear similar to non-Romany sites, but several inscriptions were particular among the recorded samples. Noteworthy
inscriptions observed included fraternal organization affiliations, persona imagery, specific religious affiliations, and spiritual symbols. Landscaped sites, benches, and urns were external features noted among the sites as well. It is also noted two recent memorial stones in the Stanley plot near the entrance of the memorial park featured photographs of the deceased, a traditional characteristic of Eastern European Rom memorial stones.

Symbols of fraternal organization membership were found on many memorial stones, and are a reflection of the Romanichal tradition of belonging to fraternal organizations. Fraternal membership was used as a means of establishing a good reputation in a new place. Instant credibility in a new town meant instant economic opportunities for travelling Romanichals (Bryer, 1986 [34]). As Floate (1999) noted, their membership was apparently important enough to be recorded on their memorial stones (48). The following fraternal organizations were recorded: the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Freemasons, the Order of the Eastern Star, the Shriners, and the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

As is customary with most memorials, religious and spiritual symbols were inscribed onto the memorial stones. Both Anglican and Catholic affiliations were discerned from the crosses etched into the stones. Anglican crosses were found on Lovell and Broadway stones; and crosses with rosaries draped over them were found on the stones at a Riley family plot. The latter observation suggests the Riley’s were Catholic, and therefore possibly Irish Travellers, since Irish Travellers are predominantly Catholic, whereas Romanichals are typically Protestant, though many have begun to join more evangelical sects such as the Pentecostal and Assembly of God churches (Salo 1979, 79;
Salo 1987, 91). This claim is strengthened by the ambiguity of the Riley surname, for it has been documented as both Irish Traveller and Romanichal (Dawson 2006, 48).

Many memorial stones suggest religious affiliation as well, featuring depictions of folded hands praying, a symbol of pious devotion. Spiritual emblems of eternal life, flames from a torch, were discovered on a Williams and Broadway memorial stone. These findings suggest a deep religiosity among the Romanichals; however, many scholars discount Romanies’ religious convictions (Salo 2005). Yet, the Romanichal and other Romany groups’ turn toward fundamental Christianity offers a valid explanation for the continuing prevalence of non-Catholic religious symbolism on their memorial stones.

Engraved imagery of personal characteristics of the deceased was another observed attribute. Though nicknames were etched into a few memorial stones, two had especially personal inscriptions. James “Big Jim” Riley’s memorial features a drawing of a muscular arm flexing in the center, clearly a reflection of his physique and cherished nickname. Another example was Mary D. Riley’s large memorial stone, featuring an engraving of a traditional Romanichal covered wagon, or vardo, and a lengthy epitaph summarizing her life (Fraser 1992 [216]):

“MRS. MARY D. WILLIAMS
BORN IN SOMERSET, ENGLAND
MAY 6, 1828

THE LAST FORTY FOUR Y’RS OF HER LIFE HAS BEEN SPENT IN THIS COUNTRY, FORTY OF WHICH SHE HAS BEEN A WIDOW. SHE WAS THE MOTHER OF SEVEN CHILDREN, THREE OF WHICH SURVIVE HER TWO SONS AND ONE DAUGHTER WHO SPEAK OF THEIR MOTHER IN TERMS OF HIGHEST REGARD. SHE WAS ONE OF THE MOST CAREFUL AND AFFECTIONATE OF MOTHERS AND THEY FEEL THEY HAVE TO PART WITH AS GOOD A MOTHER AS EVER LIVED.”
3.4.2 Benches and Urns

Benches and urns were noted as standout features at a few selected memorial sites. A pair of benches was found at one Broadway memorial site near the entrance, though they did not look well-used. Urns were prevalent as well. A single urn, which represents the soul, was noticed resting on the center mantle of an elaborate Broadway monument. Matching urns placed near the sides of a monument are a hallmark of Scottish Traveller memorial sites, though several Romanichal sites featured the same attribute (Erwin 1993, 114).

Figure 3-24. Romanichal family monument with landscaping. Note the flowers in front of the stone and the urns. This picture was taken in the fall, but in warmer months, flowers are planted in the urns. Photo by author.

Matching urns were present at a Lovell, Williams, Stanley, and Broadway memorial site. The Lovell urns were inscribed with “MAMA” and “SON-FROM MAMA,” perhaps because the dedicated son was the parent’s only child that made it to adulthood, making him especially cherished. The Stanley monument has four urns, two solid-rock urns built into the monument, and two additionally brought in to hold flowers.
3.4.3 Visitation & Landscaping

Landscaping, along with visitation, are the two essential components to the vital cultural purpose Romanies have at the memorial park. Romanies have been thought to visit their deceased not only to appease their *mulo*, but also to keep up the appearance of their family grave, which is thought to be a representation of their family group. Williams (2003) writes that Romanies are aware their deceased relatives are resting in *Gadje* territory, and offer extreme amounts of care to keep the site looking both beautiful and imposing to non-Romanies, as can be seen in Figure 3-25 (Okley 2003, 157).

Non-Romanies can affirm the existence of a Romany population based upon the presence of landscaping on their memorial stones. Frequently landscaped sites indicate at least a portion of their *familia* is still in the vicinity because Romanies are not known to travel great distances to visit deceased relatives as they do for the funerals. Landscaped sites appear frequently, though not abundantly, among the Romanichal memorial population in Woodlawn. Figure 3-26 highlights these sites. Evidence of this can be seen among the landscaped Romanichal family plots, such as the Stanley site shown in Figure 3-25.
The peculiarities of memorial site landscaping are worthy of examination. Landscaped sites include sites where flowers and floral arrangements were placed by family members. The emphasis on family members placing their own flowers, always bought from “their” florist, cannot be stressed enough. The customer relations clerk once placed a wreath delivered for the Stanley family on their nearby monument, only to later be admonished by a visiting Stanley relative for touching the family wreath. Likewise, members of these families plant flowers or hire landscapers to plant them at the monument sites. (Field Notes, Feb. 2012).

The majority of landscaped sites feature a variation of a care symbol near the family monument. These emblems signify a particular site requires custom landscaping, such as edging and trimming (Woodlawn maintenance worker, personal interview with author, 7 Mar. 2011). One type of care marker symbolizes fraternal order affiliation, such as the Freemason compass, always inscribed on the surface of memorial stones. The authenticity of these memberships is often doubted, though Romanies have a history of
fraternal brotherhood affiliations. The other type of care symbol is a simple metal signpost that reads “CARE.”

Interviews with memorial park workers also shed valuable light on the nature of the families’ site upkeep. A senior maintenance worker asserted Romanichals who purchase care signs spare no expense, and spend large sums of money—all cash—on site upkeep, requesting only the finest floral arrangements and wreaths for their deceased family members. The same maintenance worker spoke of one family that had adorned their family’s site with flowers planted in the shape of a horseshoe, paying homage to their horse trading legacy. The family was eventually forced to halt this tradition when

Figure 3-26. Landscaped Romanichal Memorial Sites.
the park changed their site-care cost from a flat rate to an amount per square inch of decoration.

The maintenance worker also informed me of the recent transfer of an individual Romany to Woodlawn from an out-of-state memorial park. He explained that this Romany family, the Mitchells, who are extremely wealthy from their successful blacktopping business, sought to move the deceased relative into a well-established Romanichal section of the memorial park, surely costing thousands of dollars (Field notes, Feb. 2011). This process is just one example of the immense amounts of money Romanies lavish on burials. The senior maintenance worker’s account also corresponds with Haberstein and Lamers (1963) claim Romanies often have their deceased relatives’ bodies shipped to memorial parks long desired by the group (722).

Throughout the interview process, the author gathered the groundskeeper held a good, if not cozy, relationship with the Romanichal families. He spoke highly of the families and claimed to even have eaten dinner with one particular family on more than one occasion. The claim is doubtful, however, as Romanies keep a considerable social distance between themselves and the gadje, especially those who work amongst the dead, or moxadi, and are considered potential bad luck (Salo 1991, 306).

Conversely, it is possible the Romanichals used the non-Romany memorial park staff to gain favorable plots, discounts or preferential treatment. Non-Romanies are indeed essential to Romanies seeking to gain access to burial space, as “sedentarist society monopolizes graveyards” (Okley 2003, 158). One can imagine the benefits a close relationship with a head groundskeeper would have, such as potential discounts or special care.
The customer relations clerk repeatedly mentioned how the Romanichals always try to “make a deal,” implying intense bartering when purchasing plots or memorial stones. Similarly, the memorial park admitted to conceding to one of the Romanies’ insistent requests. After many squabbles about leaving mementos at memorial sites, the park administration eventually allowed the Romanichals to place small trinkets and keepsakes on them, though it violated park policy (Personal interview with author, Feb. 2011). Stephens (2003) also noted memorial parks have recently begun to cater to the special needs of Romany funeral and burial services by accommodating the large crowds at services and acknowledging the Romanies’ desire to control and maintain their memorial sites (88).

