



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

“Saving the authentic *gypsy*. Paul Bataillard and the beginnings of French Gypsyology”

verfasst von / submitted by

Sandra Klos, B.A.

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

European Master of Arts in Women's and Gender History (MA)

Wien, 2018 / Vienna 2018

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 066 608

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet

MATILDA – European Master in Women's and Gender History

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Kerstin Susanne Jobst, M.A.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Terminology	7
3.	Reversing the gaze on scientific knowledge	10
4.	Gypsyology in nineteenth century Europe	17
4.1.	From H.M.G. Grellmann to the <i>Gypsy Lore Society</i>	17
4.2.	The beginnings of anthropology in France	22
5.	Paul Théodore Bataillard (1816–1894)	26
5.1.	Biographical remarks on Paul Bataillard	26
5.2.	The evolution of Bataillard’s research and publications.....	31
6.	Hypotheses on <i>gypsy</i> history and anthropology	37
6.1.	Bataillard as an observer of <i>gypsy</i> depictions in French newspapers	37
6.2.	Gender as a category of difference in anthropological writings	43
6.3.	Threatened ‘racial purity’	53
6.4.	A new theory on <i>gypsy</i> origin	59
7.	Bataillard’s methodology	64
8.	The purpose of Gypsyology	70
9.	Bataillard within European Gypsyology	77
10.	Conclusion.....	85
11.	Bibliography	92
11.1.	Primary sources	92
11.2.	Secondary sources	96
12.	Appendix	102
12.1.	Abstract.....	102
12.2.	Deutsche Zusammenfassung	102

1. Introduction

“*Das Forschungsobjekt hat seinen Mund zu halten.*“¹ (The research object ought to shut up.) Thus criticized Romani Rose, chairman of the Central Council of German Sinti and Roma (*Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma*), angrily but applicably the historic relationship between researcher and *gypsy*² in 1983. Until the intervention of the civil rights movement of Sinti and Roma³, he declared, Gypsyology, the scientific discovery and description of the *gypsy* identity, was conducted by “amateurs” and imbued with “pseudoscientific racism”.⁴ He argued for the de-problematization of Romanies and a new problematization of the scientific gaze. Science must lose its untouchable status and “aura of objectivity”.⁵ This appeal outlines the research objective for this paper to the point. However, the hypothesis of the amateur status and the pseudoscientific methodology will be examined critically.

Generally speaking, there are two prevailing research opinions about the process of establishing Gypsyology in the course of the nineteenth century: One is presented by Reimer Gronemeyer and Georgia A. Rakelmann, who have characterized the nineteenth century as the heyday of ethnological romanticism with “gypsy-friendly traits” (*zigeunerfreundliche Züge*).⁶ In contrast, Klaus-Michael Bogdal described nineteenth century Gypsyology in much stronger terms as “ethnic cleansing in the minds and the prelude to real persecutions and expulsions”.⁷ This disparity of judgements clearly shows the diversity of research in this period and the alternating views on the *gypsy* as *tremendum* or *fascinosum*. Micro-historic studies on the history of *gypsy* scientists demonstrating these nuances are still rare and concentrate on a few individuals such as H.M.G. Grellmann, George Borrow or Heinrich von Wlislöcki.⁸ Interestingly enough, however,

¹ Romani Rose: Vorwort, in: Zur Mythischen Figur des Zigeuners in der Deutschen Zigeunerforschung. Mit einem Vorwort von Romani Rose (Forum für Sinti und Roma, vol. 1), by Kirsten Martins-Heuß, Frankfurt am Main 1983, p. 7.

² The lowercase cursive spelling of *gypsy* and *gypsies* in this paper is meant to emphasise the socially constructed character of this group name. For further explanation on this terminology cf. chapter 2.

³ In the following ‘Romanies’. For further explanation on this terminology cf. chapter 2.

⁴ Rose: Vorwort, p. 1.

⁵ Ibid., p. 9.

⁶ Reimer Gronemeyer / Georgia A. Rakelmann: Die Zigeuner. Reisende in Europa. Roma, Sinti, Manouches, Gitanos, Gypsies, Kalderasch, Vlach und andere, Köln 1988, p. 219.

⁷ Klaus-Michael Bogdal: Europa erfindet die Zigeuner. Eine Geschichte von Faszination und Verachtung, Berlin 2011, p. 271: “ethnische Säuberung in den Köpfen und das Vorspiel wirklicher Verfolgungen und Vertreibungen”.

⁸ See also pp. 14f.

the contributions of French scientists, such as the founder of French Gypsyology, Paul Bataillard (1816–1894), are still largely missing from historiography.

Nevertheless, Bataillard's sources and research notes seem to experience a recent renaissance. The Paris-based independent journalist, archivist, and researcher in the fields of history, anthropology, and prehistoric archeology of *gypsies* published dozens of articles and books, and left behind hundreds of items, photographs, letters, manuscripts, books and translations, notes, and more. After his death in 1894, most of his documents became a special collection at the Manchester City Library⁹, with more documents to be found i. a. in Paris¹⁰, Liverpool¹¹, Leeds¹², Bucharest¹³, and in private archives.¹⁴ Besides a few general references to Bataillard's impressive collection, with credits given to his role in the Romanian Revolution of 1848, and his friendships with Edgar Quinet and Eugène Fromentin, Bataillard's name was rarely mentioned in post-war Europe. The critical history of science which emerged with the aforementioned civil rights movement, apparently omits Bataillard, his contributions to gypsy anthropology, his network of correspondences with other academics of his generation, and his storehouse of historical sources altogether. At the EHESS in Paris, Bataillard and his records now seem to be rediscovered: Ilse About, co-editor of two anthologies in which some of Bataillard's sources were referenced, recently curated a photographic exhibition with photographs from the Bataillard Collection at Manchester, and published an article on Bataillard as an ethnographer of the Manouch societies of Paris.¹⁵ Sébastien Meyer contributed to these anthologies and is currently working on his doctoral thesis at the EHESS entitled *Écriture Savante, Lecture Poétique. La*

⁹ Manchester City Library (henceforth MCL), Special Collections, The Bataillard Collection (henceforth BC), boxes 1–60 (preliminary numeration by Meyer).

¹⁰ Bibliothèques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Manuscrits et archives littéraires et artistiques français du XX^e siècle, Collection Jean Boudout-Edgar Quinet; Bibliothèques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Manuscrits et archives scientifiques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Fonds d'archives scientifiques, Fonds de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris.

¹¹ University of Liverpool, Sydney Jones Library, Special Collections & Archives, Gypsy Lore Society Archives. The *Gypsy Lore Society*, a transnational scholarly institution and center for gypsy studies, was founded in 1888 in Edinburgh, before it was transferred to Liverpool. See also p. 21.

¹² University of Leeds Library, Special Collections, Romany Collection.

¹³ National Library of Romania, special collections, Brătianu Collection. Cf. Olimpiu Boitoș: Paul Bataillard et la Révolution Roumaine de 1848. Contribution à l'Histoire des Relations Franco-Roumaines, Extrait des « Mélanges de l'École Roumaine en France », 1929, II., Paris 1930.

¹⁴ See also p. 84.

¹⁵ Ilse About / Marc Bordigoni (Ed.): *Présences Tsiganes. Enquêtes et Expériences dans les Archives*, Paris 2018; Id. / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre (Ed.): *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, Arles 2018; Id.: *La Société des Manouches de Paris au XIX^e siècle. Autour de quelques Explorations Ethnographiques de Paul Bataillard*, in: *Ethnologie française* (2018, forthcoming).

*Représentation des Bohémiens d'Europe au XIX^e siècle.*¹⁶ About suspects that the place of Bataillard's archives being outside of Paris and France is partly to blame for the fact that they have not been consulted in many years.¹⁷ Bataillard's publications, however, were always accessible but still remain rarely cited. A notable exception is the anthropologist Emmanuelle Stitou at Toulouse, who published an article in *Études Tsiganes* (2001) on the representation of the "Bohémienne" in nineteenth century sources, amongst which an article by Paul Bataillard can be found.¹⁸ Like Henriette Asséo¹⁹ and Bogdal²⁰, Stitou uses the dichotomy between fascination and rejection as her central category of analysis is. Her gender-sensitive approach towards Bataillard's writings is inspiring and a more in-depth historical contextualization will be provided in this paper.

Although Bataillard's name may be unknown to many historians and historiographers nowadays, he was far from being irrelevant in his epoch. About highlighted that Bataillard was a well-known figure and scientific pioneer, and that his works were fundamental to the scholarly understanding of *gypsy* societies.²¹ Likewise, Meyer called Bataillard one of the first historians of the *gypsies*.²² Even earlier than these two researchers, the French anthropologist and president of the *Gypsy Lore Society* in the 1930s, Eugène Pittard, considered Bataillard the most important researcher of the *gypsies*' origin.²³

Indeed, the knowledge Bataillard produced profoundly shaped the way in which science proceeded after his demise. François de Vaux de Foletier, co-founder of the journal *Études tsiganes* and French authority on the history of *gypsies* and Romanies, still dealt with the same questions as Bataillard. For instance, he discussed the same

¹⁶ Sébastien Meyer: Des Itinéraires Confluents. Artistes, Savants et Modèles Bohémiens en France, Entre 1830 et 1870, in: *Présence Tsiganes. Enquêtes et Expériences dans les Archives*, ed. by Ilsen About / Marc Bordigoni, Paris 2018, pp. 265–287; Id.: Exercices de Style et Regards Savants. L'Anthropologie des Tsiganes et la Photographie au XIX^e siècle, in: *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, ed. by Ilsen About / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre, Arles 2018, pp. 164–167.

¹⁷ Ilsen About / Marc Bordigoni: Écrire une Histoire des Mondes Tsiganes : La Découverte et Soulèvement des Archives, in: *Présence Tsiganes. Enquêtes et Expériences dans les Archives*, ed. by Ilsen About / Marc Bordigoni, Paris 2018, p. 30.

¹⁸ Emmanuelle Stitou: Entre Fascination et Rejet. L'Image de la Bohémienne dans quelques Écrits du XIX^e siècle, in: *Études Tsiganes* 47/3 (2011), pp. 26–39.

¹⁹ Henriette Asséo: L'Histoire au XIX^e siècle, in: *Les Populations Tsiganes en France*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Liégeois, Paris 1981, pp. 5–13.

²⁰ Bogdal: Europa.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Meyer: Exercices, p. 164.

²³ Eugène Pittard : Les Tsiganes ou Bohémiens. Recherches anthropologiques dans la Péninsule des Balkans, in: *Le Globe. Revue Genevoise de Géographie* 70 (1931), p. 13.

two Persian reports on the arrival of Indian musicians in the Persian empire in the mid-tenth century. As it turns out, Bataillard's interpretations on these texts remained nearly unchanged two generations later: De Vaux de Foletier shared Bataillard's scepticism that these Persian sources are weak evidence for the *gypsy* migration period.²⁴ De Vaux de Foletier honored him as a credible contemporary witness and "one of the few writers of the romantic epoch who did not content himself with prevalent prejudices".²⁵ Jean-Pierre Liégeois, founder of the *Centre de recherches tsiganes* in Paris and adviser of the European Council and the European Commission, can be cited as the voice of our current generation of research in this field. He revisited the same sources once again and echoed Bataillard's criticism on the meanwhile firmly established theory that all *gypsies* once originated from India.²⁶ Thus, Bataillard may not have overturned the Indian origin theory, which is still reproduced to this day for simplicity reasons, but researchers should know his name when presenting a more nuanced approach.

Furthermore, Bataillard's seminal "bronze theory", his alternative or rather addition to the Indian origin theory, was never forgotten either: He claimed that *gypsies* were living in Europe for over three thousand years and that they were responsible for the introduction of bronze in western and northern Europe. In 1953, Jules Bloch still rejected Bataillard's hypothesis as "reveries".²⁷ However, Frans de Ville brought it back up for discussion by publishing additional archeological evidence three years later.²⁸ According to de Ville, Bataillard was a "competent Gypsyologist" (*tziganologue averti*).²⁹ Jean-Paul Clébert concluded in 1961 that Bataillard had been the first to study the relationship between the *gypsies* and the history of metallurgy seriously, but with an exaggerated and disadvantageous enthusiasm.³⁰ Thus, while Bataillard's efforts to discuss a European origin theory were considered controversial, they remained relevant – albeit, only in France.

Recently, French historians have begun to rediscover the *archives savants* (scholarly records) and to put together a prosopography of modern and contemporary

²⁴ See also p. 87; François de Vaux de Foletier: *Les bohémiens en France au 19^e siècle* (Collection Lat-tès/Histoire « Groupes et Sociétés »), Paris 1981, p. 17.

²⁵ François de Vaux de Foletier: *Voyages et Migrations des Tsiganes en France au XIX^e siècle*, in: *Études Tsiganes* 19/3 (1973), p. 1.

²⁶ Jean-Pierre Liégeois: *Tsiganes*, Paris 1983, pp. 33f.

²⁷ Jules Bloch: *Les Tsiganes* (Que sais-je?, vol. 580), Paris 1953, p. 31.

²⁸ Frans de Ville: *Tziganes. Témoins de Temps*, Bruxelles 1956, p. 48.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Jean-Paul Clébert: *Les Tziganes* (Collection Signes des Temps, vol. 10), Paris 1961, p. 30.

Gypsyology.³¹ To that end, About and Bordigoni suggested to start with the records of the *Gypsy Lore Society* as a center and platform of transnational exchange. Bataillard himself was an early member of this society and his own network of contacts is impressive, unveiling his great efforts of connecting with fellow researchers.³²

French historian, Jean-François Bert, wrote a useful guide on how to consult an *archive savante*, equipped with relevant research questions.³³ For instance, why did Bataillard leave behind his records? As an archivist he understood the order and value of preservation. It was also an early practice of anthropologists to do so.³⁴ The intentional preservation of records opens up new questions about the arrangement and annotation of materials. The Manchester City Library kept the original boxes and internal order with a makeshift numeration added by Meyer. The sixty boxes are ordered thematically and most often by region – not by chronology for example. Who made this choice, when, and for which purpose?³⁵ The materiality of documents can also be revealing: The journal which Thérèse Bataillard kept about their visits of *gypsy* communities seems to have been planned as a long-term project in this large-format notebook, albeit only a few pages are filled in.³⁶ Handwriting styles also contain useful information: Most notes Bataillard kept for himself are written rather quickly with many abbreviations and in pencil. By contrast, the letter he wrote to Delatour was a finalized, polished version of his notes – written more legibly than most of his other letters. It can be thus assumed that he knew or maybe even asked Delatour to send it to the press for publication.³⁷ Furthermore, Bert pointed out the value of a researcher’s library by calling him a “bulimic reader, [...] quill in his hand” (*lecteur boulimique, [...] plume à la main*).³⁸ Bataillard’s library of books and translations is certainly noteworthy, not only for the diversity of authors and titles but also for his marginalia: For instance, a review by de Rochas was commented furiously by “the bulimic reader” Bataillard with exclamations such as “no”, “not at all” or “incorrect”.³⁹ Archives thus offer a

³¹ Cf. About / Bordigoni: *Écrire une Histoire*, pp. 27f.

³² See also chapter 9.

³³ Jean-François Bert: *Qu’est-ce qu’une archive de chercheur ?* (Collection « Encyclopédia numérique »), Marseille 2014.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

³⁵ It is possible that it was arranged by Bataillard himself. However, it could have also been his wife Charlotte Bataillard, one of his daughters Louisa Blakesley or Henriette Wilson, or an archivist at Manchester.

³⁶ MCL, BC, box 4.

³⁷ MCL, BC, box 9. See also p. 31.

³⁸ Bert: *Archive*, p. 55.

³⁹ MCL, BC, box 6. See also p. 80.

multidimensional spectrum of sources and allow conclusions about heuristics, reading strategies, the evolution of knowledge, the originality of an idea, the honesty of disclosing references, and everyday life challenges, such as funding, networking, etc.

In conclusion, Paul Bataillard's publications, records, and scientific networks are being considered expedient for the examination of the scientific gaze on *gypsies* and Romanies in the nineteenth century. After a short discussion of terminology (chapter 2), as well as theories and practices on reversing the gaze on scientific knowledge (chapter 3), this paper is divided into three parts: The first section sketches out the context of Bataillard's research by reviewing the state of *gypsy* studies in Europe during Bataillard's lifetime (chapter 4.1) and the institutional beginnings of anthropology in France (chapter 4.2). The following biographical chapter explores Bataillard's social milieu, his travels, resources, and career paths (chapter 5.1), and it relates the evolution of his works chronologically to his biography (chapter 5.2). This first section thus asks in which social and institutional contexts Bataillard produced knowledge about the imagined race of *gypsies*. Prosopographic methods allow an external perspective on science that 'progresses' not only through empirical cognition but largely due to its 'situatedness' in certain social, institutional, and biographical contexts.⁴⁰ The next section of this paper changes the perspective to an internal view of Bataillard's thought processes, breaks up the chronological order of the previous chapters, and instead thematically discusses a selection of guiding principles and presumptions in his theories: Concepts of race, racial purity and its potential dilution are discussed in chapter 6.1. Popular depictions of *gypsies* exemplified by Bataillard's collection of newspaper articles, allow an insight into implicit biases as well as widely known imaginations and positions Bataillard could potentially object to (chapter 6.2). A special mention is given to gendered codes, depictions, and presumptions as gender proves to be an omnipresent category of difference in anthropological writings and imaginations of modernity (chapter 6.3). While the first chapters in this section discuss aspects applicable to all anthropological records in general, the final chapter closes with a theory specific to Bataillard that sets him apart as a researcher: His theory of the partial European decent of *gypsies* and their supposed role in introducing bronze to prehistoric Europe (chapter 6.4). While the previous section provided an external critique of the sources, this section is largely based on an immanent critique of the texts. The final section represents my

⁴⁰ See also p. 11.

interpretations of the sources previously critiqued. It consists of three chapters dedicated to methodology (chapter 7), motivations (chapter 8), and Bataillard's impact on French and European *gypsy* anthropology and history (chapter 9). The first two chapters interpret the results of the previous immanent analysis and ask how Bataillard's claim to scientificity and possibly positivistic truth is justified, and which intentions accompany and shape his way of knowledge production. The last chapter is dedicated to Bataillard's position in the scientific community, the influence he had in his field, and how he was commemorated post-mortem.

Where in the spectrum of blind but mostly harmless romanticism on the one hand, or wilful preparation of mass extermination on the other hand, was Bataillard positioned? Was nineteenth century Gypsyology indeed only amateurish pseudoscience? Finally, if Bataillard influenced subsequent generations of scientists and possibly media discourses and policies, what drove *him* to this subject and how did *his* motivations shape his findings? In other words, what needs to be considered before utilizing Bataillard's long abandoned *archive savante* for the purpose of *gypsy* or Romani history?

2. Terminology

Two concepts are to be differentiated in this study: *gypsies* and Romanies. The simplest way to put their difference is in the words of Klaus-Michael Bogdal: "Sinti or Roma are born, 'Gypsies' are a social construct".⁴¹ In other words, Romanies are thinking, feeling and acting subjects, whereas *gypsies* are an imagined collective group produced by a reservoir of knowledge, images, and media representations. In critical whiteness theories it has been established to write '*white*' in lowercase cursive in order to mark its constructed character and to contrast it with 'Black' with a capital 'B' as a category of identity, knowledge and resistance.⁴² Analogously, I suggest the employment of lowercase cursive '*gypsies*' and capitalized 'Romanies'.

⁴¹ Bogdal: Europa, p. 15: "Sinti oder Roma werden geboren, 'Zigeuner' sind ein gesellschaftliches Konstrukt".

⁴² Cf. Maureen Maisha Eggers / Grada Kilomba / Peggy Piesche / Susan Arndt: Konzeptionelle Überlegungen, in: Mythen, Masken und Subjekte. Kritische Weißseinsforschung in Deutschland, ed. by id., Münster 2009, p. 13.

This is not to say that the term ‘Romanies’ as a collective umbrella term or identity is universally accepted or met without criticism.⁴³ Some prefer to use ‘Gypsies’ with a capital ‘G’ signifying their rightful status as an ethnic group while being careful not to define or label the group in ways which could then be used as a stick against them.⁴⁴ International communication further complicates the debate as different national and local histories created a variety of different connotations and sensibilities with certain terms: The English form ‘gypsy’ or the French ‘tsigane’, for example, have proven to be more easily reclaimed by the minority group than for example the German equivalent ‘Zigeuner’, a term rejected in both Germany and Austria and replaced by ‘Sinti and Roma’, or respectively ‘Roma and Sinti’. To agree on a collective term denominating a variety of racialized peoples is thus a much more complicated and politically loaded undertaking than referring to individuals or local communities, who name themselves ‘Calé’, ‘Manouches’, ‘Traveller’, ‘Vlach’, ‘Sinti’, ‘Roma’, ‘Kalderasch’, ‘Gitanos’ and many more in various spelling styles. ‘Romanies’ is only one amongst many possible collective terms. It does not generalize ‘Roma’, nor is it limited to speakers of the Romani language. It is a broad agreement in the English language and open to change.

However, this historical study is less concerned with the subject category of ‘Romanies’ as it is with the constructed racial category of *gypsies* in primary sources. Who is included in this category, who is excluded and by which definitions? It cannot be assumed that the same people that would identify themselves as ‘Romanies’ today are the same that would have been subsumed under historical labels such as ‘gypsies’, ‘Zigeuner’ or ‘tsiganes’. *Gypsy* can refer to a certain demeanor, social status, appearance or other racialized features. These are not always specified. For example, it is sometimes unclear by which standards Paul Bataillard identified a group of people that he met in France or of which he obtained information from Algeria or the Bukovina as *gypsy*.⁴⁵ The term *gypsy* used in this paper must therefore be read as “persons defined and labeled as ‘gypsy’”.

‘Gypsy’, however, is not the only label to be found in primary sources. A notable variety is to be considered. For example, in his early works, Paul Bataillard, preferred

⁴³ A notable example is Angus Fraser: *The Present and Future of the Gypsy Past*, in: *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 13/2 (2000), pp. 17–31.

⁴⁴ Cf. David Mayall: *Gypsy Identities 1500–2000. From Egipcians and Moon-men to Ethnic Romany*, London / New York 2004, p. 15.

⁴⁵ See also chapter 6.3.

the term ‘Bohémiens’, whereas in later publications he preferred ‘Tsiganes’. In terms of content, this change does not seem to indicate any substantial difference rather than a more general tendency of contemporary French discourse to adopt ‘Tsiganes’ in scientific publications. The etymological origin of ‘Tsiganes’ (or ‘Zigeuner’, ‘Cingari’ etc.) has not been fully explained yet. It is speculated that it is derived from the Byzantine name *Ἀθίγγανοι* (read *Athinganoi*), which roughly translates to the ‘Untouchables’ and denominated an ancient Byzantine heretical sect.⁴⁶ The appellation ‘Bohémiens’ on the other hand, can be tracked more precisely: It refers to an alleged origin from Bohemia (fr. *Bohême*).⁴⁷ It was believed that a group of travelers with letters of safe conduct by the Hungarian king of Bohemia, King Sigismund, which were described in a number of fifteenth century chronicles, were the first *gypsies* in (western) Europe.⁴⁸ It is possible that beyond an assumption of origin, ‘Bohémiens’ also alluded to the Bohemian heretics of the Hussite Wars.⁴⁹ Both denominations that Bataillard used, ‘Tsiganes’ and ‘Bohémiens’, are thus not inherently positive or negative by etymological origin, nor are they used in such a way, but they indicate traditions of knowledge that cast *gypsies* in the role of outsiders or dissentients.

Finally, it is noteworthy that Bataillard was acutely aware of the fact that *gypsies* did not call themselves ‘Bohémiens’ or ‘Tsiganes’ but used the various aforementioned terms like ‘Rom’, ‘Kalo’, ‘Sinto’ or ‘Manouch’. Not only did Bataillard record these as “ethnic names they give themselves” (*noms ethniques qu’ils se donnent eux-mêmes*) but he also mentioned the correct Romani suffixes indicating the feminine and plural forms: “*Rom*, fem. *Romni*, pl. m. *Roma*, pl. f. *Romnia*; *Kalo*, fem. *Kali*, pl. *Kalé*; *Sinto*, fem. and pl. *Sinti*; *Manouch*, etc.”⁵⁰ In a footnote he explained briefly: “*Rom* = Gypsy

⁴⁶ Cf. Benedikt Wolf: Helfer des Feindes. Von der Häresie der Athinganoi zum „Stamm“ der Atsinganoi, in: Antiziganismus. Soziale und historische Dimensionen von “Zigeuner“-Stereotypen, ed. by Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma, Heidelberg 2015, pp. 18–37. However, this conclusion is not undisputed, cf. Jean-Pierre Liégeois: Sinti, Roma, Fahrende (Interface series), Berlin 2002, p. 28. See also the debate between Miklosich who is generally accredited with this etymological hypothesis and Bataillard who believed it the heretics themselves were already *gypsies*: p. 61.

⁴⁷ Cf. De Vaux de Foletier: Bohémiens, p. 20.

⁴⁸ See also p. 32.

⁴⁹ Cf. Franz Maciejewski: Elemente des Antiziganismus, in: Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion des Zigeuners. Zur Genese eines Vorurteils (Wissenschaftliche Reihe des Fritz Bauer Instituts, vol. 2), ed. by Jacqueline Giere, Frankfurt am Main / New York 1996, p. 16.

⁵⁰ Paul Bataillard: Recherches à faire sur les Bohémiens en Algérie, in: Bulletins de la Société d’anthropologie de Paris II/8 (1873), p. 698.

(in the gypsy language); the plural employed here would be *Roma*.”⁵¹ Hence it can be inferred that although he knew of Romani endonyms, Bataillard deliberately chose to employ French exonyms. His readership was not the minority group itself but his non-Romani academic colleagues. He did not believe *gypsies* were from Bohemia or a Byzantine heretic group, and yet these were the appellations used in the scientific discourse he was part of and wanted to contribute to.

In brief, this paper uses the spelling *gypsy* to denote a historical construction in primary sources which is to be distinguished from people choosing to define themselves as an ethnic minority group today. The aim of this exemplary micro-historical study of the writings of Paul Bataillard is to deconstruct who was defined as *gypsy*, by whom, in which context, for which reasons and with which consequences.

3. Reversing the gaze on scientific knowledge

Drawing on Michel Foucault’s historical studies, feminist and postcolonial critiques of science have shown that the production of knowledge is closely linked to power structures. According to Foucault, “power” (*pouvoir*) and “knowledge” (*savoir*) are interdependent and cannot be separated from one another: In order to gain knowledge, power is required. Once knowledge is obtained, it allows and enables the execution of power and vice versa.⁵²

Since science facilitates control, power is used to define which knowledge may be recognized as scientific knowledge. Foucault uses the term “episteme” (*épistémè*) to describe this selection process:

I would like to define the *episteme* retrospectively as the strategic apparatus which permits of separating out from among all the statements which are possible those that will be acceptable within, I won’t say a scientific theory, but a field of scientificity, and which it is possible to say are true or false. The *episteme* is the ‘apparatus’ which makes possible the separation, not of the true from the false, but of what may not be characterised as scientific.⁵³

⁵¹ Id.: *Les Zlotars. Dits aussi Dzvonkars. Tsiganes Fondateurs en Bronze et en Laiton dans la Galicie Orientale et la Bukovine*, Paris 1878, p. 516: “Rom = Tsigane (en langue tsigane) ; le pluriel employé ici devrait être Roma.”

⁵² Cf. Michel Foucault: *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. by Colin Gordon, New York 1980.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

Foucault thus enables historians to analyse the conditions under which statements will be considered scientific. Accordingly, “epistemic violence” has been defined by Sebastian Garbe as either the forced delegitimization, sanctioning and displacement of a certain knowledge (negativization) or the enforced dispersion of another one (positivization).⁵⁴ Since there is not one specific, but a variety of evolving scientific methods, Vandana Shiva has argued that every claim to scientific authority or ‘expert’ status needs to be scrutinized.⁵⁵ Hence the complacency of the scientific label itself has become the focus of the history of knowledge. How is a scientific truth value attributed to a statement? How does power control such an episteme? For which political reasons is a certain knowledge dispersed or repressed?

To answer these questions, it can be useful to conceptualize knowledge as being “situated”. Donna Haraway has coined this term in 1988 to draw attention to the fact that an idea is not only conceived by pure cognitive reasoning but also in a specific sociohistorical context that allows an idea to resonate with its environment or else be forgotten.⁵⁶ Haraway therefore advocated for a practice of ‘positioning’ as it has been conceptualized by feminist standpoint theory. It asks scholars to reflect on and disclose not only their sources and scientific methods but also their own social and political positions when proposing an idea. Similarly, Diana Hummel stated that the representation and negotiation of knowledge and the construction of scientific objects is the result of social interactions.⁵⁷ They are hence ‘situated’ in specific cultures and ideologies so that tools of the cultural studies apply.

In brief, the history of science is more than a collection of ideas aligned in a chronological order to demonstrate presumed scientific ‘progress’. Instead it also interrogates the powerplay of enforced and “subjugated knowledges”⁵⁸ as well as the contexts in which these social interactions are situated. A third dimension has not been touched on

⁵⁴ Cf. Sebastian Garbe: Dekolonisierung des Wissens: Zur Kritik der epistemischen Gewalt in der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie, in: *Austrian Studies in Social Anthropology* 1 (2013), p. 3.

⁵⁵ Cf. Vandana Shiva: Reductionist Science as Epistemological Violence, in: *Science, Hegemony and Violence: A Requiem for Modernity*, ed. by Ashis Nandy, Oxford 1988, p. 235.

⁵⁶ Donna Haraway: Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective, in: *Feminist Studies* 14/3 (1988), pp. 575–599.

⁵⁷ Diana Hummel: Der Bevölkerungsdiskurs. Demographisches Wissen und politische Macht (Forschung Politikwissenschaft, vol. 108), Opladen 2000, p. 98.

⁵⁸ “Subjugated knowledges” is a Foucauldian term, re-introduced by Haraway and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: cf. Garbe: *Deskolonisierung*, p. 3; Haraway: *Situated Knowledges*, p. 584; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, in: *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, Basingstoke 1988, pp. 271–313.

yet, namely the colonial flipside of modernity. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is known for having criticized and extended the Marxist-Foucauldian tradition on this aspect:

Foucault is a brilliant thinker of power-in-spacing, but the awareness of the topographical reinscription of imperialism does not inform his presuppositions. He is taken in by the restricted version of the West produced by that reinscription and thus helps to consolidate its effects.⁵⁹

Spivak argued that the delegitimization of non-Western epistemologies and the positivization of European scientific thought have been important modes of colonialization and coloniality. Edgardo Lander coined the term “coloniality of knowledge” (*colonidad del saber*) to analyze the continuity of epistemic violence in Latin America.⁶⁰

Colonial power imbalance on epistemologies also describes the relationship between Paul Bataillard and the Romani peoples he was studying. The dominating episteme privileged his scientific methods over Romani ways of knowing. Non-Romani scientists were the only ones presumed apt to unearth the ‘true’ Romani origin, analyse their language and catalogue racial features of the ‘true authentic’ *gypsy*. Post-colonial thinker Edward Said named this paradigm of creating a space of cultural difference “Orientalism.”⁶¹ Even though Said never gave a concrete definition of the term, it can be described as a cultural and political ideology that constructs and continuously consolidates the cultural space of the ‘Orient’ as the opposite of the ‘Occident’ against the backdrop of occidental values.⁶² The ‘Orient’ does not exist as a real geographical space but as an imaginary one created by an ‘occidental’ discourse. Part of this discourse are ‘Oriental studies’ consisting of a scientific community that produces ‘expert’ knowledge through quoting other members of that community and fitting new evidence into the mold of existing theories and terminology. The distance between the ‘Orient’ and the actual peoples and regions allegedly described grows with the consolidation of these academic disciplines, the authority of its ‘experts’ and the social distance between the researchers and their objects of research.

⁵⁹ Spivak: *The Subaltern*, p. 290.

⁶⁰ Edgardo Lander: *La Colonidad del Saber: Eurocentrismo y Ciencias Sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*, Buenos Aires 2000.

⁶¹ Edward William Said: *Orientalism*. New York 1979.

⁶² Cf. Jan-Peter Hartung: (Re-)Presenting the Other? – Erkenntniskritische Überlegungen zum Orientalismus, in: *Räume der Hybridität. Postkoloniale Konzepte in Theorie und Literatur*, ed. by Christof Hamann and Cornelia Sieber, Hildesheim / Zürich / New York 2002, p. 137.

Gilles Laferté therefore advocated for a revisiting of ethnographers' archives to better understand their contexts of knowledge production and scientific landscapes as well as to historicise the scientific gaze.⁶³ Since the ethnographer's knowledge is based on a trustful relationship between interviewer and interviewee, archived material such as field notes and correspondences could expose preconceived notions, misunderstandings, and the social conditions of the interactions. Laferté called this method of revisiting an ethnographer's archive "a sociology of the enquirer and of the institutions in which he was educated and in which he worked in order to understand his materials".⁶⁴

In nineteenth century Gypsyology, researchers tried to engage more and more personally with their study objects and thus claimed a higher legitimacy than the purely textual studies of so-called "cabinet savants".⁶⁵ Especially English 'Gypsylogists' were set out to visit *gypsy* tent settlements all across Europe.⁶⁶ Bataillard and his wife also travelled extensively within France whenever they were informed about the appearance of nomadic groups or temporary settlements.⁶⁷ Even though personal encounters should in theory diminish an orientalisating distance between subject and object of research, this step alone is not sufficient. A critical self-reflection of cultural and social distance is also required. Thus, ethnographical descriptions often still resembled the Orientalist travelling literature with their sensationalist style and allusions to revealing secret information not accessible to everyone. Orientalist tropes were also employed by Bataillard when describing the hypersexualized *gypsy* women of Algeria.⁶⁸

Feminist and postcolonial critiques of science have thus laid the foundation for a critical history of Gypsyology. Its focus cannot only be on the chronological accumulation of anthropological knowledge but also its contexts, inner logic, methodologies, actors, and underlying power structures. It must be asked who produced, diffused or repressed when, how and for what reason a specific type of knowledge. In other words, the gaze on scientific knowledge must be reversed – from the objects of research to its

⁶³ Gilles Laferté: Des Archives d'Enquêtes Ethnographiques pour quoi faire ? Les Conditions d'une Revisite, in: *Genèse* 63 (2006), pp. 25–45.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁶⁵ See also p. 79.

⁶⁶ Most famous for his extensive travelling literature was George Borrow: *The Zincali; or, An Account of the Gypsies of Spain*, New York 1842. Notable were also bestselling authors like Elizabeth Robins Pennell: *To Gipsyland*, New York 1893; Francis Hindes Groome: *In Gipsy Tents*, Edinburgh 1881.

⁶⁷ MCL, BC, box 4. Bataillard also published articles about his encounters, e.g.: Paul Bataillard: *Sur des Bohémiens Hongrois à Paris*, in: *BSAP* II/6 (1871), pp. 216–224.

⁶⁸ See also p. 51.

subjects, from assumed neutrality and scientific truth to social positioning and power politics. Examples for a critical history of Gypsyology, which begins with the producers and contexts of knowledge about Romani peoples, can be found as early as 1986: At the University of Freiburg Martin Ruch wrote his to this date unpublished doctoral dissertation on the history of German speaking Gypsyology.⁶⁹ Ruch positioned himself explicitly as “Gadscho” (non-Romani) and made it clear that he would not write another “Gadscho”-history of Romani peoples, but a history of those German scholars that studied them.⁷⁰ Methodologically, he followed Jürgen Habermas’ hermeneutic critique of science that aims at disrupting Humanities’ claim to objectivity acknowledging that scientific truth is nothing but a consensus among academics.⁷¹ Ruch’s case studies include German statistician Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb Grellmann and Austrian ethnographer Heinrich von Wlislocki. For the question of who profits from Gypsyology Ruch had a clear answer: Grellmann became a renowned professor in Göttingen.⁷²

Besides this early German study, the Dutch historians Leo Lucassen and Wim Willems became internationally acclaimed pioneers of critical Romani historiography. In 1990, they chronologically tracked the entries on *gypsies* in Dutch encyclopaedias claiming they could deduce the state of knowledge at any given time from these entries.⁷³ In reference to this article Vera Kallenberg published a study on German lexicons and encyclopedias between 1700 and 1850 twenty years later.⁷⁴

In 1996, Leo Lucassen critiqued German historiography’s tendency to homogenize Romanies as an ethnic group that migrated from India to Europe in the fifteenth century, lived secluded, spoke a foreign language, and were characterized by specific traditions and by their common outward appearance (‘black’).⁷⁵ Lucassen pointed out the falsity of equating object and subject denominations, as it is impossible to tell if the persons

⁶⁹ Martin Ruch: Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschsprachigen “Zigeunerforschung“ von den Anfängen bis 1900, Freiburg 1986.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 2.

⁷¹ Ruch: Wissenschaftsgeschichte, pp. 2f.

⁷² Ibid., p. 134.

⁷³ Wim Willems / Leo Lucassen: The Church of Knowledge. The Gypsy in Dutch Encyclopedias and their sources, in: 100 Years of Gypsy Studies: Papers from the 10th Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter, March 25–27, 1988, Wagner College, Staten Island, New York, Commemorating the Centennial of the Gypsy Lore Society, ed. by Matt T. Salo, Cheverly 1990, pp. 31–50.

⁷⁴ Vera Kallenberg: Von “liederlichen Land-Läuffern“ zum „asiatischen Volk“. Die Repräsentation der ‚Zigeuner‘ in deutschsprachigen Lexika und Enzyklopädien zwischen 1700 und 1850. Eine wissenschaftliche Untersuchung (Zivilisationen & Geschichte, vol. 5), Frankfurt am Main 2010.