One Romanichal approached the memorial park as a potential business opportunity. The clerk spoke of one particular Broadway who visits his relatives “twice a year,” always making a point of asking if the memorial park would like him to fill in the potholes littering the park’s asphalt pathway. The answer is always, “No,” as the park does not allow such contracting (Personal interview with author, Jan. 2012).

From these anecdotes, it is clear Romanies gain or attempt to gain a strong relationship with valuable memorial park employees for discounts or preferential treatment, comparable to the relations they seek to form with policemen and social workers (Sutherland 1986, 65).
3.4.4 Photographs on Memorial Stones

Two recently established memorial stones in the Stanley plot near the entrance of the memorial park feature photographs of the deceased. This is worth noting because memorial stone photographs are characteristic of the memorial sites of the Rom, or Eastern European Vlach Romanies; a more in-depth discussion of Rom memorial stones is found in the following section. To the author’s best knowledge, a Romanichal family featuring a Rom-style memorial stone is unheard of, especially given the two Romany groups antagonistic relationship (Salo 1979, 83-86).

The photos may have been included due to the nature of the deceased. The two individuals passed away at a young age--a boy at 12 and a woman at 28. The woman was tragically killed after being struck by a car, while the boy’s cause of death remains unknown (Toledo Blade, August 15, 2010). The boy’s memorial stone can be found in Figure 3-27. The tragic nature of the deaths is just as plausible a reason to garnish the memorial stone with their photograph as a possible case of familial and/or cultural intermixing between Toledo Rom and Romanichals. This potential interrelationship deserves consideration for future research on the Toledo Romany population.
3.5 Conclusion

The Romanichal case study at Woodlawn Cemetery produced an assortment of otherwise unknown lore and inferential knowledge on the geographic distribution of Romany memorial sites. Fortunately, a great amount of genealogical and historical data could be found for the case study population, allowing me to construct a social network and conduct network analyses. Additionally, the vast amount of spatial and qualitative data gathered from the memorial park permitted the use of meaningful spatial statistics, and empirical assessments.

The social network built using obtained and gathered genealogical data visualized the social network of a large part of Toledo’s Romanichal population. Using network centrality measures, the size of an individual’s family and relative importance within the network could be ascertained from the relationship data. The centrality measures were then used to validate the secondary hypothesis that Romanies who build magnificent
monuments are the wealthiest and have the largest families, and thus have the highest network centralities. Unfortunately, the procedures refuted this secondary hypothesis, showing no considerable correlation between the two measures.

I grounded the social network GIS mapping software to better examine how social ties manifest themselves in memorial site arrangement. After investigating the myriad arrangements within the network, it was concluded the location of memorial sites are determined by intra and inter-family relationships, specifically marriage. It was also conjectured the distribution of the memorial sites throughout the memorial park was initially established by Romanichal patriarchs who were horse traders. The subsequent geographic organization of memorial sites was dictated by land availability, though anomalies did occur.

The quantitative methods used on the Romanichal data yielded mixed results. The initial spatial statistical tools were used to quantitatively authenticate the long-held claim Romany memorial sites are clustered in the memorial park. The cluster analyses produced significant results confirming Romanichal memorial sites at Woodlawn Cemetery are indeed clustered.

Conversely, the spatial and non-spatial statistical tools employed to discover a correlation between the “level of majesty” and network centrality did not yield validating results. Advanced spatial statistical tools, such as hot/cold spot analysis, were run with a more than adequate sample size (>30), but no agreeing quantitative evidence was produced (“How Hot Spot Analysis…”). The Pearson’s product moment coefficient produced a result representative of the other processes—a small positive correlation
between the level of majesty and network centrality. Thus, the secondary hypothesis was refuted.

The qualitative examination of the Romanichal memorial sites fell more in line with traditional necrogeography and Romany Studies. Periodic inspections of the memorial sites as well as the engravings on the stones were useful for acquiring insights regarding personal history and visitations. Anecdotal knowledge gained from the memorial park staff about conducting business with the Romanichals generated fascinating insights on the attitudes and quirks present-day Romanichals.

Overall, my mash-up of methodologies produced otherwise unpublicized and neglected lore and knowledge about Romanichal memorial sites. From stories gained from interviews and genealogical records, to overarching theories about memorial site distribution, the tools used were able to concretely test the stated hypothesis of this thesis. In conclusion, though the secondary hypothesis was proven invalid, the diverse methodology of the project produced valuable results and inferences that should be further developed and tested using other Romany memorial park populations. One such investigation is found in the proceeding chapter.
Chapter 4

Analysis of the Rom population at Calvary Cemetery

4.1 Introduction and Methods

My Romanichal case study findings are enriched by comparing and contrasting them with Vlach (Eastern European) Rom burial sites located a few miles away at Calvary Cemetery. My analysis of the Calvary Cemetery data provides some additional anecdotes, lore and insights about local Romany social networks and spatiality. Not all of the analysis methods can be utilized on the Rom population due to a dearth of comparable data (39, compared to 141 Romanichals in Woodlawn Cemetery). All the Rom interred at this memorial park are assumed to belong to the same kumpania, and are classified by familia, which is assumed from an individual’s “American” surname (for example: Nicholas, Evans, Miller, or DeMetro).

The genealogical data I was able to gather was scant, thus a useful social network was not able to be created. However, from available data I surmised the Rom case study population originated from Brazil sometime in the early 20th century. For most of the population, methods previously used to gather genealogical data often proved futile because Rom names for the non-Romany world (gadzikano) were too common to
confidently identify as Rom. Another complicating factor was the frequent use of certain names, such as the many Frank Demetros, which muddled the genealogical databases. The data-gathering struggle is a testament to the secrecy that has protected Rom livelihoods for hundreds of years.

Due to data constraints, the empirical cartographic analysis will have a different focus than the Romanichal case study. The analysis of the Rom memorial sites will focus on the *familias* present, temporal distribution, Rom “kings,” and evidential feuding. A comprehensive spatialized social network could not be built because of the lack of genealogical information; however, a small network for a “royal” Rom family could be visualized thanks in large part to atypical newspaper articles and obituaries.

Spatial statistics were also applied to the Rom data. However, because no centrality measures could be calculated, advanced spatial statistics used on the Romanichal case study are not possible with this Rom dataset. However, distances between memorial sites will be calculated to validate long held empirical claims Romany memorial sites are arranged in family clusters.

The qualitative analysis was also affected by the more secretive and mobile local Rom population. Despite several attempts by the author, meaningful interviews could not be arranged with the staff at the Catholic cemetery where the Rom are interred. As such, exterior elements such as memorial stone styling, inscriptions, and remembrances are analyzed and discussed here, based primarily on the most reliable secondary sources available on Romany-American culture.

The Rom case study population proved to be a great deal more difficult to study than the Romanichal case study population. This is likely due to secrecy differences
linked to the degree of cultural assimilation between the two groups; the Rom work more in the underground economy than Romanichals, who admit the Rom maintain traditional customs better than other Romany groups (Salo 1979, 85). The heightened secrecy of the Rom is apparently respected by the non-Romany memorial park staff, who were reticent to speak about Romanies; one secretary even became visibly anxious when asked a question about the Rom. Despite these difficulties, I achieved a basic comparison study using appropriate methodologies similarly applied to the Romanichal case study.

4.2 Empirical Cartographic Analysis

4.2.1 Familias Present

The *familia* is the most basic functional unit of Rom social organization. The unit spans three or four generations and consists of a man and his wife, his parents, their grown sons and their wives, and in some cases, divorced daughters, their children, and occasionally adopted nieces, nephews, and other relatives (Sutherland 1986, 183-4). Although Sutherland (1986) states that rarely one “American” surname is chosen per *familia*, it is assumed in the GIS produced maps this is the case for cartographic clarity’s sake. Judging by the noticeable geographic clustering of identical surnames, and without genealogical or anecdotal validation or denial, this assertion may be indeed true.

The memorial park features eight *familias* and three self-ascribed Rom “kings,” who will be discussed later. The Rom in the case study used common Rom-American surnames, such as Demetro, Miller, Mitchell (McLaughlin 1980, 39). However, according to Gypsy Lore Society president Shelia Salo, the Calipetro surname “does not
belong,” despite the genealogist informants’ claim the individual is related to the Rom (personal correspondence 24 Dec. 2011). Miller and Demetro are the most common surnames in the memorial park.

Figure 4-1. Rom Familias in Calvary Cemetery. Note the “stars,” which symbolize the reputed Rom “kings” present in the population.