⁷⁵ Leo Lucassen: Zigeuner. Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland 1700–1945, Köln / Weimar / Wien 1996, pp. 13f.

defined as “gypsies” in the sources felt related to one another and ethnically distinct from other groups.⁷⁶ Instead of studying Romani peoples, he therefore proposed to track the term “gypsy” and its use in context. His research, did not begin with literary or scientific texts but with police archives and definitions given in hearings and protocols.

Willems took a similar approach. In 1997, he published his doctoral dissertation “In Search of the True Gypsy”⁷⁷, in which he refuted any essentialist or even ethnic definition of Romanies as one people and systematically historicised such definitions. His case studies include once more Grellmann as well as the English ethnographer George Borrow. He placed their lives, work, and social context at the heart of his study and investigated how they acquired their knowledge.

Widening Willems scope of research in 2004, David Mayall published his study on definitions of *gypsy* identities ranging from 1500 to 2000.⁷⁸ With his *longue durée* approach Mayall shared Lucassen’s and Willem’s critique of the Romanies’ ethnic definition. He argued that this new ethnic identity was equally artificial as the labels put on Romanies in the past, such as “Egyptians” or “moon-men”.

Critically annotated source editions to inspire further research and make primary sources more accessible are rare: They include Harald Haarmann’s edition of Rüdiger’s linguistic study⁷⁹ and Joachim S. Hohmann’s edition of essays and letters by von Wlislocki.⁸⁰ As a result, the history of Gypsyology remains an exclusive field of research, accessible only to a few dedicated specialists with access to archives. Comprehensive, up-to-date bibliographies, tying these scattered primary sources together, are still to be desired.

Some historiographical overviews can be found in commemorative publications, such as the one for Donald Kenrick in 2000: Thomas Acton applied the prosopographic perspective on Romani Studies and critically embedded scholarly achievements in the context of the civil rights movement and in particular in the biographic context of

⁷⁶ Lucassen: *Zigeuner*: p. 14.

⁷⁷ Wim Willems: *In Search of the True Gypsy. From Enlightenment to Final Solution*, London / Portland 1997.

⁷⁸ Mayall: *Gypsy Identities*.

⁷⁹ Johann Christian Christoph Rüdiger: *Von der Sprache und Herkunft der Zigeuner aus Indien*. Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig 1782. Mit einer Einleitung von Harald Haarmann (*Linguarum Minorum Documenta Historiographica*, vol 6), Hamburg 1990.

⁸⁰ Heinrich von Wlislocki: *Zur Ethnographie der Zigeuner in Südosteuropa. Tsiganologische Aufsätze und Briefe aus dem Zeitraum 1880–1905 (Studien zur Tsiganologie und Folkloristik, vol. 12)*, ed. by Joachim S. Hohmann, Frankfurt am Main et al. 1994.

Kenrick.⁸¹ In 2016, a short but insightful synthesis of the transnational academic landscape of Gypsyology during the enlightenment period was published by Henriette Asséo in a commemorative publication for the anthropologist Maurice Godelier.⁸² Asséo concluded that the enlightenment produced two separate branches of Gypsyology: a linguistic and an Indianist or Orientalist branch.⁸³ Asséo has also worked biographically on specific scientists, such as Isidore Kopernicki⁸⁴, and thus advanced the historical analysis of the scientific gaze on *gypsies* in France. Currently, Ilse About and Sébastien Meyer are working on a revisit of the Bataillard records and have found them useful for the analysis of artistic views on *gypsies*, the history of anthropometric photography, the diversity and social evolutions of the Manouch milieu in Paris and France, as well as popular and scientific representations of *gypsies* in Europe.⁸⁵

Besides lexical sources, police archives and revisiting academic authoritative texts, photography has been explored as a type of sources to reverse the *Gajo*-gaze and interrogate the (re)production of knowledge in the nineteenth century.⁸⁶

However, accepting the continuous impact of scientific racism on contemporary discourse and the necessity for a critical history of science is not yet universally accepted. Most recently, Thomas Acton has responded to a debate at the board of the *Gypsy Lore Society* (the leading scholarly institution engaged in *gypsy*/Romani studies, founded in 1888) rejecting a motion regretting its “historic racism and the harm caused by it”.⁸⁷ A critical history of nineteenth century Gypsyology must therefore continue to question the scientific gaze, its contexts, claims to truth, methodologies, impact and

⁸¹ Thomas Acton: Introduction. The Life and Times of Donald Simon Kenrick, in: *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle. Commitment in Romani Studies. A Collection of Papers and Poems to Celebrate Donald Kenrick's seventieth year*, ed. by id., Hatfield 2000, pp. ix–xxxii.

⁸² Henriette Asséo: *Des Bohémiens Européens et de leurs Savants à l'époque des Lumières*, in: *Le Monde en Mélanges. Textes offerts à Maurice Godelier*, ed. by Monique Jeudy-Ballini, Paris 2016, pp. 381–402.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

⁸⁴ Henriette Asséo: *Izydor Kopernicki et les Roms de la Galice Polonaise*, in: *Études tsiganes* 48–49/4 (2011), pp. 140–147.

⁸⁵ About: *Société*; About / Bordigoni: *Présence Tsiganes*; About / Pernot / Sutre: *Mondes Tsiganes*; Meyer: *Itinéraires*, pp. 265–287; Id.: *Exercices*, pp. 164–167. Meyer is currently working on his doctoral thesis at the EHESS in Paris entitled “*Écriture Savante, Lecture Poétique. La Représentation des Bohémiens d'Europe au XIX^e siècle*”.

⁸⁶ Cf. Gerhard Baumgartner: “Zigeuner”-Fotographie aus den Ländern der Habsburgermonarchie im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert, in: *Inszenierung des Fremden. Fotografische Darstellung von Sinti und Roma im Kontext der historischen Bildforschung*, ed. by Silvio Peritore and Frank Reuter, Heidelberg 2011, pp. 133–162.

⁸⁷ Thomas Acton: *Scientific Racism, Popular Racism and the Discourse of the Gypsy Lore Society*, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39/7 (2016), pp. 1187–1204.

power structures. Many texts from the beginnings of scientific knowledge production on *gypsies* as well as Romani peoples in France are yet to be critically historicized – and Paul Bataillard’s texts are counted among them.

4. Gypsyology in nineteenth century Europe

4.1. From H.M.G. Grellmann to the *Gypsy Lore Society*

In the second half of the eighteenth century, a rise in scientific interest to study *gypsies* can be observed. Between 1770 and 1790 a remarkable number of publications was dedicated to this minority group that stood out while nation states were forming.⁸⁸

The linguistic bridge between the Romani language and the Indian Sanskrit was gradually revealed and promised to give new clues about the so far mythical place of *gypsy* origin. In 1753, Hungarian minister István Váli compiled a glossary of over a thousand words in Singhalese, which he had gathered by talking to students from Ceylon during his trip to Leiden, Holland.⁸⁹ After returning home to Hungary, he read the words to a group of Romani speakers, who apparently were able to understand most of them. In 1776, Englishman Jacob Bryant collected a few hundred of Romani words and noticed their similarity to Indo-Iranian languages.⁹⁰ Finally in 1782, a German linguist, Johann Christian Christoph Rüdiger, published an essay in which he confirmed the supposed northern Indian origin of *gypsies*.⁹¹ The professor from the University of Halle did not content himself with a purely linguistic study, but took a strong stance against the discrimination and persecution of *gypsies*.

In the very same year that saw Rüdiger’s publication, however, a widely discussed event prompted the publication of the first and to this day most influential monograph on *gypsy* history, origin, language, and ethnography by Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb Grellmann: “Die Zigeuner. Ein Historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und

⁸⁸ Wim Willems: Außenbilder von Sinti und Roma in der frühen Zigeunerforschung, in: Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion des Zigeuners. Zur Genese eines Vorurteils (Wissenschaftliche Reihe des Fritz Bauer Instituts, vol. 2), ed. by Jacqueline Giere, Frankfurt am Main / New York 1996, p. 92.

⁸⁹ Cristian Suci: G.H.M. Grellmann and the Enlightenment’s Discovery of the Roma, in: Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai – Studia Europaea 1 (2008), p. 194.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Rüdiger: Von der Sprache.

Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksahle dieses Volks in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge“.⁹² Grellmann had studied theology and philosophy in Jena before teaching statistics at Göttingen, one of the most renowned German universities.⁹³ The event which made Grellmann speed up his publication process was a cannibalism trial in the Hungarian district of Honth: 133 Hungarians, labelled as *gypsies*, were accused and found guilty of cannibalism; until an imperial delegation from Vienna stopped the torturous executions.⁹⁴ In his second edition (1787), after having studied the case through various dubious sources, Grellmann agreed with the imperial decision on the defendants' innocence while simultaneously upholding his original claim that cannibalism was an old *gypsy* custom, and that the cruel proceedings of the trial were justified.⁹⁵ In his view, the mission to 'civilize' and turn *gypsies* into 'useful' citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, initiated by Maria Theresia and reinforced by Joseph II, was the right path, albeit did not go far enough. In his ethnographic chapters, Grellmann portrayed *gypsies* as an oriental race unable or unwilling to change their 'primitive' lifestyle.⁹⁶ He largely based these findings on a series of over 40 anonymously published newspaper articles in the *Wiener Anzeigen* from 1775 and 1776, which he quoted almost verbatim.⁹⁷ Grellmann's linguistic chapters, from which he drew the conclusion that the *gypsy* race must originate from India, were based on the works of his mentor Christian Wilhelm Büttner, who provided a glossary compiling findings on the Romani language from Vulcanius to Rüdiger.⁹⁸

A central question in Grellmann's writing was whether *gypsies* could change who they were said to be. On the one hand, he argued that *gypsy* migration history had given no evidence of change:

Africa does not make them blacker, Europe does not make them whiter; in Spain they do not learn to be lazy, in Germany they do not learn to be industrious;

⁹² Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb Grellmann: *Die Zigeuner. Ein Historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksahle dieses Volks in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge*, Dessau / Leipzig 1783.

⁹³ Bogdal: *Europa*, p. 162.

⁹⁴ Willems: *Außenbilder*, p. 93.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁹⁶ Grellmann: *Zigeuner*, pp. 15–154.

⁹⁷ Willems identified the anonymous author recently as Lutheran minister Samuel Augustini ab Hortis of Upper Hungary (Slovakia). Cf. Suciú: G.H.M. Grellmann, p. 194.

⁹⁸ Grellmann: *Zigeuner*, pp. 155–174. Cf. also Fraser: *Present and Future*, p. 21.

amongst Turks they do not learn to worship Mohammed, amongst Christians they do not learn to worship Christianity.⁹⁹

On the other hand, Grellmann believed that *gypsies* can and must be ‘re-educated’. Economically speaking, he asserted, they represent manpower that was yet untapped by European empires and nation states:

And now one needs to imagine the Gypsy that has stopped being a Gypsy; to be imagined with his fertility and his numerous offspring, who will all have been re-worked into useful citizens; and one would feel how little profitable it was to toss him as dross.¹⁰⁰

In the end, Grellmann believed, *gypsies* were susceptible to change but it would take force and education whereas gradual acculturation allegedly had no effect. His argumentation was paternalistic, putting *gypsies* into the position of children – a commonplace for colonized subjects in civilization theories that were developed in the imperialist era.

Grellmann’s monograph had an enormous impact on European scholarship. It was published at a time when academic and popular interest in *gypsies* was heightened. His findings were hardly new, his methodology at times questionable, and his conclusions deduced first and foremost from his political world views¹⁰¹; yet his success cannot be denied. Christoph Martin Wieland wrote a book review in the widely circulated *Teutscher Merkur*¹⁰²; the first English translation was published in 1787, followed by a Dutch and a French edition in 1788 and 1791. Studying one of the first and most accurate bibliographies on *gypsies* by G.F. Black in 1914, Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems, and Annemarie Cottaar noticed a striking frequency of phrases like ‘based on (or derived from) Grellmann’ in the over 4000 compiled titles.¹⁰³ Even half a century later, when Paul Bataillard was arriving at the subject, he often recited Grellmann’s work. He

⁹⁹ Grellmann: *Zigeuner*, p. 1: “Afrika macht sie nicht schwärzer, Europa nicht weißer; in Spanien lernen sie nicht faul, in Deutschland nicht fleißig seyn; unter Türken nicht Mohammed, unter Christen nicht Christentum verehren.“

¹⁰⁰ Grellmann: *Zigeuner*, p. 140: “Und nun denke man sich den Zigeuner, wenn er aufgehört hat, Zigeuner zu seyn; denke sich ihm mit seiner Fruchtbarkeit und seinen zahlreichen Nachkommen, die alle zu brauchbaren Bürgern umgeschaffen sind; und man wird fühlen, wie wenig wirthschaftlich es war, ihn als Schlacke weg zu werfen.“

¹⁰¹ A more in depths analysis of Grellmann’s methodology, work with primary sources and political world views cf. Willems: *Außenbilder*, pp. 88–98; Willems: *In Search*, pp. 22–92; Suci: G.H.M. Grellmann, pp. 189–200.

¹⁰² Bogdal: *Europa*, p. 162.

¹⁰³ Leo Lucassen / Wim Willems / Annemarie Cottaar: *Gypsies and other Itinerant Groups. A Socio-Historical Approach*, New York 1998, p. 74.

owned editions in German, French, and English, and annotated the French edition elaborately.¹⁰⁴ Last but not least, Grellmann was rewarded with the title of a professor at his university in Göttingen, an accomplishment none of his successors would reach.

Although further research took place after Grellmann, new research, general academic interest that would grant researchers institutional recognition and resources had shifted away. Even Grellmann himself did not publish another book. Hence, research continued to be fragmented into various academic disciplines. In the linguistic field, Grellmann was quickly overtaken, once Sir William Jones established Sanskrit – and by default the Romani language – as a member of the Indo-European family.¹⁰⁵ In 1844, August Friedrich Pott at Halle, finally and definitively located the origin of the Romani language in the Punjab region in northern India.¹⁰⁶ In his introduction, Pott proudly declared that he had met Romani speakers only once or twice in his life, but based his research on previous linguistic studies.¹⁰⁷ This form of negativization of indigenous epistemologies and the privileging of the scientific ‘quotation community’ was typical of contemporary Orientalist discourses.¹⁰⁸ Similarly, Franz Miklosich in Vienna based his research in the 1870s only on secondary sources when constituting the migration route that is considered the standard even today: India-Persia-Armenia-the Byzantine Empire-the Balkans.¹⁰⁹ Ian Hancock pointed out that Miklosich drew at least some of his conclusions from vocabulary that does not even exist in any Romani dialect, just as Pott had done earlier in his study of the origin of the Romani language.¹¹⁰ Hancock blamed the English writer George Borrow for circulating such ‘fake’ Romani words. However, since Borrow was not and never claimed to be a scientist, it was Pott’s and Miklosich’s responsibility to verify their sources.

George Borrow is a prominent example of a new generation of amateur ‘Gypsylogists’, who travelled extensively to meet *gypsy* communities and record their

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Sabine Wilson: Paul Théodore Bataillard, in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* (1955), p. 41.

¹⁰⁵ Fraser: *Present and Future*, p. 21.

¹⁰⁶ August Friedrich Pott: *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien. Ethnographisch-linguistische Untersuchung, vornehmlich ihrer Herkunft und Sprache, nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen. Erster Theil: Einleitung und Grammatik*, Halle 1844.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*: Vorwort, p. X.

¹⁰⁸ See also pp. 10, 12.

¹⁰⁹ Franz Miklosich: *Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas I–XII.*, Wien 1872–1880.

¹¹⁰ Ian Hancock: *The Concoctors: Creating Fake Romani Culture*, in: *The Role of the Romanies. Images and Counter-Images of ‘Gypsies’/Romanies in European Cultures*, ed. by Nicholas Saul / Susan Tebbutt, p. 91.

encounters. In the 1840s and 1850s, Borrow published his travelling literature about the ‘Gitanos’ in Spain and his contacts to British ‘Romanichals’.¹¹¹ In England, he is associated with inspiring ‘Gypsy lore’. Soon after his death in 1881, his successors founded the internationally influential ‘Gypsy Lore Society’ (henceforth GLS). The tradition of ‘Gypsy lore’ usually takes a benign stand towards *gypsy* communities, observes them at a distance from a privileged standpoint and compares them to an imaginary-mythical and idealized image of the ‘authentic’ *gypsy* culture. Many scholars have pointed out that this form of romanticizing presumed Romani culture only reproduces racist presumptions about the ‘true’, ‘authentic’, ‘pure-blooded’ *gypsy*.¹¹² According to Thomas Acton, the GLS still has not acknowledged “its historic racism and the harm caused by it”.¹¹³

The GLS was founded in Edinburgh in 1888 with its first president being Charles Godfrey Leland, an American who had settled in England and who followed Borrow’s folkloristic school of thought, which he combined with an anthropological framework.¹¹⁴ At the end of 1888, there were sixty-nine members, twelve of which were institutional. Individual membership was predominantly British, but became increasingly international, with larger cohorts from Austria-Hungary and the United States. Its publication, the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* (henceforth JGLS), became the most important transnational platform for Gypsyology and Gypsy lore. The editors’ preface to the first issue of the JGLS set the solution of the conundrum of *gypsy* origins as a major target. The society lasted only until 1892, but was revived in 1907, surviving with a few intermissions up to present times. After the cessation of the JGLS in 1892, Leland’s Austrian colleague Anton Hermann took it upon himself to reconceptualize his own journal “*Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn*” (ethnological notifications

¹¹¹ Cf. Willems: *In Search*, pp. 93–170; Karola Fings: *Sinti und Roma. Geschichte einer Minderheit*, München 2016, p. 21.

¹¹² For the English-speaking context cf. Willems: *In Search*, p. 4; Fraser: *Present and Future*, p. 22; Mayall: *Gypsy Identities*, pp. 15f.; Acton: *Scientific Racism*, p. 1192; Ronald Lee: *Roma in Europe: “Gypsy” Myth and Romani Reality – New Evidence for Romani History*, in: “Gypsies” in *European Literature and Culture. Studies in European Culture and History*, ed. by Valentina Glajar / Domnica Radulescu, New York et al. 2008, p. 10. For the German-speaking context cf. Bogdal: *Europa*, p. 14; Maria Melms / Michael Hönicke: *Antiziganismus und Tsiganologie. Versuch einer Standortbestimmung*, in: *Vielheiten. Leipziger Studien zu Roma/Zigeuner-Kulturen (Tsiganologie, vol. 2)*, ed. by Theresa Jacobs / Fabian Jacobs, Leipzig 2011, p. 177. For the French-speaking context cf. Liégeois: *Tsiganes*, p. 10.

¹¹³ Acton: *Scientific Racism*, p. 1187.