The memorial stones are geographically distributed in three section corners of the memorial park, two of which form a prominent enclave bordering a major intersection for traffic accessing the memorial park grounds. The north-most section contains the widest variety of familias, mostly Demetros and Coopers, but also two Masons and one Clark. Millers dominate the corner immediately south, though two Nicholases and one Demetro
are present as well. The distant corner, approximately 410 feet away, contains mostly Millers, but also includes a Mitchell couple and the questionably-Rom Calipetro woman.

The reasoning behind the distribution is likely similar to the Romanichal distribution: kinship ties, occupation, and land availability. Although kinship ties could not be ascertained due to the limited amount of data available, judging by the clusters of *familias*, it can be assumed proximate memorial stones of the same surname are close relatives.

Only three individual’s occupations were discovered: a coppersmith, a roofing contractor, and a junk peddler (Toledo Blade January 9, 1962 and July 25, 1982). However, several Coopers were present in the population, a name derived from the word for the occupation of one who repairs or casts buckets, implying a coppersmith trade somewhere in the family’s history. Though the small sample of known occupations prohibit a meaningful cartographic assessment, examination of the relative “level of majesty” for all the memorial sites indicate a trend similar to the Romanichal case study.
Figure 4-2 shows the majority of monument-level memorial stones appear in the center of subset 1. Surrounding these approximately six-foot tall monuments, are smaller, ground-level memorial stones, undoubtedly symbolizing a lesser rank among the Rom (Kephart 1950, 642). These monuments likely belonged to familia elders, individuals known as a “Big Man” or Rom Baro, who are themselves (or act as advisers to) the “king” or chief of the vitsa (Gropper 1975, 70-3). Two “kings” are present in this cluster of monuments, further suggesting the cluster’s position as the epicenter of all the memorial sites. The memorial distribution found in subset 2, distantly southwest of the discussed enclave, was likely the result of land availability to be discussed next.
4.2.2 Temporal Distribution

As I had explained in the Romanichal case study, the temporal distribution of memorial sites is used as the basis to assess land availability. The resultant distribution is more defined and marked than the Romanichal case study, in large part due to the more condensed clusters. Consequently, the land availability perspective is an effective means of explaining the arrangement and development of Rom memorial sites at Calvary Cemetery.

Figure 4-3. Rom Memorial Sites by Individual’s Year Deceased at Calvary Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
The southern half of subset 1 is the oldest section, followed by the northern portion of the subset, with subset 2 being the youngest. This assertion is most effectively illustrated with the average year of cessation. The average year of passing on for the southern cluster of subset 1 was 1959, 1969 for the cluster north of the driveway, and 1983 for isolated subset 2. The differences are positively correlated with an increased geographic distance from the “founding” Rom elders in the southern cluster of subset 1.

The apparent lack of recent Rom burials in Calvary Cemetery suggests the emigration of Rom from Toledo. The most recent burial in the case study occurred in 1999 with the death of the Calipetro woman; the last burial of a confirmed Rom occurred with the death of a young Miller girl in 1986. This finding is concomitant with the population figures for Toledo Rom described by a member of the Miller family in Joe Miller’s obituary. The relative stated, in 1981, that fewer than 100 of the “tribe” remain in Toledo. Only four Rom were buried in that cluster after Joe Miller’s death. Ruminations on the causes for this migration will be discussed further later on.

Contrarily, one memorial park office worker assured me several Rom from “Detroit” have been recently buried at the memorial park (interview with author January 2012). One such memorial stone, an old Miller woman, has been discovered near the road on the other side of the park from where the case study cluster is found. The distance suggests no direct connection to the case study population; she could have been a Miller of a different vitsa.; or perhaps she is related and no plots nearer to the cluster could be purchased. No genealogical data could be found; and the memorial park clerk was unwilling to elaborate any further on the topic.
The result of the land availability interpretation on the geographic distribution of memorial sites produced a logical and likely conclusion: the Toledo Rom started burying their deceased family members in the southern cluster of subset 1, and then had to move burials just north across the pathway of that cluster, and finally to the isolated corner cluster shown in subset 2. Quality burial plot availability was an especially scarce resource due to Romany’s demand for preferential plots near the pathway, as well as trees or shrubs, which perhaps limited the size of the enclave itself, as distantly located recent Rom burials suggest (Nemeth 2002, 68-9). The strong proof supporting this conclusion suggests land availability is a motivating factor behind the geographic distribution of the Toledo Rom’s memorial sites, and also promotes the method’s usefulness for future case study examination.

4.2.3 Rom “Kings”

Three reputed or self-ascribed “kings” and one “queen” were identified in the case study population from uncommon newspaper obituaries, as seen in Figures 4-1, 2, and 3 (obit of Eli Miller, Annie D. Miller, Steve Davis Nicholas, and Joe Miller). The term “king” is often refuted or ignored by Romany studies scholars, though it is often used by Rom who are self-ascribed leaders (Gypsies in Toledo, Greenfield 1977, 32).

Academically, the word “king” is only indexed by Gropper (1975), who defines the term as an expression used by Romanies in reference to their leader when relating to the gadje, though she does admit “chief” would be a more appropriate equivalent (70-1). Greenfield (1977) also makes mention of the term, but immediately denounces any idea of “Gypsy royalty,” and blames the prevalence of the title on journalists who “found it
colorful to write of Gypsy kings or queens” and the Romanies who take advantage of the situation by indulging the romantic image (32). Other sources (Sutherland 1986, Salo 1981, McLaughlin 1980, Tyrner-Stastny 1977) use the leadership titles, “chief” and Rom Baro, or “big man,” and “Shoto,” derived from “Big Shot”.

The social organizing unit the “king” leads is unclear; nevertheless, from the sources gathered, I conjecture the “king” leads the vitsa and heads up the kumpania. Gropper (1977) uses a hierarchical definition: the head of a familia (extended family) is a “Big Man,” and the “Big Man” of the ruling family of a vitsa is the “king” (70). Furthermore, the “Big Men” of all the familias comprising a vitsa act as a “Council of Elders,” which advise the king on decisions and voice their approval or disapproval of the “king,” in addition to choosing a new vitsa leader in case of the latter (Gropper 1975, 72). Conversely, Sutherland (1986) uses the Rromanes word phuro to define the eldest patriarch of a familia, and defines the role of the “king” equivalent as the leading “Big Man” of a vitsa or kumpania (106). Salo (1981) defines the “chief” as the leader of the nebulous “community” (83). Additionally, Rom “queens,” known as romni bari, may also be consulted during a decision making process, as many old women (singular: phuri) are respected and obeyed (Sutherland 1986, 105)

Despite difficulty defining the social organizing unit “kings” control, the role they play in Rom society and economics is relatively uniform. The foremost functions of a “king” are to maintain peace between familias and individuals; serve as the main contact with the non-Romany world, principally to establish friendly (if not coercive) and economically beneficial ties with local authorities and local fraternal organizations; and officiate holidays and social events (Gropper 1975, 71; Salo 1981, 83; Sutherland 1986
The leader of the *vitsa* is appointed based on strength and intelligence, and has the final say in decisions affecting the whole *vitsa*, though as was mentioned before, he must first reach a strong consensus with his “Council of Elders (Rom Baros)” (Gropper 1975, 71-2; McLaughlin 1977, 33). The “king” must also act as a moderator of outside Romany groups and enforcer of Romania (Rom law, commonly spelled “Ghomania” by American Rom) within territorial jurisdictions, and also serve as a generous host for frequent visitors from the *vitsa* (Gropper 1975, 72-3; Sutherland, 106). Unfortunately, the leader must additionally act as a financial resource for needy members, as well as fill the role of a “bail bondsman” and financially support members who have gotten into legal trouble or have been incarcerated (*Gypsies in Toledo*). The “king” should be a wealthy man, and *vitsa* “taxes” are collected for the leader, but as Gropper (1975) affirms, “he is always in need of cash” (72-3).

Choosing a “king” is merit-based and heavily influenced by the abilities of a “Big Man” in the Rom court of law, or *kris* (Gropper 1975, 73). Prestige and respect are also innate reasons for selection and maintenance of authority over the *vitsa*; this is why leaders are anxious to keep out non-relatives and invite fellow *vitsa* members to their *kumpania*, often leading to relatively homogenous communities (Sutherland 1986, 106). Wealth, influence with non-Romanies, and large amounts of manpower (sons), and even certain physical attributes, such as a large frame, girth or height are other essential qualifications for leadership selection (Gropper 1975 73-4; Sutherland 1986, 106, 116). Hereditary leadership is common within the same *familia* or nuclear family, creating occasional “royal families” within the *vitsa* (Gropper 1975, 74).
I found one such hereditary “royal family” in the case study, as indicated in Figure 4-4 using a spatialized social network. The map highlights the impact of land availability among the Rom in Calvary Cemetery. Joe Miller is interred in subset 2, relatively far away from his father Eli, who abdicated the “throne” for him, as well as his brother, who to the author’s best knowledge, was not a leader.

Most interestingly, however, is the great physical distance Joe is from his wife, “queen” Annie. Her memorial stone is close by Joe’s parents and brother--so why were they not buried in the same site? Many of the other Rom couples in the memorial park shared husband and wife sites, including all the “kings.” Perhaps it has something to do with the fact that Annie passed on 24 years before Joe. Maybe Joe remarried and chose not to be buried with his “queen?” This is unlikely not only because of his wife’s popularity (see “Gypsy Queen Buried”), but because it is assumed Joe wanted to be buried near his family. Conceivably, bad blood could have brewed between Joe and Annie’s family, or the park could not place Joe next to her for some technical reason. Without more recent history or lore, none of these questions can be answered. It is sufficient here to raise some of the possibilities as an educational exercise for readers unfamiliar but curious about Romany intra-group relations.
Two Miller “kings,” one Miller “queen,” and a Nicholas “king” were identified amongst the Rom in Calvary Cemetery. All the “royal” Rom were (presumably) self-identified as “Brazilian Gypsies” (“Gypsy Queen Buried, “Gypsy King Laid to Rest in Toledo”). These “kings” were discovered through the use of uncharacteristic newspaper articles pertaining to their funerals and individual obituaries that included valuable and otherwise secret information.

From the obits, the geographic scale and population of the youngest Miller (Joe) “king’s” vitsa could be found. The article stated that at the time of his death, Joe Miller was the “king” of over 2,500 Rom nationwide, an increase of 1,800 from the time he inherited the title from his father 32 years earlier when he was 41 years old (Toledo Blade, November 12, 1981). This claim suggests great leadership success. The population
of the Nicholas “king’s” vitsa was not disclosed, but 400 Rom did attend his funeral in Battle Creek, Michigan (“Gypsy King Laid to Rest in Toledo”).

The geographic space of the Miller’s vitsa could also be gathered from their obituaries. In Joe Miller’s obituary, it is stated his “tribe” was based in Chicago and Toledo, indicating a localized vitsa. The obituary of his wife Annie, who passed on 24 years before Joe, had a larger geographic scale, citing relatives from “Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Alabama, and other states”; and it was added (in Joe Miller’s obit) “nearly 40,000 [sic] gypsies in North and South America” knew of her passing (“Gypsy Queen Buried”). The latter statement is undoubtedly aggrandizing showmanship. Additionally, the only clue into the population of “king” Nicholas’ vitsa was that “Brazilian Gypsies from far and wide” attended his funeral.

Clues about the “reign” of the eldest Miller “king” were found in his obituary. It is reported he “maintained tradition and required all women of the clan to wear traditional [sic] gypsy costumes” (Toledo Blade, January 9, 1962). This is confirmed with the dress of his wife, Mary, as she appears on their memorial stone photograph. This style of dress would have made the women appear exotic in a crowd of gadje, but would also blend with other Rom women, as non-Romanies would be too distracted by their garb to notice the individual’s face (Gropper 1975, 53). In that photograph Eli is wearing a “Stetson” hat, which is used to enhance the size of the head, an important physical trait for a Rom leader (Sutherland 1986, 116). Mary and Eli’s photograph can be found in Figure 4-5.
The legendary Romany “kings” are present in the Rom case study population. These *vitsa* leaders were highly respected members of Rom society and had enormous responsibilities to their people, both 1) economically, by providing work and an agreeable work environment, and 2) socially, by officiating celebrations and sorting out arguments in the *kris*. With this information in mind, the centrality of the “kings” as well as other “Big Men” amongst the Rom in Calvary Cemetery, as discussed in the previous section, is more understandable and is certainly a result of a designed-in architecture of local hierarchy and power. These influential, authoritative, but inherently democratic “kings” are the center of Rom social and economic organization in life; their importance lives on and is mirrored by their centrality in the memorial park after death.
4.2.4 Apparent Feuding as Related to Memorial Stone Vandalism

Over the course of the Calvary Cemetery field study, I noticed intentional damage to several of the photographs on the memorial stones. The logical reaction to this claim would be to insist that the damage was incurred by harsh weather conditions, random vandalism by strangers, or careless maintenance workers, but the condition of the photographs compared those on nearby memorial stones suggest some memorial stones were deliberately damaged. Figure 4-6 illustrates the damage argument using three ground-level memorial stone photographs all located in the same cluster within the Rom enclave. Additionally, Figure 4-7 illustrates a comparison between a damaged monument and a non-damaged Rom monument of the same area and era, as well as one monument that had its photograph forcibly removed.

Figure 4-6. Conditions of Ground-Level Memorial Stone Photographs. Left: Destroyed photograph due to harsh weather or grounds-keepers. Center: Suggested intentionally damaged photograph. Right: Undamaged photograph. Photos by author.
Figures 4-6 and 4-7 visually support the intentional damage hypothesis. “Natural” occurrences, such as harsh weather or landscaping accidents, could be used to excuse the ground-level memorial stone photographs that would be parallel to such harmful elements, but spotty damage primarily on the individual’s face, strongly implies a malicious motive. The perpendicular angle of the monuments’ photographs to the potential of the aforementioned “natural” harm and real obvious intent of the nicks in the selected damaged photograph leaves very little room for argument against the intentional damage conclusion. Furthermore, there is evidence the photograph of “king” Joe Miller was forcibly removed, for only a bent metal piece, presumably the photograph holder, is all that remains in the spot where photographs are typically placed.

With the visual assessment concluding the damage was indeed intentional, the question of why several memorial stone photographs were damaged can be posed. When considering this issue, three potential culprits arise: angry non-Romanies, non-Rom
Romanies, or fellow Rom. Non-Romanies are unlikely to take such personal action against the Rom in the memorial park, for matters would have likely been sorted out in person or in (American) court. The non-Rom Romany hypothesis is possible as there is evidence of Romanichals and Rom coexisting in Toledo; however, such an implication would be impossible to support with the available data. The most likely cause of the damage is by feuding Rom, judging by the selectiveness of individuals and familias damaged.

Feuds, physical fights or intentional harm done to a Rom by another Rom are generally caused by territorial disputes, uneven economic partnerships, or defamations involving a woman’s integrity. Incidents over these issues are all chronicled in Sutherland (1986). According to Sutherland’s (1986) accounts, when a feud occurs an act of harm is first pursued, including fist fighting, smashing someone’s car, or plotting to cease another’s welfare support (125, 122-2). The next step is to include some gadje (non-Romany) official, such as police officer, to end physical dispute and “relieve the immediate tension” (ibid, 131).

After the physical dispute is over, the Rom address the problem in either or both the diwano, a group of adults convened to discuss a matter publicly,” or a kris romani, or trial arbitrated by an arranged group of elders whose verdict is morally binding. Ignoring their ruling would be to ignore Romania, the enforced social order of the Rom (Sutherland 1986, 317, 319). Sutherland (1986) also suggests the kris romani is reserved for very serious cases, such as divorce, although Gropper (1975) does not mention the diwano, insinuating the kris is used to mediate all grievances (Sutherland 1986, 132;
Gropper 1975, 47-8). Despite discrepancies in the exact judicial process, it is agreed all feuds are ultimately settled by a Rom adjudication.

Rom feuds typically do not involve serious violence outside of a brief brawl between the parties involved. However, members of other Romany ethnic groups have been slain in disputes, most notably the Finnish Kale Romanies, as a result of their idiosyncratic justice system based on “blood feuds” that occasionally result in murder (Weyrauch 2001, 154-5, Cooke 2007). Notwithstanding an overall absence of violence in Rom culture, it should be known the kris alone holds the power of criminal law that can, but rarely does, legitimize violence against an offender (Acton 2003, 644).

Slavas, or saint’s day feasts, particularly Easter celebrations, are known to be the prime setting for feuds due to the physical proximity of large amounts of Rom (Sutherland 1986, 123). Alliances between feuding parties are drawn hierarchically from highest to lowest affiliation according to one’s nuclear family kinship ties, familia, vitsa, and kumpania (ibid, 125). Eventual blame for the event generally shifts to “outsiders” involved, those belonging to a different kinship line, vitsa, or kumpania whenever possible (ibid 1986, 123).

Because of the incendiary and dramatic nature of the event, Romany feuds are often reported by the media. One recent, well-reported feud occurred in 2007 in Newport Beach, California over contested fortune telling territory (Mickadeit 2007). During the feud, one feuding party drove up and attempted to view the casket of his rival’s deceased relative, only to be surrounded by angry members of the extended family. The visiting rival then quickly drove off, shouting insults about the dead relative (ibid). This example illustrates no place is sacred, even a cemetery, in the midst of a feud.
With background information on feuds understood, the evidence of feuding among the Rom at Calvary Cemetery can be examined. Figure 3-8 highlights all of the damaged memorial stones and defines the individual’s *familia* affiliation. The map indicates most of the damaged memorial stones belong to members of the Demetro *familia*, though two Millers and one Cooper memorial stone were also damaged. Based on the Cooper memorial stone’s location within a cluster of Demetro memorial sites, it can be assumed the Cooper individual was closely related or affiliated with the surrounding Demetros.