¹¹⁴ Fraser: *Present and Future*, p. 22.

from Hungary) as the new JGLS.¹¹⁵ Internationally famous Gypsyologist Heinrich von Wlislöcki became Hermann's permanent employee and Leland himself publicly appealed to the members of the GLS to support Hermann's journal.¹¹⁶

Thus, in the wake of Grellmann's seminal thesis a transnational, multidisciplinary scientific community was in the making. These enterprises, however, remained outside of the universities, with little apparent influence on politics, and driven by the commitment of individuals – amateurs and scholars. Centers of research were England and Austria-Hungary with their major fields of interest being the origin, migrations, and an ethnographic portrait of the *gypsies*. While linguistics used to be the leading discipline to answer these questions, ethnology and anthropology were emerging as new additions in Gypsyology. In France, these new disciplines were growing fast, but Bataillard's particular, decade-long commitment to *gypsy* anthropology still stands out. Due to the bilingualism of his second wife, Charlotte Willard, an English woman¹¹⁷, he also became an early member of the GLS¹¹⁸ and was able to publish an English version of his doctoral thesis for the JGLS in 1889 and 1890.¹¹⁹

After this short overview of the state of affairs in European Gypsyology up until Bataillard's interventions, the following chapter on the history of French anthropology and its institutional manifestations in Paris, will allow a closer look at Bataillard's local scientific community and the ideological context of his research and publications.

4.2. The beginnings of anthropology in France

Paul Bataillard's research was interdisciplinary in design but he placed himself closest to the newly emerging French anthropology and its institutional manifestation, the *Société d'anthropologie de Paris* (henceforth SAP). He entered the society in 1864¹²⁰, and henceforth most of his publications appeared in the *Bulletins de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris* (henceforth BSAP), the society's official organ. One of his

¹¹⁵ Ruch: Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte, pp. 287.

¹¹⁶ Charles G. Leland: An die g. Mitglieder der „Gypsy Lore Society“, in: Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn. Zeitschrift für die Völkerkunde Ungarns und der damit in ethnographischen Beziehungen stehenden Länder. Zugleich Organ für allgemeine Zigeunerkunde, Budapest 1893, inner cover text.

¹¹⁷ Wilson: Paul, p. 39.

¹¹⁸ Gypsy Lore Society: Members, in: JGLS 1 (1889), p. 181.

¹¹⁹ Paul Bataillard: Beginning of the Immigration of the Gypsies into Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century, in: JGLS 1 (1889), pp. 185–212, 260–286, 324–345; id.: Beginning of the Immigration of the Gypsies into Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century, in: JGLS 2 (1891), pp. 27–53.

¹²⁰ In this year, the society became a public charity (*utilité publique*).

articles, “*Les Zlotars. Dits aussi Dzvonkars, Tsiganes Fondateurs en Bronze et en Laiton dans la Galicie Orientale et la Bukovine*”, was even entered in the SAP’s series *Mémoires de la Société*.¹²¹ In Bataillard’s obituary, the SAP’s president, Camille Dareste, praised Bataillard’s frequent partaking in discussions, his membership of the *Comité central*, and his position as rapporteur of the Godard award commission.¹²² The award was named after the donor Ernest Godard, one of the SAP’s founding members in 1859. Through Bataillard’s involvement, it was presented to René Verneau for his research about the different pelvis forms of the human races.¹²³

Bataillard was clearly committed to anthropology and the SAP in particular. Thus, it seems necessary to take a closer look at this institution, its members, and ideological framework: Who were Bataillard’s colleagues? What were the topics and questions discussed in the BSAP and what status did *gypsy* anthropology have in this context? Finally, which vocabulary was frequently used? Not all of these questions can be sufficiently answered in this short synthesis, but they will accompany the subsequent analysis of Bataillard’s writings.

The SAP’s predecessor organisation, the *Société ethnologique*, was founded in 1839 by William Edwards, who defined ethnology as “the science of races” (*la science des races*).¹²⁴ Edwards, who was born in Jamaica, was named “The father of Ethnology in France” by Claude Blanckaert.¹²⁵ In Linnean tradition, his race-based definition of ethnology was chiefly concerned with the major taxonomic divisions of mankind. After Georges Cuvier and Johann Friedrich Blumenbach had subsumed all *white* people in one entity, the Caucasian type, the ‘other’ human race divisions were fervently debated. Difference was interpreted as the effect of a land, a climate, a way of life, and a state of civilization – factors affected by migrations and the vicissitudes of history.¹²⁶ The two principal problems of ethnology were the inalterability of races and the quarrels

¹²¹ Émile Duhouset: Sur les Tsiganes de la Perse. Réponse à M. P. Bataillard, in : BSAP 2/10 (1875), p. 597; Bibliothèques du Muséum national d’histoire naturelle, Fonds de la Société d’Anthropologie de Paris, Mémoires 2ème série, vol.1, Fig. 45: Les Zlotars ou Dzvonkars par Paul Bataillard, SAP 155 (14) / 17.

¹²² Camille Dareste: Correspondance, in: BSAP 4/5 (1894), p. 230.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Jean-Claude Wartelle: La Société d’Anthropologie de Paris de 1859 à 1920, in: Revue d’Histoire des Sciences Humaines 1/10 (2004), p. 127.

¹²⁵ Claude Blanckaert: On the Origins of French Ethnology. William Edwards and the Doctrine of Race, in: Bones, Bodies, Behaviour. Essays on Biological Anthropology (History of Anthropology, vol. 5), London / Madison 1988, p. 20.

¹²⁶ Ibid., p. 29.

between ‘monogenists’ (theorists of one common human descent) and ‘polygenists’ (theorists of two or more origins of different human races).¹²⁷ Edwards died in 1842 and the society’s activities were interrupted, until finally dissolved in 1862.¹²⁸

In 1859, the *Société d’anthropologie de Paris* was founded by Paul Broca. It has been argued by Jean-Claude Wartelle that this was the first time any society used this term.¹²⁹ However, Blanckaert had already pointed out that Edwards and the phrenologist Johann Caspar Spurzheim had founded the first *Société anthropologique* in 1832.¹³⁰ Broca had a decisively different understanding of anthropology than Edwards. He was a doctor and surgeon, and defined anthropology as a natural science privileging anatomy and physiology over cultural ethnology or Herodotean ethnography.¹³¹ Broca’s SAP was born in the context of academic medicine. It incorporated a naturalist description of the human race, its geographic variants, and the knowledge of its paleographic history. Broca perpetuated the Edwardsian program of raciology but also introduced the use of anthropometric and craniological measurements, under the influence of men like the American Samuel Morton and the Swede Anders Retzius.¹³² Anthropology became an interdisciplinary science of the collectivity of the human being, ranging from medicine, across paleontology to sociology. Bataillard was personally acquainted with Broca, who accompanied him at least once to a visit of a *gypsy* community in 1865.¹³³ The third and last secretary of the SAP that Bataillard witnessed was Charles Letourneau, a sociologist pushing the boundaries of anthropology when he had a new chair of sociology created for him at the *École d’Anthropologie* in 1885.¹³⁴

While initially only a small minority of Edwardsian ethnologists rallied to the new institution, membership of the SAP grew quickly from 19 founding members in 1859 to 679 members in 1880, the year that Broca died.¹³⁵ Unlike Edwards’ association, the SAP survived the passing of its founder and became a role model for similar European

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 33.

¹²⁸ Cf. Emmanuelle Sibeud: *The Metamorphosis of Ethnology in France, 1839–1930*, in: *A new History of Anthropology*, ed. by Henrika Kuklick, Malden / Oxford / Carlton 2008, p. 98; Claude Blanckaert: *Fondements Disciplinaires de l’Anthropologie Française au XIXe Siècle. Perspectives Historiographiques*, in: *Politix* 8/29 (1995), p. 50.

¹²⁹ Wartelle: *Société d’Anthropologie*, p. 126.

¹³⁰ Blanckaert: *Fondements*, p. 31.

¹³¹ Wartelle: *Société d’Anthropologie*, p. 126f.

¹³² Blanckaert: *On the Origins*, p. 46.

¹³³ Meyer: *Excercises*, p. 166.

¹³⁴ Wartelle: *Société d’Anthropologie*, p. 147.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

and North American organisations.¹³⁶ Anthropology was rapidly to be applied to the economy (ergonomics), to medicine (the detection of ‘degenerates’), to the army (the selection of conscripts), to legal psychiatry and criminology, and finally to politics.¹³⁷

Concerning internal debates, the SAP continued the raciological quarrel between monogenists and polygenists. While evolutionism provided a synthesis of the two positions in England and Austria-Hungary and gave way to new debates between Neo-Lamarckists and Neo-Darwinists, in France, no such synthesis took hold.¹³⁸ Evolutionism in France was chiefly concerned with Gobineau’s thesis of the degeneration of the French nation through the mixture of races – a thesis strongly refuted by Broca.¹³⁹ A copy of Gobineau’s work can be found in the Bataillard Collection.¹⁴⁰

As an independent scholarly society, the SAP was more open to women’s participation than the barred ranks of university chairs and research centers. However, during Bataillard’s lifetime this potential was hardly utilized and male dominance and patriarchy remained the norm: In 1870, the SAP admitted its first female and outspokenly feminist member, Clémence Royer, the first French translator of Darwin’s “On the Origin of Species”, who had just finished her third translation.¹⁴¹ In July 1874, Royer lashed out in anger at her colleagues when during an assembly these were descanting once again about the decrease of natality in France without putting women’s motivations into consideration.¹⁴² This incident did not only reveal the patriarchal nature of most demographic debates in the SAP but also testifies for early resistance against the marginalization of women’s voices in such debates. Until Broca’s death in 1880, Royer remained the only known female member of the SAP.

In conclusion, Bataillard’s research was situated in a context of interdisciplinary research and exchange, with a tendency to biologize and put in measurable terms social questions, patriarchal power imbalances and the unquestioned proposition of different human races, stages of civilization and the possibility of racial perfectibility or degeneration respectively. Within the SAP, Bataillard was a well-respected member.

¹³⁶ Wartelle: *Société d’Anthropologie*: p. 129.

¹³⁷ Blanckaert: *On the Origins*, p. 49.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* Neo-Darwinists believe in development through natural selection and genetic mutation, whereas Neo-Lamarckists believe that adaptation to the environment is more responsible for development.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ MCL, BC, box 45.

¹⁴¹ Wartelle: *Société d’Anthropologie*, pp. 131f..

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 132.

Nevertheless, the aforementioned obituary by SAP's president Camille Daresté, also sheds light on his colleagues' opinion of his work: Bataillard's life-long occupation with *gypsy* anthropology was described as "a fixed idea" (*une idée fixe*) and the one biographical anecdote that was chosen to retell was a story of him having allegedly been robbed by *gypsies* to whom he hospitably had opened his doors.¹⁴³ His passion was clearly recognized albeit slightly ridiculed as an obsession and his wanting to actually meet his research objects seems to have earned him some laughs in the society.

5. Paul Théodore Bataillard (1816–1894)

5.1. Biographical remarks on Paul Bataillard

Paul Théodore Bataillard was born in Paris on March 23, 1816. He was the youngest of the four children of Pierre Charles Angélique Bataillard and Agathe Pierrette Vasse, a bourgeois, royalist and catholic household.¹⁴⁴ His mother had died when he was only two years old and he was brought up by his aunt. After graduating from his school in Troyes, he moved back to Paris to study law at the *Faculté de Paris*. Bataillard did not finish his degree, but instead transferred to the *École des Chartes*, where he continued to study religion, philosophy, and politics with no fixed idea for a career path.¹⁴⁵ It appears that it was during these student years that he first became interested in the study of the *gypsy*.¹⁴⁶ How this interest was nurtured and sustained remains debatable as he did not address it explicitly in his writings.¹⁴⁷ His first four-part series of newspaper articles on the '*Bohémiens*' was published in July 1840 for a local newspaper of the Pyrenees.¹⁴⁸

It was also during this time that Bataillard forged friendships with Emile Beltrémieux, a medical student with whom he shared his strong democratic convictions, and Eugène Fromentin, an unwilling law student who would later become a famous

¹⁴³ Daresté: *Correspondance*, p. 231.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Wilson: *Paul*, p. 37; Eugène Fromentin: *Lettres de Jeunesse. Biographie et Notes par Pierre Blanchon* (Jacques-André Méry), Paris 2009, p. 47.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Barbara Wright: *Eugène Fromentin: A Life in Art and Letters (Romanticism and after in France, vol. 5)*, Bern et al. 2000, p. 59.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Wilson: *Paul*, p. 37.

¹⁴⁷ See also chapter 8.

¹⁴⁸ See also pp. 30f.

writer and painter.¹⁴⁹ Bataillard himself was brought up in an artistic milieu.¹⁵⁰ The trio became inseparable in the following years. Shortly after meeting them for the first time, Bataillard left again for the Pyrenees to pursue his *gypsy* studies. In a letter twenty-four years later, he confirmed that he had met *gypsies* of the Basque country in 1840, although it is not much known about this encounter.¹⁵¹ On his way there in September 1840, he learned about the death of his father. Orphaned and with still no clear path in life, his brother, Charles Bataillard, who was fourteen years older than him and a distinguished lawyer and archeologist, acted *in loco parentis* for his younger brother.

In the following year, Paul Bataillard obtained his diploma at the *École des Chartes* as ‘archivist-paleographer’ (*archiviste paléographe*).¹⁵² In the same year, he and his friend Fromentin wrote a literary study (which remained unpublished during their lifetime) of Edgar Quinet’s “Ahasvérus”, an epic drama on the theme of ‘the Wandering Jew’.¹⁵³ Quinet was a republican-minded lecturer at the *Collège de France* and Bataillard and Fromentin were his loyal disciples. Fromentin also worked on a French translation of Johann Gottfried Herder’s works and familiarised Bataillard with his writings.¹⁵⁴ Herder conceptualized “one people” (*ein Volk*) equalling “one national character” (*ein Nationalcharakter*), which he believed to be “natural”.¹⁵⁵ The “wild mixing of human species and nations under one rule”, on the other hand, was to be rejected.¹⁵⁶ Herder’s philosophy on the homogeneity of peoples or nations might have influenced Bataillard’s concept of the *gypsy* as a homogeneous entity. Furthermore, Fromentin travelled three times to Algeria and became an Orientalist¹⁵⁷, which might have inspired Bataillard’s own article on the *gypsies* of Algeria – which he wrote without having been there himself.¹⁵⁸

In 1844, with an addition in 1849, Bataillard published his first and most influential thesis “*De l’Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe*”. He interrupted

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Wright: Eugène, p. 59; Fromentin: Lettres, p. 48; Barbara Wright (Ed.): Correspondance d’Eugène Fromentin. Tome I: 1839-1858, Paris 1995, p. 34.

¹⁵⁰ About: Société.

¹⁵¹ MCL, BC, box 3.

¹⁵² N.N.: Chronique, in: Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes 55 (1894), p. 226.

¹⁵³ Wright: Eugène, p. 60.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Johann Gottfried Herder: Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit. Zweiter Teil. Neuntes Buch, Berlin 2013, S. 367.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.: “die wilde Vermischung der Menschengattungen und Nationen unter einem Zepter“.

¹⁵⁷ Wright: Correspondance, p. 13.

¹⁵⁸ See also p. 51.

his research thereafter to dedicate himself to the political struggle of the liberal and democratic press. He collaborated with the journals *Libre Recherche* and *Revue de Paris* and became one of the editors of the *Revue Critique*.¹⁵⁹ First and foremost, he drew attention to Russia's ambitions to expand in eastern Europe and the Romanian nationalist awakening. When Wallachians fought against Russian imperialism in 1848, his mentor and friend Quinet and his colleague Jules Michelet, inspired him to support their struggle. Bataillard became acquainted with the Romanian community in Paris as early as 1845 and supported them henceforth "with his words and his quill" (*par la parole ou par la plume*).¹⁶⁰ He became one of the co-founders of *Les Écoles*, a republican revue journal, and published in *Le National*, where Beltrémieux had worked as an editor until his early demise in 1848.¹⁶¹ In March 1849, republican Xavier Durrieu founded *Le Temps* and accepted to publish many of Bataillard's articles that criticized French indifference towards Russia's growing influence in Eastern Europe.¹⁶² Likewise, Bataillard called out pro-Russian sentiments in the *Assemblée Nationale*.¹⁶³ Besides his support with words, Bataillard also offered practical aid when accepting to receive mail to his address on behalf of exiled revolutionaries.¹⁶⁴ Both of Bataillard's later wives were also committed to the Romanian struggle.¹⁶⁵ The Romanian youth educated in Paris, in return, also brought ideas of slavery abolitionism back to their homeland, inspired by the French abolitionist movement headed by their mentors Quinet and Michelet.¹⁶⁶ Together with Bataillard, both were later proclaimed 'Romanian Citizens', 'Honorary Members of the Academy of Romania' as well as 'Officer of the Order of the Star of Romania'.¹⁶⁷ There were even plans by Constantin Alexandru Rosetti in 1866, then Prime Minister of Romania, to appoint Bataillard as the head of the National

¹⁵⁹ N.N.: Bataillard, Paul Théodore, in: *Dictionnaire de Biographie Contemporaine*, ed. by A. Bitard, 31887, online: World Biographical Information System <<https://wbis.degruyter.com/biographic-document/F11194>> [19/02/18].

¹⁶⁰ Boitoş: Paul Bataillard, p. 12.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13; cf. Angela Jianu: *A Circle of Friends. Romanian Revolutionaries and Political Exile, 1840–1859*, Leiden 2011, p. 95.

¹⁶² Cf. Boitoş: Paul Bataillard, pp. 44, 108; Jianu: *Circle*, p. 154.

¹⁶³ Cf. Jianu: *Circle*, p. 154.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Boitoş: Paul Bataillard, p. 38.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Raluca Tomi: *The French Influence over Abolitionism in the Romanian Principalities*, in: *Transylvanian Review* 19/4 (2010), p. 15.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Wilson: Paul, p. 38; *La Société de l'École des Chartres* (Ed.): *Livret de l'École des Chartres 1821–1891*, Paris 1891, p. 126.

Archives of Bucharest.¹⁶⁸ Bataillard's commitment to Romania was not an isolated chapter in his biography but an expression of his anti-imperialist, respectively nationalist sentiments, his democratic convictions, and his transnational networks to intellectuals not only from western European states.

In September 1849¹⁶⁹ Bataillard married Thérèse Beltremieux, young widow of Bataillard's late friend Emile Beltremieux. Together, they travelled across France, largely in search of *gypsies* as their journals reveal.¹⁷⁰ On Mai 10, 1852 Thérèse Bataillard died like her first husband of consumption, leaving Paul Bataillard with the care of their young daughter. In the following year, he remarried the English woman and friend of his first wife, Charlotte Willard. Her bilingualism turned out to be an important asset to their research and brought them closer to the English Gypsylorists who would later found the *Gypsy Lore Society*. They invited Paul Bataillard as a member, published his thesis translated by his wife, and after his passing advised Charlotte Bataillard to have his collection bought by the *Manchester Free Library*.¹⁷¹

In 1855, after the coup of Napoleon III on December 2, 1851, Bataillard faced a short term of imprisonment for having supported the republican adversary of Napoleon III, Hugues Felicité Robert de Lamennais.¹⁷² However, some sources also blame the instigation of his first mother-in-law, who frequented the court of Napoleon III, and apparently, had no great sympathies for her son-in-law after his remarriage.¹⁷³ Bataillard's political convictions and adherence to principals led to stringent financial straits during the Second Empire, when, although without regular employment and with a young family to support, he refused to apply for a government post under this new regime.¹⁷⁴ He also was a Free Mason like many of his republican and pro-Romanian friends.¹⁷⁵

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Jianu: Circle, p. 336.

¹⁶⁹ Wilson noted here the year 1848: Wilson: Paul Théodore Bataillard, p. 38. More precise seems, however, the date that Wright gives, the 22nd of September 1849: Wright: Correspondance, p. 50. Emile Beltremieux died on January 6, 1848 of consumption.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Wilson: Paul, p. 39; MCL, BC, box 4.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 40.

¹⁷² Cf. Fromentin: Lettres, p. 48.

¹⁷³ Cf. Wilson: Paul, pp. 39f.; N.N.: Bataillard (Paul-Théodore), in: Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains, 1893, online: World Biographical Information System <<https://wbis.degruyter.com/biographic-document/F11194>> [20/02/18].

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Wilson: Paul, p. 39.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.; Fromentin: Lettres, p. 158.

Due to becoming a public charity in 1864, the *Société d'anthropologie de Paris* grew in numbers and invited new members, such as Paul Bataillard, to join their ranks.¹⁷⁶ Henceforth, Bataillard published the majority of his writings in the *Bulletins de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris*. Another testament to the authority he had meanwhile gained on the subject of *gypsies* in France was his invitation to write an article for the “Paris-Guide”, a booklet for the 1867 world exhibition in Paris, entitled “Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris”.¹⁷⁷ Finally, after many years of irregular employment, on January 15, 1877 Paul Bataillard found a permanent home at the *Faculté de Médecine de Paris* as an archivist (in the rank of a librarian).¹⁷⁸

On March 1, 1894, at seventy-eight years old, Paul Bataillard died in Paris. In his obituary by the SAP it was speculated that the grief over having lost his son, a young doctor who was in Vietnam at the time, just eighteen months prior, had expedited his impending end.¹⁷⁹ Bataillard and his family had collected hundreds of documents and items presumably related to *gypsies*. His wife and daughters have decided that this vast collection should be brought to England as the Gypsyologist and long-time correspondent of Paul Bataillard, David MacRitchie, had suggested.¹⁸⁰ It contains works of several volumes, pamphlets of a few pages, articles from magazines, newspapers and encyclopaedias in various languages¹⁸¹: English writers include Henry T. Crofton, George Borrow, and Charles G. Leland. The Turkish writer Paspati is represented as well as the German Liebich, the Romanian Vaillant, the Norwegian Sundt, the Italian Ascoli, and the Austrian von Wlislöcki. The collection includes several copies of Grellmann’s “Historischer Versuch über die Zigeuner”, of which the French edition is richly annotated, as well as the privately printed “Czigány Nyelvtan”, by Archduke Joseph that was presented by the author to Bataillard and contains the latter’s scholarly notes. It should be noted that Bataillard’s knowledge of the English language was only fragmentary but that his wife Charlotte facilitated the correspondence with English-speaking writers. The Bataillards were not only interested in scholarly works but also collected many

¹⁷⁶ See also chapter 4.2.

¹⁷⁷ N.N.: Bataillard, Paul Théodore, in: Dictionnaire de Biographie Contemporaine, ed. by A. Bitard, 31887, online: World Biographical Information System <<https://wbis.degruyter.com/biographic-document/F11194>> [19/02/18].

¹⁷⁸ N.N.: Chronique et Mélanges, in: Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes 38 (1877), p. 176.

¹⁷⁹ Dareste: Correspondance, p. 231.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Wilson: Paul, p. 40.

¹⁸¹ Cf. N.N.: The Bataillard Gypsy Collection, in: The Library 7 (1895), pp. 402–404; N.N.: The Bataillard Gypsy Collection, in: The Manchester Guardian, Oct 9, 1895, p. 8.

fictional romances and plays, photographs and some objects like combs, bells, and other articles allegedly manufactured by *gypsies*.¹⁸² Bataillard's grand-daughter Sabine Wilson noted therefore in 1955 that the Bataillard Collection has become "one of the great storehouses of Gypsy literature".¹⁸³

Paul Bataillard was in brief a Paris-based, but internationally connected and politically active researcher, writer and collector. His decade-long dedication to *gypsy* anthropology stood out in France and among his international colleagues.

5.2. The evolution of Bataillard's research and publications

Paul Bataillard's research and publications on *gypsies* span five decades from his earliest articles in 1840 as a young student traveller to his last in 1890 at the age of seventy-four as a critically acclaimed authority on this topic. This chapter will summarize chronologically the evolution of Bataillard's writings and theses before a thematic analysis highlighting certain aspects of his works follows.

His first four-part series of articles were published in July 1840 for a local newspaper of the Pyrenees and were based on a long letter he wrote to his professor and friend Delatour at the *Collège de France* in Paris.¹⁸⁴ The young newspaper *L'Observateur des Pyrénées* went in print only on the first of March of the same year and was printed three times a week.¹⁸⁵ Bataillard outlined in this letter his research project and asked for any useful information or contacts: In a first part, he planned on compiling a bibliographical inventory of the research that had already been conducted up until this point. In his second part, he wanted to focus more specifically on *gypsies* in France and their "secret life" (*vie intime*).¹⁸⁶ Focal points here were their physical appearance, marriage customs, religious beliefs, social organisation, ceremonies, health, and more.

Four years later, in 1844, his first thesis and to this date most famous work was published under the title: "*De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en*

¹⁸² Cf. N.N.: The Bataillard Gypsy Collection, in: *The Library* 7 (1895), pp. 402–404; N.N.: The Bataillard Gypsy Collection, in: *The Manchester Guardian*, Oct 9, 1895, p. 8.

¹⁸³ Wilson: Paul, p. 42.

¹⁸⁴ Paul Bataillard: Les Bohémiens, in: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, 19/07/1840, p. 1–3; Id.: Les Bohémiens, in: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, 22/07/1840, pp. 1f.; Id.: Les Bohémiens, in: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, 24/07/1840, p. 1–3; Id.: Les Bohémiens, in: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, 26/07/1840, p. 1–3. A copy of his letter can be found in MCL, BC, box 9.

¹⁸⁵ N.N.: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, online: <<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb328277978>> [19/03/18].

¹⁸⁶ Paul Bataillard: Les Bohémiens, in: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, 26/07/1840, p. 2.

Europe". It was printed in two parts by the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*¹⁸⁷, the publishing organ of his school, and as a thin booklet of 59 pages by a small publishing company in Paris.¹⁸⁸ His theses have evolved and changed significantly during the following decades, influenced by colleagues like August Pott, Michiel de Goeje, Franz Miklosich and Alexandre Paspatis, and culminating in his new original hypothesis on the European origin of *gypsies*. However, his name is most commonly associated with this first thesis of 1844.¹⁸⁹ Bataillard emphasized that he had been doing research on this topic for several years already, without giving more specific details about how his research interest had developed.¹⁹⁰ With remarkable self-confidence, he then continued to position himself against the two most influential authorities on the subject at the time: on the one hand, George Borrow, who Bataillard classified as a traveller and novelist who did not use scientific methods or references¹⁹¹, and on the other hand, Grellmann, who he criticized for not having met with *gypsies* personally and not critically analyzing his compiled sources.¹⁹² The main objective in his thesis was to raise doubt about the arrival date Grellmann gave for *gypsy* immigration into Europe, namely the year 1417. Grellmann himself referenced fifteenth century chroniclers like Krantz and Corner, but Bataillard pointed out that these authors were copying and recopying from one another without having witnessed the *gypsies*' arrival themselves. Even if they should be believed, the year 1417 could only account for an arrival in western Europe, whereas Bataillard believed immigration into eastern and southern Europe to have taken place much earlier. He referenced philological works to show that *gypsies* must have dwelled for a longer period of time in Asia Minor and Egypt as well as casual mentions of *gypsies* in Hungary in 1260 and in Poland in 1256. He did not go as far as trying to disprove Grellmann completely as he admitted to not have enough reliable sources to do so. He simply planted the seed of doubt, announced his long-term research project in this field, and asked other scientists for more information, if they should come across more sources on this case.

¹⁸⁷ Paul Bataillard: De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe, 1, in: Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 5 (1844), pp. 438–475; Id.: De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe, 2, in: Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 5 (1844), pp. 521–539.

¹⁸⁸ Id.: De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe, Paris 1844.

¹⁸⁹ See also p. 82.

¹⁹⁰ Bataillard: Apparition, p. 3.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁹² Ibid., p. 4.

Over the span of the next five years he continued his research, collected and evaluated sources, and in 1849 he was ready to publish his addition: “*Nouvelles Recherches sur l’Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe*”.¹⁹³ He presented three new sources that should prove the existence of *gypsies* in eastern and southern Europe before 1417: a Romanian document, a traveller’s account about Crete, and an unpublished chronicle of Cyprus. It is noteworthy that the friendships Bataillard had forged since 1844 with the Romanian diasporic youth in Paris, provided him with the key Wallachian source that inspired this new publication, in which he proved that *gypsies* were present as slaves in Wallachia and Moldavia as early as the fourteenth century.¹⁹⁴ Being aware that as research would progress and new sources would push the arrival date further and further back, he was reluctant to specify a new arrival date but agreed with Austrian philologist Franz Miklosich that immigration into Europe could have taken place as early as the ninth century. What seemed to have been the established consensus at the time, the *gypsies*’ Indian origin, raised new questions: Which part of the Indian society left India; and not only when but why?

Gypsyology was not an established field of study yet that could attract many research resources or institutional support. While English writers like George Borrow could make a living from his popular books written for a larger audience, scientific research was still lacking central platforms, conferences, journals and chairs. Hence, it should not come as a surprise that Bataillard took a nearly twenty-year-long break, becoming involved in different political projects¹⁹⁵ and publishing only smaller works. Among those were an article about the Moldo-Valachie¹⁹⁶, the “Paris-Guide”-article for the world exhibition¹⁹⁷, and “some words” (*quelques mots*) on travelling gypsy bands in France which he believed to be of Hungarian origin.¹⁹⁸ His notes and correspondences of the time show that Bataillard never got distracted from the topic but meticulously followed new research trends, local newspapers, and contacted publishers all around Europe. The archived collection of his works in Manchester is not without

¹⁹³ Paul Bataillard: *Nouvelles Recherches sur l’Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe*, Paris 1849; Id.: *Nouvelles Recherches sur l’Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe et sur l’Origine de ce Peuple*, in: *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 11 (1850), pp. 14–55.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Tomi: *French Influence*, p. 18. See also pp. 27f.

¹⁹⁵ See also pp. 27f.

¹⁹⁶ Paul Bataillard: *De la Situation Régulière de la Moldo-Valachie vis-à-vis de la Porte*, Bruxelles 1857.

¹⁹⁷ Id.: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, in: *Paris-Guide par les principaux écrivains et artistes de la France*, vol. 2: *La Vie*, Paris 1867, pp. 1107–1123.

¹⁹⁸ Id.: *Quelques Mots sur les Bohémiens Hongrois*, in: *BSAP* 4 (1869), pp. 549–552.

reason sorted by regional chapters as it shows the vast array of his research interests, extensive notes, and unique expertise ranging from India, to Egypt, and Portugal.¹⁹⁹ Becoming a member of the SAP in 1864 meant not only finding a new institutional home and publishing platform, but also a more focussed research direction and new contacts in the scientific community. Anthropological questions, vocabulary, and framing became henceforth increasingly evident in his style of writing.

In 1872, Bataillard was ready to publish a more ambitious essay again, bringing his name back into the transnational conversation, and sharing with his colleagues his overview of the newest research in his field of study.²⁰⁰ He published a well received literature review emphasizing once again the impact of Grellmann and Borrow but also of Pott and Miklosich, and newer names like the Greek doctor in Constantinople Alexandre Paspati and the Milanese Orientalist Graziadio Isaia Ascoli. Bataillard was sent copies of two German and a Portuguese book review and a private feedback by Miklosich from Vienna.²⁰¹

The 1870s were for Bataillard a highly productive decade in which he prepared his second major thesis with a new, original hypothesis on *gypsy* origin that would finally set him apart from his colleagues. He began with smaller articles for the BSAP that were beyond his core field of expertise, like an article about *gypsies* in Algeria²⁰² or on the Romani language.²⁰³ They show how far he had come as an authority in *gypsy* studies who could speak with self-confidence on interdisciplinary topics on the fringes of his own research. In 1875, he established his authority internationally with his first article in English and for a journal outside of France.²⁰⁴ In the British review journal *The Academy* Richard Burton, like Borrow an English traveller and writer, had recently claimed priority in identifying the *gypsies* with the Djatts of the banks of the Indus. Bataillard could not leave this claim without objection. In a direct response, he pointed out that Dutch Orientalist Michiel Johannes de Goeje, who had published his thesis in

¹⁹⁹ MCL, BC, boxes 1–60.

²⁰⁰ Paul Bataillard: Sur les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale, in: BSAP 7 (1872), pp. 706–711; id.: Deuxième Note sur les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale, in: BSAP 7 (1872), pp. 748–755; id.: Les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale, Paris 1872.

²⁰¹ MCL, BC, boxes 12, 51f.

²⁰² Bataillard: Recherches; Id.: Notes et Questions sur les Bohémiens en Algérie, Paris 1874.

²⁰³ Id.: Sur la Langue des Bohémiens, in: BSAP 9 (1874), pp. 128–138.

²⁰⁴ Id.: The Affinities of the Gypsies with the Jats, in: *The Academy*, 5/6/1875, pp. 583–585.

the same year and who had sent a copy of his publication to Bataillard²⁰⁵, had treated this question at length and had attributed the first idea of this identification to Pott in 1853. Bataillard then set forth his own claim to this discovery:

Allow me to claim a still earlier priority (dating from 1849) [...]. I have a right not to be completely forgotten, especially when it concerns an interesting point in the history of the Gipsies upon which I have hitherto published only some fragmentary works, but to the study of which I have devoted so many years.²⁰⁶

This short notice reveals three noteworthy aspects about Bataillard's position in the scientific community: Firstly, he was highly observant of the multinational research community and ready to shut down false claims being made. Secondly, he was confident about the value of his work as a young graduate student and his right 'not to be forgotten'. Finally, he alluded to the fact that so far, he had only published fragmentary parts of a larger research project still in the works.

In the same year, 1875, Bataillard explained in a BSAP-article in which direction this decade-long research had led him as he appealed to other scientists to join him on this path. For the first time he used the term "tsiganologue" (Gypsyologist)²⁰⁷, establishing *gypsy* studies as a new discipline in its own right. Such a Gypsyologist, he claimed, had to go beyond anthropology but must also know the archeology of the bronze age and certain periods of the iron age.²⁰⁸ While he had already spread doubt about the year of 1417 that Grellmann gave for the *gypsies*' arrival in Europe, he now went much further back in time and focused on Europe's prehistory.

The introduction explains this context²⁰⁹: He believed that Djatts and other Indian peoples have been transported in different periods from India to more western regions and finally, in 855, to the territory of the Byzantine Empire. This first part of his hypothesis goes along with the findings of Pott, Ascoli, Paspati, Miklosich, and de Goeje. However, unlike the others, Bataillard believed that in the Byzantine Empire they must have fused with the already pre-existing local *gypsy* peoples as it seemed unlikely that all the *gypsies* known in western Europe since the fifteenth century would have descended from a few thousand Djatts transported there in 855. He also claimed that the

²⁰⁵ MCL, BC, box 55. The original was written in Dutch and it was only ten years later that Bataillard had it translated into French: MCL, BC, box 32. In 1886, David MacRitchie, a British Gypsyologist, translated de Goeje's work into English.

²⁰⁶ Bataillard: *Affinities*, pp. 583f.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 550.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 556.

²⁰⁹ *Id.*: *État de la Question de l'Ancienneté des Tsiganes en Europe, pour servir d'Introduction à la Question de l'Importation du Bronze dans le Nord et l'Occident de l'Europe par les Tsiganes*, Paris 1877.

skills of working metal dated from remote antiquity, a theory based on archeological findings from the bronze age as well as historical interpretations of the texts of Herodotus and Homer. Not only would *gypsies* have already existed in Europe during the bronze age, Bataillard claimed, but they were also responsible for introducing the production of bronze metal into northern and western Europe during their many migrations until finally settling in the West in the fifteenth century. He thus rejected his earlier agreement with Pott, now arguing more with archeological references than with linguistic evidence. His full thesis, published a year later, in 1878, included many drawings of archeological artefacts of the bronze age.²¹⁰ While praised for his ambition and depth by his peers of the SAP who honored him by publishing it in the official series of theses by the SAP, his international colleagues reacted more reserved to his innovative origin theory.²¹¹

His late works in the 1880s until his death in 1894, consisted mainly of producing further evidence of his origin hypothesis and regional studies for Portugal and Spain as well as for Greece.²¹² His wife Charlotte Bataillard translated his four-part series of articles for the JGLS, in which he summarized his life-long research findings for the new international platform of *gypsy* studies.²¹³ He witnessed the preliminary demise of this promising institution due to financial constraints and was sent copies of the Viennese journal that wanted to take on their legacy.²¹⁴ Based on the articles he had prepared for the JGLS, he also published a French summary of his research.²¹⁵

This chronological overview of the evolution of Bataillard's research and publications may serve as an introduction to the following chapters discussing more in depth some selected highlights of his work before moving on to the analysis of his impact and

²¹⁰ Paul Bataillard: *Les Zlotars, dits aussi Dzvonkars, Tsiganes, Fondateurs en Bronze et en Laiton dans la Galicie Orientale et la Bukovine*, in: *Mémoires de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris* 2/1 (1878), pp. 499–566.

²¹¹ See also chapter 9.

²¹² Paul Bataillard: *Sur les anciens métallurges en Grèce*, Paris 1880; id.: *Les Gitanos d'Espagne et les Ciganos de Portugal, à propos de la Question de l'Importation des Métaux en Europe par les Tsiganes*, Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques. *Compte Rendu de la Neuvième Session à Lisbonne* 1880, Lisbonne 1884, pp. 483–518.

²¹³ Id.: *Beginning of the Immigration of the Gypsies into Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century*, in: *JGLS* 1 (1889), pp. 185–212, 260–286, 324–345; id.: *Beginning of the Immigration of the Gypsies into Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century*, in: *JGLS* 2 (1891), pp. 27–53.

²¹⁴ See also p. 21.

²¹⁵ Id.: *Les Débuts de l'Immigration des Tsiganes dans l'Europe Occidentale au Quinzième Siècle. Résumé suivi d'Explications Chronologiques*, in: *BSAP* 4/1 (1890), pp. 290–318; id.: *Les Débuts de l'Immigration des Tsiganes dans l'Europe Occidentale au Quinzième Siècle. Résumé suivi d'Explications Chronologiques*, Paris 1890.

legacy. The five decades of Bataillard's research show a remarkable passion and curiosity as driving forces, and a consistency in content coupled with a steady refinement in terms of time and space parameters.