![Figure 4-8. Map of Intentionally Damaged Rom Memorial Stones.](image)
The two Miller memorial sites are of interest because of the status of the individuals to whom they belong. One may recognize the “king” Joe Miller memorial site as the damaged Miller site in the subsection labeled “2.” His brother, Thomas’ memorial site was the other Miller site damaged. The fact that the perpetrators would choose to damage the monuments of members of the “royal family” is too significant to pass off as random. Unfortunately, I could not gather information on when the assault on the memorial stones occurred from the park staff or from news reports, so theories on the cause of the feud can only be conjectured based on empirical evidence.

Assessing the spatial distribution of memorial sites based on affiliation offers some clues into the mystery behind the damaged memorial stones. As was mentioned earlier, the Cooper individual is likely closely related to the damaged surrounding Demetros. Using Figure 4-1 and 4-3 as a reference, the isolated and damaged Demetro in the southern cluster of subsection “1” was likely the first Demetro in the enclave, but could have been related to the neighboring Millers or Nicholases, based on spatial proximity. The “royal” Millers were already identified; however, Joe was the most recent burial among the damaged stones, implying the assault was waged after his death.

With this background, I hypothesize the cause of the damage was a feud between the Demetros and the descendants of “king” Joe Miller. Joe Miller was a reputed millionaire when he passed away; and Barney Miller, who appears to be a relative of his, was subsequently “crowned king” of Toledo, but was arrested for “scams and swindles” (*Gypsies in Toledo*). I suspect either Joe or Barney Miller’s sanctioned questionable, though likely lucrative, occupational methods that caught too much attention from police, rendering Toledo too difficult to work unfettered from law enforcement in (Salo 1979,
The Demetros, unable to earn money, were then forced to leave the *kumpania*, which created resentment toward their leader and thus the contemporary “royal family,” which motivated them to deface their respective memorial stones, possibly including a fellow Demetro. Note the memorial stone of “king” Eli Miller, Joe’s father, was not harmed, as his leadership established the Rom in Toledo, thus rendering it reprehensible to deface. In response, the Millers avenged their actions and defaced the suspected Demetros’ relatives’ memorial stones.

Vlach Romanies carry the tools of their trade in their vehicles; I suspect vindictive Romanies may have taken their hammers out of their trunks to settle old scores with their estranged relatives and competitors. As is the case with many of my hypotheses applied to this Rom case study population, more detailed and reliable genealogical data is needed to authenticate my claims. Obviously, primary ethnographic information would be ideal to solve this mystery, but the supposition based on empirical spatial analysis, coupled with bits of lore, created a very reasonable concluding hypothesis.

### 4.3 Spatial Statistics

The variety spatial statistical tools used for the Rom case study were limited due to the lack of social network measures. Consequently, the only meaningful calculations that could be run on the data were an “average nearest neighbor” and a “distance band from neighbor count.” The “average nearest neighbor” and “distance band from neighbor count” both indicate the density of a population, thus they will be used to infer the level of clustering occurring in the memorial park. More in-depth descriptions of these tools are found in section 3.3.1.
4.3.1 Cluster Assessment

The results of the calculations indicate the Rom population in Calvary Cemetery is clustered and can be considered an enclave. Table 4.1 lists the calculation results. The average nearest neighbor of any memorial site was only 3.64 feet, about six feet less than the Romanichal average nearest neighbor calculation. This wide discrepancy is caused by the vastly smaller geographic space the Rom occupy in the park; only three sections (two practically adjacent) are occupied by the Rom compared to the fourteen, often distant sections the Romanichals inhabit.

Closer familial ties likely played a part in the small average nearest neighbor distance. As was previously stated, all the Rom in the memorial park are assumed to belong to the same kumpania, but their vitsa affiliation could not be assessed without more genealogical data. However, the density of memorial sites suggest a dense family network, as was validated in the Romanichal case study.

Table 4.1. Memorial Stone Distribution Density Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total and Average Distance of (n) Neighbors</th>
<th>All Memorial Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Distance 8 Neighbor Distance</td>
<td>85.43 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance per Neighbor (n=8)</td>
<td>10.68 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 3 Neighbor Distance</td>
<td>10.93 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance per Neighbor (n=3)</td>
<td>3.64 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Nearest Neighbor Calculation (n=1)</td>
<td>3.64 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the *vitsa* is subdivided along sibling lines, meaning everyone in the group is related to some extent, Rom are also buried near family members likely belonging to the same *vitsa* (Sutherland 1986, 183). However, they may also belong to the same *kumpania*; on occasion a single *vitsa* can comprise one *kumpania* (Sutherland 1986, 106). Conversely, if all members of the Rom population in Calvary Cemetery are related only based on *familia* and associated by *kumpania*, the meaning of the relations implies a degree of camaraderie among the *kumpania* not previously observed.

Though the initial claim the case study population all belong to the same *vitsa* is the most probable, the latter postulation they all are part of the same *kumpania* raises significant questions about what unit of social organization in life determines their final organization in the memorial park. This challenging question will require extensive genealogical information or a willing Rom informant, but is worth pursuing in future research.

The eight-neighbor distance among the memorial sites can also be used to assess the extent of the *familias* present. A typical *familia* includes a man and his wife, their grown sons and their wives, with a mean total of eight individuals (Sutherland 1986, 183-4). The eight neighbor distance was nearly three times the average nearest neighbor distance, indicating clusters of eight individuals are not common in the population.

Of course, many couples are buried together, but not all Rom couples shared the same memorial stone, though they likely are in very close proximity. All the Demetro memorial sites followed this pattern; adult men and women have individual memorial stones with titles like “Daughter” or “Father” above their name, however the title of
“Husband” or “Wife” is never included. Nevertheless, it is assumed all adult Rom are married.

All variables considered, the eight-neighbor distance suggests only a few members of each *familia* are buried in Calvary Cemetery. This finding brings into question Habenstein et al.’s (1963) claim Romanies choose to be buried in long-favored cemeteries, though the assertion held true for the Romanichal population (722). This suggests an attitude difference between the two ethnic Romany groups. Perhaps the more mobile nature of the Rom is the reason behind the memorial park featuring incomplete *familias*? As mentioned in the temporal distribution section, many Rom moved out of Toledo by the 1980s; perhaps members of the *familia* that moved on were then buried in their newer market area? This possibility deserves further investigation.

4.4 Qualitative Analysis

4.4.1 Memorial Stone Style

The Rom memorial stones’ distinctiveness among most Catholic memorial sites, coupled with advanced knowledge of common Rom surnames permitted an accurate collection of memorial stones for the case study. Similarly to the Romanichal memorial site detection method, one needs to find just one Rom memorial stone and then search the immediate periphery to find more. I did, however, encounter a few “Miller” memorial sites around the Rom cluster which appeared nothing like the other Rom sites; thus, surnames and proximity do not always indicate a Rom memorial site. That is why
stylistic differences are important to note and consider when examining a Romany memorial site population.

Rom memorial stones are similar to other Catholic and East European stones, but feature a few distinctions. The great majority of Rom memorial stones are styled similarly to Bohemian gravestones, with a portrait of the deceased, and occasionally his wife, on the stone in the center or upper corner. A comparison can be seen in Figure 4-9. Nearly all monuments are five to six foot tall cross-shapes, though the most recent Rom monument style is a more traditional and rounded headstone.

The more numerous ground-level memorial stones were also styled similarly, featuring photographs of the deceased and variations of Catholic imagery. As Romany scholar Elsie Dunin pointed out in her examination of Los Angeles Rom memorial stones, most of the ground-level stones represent individuals, though one Cooper stone in the case study did feature a husband and wife together. These memorial stones did not include any indication of spousal relationships (“Revisiting Romani (Gypsy) gravestones in Los Angeles”).
Figure 4-9: Rom and Bohemian memorial stone style similarities. The memorials stones on the far left and right are Rom graves found in Calvary Cemetery in Toledo, OH. The center photograph is of a Bohemian memorial stone found in the Bohemian National Cemetery in Chicago, IL. The most noticeable similarity they share is the photograph of the deceased. Photos by author.