6. Hypotheses on *gypsy* history and anthropology

6.1. Bataillard as an observer of *gypsy* depictions in French newspapers

The Bataillard Collection at Manchester contains numerous newspaper clippings from local, national, and even international newspapers which the Bataillards collected. While this chapter will focus on French journals only, it is noteworthy that the collection offers a unique insight into nineteenth century European reporting on *gypsies* in general. Two main periods of reporting can be differentiated: The late 1830s to early 1840s in local newspapers of the Pyrenees that were rather hostile towards *gypsies* and spiked Bataillard's interest, and the 1860s and 1870s in which nomadic bands of *gypsies* travelled through France attracting curious crowds of onlookers. It can be assumed that Bataillard was sent most of these articles by colleagues or was made aware of them by his dense network of correspondences. However, Bataillard was a journalist and editor himself²¹⁶, and most likely subscribed to many media outlets as well. Yet, this collection does not capture a systematic research of media coverage on *gypsies* in France but a special selection through the lens of an individual. The fact that Bataillard collected, archived, and sometimes annotated these clippings allows assumptions about the popular image of *gypsies* he was confronted with, his interest in studying them, and the ways he positioned himself in relation to these depictions. Special attention will thus be given to the vocabulary, motives, and narratives used in these articles as well as Bataillard's reactions to them. A closer look to the gendered aspects of *gypsy* imagery will follow in the next chapter.

The earliest note Bataillard left behind was written in reaction to a newspaper article from March 14, 1836²¹⁷, when he was only twenty years old. He expressed dismay over the fact that *gypsies* were expelled from a region in the Pyrenees and that there was no time left to intervene. Clearly emotionally committed, the young law student

²¹⁶ See also p. 27.

²¹⁷ MCL, BC, box 3. The article itself was not archived.

asked: “Have they found defenders?” (*Ont-ils trouvé des défenseurs?*).²¹⁸ Over the next few years he would follow the situation of the *gypsies* in the Pyrenees, travel there himself several times, and have the passionate letter he wrote to his professor with his research plan published in 1840.²¹⁹ In 1837, he read in the local newspaper *Mémorial des Pyrénées* that *gypsies* were neither Spanish nor French but had no homeland.²²⁰ The unknown author suggested that they were to be deported as they were “a foreign horde with neither faith nor law” (*une horde étrangère, n’ont ni foi ni loi*).²²¹ Under the same title an article was published the following year in the same newspaper continuing the motif of statelessness and reinforcing the call to action²²²: It claimed that *gypsy* traditions were “primitive” (*mœurs primitives*) and “the most backwards” (*traditions les plus reculées*); “a people without homeland in the center of civilisations” (*ce peuple sans patrie, au milieu des civilisations*).²²³ The *gypsy*, it added, and he alone, would remain immutable throughout time, always attached to their nature. “Their liberty is concerning and dangerous” (*leur liberté est inquiète et dangereuse*).²²⁴ The dichotomy of characteristics attributed to what was defined as *gypsy* and what was understood by ‘civilisation’ remained a recurring motif.²²⁵ Statelessness and freedom stood out as threatening, while ideologies of racialized nationalism were consolidating in Europe. It is noteworthy that even liberty as one of the main accomplishments of the French Revolution was cast here in negative terms, exposing its limitations. In addition, immutability and the connection to nature or an animalistic state was already suggested by Grellmann, legitimizing extreme measurements such as forced (re)education and residential schools in Grellmann’s case, or deportation from the Basque country as suggested here, half a century later. It seemed like action needed to be taken as ‘primitive’ traditions amongst ‘civilised’ nations were thought to be unacceptable and a voluntary adaptation to the nation state and European civilisation could not be expected. From this perspective, deportation did not seem out of proportion but a necessary, unavoidable measurement.

²¹⁸ MCL, BC, box 3.

²¹⁹ See also pp. 30f.

²²⁰ N.N.: Des Bohémiens du Pays Basque, in: *Mémorial des Pyrénées*, 14/10/1837, p. 3.

²²¹ *Ibid.*

²²² N.N.: Des Bohémiens du Pays Basque, in: *Mémorial des Pyrénées*, 27/03/1838, p. 3.

²²³ *Ibid.*

²²⁴ *Ibid.*

²²⁵ Cf. also Stitou: *Fascination*, p. 26.

However, the general public did not seem convinced and no such action was taken. In 1841, a more ‘enlightened’ approach, in accordance with Grellmann’s suggestions, was proposed in the *Mémorial des Pyrénées*²²⁶: “Correctional facilities” (*une maison de correction*) for *gypsies* under the age of sixteen should be provided. In a remarkably different tone the unknown author asked: “Does society not also have obligations towards these unfortunate beings?”²²⁷ Thus, there seemed to be no consensus on *gypsies* being these dangerous, unchangeable outsiders even among the contributors of this one newspaper. The premise of *gypsies* being more prone to criminal activities was still given, however, not explained by an unchangeable nature but by social factors of their upbringing. Society then had obligations towards its members, instead of towards a national ‘we’ against ‘them’, the others.

Only a few days later, this opinion, was shut down by the first named author in this series, the Vicomte de Belsunce, who even made it on the title page.²²⁸ He defended the idea of deportation as “the only measurement to rid us of this leprosy, this subject of terror”.²²⁹ This strong vocabulary was continued in his second article in the following year²³⁰: In his opinion, the *gypsy* was a “detrimental animal, doing bad by essence, by choice and need to do it”.²³¹ He also called them “corrupters of society” (*corrupteurs de la société*)²³², and he added the notion of a conspiracy theory: He claimed that *gypsies* were “spies” (*espions*), “secret agents” (*agents secrets*), and even recruited and armed by the police under the pretext of increasing the number of border patrol officers.²³³ This conspiracy theory of nomadic *gypsies* being spies for a foreign power, infiltrating western Europe, has a long tradition dating back to the sixteenth century when *gypsies* were accused of being spies for the Ottomans.²³⁴ De Belsunce also had more concrete plans for deportation as he suggested to transport *gypsies* to Algeria.²³⁵ In

²²⁶ N.N.: Des Bohémiens âgés de moins de seize ans, in: *Mémorial des Pyrénées*, 11/11/1841, pp. 2f.

²²⁷ Ibid.: “La société n’a-t-elle pas aussi de devoirs à remplir envers ces malheureux ?”

²²⁸ Vicomte de Belsunce: Sur les Bohémiens, in: *Mémorial des Pyrénées*, 18/11/1841, pp. 1f.

²²⁹ Ibid.: “le seul moyen de nous délivrer de cette lèpre, de ce sujet de terreur.”

²³⁰ Vicomte de Belsunce: Observations sur les Bohémiens, in: *Mémorial des Pyrénées*, 06/02/1842, pp. 1–3.

²³¹ Ibid., p. 1: “animal nuisible, faisant le mal par essence, par choix et besoin de le faire.”

²³² Ibid., p. 3.

²³³ Ibid., p. 1.

²³⁴ Cf. Sandra Klos: Narratives of Otherness. Debates on the Origins of Romani Peoples in the Fifteenth Century, in: *Beiträge zur Minderheitengeschichte* 1/2016, online: <<http://minorities.hypotheses.org/essays-und-reflexionen-zum-thema-minderheitengeschichte-und-buergerrechte>> [11/05/18].

²³⁵ Vicomte de Belsunce: Observations sur les Bohémiens, in: *Mémorial des Pyrénées*, 06/02/1842, p. 3.

obvious devaluation of Algeria as being unequal to the motherland of France, he could have been inspired by stories about British prison colonies.

Bataillard collected these articles even though he was hardly of the same opinion. His research plans published in 1840 in *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*²³⁶ suggest that he saw *gypsies* more as a *fascinosum* than as a *tremendum*. Instead of proposing re-education or deportation of *gypsies*, he wanted to know more about their 'secret life' and document their customs and traditions, implying cultural difference while not labelling them as 'backwards'. The fact that he collected these articles demonstrates his early interest as well as awareness of the topic and the spectrum of opinions on it. The synchronicity of this wide range of popular opinions also breaks up historiographical chronologies of Grellmann's 'era of enlightenment', followed by the nineteenth century as the 'age of romanticism'. Instead, these different perspectives on *gypsies* all coexisted parallel. The following articles of local accounts from the late 1860s and early 1870s suggest a prevalence of the less fearful and more curious and fascinated observers, but more hostile opinions could have nevertheless coexisted.

Bataillard collected several French newspaper articles from 1869 to 1873 signaling and documenting the presence of nomadic *gypsies* living in tents and carrying all their belongings in wagons.²³⁷ Sightings were especially numerous in the Lyon area and later in Paris. Events commonly followed a specific pattern: *Gypsies* settled outside of a French town attracting large crowds of curious residents. *Gypsy* men offered their skills in metal work, while women made a living from chiromancy and soothsaying. When there was no work to be done anymore, they packed up their belongings and disappeared. The descriptions of these tent settlements often included the words "picturesque" (*pittoresque*) and "spectacle".²³⁸ As Meyer explained in relation to art works of this epoch, artists used these occasions to stage the picturesque native country as the far Orient.²³⁹ One article claimed that more than half of the city went to this 'spectacle'.²⁴⁰ The reporters stressed that these were rare occasions, and one journalist even actively promoted going there: "Readers, go see the Gypsies at the fortifications of

²³⁶ See also pp. 30f.

²³⁷ For many of these articles full bibliographical information cannot be provided. Only dates were consistently recorded.

²³⁸ E.g. N.N., *Petit Journal*, 20/05/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8; N.N., *Le Courrier de Lyon*, 23/05/1869, p. 2, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²³⁹ Meyer: *Itinéraires*, p. 266.

²⁴⁰ N.N., 27/05/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8.

Villiers, it is a curious and original spectacle.”²⁴¹ Illustrated journals like *Le Monde Illustré* capture these encounters in drawings²⁴²: Inside the tent settlements a lively chaos is represented by many strange objects, animals, and barely clad children surrounding parents with costumes that clearly differentiate them from the curious Parisians. Outside a large crowd has gathered, trying to get a look behind the fences, and police securing and regulating the entrance to the tent city.

While these accounts are vastly different from those suggesting deportation, they have one important aspect in common: the emphasis of otherness. *Gypsies*, it seems, were universally seen as outsiders, representing a stark contrast to ‘civilisation’. In pictures this was shown through darker skin tones, different hairstyles, and dresses. The vocabulary used often included “savage” (*sauvage*)²⁴³, “half-savage” (*demi-sauvage*)²⁴⁴, “almost savage” (*presque sauvage*)²⁴⁵, “Oriental”²⁴⁶, “barbarians” (*barbares*)²⁴⁷, or “monkeys” (*singes*)²⁴⁸. Since hygiene and ‘purity’ were considered markers of ‘civilisation’, the “hideous dirtiness” (*saleté hideuse*)²⁴⁹ of *gypsies* was often stressed. These depictions were contrasted with what was considered ‘our civilisation’: “savages in the middle of our civilisation”²⁵⁰, “without letting themselves be tamed by our civilisation”²⁵¹, “give these barbarians an idea of our civilisation”²⁵², etc. Furthermore, the appearance of these *gypsy* bands was often described as an “invasion”.²⁵³ The synchronicity of contrasting descriptions like ‘rare spectacle’ and ‘invasion’, or ‘dirtiness’ and ‘picturesque’, shows the spectrum and volatility of popular opinions. People seemed to be interested as well as fearful. Fascination, therefore, is not the same as acceptance.

²⁴¹ N.N., *Le Petit Moniteur*, 27/09/1873, at MCL, BC, box 8: “Lecteurs, allez voir les Bohémiens aux fortifications de Villiers, c’est un spectacle curieux et original.”

²⁴² N.N.: Paris – Les Bohémiens nomades à la porte des Batignolles, in: *Le Monde Illustré*, 21/09/1872, p. 172, at MCL, BC, box 5.

²⁴³ N.N., *Phare*, 14/09/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10.

²⁴⁴ N.N., *Courrier de Lyon*, 07/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²⁴⁵ N.N., *Courrier de Lyon*, 23/05/1869, p. 2, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁷ N.N., *Courrier de Lyon*, 07/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8; N.N., *Journal des Débats*, 24/09/1873, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²⁴⁸ N.N., *Le Petit Moniteur*, 27/09/1873, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²⁴⁹ N.N., *Courrier de Lyon*, 07/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8; N.N., *Courrier de Lyon*, 23/05/1869, p. 2, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²⁵⁰ N.N., *Phare*, 14/09/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10: “des sauvages au milieu de notre civilisation”.

²⁵¹ N.N., *Phare*, 04/08/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10: “sans se laisser entamer par notre civilisation”.

²⁵² N.N., *Journal des Débats*, 24/09/1873, at MCL, BC, box 8: “donne ces barbares une idée de notre civilisation”

²⁵³ *Ibid.*

Bataillard's passion to research the 'secret life' of *gypsies* was certainly impacted by this zeitgeist of fascination with what he presumed to be a 'disappearing race'.²⁵⁴ His tone, however, is decidedly different and his personal judgements much more implicit. In 1871, he wrote his own newspaper article in the anti-bonapartist journal *La Cloche* about the appearance of *gypsies* in Paris.²⁵⁵ In a neutral tone he summed up his observations and conclusions from the last few years: For four or five years the *gypsies*, who he presumed to be Hungarian, had passed through western Europe, especially France. He had followed their journey through local newspapers and only lost track of them during the German occupation of Paris. His own excitement only shines through at the end when he described their long overdue meeting. The day before he wrote the article he "finally" (*enfin*) met them in person and found them to be "fine and charming men" (*des hommes superbes et charments*).²⁵⁶ The extraordinary nature of his writing only becomes apparent when compared to the other articles discussed before in this chapter. Two aspects stand out: Firstly, the lack of a dichotomy between civilisation and *gypsies*, and secondly, their presumed Hungarian nationality. The first aspect is hardly noticeable when reading the text on its own but "fine and charming men" could also be the description of English gentlemen and bears no resemblance to 'invading, strange foreigners' or 'savages in the middle of civilisation'. The second aspect will be discussed more in depth in chapter 6.4 on Bataillard's origin theories. For the moment, it shall only be noted with which self-evidence it is stated and at no point explained or justified that these strangers that have elsewhere been described as wanderers without homeland did in fact, according to Bataillard, have a homeland, i.e. Hungary, ergo a European homeland. It changes the narrative significantly when *gypsies* – despite still seen as racially different – are acknowledged to have European nationalities.

This chapter introduced Bataillard's writing style and theories by contrasting them with the material he himself collected and was exposed to. As shown, exposure to certain representations cannot be equalled with congruence of ideas. Yet, in his writings Bataillard addressed a similar readership and thus his theories would have been most easily adopted when compatible to already known representations. What has been excluded in this chapter is the gendered nature of almost every description of a group of people. The next chapter will thus further lead into Bataillard's writings, beginning

²⁵⁴ See also p. 73.

²⁵⁵ Paul Bataillard: Les Bohémiens Hongrois à Paris, in: *La Cloche*, 07/10/1871.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

once again with the archived material, while discussing ‘gender’ as an overarching analytical category of difference.

6.2. Gender as a category of difference in anthropological writings

The analysis in the previous chapter has largely excluded gender markers in order to give them more room for reflection here. In contrast to much of the scientific literature that focuses on either racial difference or gendered difference, it shall be acknowledged that depictions of people are rarely gender-neutral but commonly differentiated along a presumed gender binary. Feminist historiography has adopted the term ‘intersectionality’ – originally from the realm of jurisdiction by Kimberlé Crenshaw – to analyse how different categories of difference ‘intersect’ each other in descriptions of people’s identity.²⁵⁷ *Gypsy* men and women may have had some of the same racial features attributed to them (e.g. darker skin tone), but authors may evaluate some of these stereotypical attributions differently according to the ascribed gender: For example, while ‘liberty’ in *gypsy* men was often romanticised as an escape from the constraints of civilisation, ‘liberty’ in *gypsy* women could have sexualized overtones, associating them with early sexual maturity and sex work. The two presumed genders do not only have different ascribed sexualities but also age descriptions: On the one hand, *gypsy* men are generally described as strong and youthful. On the other hand, the old, often deemed ugly, fortune-telling *gypsy* woman is an important motif in descriptions and very much different from the young, beautiful, seductive, and sexually available *gypsy* girl. Depending on the situation, other categories of difference, such as class, religion, nationality, physical or mental ability, etc., may come into play (or ‘intersect’).

Scientific literature on racism in Europe identifies the human body as the fundamental locus of inscribing or materializing racialized, colonial, gendered, and classist practises of dominance.²⁵⁸ Eurocentric ideals of beauty and sexuality, for instance, exist as embodied experiences.²⁵⁹ The non-*white* female body is depicted as less ‘innocent’ or ‘pure’ as the *white* female body with its ascribed passive sexuality. The black male body, on the other hand, is believed to be sexually potent, healthy, physically strong,

²⁵⁷ Cf. Kimberlé Crenshaw: Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color, in: Stanford Law Review 43 (1991), pp. 1241–1299.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Anette Dietrich: Weiße Weiblichkeiten. Konstruktion von „Rasse“ und Geschlecht im deutschen Kolonialismus, Bielefeld 2007, p. 17.

²⁵⁹ Cf. George L. Mosse: Die Geschichte des Rassismus in Europa, Frankfurt am Main 1990, p. 36.

resilient, stoic, emotionless, and pain-resistant. Yet, the body of literature on racism often fails to address the exoticized and othered bodies within Europe, i.e. the experiences and images of racialized and gendered *gypsy* bodies.

Studies on gendered representations of *gypsies*, on the other hand, rarely take a historic dimension into consideration or present evidence through primary sources. Notable exceptions are the trailblazing monograph by Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon “The Destiny of Europe’s Gypsies”²⁶⁰ from 1972, a 2008 article by Ian Hancock on “The ‘Gypsy’ Stereotype and the Sexualization of Romani Women”²⁶¹, and a 2011 article on the representations of the “Bohémienne” by Emmanuelle Stitou.²⁶²

Firstly, Kenrick and Puxon name some of the stereotypes against *gypsy* women, before debunking them as myths. Historical examples are used to illustrate the long tradition of these stereotypes. For instance, they cite a German author at the beginning of the twentieth century claiming that “every brothel-queen in England was a Gypsy” and that ordinary people in Albania considered *gypsy* girls no better than sex workers.²⁶³ Furthermore, they claim that London sex workers during the nineteenth century dressed up as *gypsy* women to attract clients at Epsom during Derby week.²⁶⁴ They conclude that “from supposed unclean habits to dirty sex life is no step at all”.²⁶⁵ Citing a contemporary French survey, Kenrick and Puxon infer the popular belief that *gypsy* men have designs for non-*gypsy* women. Finally, without further reference they assert: “It is widely believed of course that Gypsies enjoy a better and fuller sex life. The Gajo mind alternates between the conviction that Gypsies are just loose in their morals and the suspicion that they enjoy a natural and spontaneous love-life.”²⁶⁶ Albeit only shortly discussed and lacking full contextualization, these remarks on the sexuality and sexualization of *gypsy* men and women, remain relevant until today as they are still understudied subject matters.