4.4.2 Inscriptions

The inscriptions on the Rom’s memorial stones provide visual insight into their lives and beliefs. All the memorial stones feature Catholic imagery, typically crosses and rosaries, but also depictions of Jesus or Mary. Daisies, symbolic of innocence, are etched on the children’s memorial stones. No Masonic symbols were found on any of the memorial stones. Though the newer monuments resemble the Romanichal’s (one features matching urns), Rom memorial stones are generally more ornate (Field notes, Apr. 2011).

The prevalence of Catholic imagery on the memorial stones can be explained as the result of the Rom’s Catholic origins in Europe, as well as migrations to Central and South America (Sway 1988, 57). However, this religious affiliation is generally superficial, and Rom are skeptical of clergy being celibate, as it “runs counter to the rules of the universe” (Gropper 1975, 112). The Rom’s outlandish “Catholic camouflage” is also used in fortune-telling parlors (statues of Jesus, Mary, and various saints) to build rapport with clients (Sway 1988, 51). The case study memorial stones reflect this
strategy, appearing as Catholic as possible primarily by exhibiting prominent images of the cross, as well as pictures of icons.

“King” Joe Miller had a particularly fascinating inscription on his memorial stone. The engraving is the Christian Science “Cross and Crown” emblem: a cross running through the center of a crown signifying adherence to Christian Science religion. I am hesitant to postulate Joe Miller had a Christian Science faith, but suggest he or his family opportunistically may have “borrowed” the symbol to satisfy their desire to inflate his status as a Rom “king.” Another possibility is Joe Miller anticipated members of Christian Science faith, observing the symbol on his tombstone, might keep his burial site tidy as a religion-based community service (see Nemeth 1970). Nevertheless, Joe Miller’s insignia shows how carried away a “Big Man” can get with the romanticized idea of a “Gypsy King” used by the non-Romany media, especially because Romanies themselves do not ascribe their leader(s) with the title “king.” Judging by his “royal” inscription, Joe Miller likely felt, and perhaps had, great power over his vitsa. The emblem can be seen in Figure 4-10.
The photographs found on the memorial stones grant non-Romanies a rare chance to plainly view identified Romanies. The photographs provide valuable ethnographic insight on the Rom’s physical appearance and attire during the era they passed away. The women were generally well dressed with their hair worn back, and the men typically wore suits, a “Stetson” hat, and donned a mustache.

Examination of the photographs also indicates several Rom women wore many pieces of noticeable jewelry, including the popular gold “tear-drop” chain (Sutherland 1986, 28). However, the nature of some women’s jewelry was not what immediately met the eye. Figure 4-11 displays this occurrence; necklaces and earrings were painted onto the bodies of the women in the photographs.

The reason behind this may have been a shortage of photographs of the women with jewelry on, though it is unlikely as Rom women wear generally as much jewelry as possible (Sutherland 1986, 28). More likely, the family did not have the wealth for impressive pieces of jewelry and resorted to painting on extravagant necklaces and
earrings to raise the apparent status of the family member. Further identification of this phenomenon among Rom memorial stones deserves investigation in other memorial parks with Rom populations.

Figure 4-11. Painted Jewels on photographs of Rom Women. If one looks closely at the photographs on the woman’s memorial stones, it becomes apparent pieces of jewelry have been painted on the picture, perhaps to appear wealthier. Photos by author.

4.4.3 Remembrances

Remembrances found at the Calvary Cemetery Rom memorial sites included flowers and food offerings. Overall, the Rom memorial sites were much less decorated with landscaping and flowers than the Romanichal memorial sites at Woodlawn Cemetery. The lack of landscaping and decorations suggest many of the deceased Rom’s
relatives moved out of Toledo, and have not been back in town, for Romanies practically always visit interred kin at the memorial park if they are passing through the town (Williams 2003, 16-7).

Four individual’s markers intentionally laid flowers on presumably their kin’s memorial sites. All the individuals were of the Demetro familia; and curiously, all of the flowers were artificial. The use of artificial flowers was observed during all the seasons, so the necessary use of plastic flowers in winter is out of consideration. A potential connection may be drawn between the traditional Romany occupation of selling artificial flowers door-to-door or on the street and the synthetic flowers on memorial sites (Salo 1981, 81). Perhaps these Toledo Demetros sold artificial flowers at some point, and have since used them instead of the real flowers? Only advanced ethnographic and historical field work can validate or refute this speculation.

Figure 4-12. Artificial Flowers beside a Rom Memorial Stone. Photo by author
Romany memorial sites, if they are to be decorated at any time, will be adorned during holidays (Lonergan 2003, 91). For the duration of the field study, the aforementioned flowers were placed beside the select Demetro memorial sites; however, over the 2011 Christmas holiday, a food offering was made at the only Mason memorial site. The food, Christmas-themed candy, was placed at the base of the cross-shaped memorial stone. Holiday specialty decorations by Romanies were also noted by Stephens (2003). A cigarette butt was found alongside the Mason memorial stone, perhaps a sign relatives delivered the offering a short time before my visit (Field notes, Jan. 2012). The food offering can be seen in Figure 4-13.

No wreaths were found at the Rom memorial sites over the course of the holiday season. Again, the lack of wreaths or general landscaping for the Rom memorial stones is likely because the relatives of the deceased have moved out of Toledo and have not since returned to the city. This claim ran concomitant with the dwindling population picture a Toledo Miller informant produced for the Toledo Blade (Toledo Blade, November 12, 1981). On the whole, Rom memorial sites were relatively sparse and inactive compared to the greater number of visited and decorated Romanichal memorial sites at Woodlawn.
4.5 Conclusion

The Rom case study population at Calvary Cemetery was much more enigmatic than the Romanichal case study population, but the analyses still provided a useful assessment of the value of methods used in the Romanichal case study. The primary issue was the lack of genealogical and anecdotal data, which prevented a social network from being constructed, as well as advanced spatial statistics. Despite this issue, a meaningful investigation of Rom memorial stones was achieved using empirical cartographic analysis, spatial statistical analysis, and qualitative analysis. Each of these methods produced insights into otherwise hidden knowledge about the Rom of Toledo.

Although the empirical cartographic analysis for the Rom case study did not feature a robust spatialized social network, it did examine the spatial patterns of familias, Rom “kings,” apparent feuding, as well as the temporal/spatial distribution of the memorial sites. The arrangement of the familias was determined to be in three clusters, two of which were across from one another, forming a definite cluster. This conclusion
refutes Williams’ (2003) claim deceased Romanies are scattered among the *gadje* across a memorial park (16). It was also found the monuments of the deceased were grouped toward the center of the enclaves, with ground-level memorial stones fanning outward. The centrally located monuments likely belong to the Rom elders and the *Rom Baro*.

Next, I examined the temporal distribution of the Rom memorial sites to interpret the spatial distribution. After close investigation, it was concluded the cluster of Rom memorial sites grew over time from the aforementioned center to the corner plot immediately to the north, and then about 410 feet to the south due to the lack of available land. The temporal distribution of the memorial sites followed this pattern practically flawlessly; indicating the Rom were not buried in planned family plots, but individualized clusters near close relatives where land was available. Furthermore, this solid assessment bolsters the utility of the empirical cartographic analysis of the temporal distribution of Romany memorial sites as a means to determine the reasoning behind their spatial distribution.

Rom “kings” and apparent feuding were other aspects of the Calvary case study population to be investigated. According to various Toledo newspaper accounts, Toledo was home to three Rom “kings,” and one “queen.” The centralized spatial distribution of the “royalty” in the memorial park mirrors their paramount importance within Rom culture in life.

Evidence of feuding was discovered during field work and subsequently mapped. Apparent anthropogenic nicks, scratches and gouges into the ceramic photographs of the deceased were the means of grievance expression. The feuding parties likely used a hammer, or perhaps even a handgun, to deface the likenesses of begrudged individuals.
“King” Joe Miller and his brother’s monuments were both defaced, along with many Demetro memorial sites. After considering the varied age of damaged monuments, with the most recent burial taking place in 1981, it was concluded the offended parties had immediate grievances, but took out their anger on the likenesses of their enemy’s family members. While just a hypothesis, if a feuding Rom is willing to crash a funeral or batter a car to upset his foe, then the defacing of memorial stones is quite feasible indeed.

The only spatial statistical tools appropriate to use with the limited Rom dataset were an average nearest neighbor and distance band from neighbor count. These cluster assessments indicated the memorial sites are clustered, quantitatively verifying the claim Rom form an enclave in Calvary Cemetery. The results also indicated only a few members of each familia are buried in Calvary Cemetery, unlike the multigenerational family plots found amongst the Romanichal memorial sites. Though limited in scale, the cluster assessment calculations were valuable in quantitatively testing empirically-derived claims on Rom memorial sites, and provided a reliable comparison for two different ethnic Romany memorial park populations.

My qualitative analysis focused on the memorial stone styles, inscriptions, individual photographs, and remembrances. All the memorial stones were styled in an extremely Catholic manner, reflecting the devout personas they strived for in life. The photographs offered a glimpse into Rom attire in the 1950s to the 1980s, in addition to revealing a couple Rom women had jewels painted on their memorial stone photographs. Typical Rom remembrances such as flowers and candy were found during field sessions in the memorial park as well. Overall, the Rom memorial sites were much more
homogenous than the Romanichals, perhaps reflecting the group-centric attitude of their social order, or Romania.

In conclusion, the analysis of the Rom case study population was successful in advancing knowledge about Rom memorial sites and unveiling Toledo Rom lore. The empirical cartographic analysis of the temporal distribution and the cluster assessment of the memorial stones yielded particularly tangible results. Certainly, more genealogical data and the subsequent social network would have made the Rom case study more comparable to the Romanichal case study, but the notable amount of knowledge produced using the available data is a hopeful sign my methodology can be effective even with especially secretive Romany groups.
Chapter 5

The Toledo Romany Landscape: A Brief Examination of Spatial Co-existence

The fact there are two ethnic Romany case study populations in Toledo suggests Romanichals and Rom co-existed in the city for at least 30 years, if not currently. Chapter 5 will briefly introduce this topic by commenting on two maps (Figure HHA and HAB) of Romany households and businesses compiled from historic city directories and phone books. This section is not intended to be a detailed study of how the two ethnic Romany groups interact in Toledo; it is simply an exploratory investigation into their spatial coexistence I recommend future Romany scholars pursue, not only for Toledo, but for any and all large cities and metropolitan areas with a significant Romany population.

5.1 Empirical Cartographic Analysis

Rom and Romanichal co-existence can generally be organized by their respective economic niches. Economic niches are filled by different occupations Romanies have discovered to profitably fit into market gaps, taking advantage of imperfections in the regional market (Nemeth 2002, 53). The Toledo Rom appear to follow the “service
nomad” model defined by Nemeth (2002), but the Toledo Romanichals appear to be relatively sedentary, signifying a mastery over a viable niche in the city’s market.

The sedentary nature of Toledo’s Romanichals suggests a desire to protect their market niche; however, the territoriality of contemporary Romanichals has not been documented. Nonetheless, it can logically be assumed an ethnic Romany group that “controls” a territory (Toledo Romanichals), or has good relations with local authorities, has the power to use the authorities to make work too difficult for an intruding Romany group, which acts as an impetus to negotiation with the established group. Salo (1981) provides an example of inter-ethnic contention between Rom natsiyi (Rom tribe or “race”), with sedentary Kalderash refusing to help unrelated, interloping Lovara who ran into trouble with the authorities for hawking rugs while travelling within the Kalderash’s kumpania (89-90; Sutherland 1986, 181).

The similarities between Romanichal and Rom occupations are apparent and striking, highlighting their common existence as market “gap fillers” (Nemeth 2002, 53-4). Customary Romanichal occupations include automobile and trailer sales, paving, roofing, commercial and residential spray painting, and carnival stand owner-operators (Boles 1952, 107-8; Salo 1981, 88; McLaughlin 1980, 51). Typical Rom occupations include metal work (including scrapping), paving, auto and home repairs, roofing, automobile and trailer sales, and fortune telling (Salo 1979, 78; Salo 1981, 80-5 Gropper 1975, 40-4). Furthermore, several authors controversially suggest fraudulent schemes and dishonest practices of certain occupations be added to that list (McLaughlin 1980, Lonergan 2003, and Morris 1994). Despite the damning stereotypes of Romany
occupational practices, their claims are concomitant with a few contemporary Toledo Rom livelihoods (*Gypsies in Toledo*).

![Figure 5-1. Documented Romany Businesses in Toledo, OH, 1910-Present.](image)

While the exact organization of occupations and sedentary/nomad status of the Romanies of Toledo is not verifiably known, Figure 5-1 offers clues into the Romany economic landscape. The most obvious feature on the map is the concentration of Romanichal horse dealers and residences located downtown and in the south side of the
city. Of course, these businesses were absent from all city directories by the 1930s, and it is assumed their residences shifted afterward.

Contemporary Romanichal businesses have been harder to discern. Judging from the map and knowledge gained from the previously mentioned interviews with Woodlawn Cemetery staff, the Romanichals, particularly the Stanley’s, seem to “own” the Romany paving market in Toledo, though Broadways still operate in the city. The Buckland Romanichal family, not included in the case study but nonetheless transparently Romany, owns an active fortune telling establishment, which also serves as a residence on the city’s west side; it is the only current, visible Romany fortune telling establishment in Toledo. The Buckland family also owns a trailer park in southwest Toledo, which is of particular interest because Sway (1988) associated real estate ownership with Machawaya Rom (92). This suggests Romanichal Bucklands have adopted a successful sedentary economic strategy.

The only verifiably Rom businesses were a “junk dealer,” likely a scrap metal or salvage operation and a roofing/home repair contractor. The barbershop was owned by the questionably Rom Calipetro family; however, curiously enough, a descendent of the Toledo Broadway Romanichals currently owns a very successful hair salon in Toledo; and the Stanley family allegedly owns a lower-end hair and nail salon—perhaps indicating beauty salons are an assimilated economic adaption (Field notes, Jan. 2012). No Rom businesses were found in the city directory past the 1980s. The author could not find evidence of Rom fortune telling in the city, but has been told it existed in the past.

The short “lifespan” of the Rom businesses implies several possible scenarios, one being the market for their services “dried up,” a situation likely exacerbated by the
demise of manufacturing in Toledo starting in the late 1970s which caused a significant decline in population, particularly for the working and middle-classes. Other possible causes of the Toledo Rom’s emigration is the kumpania ran into trouble with the local authorities or dissipated due to conflicts within the group, or perhaps a combination of the two (Salo 1981, 89).

The latter theories involving conflict for the Rom is probably the result of a shift in economic strategy from home repair and metal work to “short cons” and other disreputable endeavors. This assertion is supported by claims by Toledo Police Detective Bernie Moss in an early 1990s local news report stating the Toledo Miller familia was involved in various “scams and swindles,” including a home invasion, and that the “king” of the group was on the run (Gypsies in Toledo). The change in strategy would have likely forced the Rom to operate in a more concealed fashion, certainly changing their advertising methods from the yellow pages to self-distributed flyers. This conflict could have also made Toledo “hot,” meaning a difficult economic environment caused by dubious economic strategies for the Romanichals, potentially creating resentment between the groups (Salo 1979, 86).
With an erudite impression of both the Toledo Romanichals and Rom’s local economic niches complete, the nature of their co-existence can be hypothesized. According to the admittedly small dataset on Toledo Romany businesses, no overlap between occupations was found between the Romanichals and Rom, implying a comfortable co-existence. However, it is likely Rom and Romanichal fortune tellers “shared” Toledo at one time, perhaps by situating themselves sufficiently geographically apart or catering to different clientele, as was the case in a similar occurrence documented by Salo (1981) (88).
Though Figure 5-2 offers no evidence of shared residences between the ethnic Romany groups, their over 20 year co-existence likely led to intermixing of some kind. A suggestion of intermarriage is perhaps the boldest claim, as Rom view themselves as a class above Romanichals and other non-Rom ethnic Romany groups (Sutherland 1986, 217). Despite the social factors preventing intermarriage, it has occurred, though it typically involves a Romanichal assimilating into Rom culture (ibid, 17). The previously discussed Romanichal memorial stone with the Rom-esque photograph bolsters the notion of Rom intermarriage with Romanichals, or otherwise Romanichal acculturation to Rom customs. Again, this untouched aspect of Romany necrogeography deserves further research.

In conclusion, the historic Toledo Romany landscape indicates a feasible economic, and thus spatial, co-existence between Rom and Romanichal populations for over 20 years. Admittedly, the compiled dataset is by no means complete, and future efforts into expanding the sample is recommended, but the available data points toward an economic arrangement that protects the Romanichals paving and fortune telling businesses, while allowing the Rom metal work, home repair, and potentially fortune telling. The non-competitive niches of the two groups allowed for a peaceful co-existence and, perhaps cultural intermixing in the form of intermarriage of mere acculturation.

However, the eventual disappearance of the Rom from the public radar, as well as memorial park, implies a mass emigration from the city due to either a weak market for their services or trouble from the authorities as a result of a nefarious economic strategy adaptation necessitated by the “drying up” of their market brings into question the state of this co-existence today. Harmonious inter-ethnic Romany economic co-existence is the
result of market-conscious Romanies with a mutual respect for each other’s role as service nomads and as Romanies; this inter-ethnic solidarity deserves further investigation and examination by Romany scholars and Cultural Geographers alike.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

6.1 Overview of Results

Data extracted from the Romany memorial stones and genealogies can effectively be used to test and substantiate long-held claims about Romany memorial sites. Utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methodological tools, including GIS mapping and social network analysis software, as well as empirical findings while in the field, three hypotheses were tested:

- The spatial arrangement of Romany memorial sites mirrors the social arrangement of their social network in life.
- Romanies and Romany families that build elaborate monuments, especially on the most “desirable” plots, can be construed as being the wealthiest individuals or families.
- Romanies are widely interred in scattered family clusters amongst others of their respective ethnic community.