²⁶⁰ Donald Kenrick / Grattan Puxon: *The Destiny of Europe’s Gypsies* (The Columbus Centre Series), London 1972.

²⁶¹ Ian Hancock: “The ‘Gypsy’ Stereotype and the Sexualization of Romani Women”, in: “Gypsies” in European Literature and Culture. *Studies in European Culture and History*, ed. by Valentina Glajar and Domnica Radulescu, New York et. al. 2008, pp. 181–192.

²⁶² Stitou: *Fascination*.

²⁶³ Kenrick / Puxon: *Destiny*, p. 38.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

Secondly, Ian Hancock has developed a similar historical perspective on the sexualization of *gypsy* women. In his 2008 article, he cites for example George Borrow describing *gypsy* girls and women “exciting passion” in *white* men.²⁶⁷ He also reasserted the stereotype that *gypsy* men were consumed with lust for *white* women and cited amongst other sources the Moldavian Civil code.²⁶⁸ Like Kenrick and Puxon, Hancock intended to demonstrate the discrepancy between the historical misrepresentation of *gypsies* and actual Romani lives and experiences.

Finally, Stitou discusses newspaper articles and literary sources from the nineteenth century and concludes that the concept of identity through rejection of alterity was especially visible in the imagery on the “Bohémienne”.²⁶⁹ She considers gendered descriptions of beauty as well as debates on sex work related to *gypsy* women.

This chapter seeks to further develop the list of historical evidence on the motif of hyper-sexualization but also shortens the timeframe and minimizes the geographical context for a more in-depth analysis of gendered depictions. Attention will be paid to repeating patterns but also to contested views and ruptures in common narratives. How is the *gypsy* gender binary constructed in relation to their *white* counterpart? How are gendered depictions of non-*white* races employed to police the gender and sexuality of its presumed *white* audience? Popular representations of *gypsy* men and women on items from the Bataillard collection serve once again as a point of departure, before Bataillard’s own writings will be analyzed. This approach allows to firstly examine the representations he was exposed to and interested in, before analyzing how he chose to reproduce some of these depictions in relation to the ones he and his readership were familiar with.

The Bataillard Collection at Manchester contains many different medias of representation: an aquarelle poster, several photographs produced in different photographic techniques, engravings, pencil drawings, illustrations in newspapers, and descriptions in newspaper articles, plays, novels, travel reports, and scientific publications. It shows the wide-ranging interest of the Bataillards in their research subject but also their passion as collectors as well as their international connectedness to other researchers and travellers.

²⁶⁷ Hancock: “Gypsy” Stereotype, p. 181.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., pp. 184f.

²⁶⁹ Stitou: Fascination, p. 27.

The drawings, paintings, and engravings often feature *gypsy* women more prominently than men²⁷⁰, whereas the arranged photographed scenes depict both equally often. The collection includes many photos taken according to anthropometric standards – frontal and in profile.²⁷¹ Bataillard had them taken in 1865 of Manouch families that consented to pose for “anthropologic observations”. Paul Broca was also present at this photo shoot. The pictures were exhibited in 1878 as part of the anthropological section of the world exhibition in 1878. Women often had voluminous, open hair or braids, deep plunging necklines or exposed breasts, and were depicted surrounded by children, breastfeeding, smoking, or playing an instrument. Men were typically bearded, doing metal work, taking care of animals, or playing music. Women and men could have metal jewelry or accessories. Children were commonly naked or barely clad, and often appeared dirty and poor. Plays in the Bataillard collection include Victor Hugo’s “Notre-Dame de Paris” with its character of the beautiful and gifted, but poor and vulnerable Esmeralda.²⁷² The beautiful and seductively dancing Carmen by Mérimée was likewise a well-known figure.

Popular opinions in newspaper articles, however, are more divided on the question of gender and beauty. While some authors reinforce the visual representations of the beautiful female *gypsy*, most articles agree on a reversal of male and female beauty among *gypsies*: “the beautiful sex is of undisputable ugliness, whereas the strong sex is of rare beauty of character”²⁷³; “the women are for the most part less beautiful than the men, and they smoke like men”²⁷⁴; “the women are mostly ugly”.²⁷⁵ When female beauty is mentioned, it most often refers to young girls with their ‘exotic’ or ‘Oriental’ beauty. In one instance, the advances of a *white* male sexual predator were revealingly downplayed as an amusing anecdote: “An Ionstic from Oullins was trying to catch an indiscrete glimpse at the sleeping place of the Gypsy women by lifting up a side of the tent that served as bower for these black beauties.” It was then reported that “the unlucky indiscrete man” (*le malheureux indiscret*) was escorted out by the “exotic tribe”

²⁷⁰ MCL, BC, boxes 4f., 57–60.

²⁷¹ Cf. Meyer: Exercices.

²⁷² MCL, BC, box 44.

²⁷³ N.N., *Courrier de Lyon*, 07/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8: “le beau sexe est d’une laideur incontestable, le beau sexe d’une rare beauté de caractère”.

²⁷⁴ N.N., 11/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10: “les femmes sont pour la plupart, moins belles que les hommes, fument comme les hommes”.

²⁷⁵ N.N., *Phare*, 04/08/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10: “les femmes sont plutôt laides”.

(*tribu exotique*).²⁷⁶ The author then continued telling that he was lucky enough to participate at a wedding ceremony between a gypsy man and a twelve- or thirteen-year-old gypsy girl. He described the ceremony as of “antique or animalistic simplicity, capable of arousing passion in both, liberal-minded as well as hyper-civilized spouses”.²⁷⁷ This episode shows that ‘beauty’ was not only a subjective feeling of esthetics but referred also to a sense of morality. The aforementioned examples praising male beauty and pointing out female ugliness did not necessarily refer to outward appearance but could also comment on morality and values. In male gypsies the “beauty of character” (*beauté de caractère*)²⁷⁸ their “male and proud expression” (*expression mâle et fière*)²⁷⁹ and their “half-savage energy” (*énergie demi-sauvage*)²⁸⁰ was valued. In these same articles, female gypsies were criticized for smoking and for their presumed sexual liberty, coded as ugliness. Other authors, like the Vicomte de Belsunce, were less implicit and openly called out gypsies for having brought sex work to ‘our civilisation’: He claimed that gypsy girls “left the church for an immediate prostitution” (*quittent l’église pour une prostitution immédiate*)²⁸¹, that sex work was “an anomaly in our civilisation” (*une anomalie dans notre civilisation*)²⁸², that public morality was endangered, and that the streets of Paris needed to be “purified” (*purifié*).²⁸³ Beauty and ugliness thus can be read as evaluations of morality. Those authors, on the other hand, that seemed to believe that there was nothing to object about seeking after ‘black beauties’ (even without their consent) and that admired their ‘animalistic’ wedding ceremonies in a ‘hyper-civilized’ world, accordingly praised gypsy women’s beauty.

Both sides, the one criticizing the presumed decline of public morality and the one that believed itself to be more ‘liberal-minded’, have one thing in common: Both hypersexualize gypsy women and associate them with sex work. Travellers’ accounts like the one by Borrow²⁸⁴ or scientific publications reinforced this stereotype. Stitou’s study shows that there were also depictions of ‘virtuous’, ‘chaste’ gypsy girls and women, but

²⁷⁶ N.N., Phare, 04/08/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10.

²⁷⁷ N.N., Courrier de Lyon, 23/05/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8: “d’une simplicité antique... ou animale, capable de faire envie à des époux libre-penseurs et ultra-civilisés”.

²⁷⁸ N.N., Courrier de Lyon, 07/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 8.

²⁷⁹ N.N., 11/07/1869, at MCL, BC, box 10.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Vicomte de Belsunce: Sur les Bohémiens, in: Mémorial des Pyrénées, 18/11/1841, p. 2.

²⁸² Id.: Observations sur les Bohémiens, in: Mémorial des Pyrénées, 06/02/1842, p. 3.

²⁸³ Ibid.

²⁸⁴ See also p. 44.

they were comparatively rare.²⁸⁵ One of Bataillard's Austro-Hungarian contemporaries, the historian Johann Heinrich Schwicker²⁸⁶, for instance, published in 1883 an extensive ethnographical description of *gypsy* women and men, quoting Pott, de Goeje, and Miklosich. Several times Schwicker claimed *gypsy* girls worked as sex workers in brothels run by their very own mothers.²⁸⁷ The young girls, he asserted, led on *white* men fully conscious of their undeniable beauty.²⁸⁸ However, their beauty decayed fast and an old *gypsy* woman was to Schwicker the prototype of ugliness.²⁸⁹ The connection to morality becomes obvious when he added that they even preformed abortions.²⁹⁰ It is noteworthy that *gypsy* men remain handsome during their lifetime in Schwicker's description: They were depicted as tall, well-proportioned, and muscular.²⁹¹ "Disfiguring corpulence" (*entstellende Corpulenz*)²⁹² was rare, according to Schwicker. Even young boys and old men could endure heat and cold and could run barefoot across ice and snow.²⁹³ Good health and features associated with manliness were thus admired in men, while presumed loose morals – even when *white* men were profiting from these – were punished. Historiography has, for obvious reasons, long compared the fate of *gypsies* with those of Jews. Yet, the gendered representations of *gypsies* during the nineteenth century are less similar to the stereotype of the 'over-civilized, degenerating, emasculated Jew', rather than the 'black, primitive, potent, non-European savage'.²⁹⁴

After this short summary of the wider European context, it is time to take a closer look at Bataillard's writings and analyse how he positioned himself in relation to these discourses. From the first outline of his research objective in 1840, Bataillard clarified that it was not his expertise to write another book about the *gypsies*' language or their history, but that he was interested in meeting them and ethnologically studying their "secret life" (*vie intime*), their relationships amongst each other, their marriage customs

²⁸⁵ Stitou: Fascination, p. 28.

²⁸⁶ Cf. N.N.: Schwicker, Johann Heinrich, online: <<http://kulturportal-west-ost.eu/biographien/schwicker-johann-heinrich-2>> [12/04/18].

²⁸⁷ Johann Heinrich Schwicker: Die Zigeuner in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen, Wien / Teschen 1883, pp. 28f., 141f.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 108.

²⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 106.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 127.

²⁹¹ Ibid., p. 104.

²⁹² Ibid., p. 105.

²⁹³ Ibid., pp. 49, 109.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Neil MacMaster: Racism in Europe 1870–2000 (European Culture and Society, vol. 2), Houndmills et al. 2001, p. 11.

and more.²⁹⁵ It could thus be expected that he would comment on gendered relationships among *gypsies* as he observed them. He also already presented some of the hypotheses and research questions he was interested in: “Suicide and infanticide are unknown among Gypsies. They thus love life in the manner of an animal that had never had the idea of suicide.”²⁹⁶ He believed both genders to be generally strong and rarely sick.²⁹⁷ While this is not a direct comment on gender, it does refer to the idea of civilization and modernity. Suicide, infanticide, mental illnesses, degeneration, and weakness were generally believed to be symptoms of an overly civilized, modern world that especially threatened masculinity. The stereotype of the ‘noble savage’ was a typical idealization of non-European lifestyles that were yet untouched by these threats to modern manhood. Similarly, myths about antiquity with its Spartans and athletic Olympians were widely popular in the nineteenth century. Remote utopias were a form of escapism from modernity. Since *gypsies* were seen as ‘the outsider within’ or ‘the savage in between civilizations’, these forms of romanticism applied to them as well.

After he met a group of *gypsies* in Paris in 1871, he affirmed that it was important to profit from the possibility to study “these exotic Gypsies” (*ces Bohémiens exotiques*) in the civilized world.²⁹⁸ He confirmed that despite their presence in Europe they have maintained their authenticity or “purity of race” (*pureté de la race*).²⁹⁹ He then described the encounter of a gypsy man that “gave [him] the vision of a barbarian from heroic ages”.³⁰⁰ He hence evoked a scene from the mystified antiquities to reinforce the idea of a different world within modern Europe. It is not by coincidence that this otherworldliness is characterized by an idealized image of masculinity. He even said that they were recognizable as *gypsies* because of “their beautiful traits” (*leurs beaux traits*).³⁰¹ As a sign of their uncivilized liberty, he also mentioned their long, open hair.³⁰² By the women of this group he was visibly less impressed: He described them as less intelligent, child-like and gave them only very little money while saving the greater part for the men.³⁰³ The observation reveals more about the observer than about

²⁹⁵ Paul Bataillard: Les Bohémiens, in: *L’Observateur des Pyrénées*, 26/07/1840, p. 1–3.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁹⁷ Paul Bataillard: Les Bohémiens, in: *L’Observateur des Pyrénées*, 26/07/1840, p. 3.

²⁹⁸ Id.: Les Bohémiens Hongrois à Paris, in: *BSAP* 2/6 (1871), p. 217.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

³⁰² *Ibid.*

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

the observed. On a discursive level, it can be assumed that there is a reason why Bataillard perceived, remembered, wrote down, and finally published his observation of long, open hair and unintelligent women. It is possible that describing hair styles was part of his anthropological approach, or that men wearing long, open hair stood out against Bataillard's own idea of a 'normal', i.e. *white*, middle class, Parisian, 'civilized' hair-style for men. Thus, this viewpoint aims less at reconstructing lived Romani experiences, but a specific 'situated'³⁰⁴ knowledge – in this case of masculinity and femininity.

This layer of beliefs and conceptions that informed Bataillard's perceptions, becomes even more apparent in 1842, when he commented in a literary review journal on the difference between fiction and 'scientific truth' on *gypsy* girls.³⁰⁵ His article responded to a short story, published four years prior in a monthly literature journal about an event that allegedly took place at the beginning of the century.³⁰⁶ This story by Prosper Barousse was illustrated with two engravings, depicting firstly, a woman clad in modest, white dress, surrounded by onlookers, and secondly, a group of people sitting around a fireplace, with a female figure on the left standing out whilst tending her long, black hair.³⁰⁷ Barousse retold the story of a girl, labelled 'Bohémienne', who remained virtuous and chaste despite manifold advances made onto her. Bataillard presented a critique of this tale that he wished would serve as a model for similar framings of fictional characters, such as Hugo's Esméralda.³⁰⁸ He intended to contrast such fiction with historical and ethnographical 'truth', referencing amongst others his own observations from his visit of Pau or the Basque country.³⁰⁹ His main objection was the girl's chastity: "The primordial and general character of the Gypsy race is the absence of any morality, and especially of any sensual morality."³¹⁰ He referenced Grellmann to support his statement. Even the most 'civilized' of gypsies would still engage in the trade of sex work after their "social conversion" (*conversion sociale*).³¹¹ He blamed "a

³⁰⁴ See also p. 11.

³⁰⁵ Paul Bataillard: *Essai sur les Bohémiens. À propos d'une nouvelle*, in: *Bulletin de la Société des Sciences, Lettres et Art de Pau* (1842), pp. 87–109.

³⁰⁶ Prosper Barousse: *Une Tribu des Bohémiens*, in: *Mosaïque du Midi* (1838), pp. 64–70.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 67. The second image is subtitled "Caverne de Bohémiens".

³⁰⁸ Bataillard: *Essai*, p. 93.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 95f.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 96: "Le caractère primordial et général de la race Bohémienne est l'absence de toute moralité, et surtout de toute moralité sensuelle".

³¹¹ *Ibid.*

particular need of the blood” (*un besoin particulier du sang*).³¹² To further dispel any notion of morality, he asserted: “[T]he women are at the disposition of whoever has himself welcomed by them or pays them.”³¹³ Their own parents and sometimes even a husband for his wife allegedly served as facilitators. “In one word, it is to be considered impossible to find in the Basque country a virgin of fifteen years.”³¹⁴ Bataillard also had some additional objections about another one of Barousse’s depictions: A typical ugliness of *gypsy* men and women, was contrary to the impression he retained.³¹⁵ He conceded, however, that their beauty indeed decayed fast.³¹⁶ While Bataillard disagreed with Grellmann and Borrow at another point, he seemed to emphatically agree with them on the aspect of sex work. Not by need or social circumstances, but decidedly by racial inscription into their ‘blood’, *gypsy* girls would engage in sex work, while the whole family was complicit. Different consequences are imaginable: no civilizing effort could change this ‘law of nature’; the morality of the clients remained unquestioned; Bataillard’s standpoint as an academic cemented a literary trope as a scientific fact; and finally, since financial compensation was deemed optional and only an invitation by a naturally lustful female was necessary, consent could easily be undermined.

This early, not widely known article from 1842, was not the only time Bataillard discussed sex work in relation to *gypsy* women. In 1873, he reinforced his ideas in an article for the BSAP on *gypsies* in Algeria.³¹⁷ *Gypsy* men, Bataillard claimed, were rarely to be seen.³¹⁸ Women, on the other hand, fell in three typical age groups: older women scrying³¹⁹, adult women caring for children³²⁰, and young girls doing sex work – or in Bataillard’s terms “satisfy the desires of men and especially of French soldiers”.³²¹ His neutral, factual tone does not reveal any moral judgement of the sex workers nor of the clients, but he did add that this work was only a temporary part of the

³¹² Bataillard: Essai, p. 96.

³¹³ Ibid.: “les femmes sont à la disposition de quiconque sait se faire bien venir d’elles ou les payer”.

³¹⁴ Bataillard: Essai, p. 96: “En un mot, on regarde comme impossible de trouver parmi les Bohémiens du pays Basque une vierge de quinze ans”.

³¹⁵ Ibid., p. 97.

³¹⁶ Ibid., p. 98.

³¹⁷ Id.: Recherches. The first footnote on page 690 explains that Bataillard’s information for this article came from French citizens that have lived in Algeria.

³¹⁸ Ibid., p. 694.

³¹⁹ Ibid., p. 693.

³²⁰ Ibid., p. 694.

³²¹ Ibid., p. 695: “pour satisfaire les désirs des hommes et surtout des militaires français”.

girls' lives and that after their marriage they would lead the lives of loyal spouses.³²² It is noteworthy that Bataillard, who had never been in Algeria himself, believed it to be true or at least plausible and publishable for Algerian *gypsies* to engage in sex work. Bataillard's close friend, Eugène Fromentin, however, was an Orientalist and visited Algeria three times.³²³ Referencing a friend's travel stories was not the high standard of methodology that Bataillard usually adhered to.³²⁴ Furthermore, the French conceptualization of Algeria as an Oriental space must be considered. What he believed to be a fact for Basque *gypsies* was even more plausible in an Oriental, colonial setting.