The spatial arrangement of memorial sites was based on, and did mirror that of the social network, as intra and inter-(nuclear) family relationships were quantitatively and empirically found to determine arrangement of memorial stones on a small spatial scale. It should be noted this result was found using only the Romanichal case study due
to the data constraints of the Rom population. Space constraints over time in the memorial park were seen as a significant force that shaped the overall distribution of both case studies. However, the apparent territoriality of the Romanichal horse-dealer patriarchs family plots played was determined as the principal force behind the initial distribution of Romanichal memorial sites in Woodlawn Cemetery.

The family size-wealth hypothesis was shown to be false due to weak empirical and quantitative evidence. Empirical examination of the social network found no noticeable trend between the two variables. The non-spatial statistical correlation between the size of an individual’s family and the elaborateness of their memorial stone produced a weaker than expected, though positive correlation. The spatial statistical analysis, which includes spatial autocorrelation, high/low clustering (Getis G*), and hot/cold spot analysis, all produced no meaningful connection between the network centrality of an individual and the level of majesty of their memorial stone.

The family cluster hypothesis was verified for both case studies using spatially statistical cluster assessment tools, thus validating several long-held empirical claims (Nemeth 1970, Nemeth 2002, Stephens 2003, Habenstein and Lamers 1963). Empirical examination also concluded Romany memorial sites formed Romany enclaves within the memorial park. The resultant operations statistically indicated the Rom case study population was more clustered and in smaller family groups than the Romanichal population, which was spread across several enclaves.

The empirical and qualitative examinations of the maps and memorial sites used previous knowledge and information on Romanichal and Rom, as well as the Toledo Romany population to propose logical inferences about the nature of the case study
populations. The principal empirical finding for the Romanichal case study was apparent territoriality of the horse-dealer patriarchs, who were the central feature of well-defined family burial plots. Empirical examination of the Rom population was necessitated due to the peculiarities of the population, particularly regarding evidential feuding, Rom “kings” in the population, and the noticeable dearth of new Rom burials in the memorial park, leading to logical postulations on the causes of their apparent emigration. Qualitative investigation of the memorial sites discerned and explained patterns and peculiarities of the Romany’s built cultural environment in the memorial park, focusing on memorial stone styling and site decorations.

6.2 Recommendations for Future Research

Further research is strongly recommended and needed for memorial park studies, particularly more comparative studies between Romany ethnic groups, albeit with extensive genealogical data. The use of SNA in the study was sufficient for the genealogical dataset, but more advanced social network analysis concepts should be applied to extract more information on the nature of ties, particularly intermarriages. SNA software applications should also be expanded to analyze aspects of the Romanies in life, such as the economic connectedness within the and among vitsa(s).

Quantitative GIS tools also offer exciting new possibilities for necrogeography and Romany Studies. The exploratory nature of my applications of spatial statistics is stressed, and additional advanced techniques are encouraged by ethnographic scholars with quantitative backgrounds. Principally, however, future analyses should include different SNA-derived centrality metrics (e.g. betweenness) for more dynamic spatial
statistical operations. Increased use of, and research on improved techniques for creating spatialized social networks for Romanies, both in life and death, is to be sought after to pinpoint their locations around the globe.

Field work and data gathering methods could also be improved. More accurate, differential GPS units would be useful for future memorial site recording to eliminate the need for the inspection of gathered coordinates on Google Earth. Stronger ties with memorial park staff, in addition to local authorities is recommended, though with caution as their accounts are likely skewed toward Romany criminality.

6.3 Implications and Concluding Remarks

Obviously, access to Romany informants is especially stressed to aid in future research; however, this methodology is promoted as an alternative to, but not a supplement for, ethnographic research when the time and energy involved for ethnographic immersion is not available. In no way does this project suggest modern methods are a pansophical fountain to all questions pertaining to Romanies, or should supplant intimate ethnographic research. In fact, many of modern analysis techniques demonstrated in this thesis may be especially effective as complements to authentic anthropological accounts on Romanies. Once more, this methodology is advocated as an alternative to, but not a supplement for, ethnographic research on Romanies when field immersion is infeasible; furthermore it is recommended this methodology also serve as a complement to intimate ethnographic research.

Overall, the project was successful in expanding and advancing the methodology of Romany Studies and necrogeography. I intend for this project to serve as a movable
template for future cemetery research in both fields. The incorporation of spatial statistics and spatialized social networks is, to the author’s best knowledge, the first application to a necrogeographic study. There is much room for improvement, however, and Geographers of all stripes are encouraged to partake in this cross-discipline approach.

The methodology of this piece is an effort to modernize Romany Studies by applying positivist analytical tools to Romany datasets, while also maintaining empirical and qualitative approaches that have traditionally created knowledge in the field. The field can expand its methods from traditionally empirical means and embrace the dominant academic paradigm’s conviction in contemporary positivist methods as the means to valid knowledge creation. This project utilizes small-scale, case study datasets to create subjective, but positivist-created “truths” on local Romany populations. This subjective, but valid and potentially authentic, approach may be the most accurate way to create knowledge on the wondrously diverse populations of Romanies throughout the world.

In conclusion, my experiment with spatially-integrated mixed-methods methodology revealed otherwise hidden knowledge and lore about two different ethnic Romany groups using gathered memorial site and genealogy data. The success found in adapting this hybrid and exploratory methodology to another Romany ethnic group case study validates the transferability of the method and usefulness for future applications. This mixed methodology, as a whole or in its various components both informs and enriches the tool-kit of Romany necrogeographers and is capable of bolstering future Romany Studies research by expanding and modernizing the long-familiar research frontiers in Romany studies scholarship and social science.
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Appendix A

Supplementary Maps

This appendix features maps of subsections of the thematic maps of Romanichal memorial stones in Woodlawn Cemetery. The memorial park was subdivided because scale was too large to offer a detailed view of the memorial stone distribution and their attributes. These maps should be used in reference to better understand what outputs I viewed to arrive at my conclusions. However, for reasons of space and relevance not all 43 outputs I created for this thesis are included. The maps below are those I felt were most relevant. If you would like to view any of the other variations of the outputs not included in this appendix, feel free to email a request to chohaney.michael@gmail.com.
Figure A-1. Hot/Cold Spot Analysis results using network centrality measure out-degree as the input field, Eastern Romany Cluster of Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH
Figure A-2. Hot/Cold Spot Analysis results using network centrality measure out-degree as the input field, Western Romany Cluster of Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
Figure A-3. Hot/Cold Spot Analysis results using network centrality measure Bonacich Power as the input field, Eastern Romany Cluster of Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
Figure A-4. Hot/Cold Spot Analysis results using network centrality measure Bonacich Power as the input field, Western Romany Cluster of Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
Figure A-5. Hot/Cold Spot Analysis results using network centrality measure Bonacich Power as the input field, Entrance Romany Cluster of Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
Figure A-6. Romanichal Parent-Child Network, Eastern Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-7. Romanichal Parent-Child Network, Western Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-8. Romanichal Parent-Child Network, Entrance Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-9. Romanichal Spousal Network, Eastern Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-10. Romanichal Spousal Network, Western Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-11. Romanichal Spousal Network, Entrance Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-12. Romanichal Sibling Network, Eastern Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-13. Romanichal Sibling Network, Western Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-14. Romanichal Sibling Network, Entrance Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, OH.
Figure A-15. Inter-Romanichal Family Connection Network, Eastern Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
Figure A-16. Inter-Romanichal Family Connection Network, Western Romany Cluster, Woodlawn Cemetery, Toledo, Ohio.
Appendix B

Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familia</td>
<td>An extended family unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadje</td>
<td>Non-Romanies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumpania</td>
<td>The economic union among Rom within a territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Rom term for polluted; impure; outcaste status by trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moxadi</td>
<td>Romanichal term for polluted, unclean, or outcaste status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natisa</td>
<td>A nation or “tribe” of Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Rom death feast given on numerous anniversaries after the death of an individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Romanies originating from Eastern Europe; also known as Vlach Rom or Vlach Romanies or Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanichal</td>
<td>Romanies originating in England and Wales; alternatively spelled Romanichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom Baro</td>
<td>The leader of a kumpania or vitsa; translates to “Big Man” in Rromanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romneychelle</td>
<td>The “way” (cultural laws) of the Romanichals; sometimes referred to as Rom ’nes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitsa</td>
<td>A social group based on cognatic kin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>