With these gendered codes in mind, comments on masculinity and femininity become visible, even when gender is not mentioned explicitly: In the "Paris-Guide" Bataillard praised features associated with masculinity, such as enduring extreme weather conditions and climates, and pointed out flaws of traditional femininity, such as loose morals and a lack of religiosity.³²⁵

Bataillard did not emphasise gendered difference as much as many of his contemporaries did but he still reproduced some common motifs. As chapter 6.4 will show, the theory Bataillard developed in his later years of the antiquity of the *gypsy* race was partly based on his identification of ancient Greek sibyls with *gypsy* women: A contemporary gendered occupation, soothsaying, was racialized and thus remained an immutable characteristic of *gypsies* throughout the ages by which they could be identified and equalled with the mythical Greek prophets. Finally, Bataillard also claimed that a contemporary occupation of *gypsy* men, metal work, could be seen as proof for them being a Neolithic race introducing bronze to western and northern Europe. The process of racialization of social circumstances was a common practice in nineteenth century anthropology. Some of these gendered and racialized stereotypes were accepted as scientific truths and self-fulfilling prophecies: For example, the idea of the beautiful, sensual, seductive young *gypsy* girl became a popular motif in literature and art with which Romani girls actively played.³²⁶ It manifested, however, also the idea of *gypsies* having loose sexual morals by virtue of their ethnicity and gender. An intersectional approach

³²² Bataillard: *Recherches*, p. 695.

³²³ Wright: *Correspondance*, p. 13.

³²⁴ See also chapter 7.

³²⁵ See also p. 54.

³²⁶ Cf. Ionela Padure: *Le Regard d'une Romni sur quelques Photographies*, in: *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, ed. by Ilse About / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre, Arles 2018, pp. 161–163.

to anthropological writings about *gypsies* is therefore necessary to analyse ‘interlocking systems of oppression’.³²⁷

Gendered difference is one element of Bataillard’s theses that ought not to be forgotten when using his writings as sources for Romani histories; as the next chapter will demonstrate, racial difference is another.

6.3. Threatened ‘racial purity’

Bataillard and his contemporaries were very much concerned with concepts of ‘races’, ‘racial purity’, and ‘authentic’ lifestyles. Models of racial difference formed against the backdrop of non-European ethnology impacted the way Bataillard imagined the community of *gypsies* and conceptualized them as a ‘race’. Whether or not an individual was seen as part of a race, was not dependent on self-definition, but on a list of characteristics that included outward appearance and lifestyle. Racial status was solely passed on through birth and could not be changed during one’s lifetime. These premises must be kept in mind when discussing “*gypsies*”; read: people defined as being part of an imagined ‘gypsy race’ defined by a set of specific characteristics. People that Bataillard addressed as “Tsiganes” or “Bohémiens” – here paraphrased as *gypsies* – are thus not to be confused with Romanies. He defined people as *gypsies* according to his own concept of race and characteristics that he attributed to ‘being gypsy’. Thus, it is worth exploring, what these definitions were. However, they can only be inferred implicitly as they were never made explicit but believed to be clear and understood by everyone. Furthermore, About insisted that these nineteenth century racial ideologies are not to be equalled to twentieth century racial anthropology or reduced to being its predecessor.³²⁸ For Bogdal, the nineteenth century *gypsy* studies were “ethnic cleansing in the minds and the prelude to real persecutions and expulsions”.³²⁹ According to About, however, Bataillard’s case allows a more nuanced approach to nineteenth century science and the plurality of opinions and tensions within the scientific community.

The anthropologists of the SAP were chiefly concerned with the major taxonomic divisions of mankind.³³⁰ After Cuvier and Blumenbach summed up all *white* people in

³²⁷ Cf. Patricia Hill Collins: *Black Feminist Thought. Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, Boston 1990, p. 221.

³²⁸ About: *Société*.

³²⁹ Bogdal: *Europa*, p. 271: “ethnische Säuberung in den Köpfen und das Vorspiel wirklicher Verfolgungen und Vertreibungen”.

³³⁰ See also chapter 4.2.

one entity, the Caucasian type, the number and differences between all non-*white* peoples were heatedly debated. One central characteristic of races as they were imagined was their essential inalterability. This imposed a major problem on ethnology to define them once and for all. The SAP's introduction of statistical notations as well as the use of anthropometric and craniological measurements is evidence of this problematic.

Bataillard's own interest in these taxonomies can be seen in his involvement with the Godard award commission that honored René Verneau for his research about the different pelvis forms of the human races.³³¹ In addition, Bataillard's correspondence with Isidore Kopernicki and the use of Kopernicki's craniological measurements of *gypsy* skulls in Bataillard's own research and publications alludes to his belief in these sciences.³³² Since his first thesis in 1844, long before he joined the SAP, he conceptualized *gypsies* in racial terms, using denominators such as "this race" (*cette race*) or "a Gypsy race" (*une race bohémienne*).³³³ In 1872, the influence of the SAP becomes apparent when he also included terminologies such as "aryans" (*Aryens*), "negros" (*Nègres*), and "Caucasian type" (*type caucasique*).³³⁴

What characterizes 'the Gypsy race' then? Bataillard himself often claimed that *gypsies* were a unique population that would stand out in Europe.³³⁵ It should therefore be easy to distinguish them from others. Nevertheless, in all his publications, spanning over five decades, a definition or even full description of this alleged race cannot be found. A fact that becomes even more interesting when taking into consideration that he did not only identify a person standing in front of him as *gypsy* but also people in historical texts dating as far back as Herodotus and Homer.³³⁶ He never published the major ethnological thesis on *gypsies* that he had announced to be working on in 1840.³³⁷ Instead he admitted in 1872 "the difficulty to distinguish them [the *gypsies*, author's note] clearly amongst so many nomadic races that resemble them in skin tone, lifestyle, etc."³³⁸ Thus, he had certain characteristics in mind to identify *gypsies* but they remained implicit not only because he believed them to be obvious to the reader but also

³³¹ See also p. 22.

³³² See also p. 64.

³³³ Bataillard: *De l'Apparition*, pp. 9, 11.

³³⁴ Id.: *Derniers Travaux*, p. 17.

³³⁵ E.g. id.: *État de la Question*, p. 62.

³³⁶ See also p. 61.

³³⁷ See also pp. 30f.

³³⁸ Bataillard: *Derniers Travaux*, p. 1.

because he had to admit that they were not definite. This problem encapsulates the wider problematic of the raciological sciences of defining races and their differences. While a full description is missing, hints about Bataillard's imagination of 'the Gypsy race' can be pieced together. In the aforementioned quote, he referred to nomadism, a certain skin tone and a certain lifestyle. As for their lifestyle, Bataillard seemed to have believed that three main occupations characterized their race: metal work, fortune-telling, and music.³³⁹ He elaborated on their alleged character traits in the "Paris-Guide":

Beautiful race, strong and fine, very weather-resistant, can adapt to all climates, very sharp, very artistic, gifted with an extraordinary musical sense, less capable, I admit, in moral and religious matters, still very apt in affectionate and grateful sentiments, and of generous vigor; thus, having savage virtues and a particular spirit which explain on their own their incredible persistence.³⁴⁰

This depiction is extraordinarily positive compared to the descriptions some of his contemporaries offered.³⁴¹ As for the outward appearance, the example of a girl who Kopernicki in a quote by Bataillard described as a "true Gypsy" was typical: "A sixteen to eighteen-year-old girl, pretty brunette, true Gypsy; skin perfectly brown, hair and eyes black."³⁴² In the "Paris-Guide" Bataillard reinforced this depiction in his own words: Gypsies "form a distinct race, strongly characterized by their Oriental type and their copper skin tone".³⁴³ He continued describing the skin tone as the one of "mulattos" (*mulâtres*) that made him feel like standing amidst a Hindu tribe.³⁴⁴ After a lecture on 'Hungarian' *gypsies* in the SAP session on October 5, 1871, Bataillard answered a question by Émile Duhousset about *gypsy* hairstyles with the following statement: "The Gypsies, recognizable first and foremost by their skin tone that is often as dark as the one of mulattos, by their extremely black eyes and hair, and by their beautiful

³³⁹ Bataillard: *Sur les Origines*, p. 548.

³⁴⁰ Id.: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, pp. 1108f.: "Belle race, forte et fine, très-résistante aux intempéries, s'accommodant de tous les climats, très déliée d'esprit, très-artiste, pourvue d'un sens musical extraordinaire, moins bien douée, j'en conviens, sous le rapport moral et religieux, très-capable pourtant de sentiments affectueux et reconnaissants, et d'élans généreux ; ayant en somme des vertus sauvages et un génie particulier qui expliquent seuls sa persistance inouïe".

³⁴¹ See also chapter 6.1.

³⁴² Id.: *Les Zlotars*, p. 514: "Une fille de seize à dix-huit ans, jolie brunette, véritable Tsigane ; peau parfaitement brune, cheveux et yeux noirs."

³⁴³ Id.: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, p. 1108: "forment une race à part, fortement caractérisée par son type oriental et son teint cuivré".

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1116.

accentuated traits, often wear their hair looking creped.”³⁴⁵ Even more to the point was Bataillard’s emphatic reaction to the girl in Barousse’s story supposedly having *white* legs: “[T]his is no Gypsy anymore.”³⁴⁶

There was another problem in defining *gypsies*, besides the lack of distinguishable features compared to other darker skinned nomadic populations: the lack of similar features in comparison with one another. Racial definitions require not only difference towards the outside but also coherence within a group. Bataillard who studied gypsies extensively, soon had to realize that the people he believed to be one entity, differentiated various groups amongst themselves and he marked this difference by recording various ethnonyms. In his collection, there is a stack of cue cards where he wrote down all the different names he found to describe *gypsies* – by themselves or others.³⁴⁷ Some of them are still used today, some of them are probably erroneous, while others have simply disappeared. His efforts to organize them by region remained an unfinished project. He discussed them in numerous publications³⁴⁸ but never went as far as doubting the overarching unity of the one ‘Gypsy race’. The “Paris-Guide”-article included his most differentiated account of named Manouch individuals and their family relations.³⁴⁹ In close contact with these individuals and their histories, he was most cautious with generalisations. He called the different ethnic subgroups “more or less distinct societies”.³⁵⁰ In his later theses on origins and migrations, he was less accurate in differentiating these but also considered multiple origins and migration patterns.³⁵¹

As ambiguous as the racial description of *gypsies* remained – needless to say that even the craniological measurements did not deliver definite results – Bataillard was sure that the ‘purity’ of the race was threatened. This obsession with “racial purity” (*pureté de la race*)³⁵² and the fear of diluting it by inter-racial sexual relationships, was a common concern of his times. On the one hand, it was claimed that races are inalterable and have stayed the same for thousands of years. On the other hand, the globalized,

³⁴⁵ Bataillard: *Sur des Bohémiens*, pp. 223f.: “Les bohémiens, surtout reconnaissables à leur teint souvent aussi foncé que celui des mulâtres, à leurs cheveux extrêmement noirs, à leurs beaux traits accentués, ont souvent les cheveux d’aspect crêpé”.

³⁴⁶ Id.: *Essai*, p. 97: “ce n’est plus une Bohémienne.”

³⁴⁷ MCL, BC, box 3.

³⁴⁸ Bataillard: *Derniers Travaux*, pp. 10f.; Id.: *Recherches à faire*, p. 698; Id.: *Les Zlotars*, p. 516.

³⁴⁹ Id.: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*. Cf. also *About: Sociétés*.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1107: “sociétés plus ou moins distinctes”.

³⁵¹ See also chapter 6.4.

³⁵² Bataillard: *Sur des Bohémiens*, p. 217.

modern world seemed to impose a unique threat to the presumed ‘natural’ order of races. The ‘civilized’ races were afraid of ‘degenerating’ and losing their alleged superior status, whereas Bataillard was more concerned about the ‘racial purity’ of *gypsies*. The ‘Hungarian’ *gypsies* he met in Paris in 1871 were according to Bataillard of the *Caldevari* tribe who he found particularly interesting concerning their ‘racial purity’: He claimed that they had remained more or less the same since prehistoric ages.³⁵³ A year later, however, Bataillard made a general claim about the antique race of *gypsies* that contradicted his former statement to some extent: In late antiquity – much like in modernity – the *gypsy* race had probably “mixed” (*mélangé*) with other races (from India), introducing a new language (the Sanskrit variation), new anthropological features (their darker skin tone) and “a foreign blood” (*un sang étranger*).³⁵⁴ The notion of a threat imposed by modernity similar to this alleged turning point in late antiquity, casted *gypsies* as a ‘disappearing race’, a motif that was an important legitimization of Bataillard’s work.³⁵⁵ His concerns were best expressed in the “Paris-Guide”: He claimed that in France, the remaining *gypsies* “have lost their character” and that it was certain that “civilization has gradually tamed them”.³⁵⁶ A *gypsy* “of rather pure blood” (*de sang assez pur*)³⁵⁷ could hardly be recognized as such anymore when met on the streets of Paris, because his style has adapted so much to modernity. Nevertheless, he claimed, these were only exterior changes “precisely in order to hide a character that has stayed the same.”³⁵⁸ He quickly added: “Hereby, I do not want to say that the *Gypsies* are uncivilizable, as it has been inhumanly pretended elsewhere”.³⁵⁹ This was a clear reference to Grellmann and his successors. It also encapsulates his dilemma between raising concerns about *gypsies* losing their character and claiming that their character essentially always remains the same. The raciological dictum of the inalterability of the races denies both civilizing progress and the fear of modern degeneration. Civilisation and modernity thus need to be conceptualized as something entirely new in human history, forces that can even change what seemed unchangeable before. This

³⁵³ Bataillard: *Sur des Bohémiens*, p. 217.

³⁵⁴ Bataillard: *Derniers Travaux*, pp. 20f.

³⁵⁵ See also p. 73.

³⁵⁶ Bataillard: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, p. 1109: “[E]n France les Bohémiens ont perdu leur caractère. Il est certain que la civilisation les entame peu à peu”.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*: “pour déguiser précisément un caractère qui reste le même”.

³⁵⁹ *Ibid.*: “Je ne veux pas dire par là que les Bohémiens soient incivilisables, comme on l’a d’autre part prétendu très-inhumainement”.

change appears as a double-edged sword: It ‘tames’ the ‘savage’, making him less frightening and justifying his place in France. Yet, it also erases all differences to whiteness that made ‘the savage’ inferior and fascinating to the *white* anthropologist. The Grellmannian idea that *gypsies* are unchangeable is even declared ‘inhuman’ by Bataillard. Yet, it was also him who needed the premise of inalterability to use present day *gypsy* occupations (metal work, soothsaying) and characteristics as evidence for the identification of *gypsies* in antiquity (prophetesses) and the bronze age (braziers).³⁶⁰

Many historians have criticized that these nineteenth century notions of ‘racial purity’ and ‘authentic lifestyles’ have not been sufficiently historicized and would continue to inform the Romani identity as one distinct entity. Inspired by a postmodern concept of culture and ethnicity, authors like Willems, Lucassen, Fraser, Myall, Hancock, Acton, Liégeois, or About reject the idea of a homogenous Romani identity. Lucassen criticized German historiography for implying the unchangeability of Romanies since their alleged emigration from India.³⁶¹ Similarly, and in reference to Willems and Lucassen, Myall deconstructed the idea of “real Gypsies” or “true-blood Gypsies”.³⁶² French civil rights activist and sociologist Liégeois insisted on the plurality of communities and preferred the term “populations called gypsies” (*populations dites tsiganes*).³⁶³ Similarly, About promoted historical and anthropological studies that do not characterize Romani worlds as homogeneous, immutable, and fundamentally opposed to non-Romani worlds, but instead as interactive, dynamic and changeable.³⁶⁴ Acton finally pointed out the role of the GLS in forging and popularizing these ideas of authentic lifestyles, racial features, and pure-bloodedness.³⁶⁵ Poignantly he declared: “The idea that the whole population wandered round in tribes strictly segregated by the proportion of Romani descent was always a racist fantasy”³⁶⁶ – notably, a fantasy that could seduce even Romanies themselves.³⁶⁷ He held the institution accountable for not having acknowledged their wrongs nor essentially changed their positions. Gendered and racial categories of difference and their contemporary, sometimes conflicting

³⁶⁰ See also p. 61.

³⁶¹ Lucassen: *Zigeuner*, p. 13.

³⁶² Myall: *Gypsy Identities*, p. 5.

³⁶³ Liégeois: *Tsiganes*, p. 10.

³⁶⁴ About: *Société*.

³⁶⁵ Acton: *Scientific Racism*, p. 1187.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1196.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1198; cf. also Nicolae Gheorghe: *Roma-Gypsy Ethnicity in Eastern Europe*, in: *Social Research* 58/4 (1991), pp. 829–844.

definitions are therefore key factors to keep in mind and openly discuss when using historical sources, such as Bataillard's records, to write about Romani histories and experiences. However, these intersecting categories must be analysed as being specific to their own epoch and not loaded with inferences of later events and mentalities. They were more than a mere 'prelude' to the twentieth century genocide as Bogdal indicated.³⁶⁸ Definitions of race or gender are never singular but always dynamic and constructed in relation and sometimes in conflict with other definitions that existed simultaneously. They must therefore always be assessed as specific to every period, source, author, and context.

While the previous chapters in this section have discussed more general tropes of representation, the final aspect that remains to discuss as far as content is concerned, is specific to Bataillard's worldview and beliefs about *gypsies*: the question of their foreignness or Europeanness.

6.4. A new theory on *gypsy* origin

Bataillard was internationally most known for his works of 1844 and 1849 on the appearance and dispersion of *gypsies* in Europe.³⁶⁹ These were the writings the GLS requested for their journal to be translated into English in 1889.³⁷⁰ Bataillard did provide a summary of his early works but since his research had since progressed, he also added notes on his new and original origin hypothesis which he had developed in the 1870s and since then continuously refined. In the 1840s, he had shown that Grellmann's theory of the *gypsies*' arrival in Europe in 1417 was only partly true. Rather, this was the year some of the first groups of *gypsies* had crossed into western European countries and scouted for settlement options, before they finally "dispersed" – or "diffused" as he later preferred³⁷¹ – into western Europe since 1438. In eastern European countries, Bataillard claimed, they must have already lived long before. His reasoning was that there were no texts signalling the arrival of *gypsies* in eastern Europe like there were for western Europe. In 1849, he added to this 'negative argument', three sources that apparently indicated a presence and possible enslavement of *gypsies* in eastern Europe

³⁶⁸ See also p. 1.

³⁶⁹ Bataillard: *Apparition*; Id.: *Nouvelles Recherches*.

³⁷⁰ See also p. 22.

³⁷¹ Bataillard: *Beginning*, p. 211.

before 1417.³⁷² While he hesitated to give a new arrival date at first, he elaborated on this question in his later works and found a remarkable answer: *Gypsies* had been living in Europe since time immemorial. This chapter seeks to investigate this new and original hypothesis, how it was developed, what proof Bataillard offered, how it was received by the scientific community, and which consequences a European origin narrative would have had.

Bataillard's origin thesis was bold to say the least. Linguists had noted the similarities between the Romani language and the Indian Sanskrit almost a century ago and Grellmann had popularized the narrative of an Indian origin. Since then, linguistics continued to be the leading academic discipline of Gypsyology: First, the linguist August Pott in Halle located the *gypsies'* place of origin more closely to the northern Indian region of Punjab, naming the Djatt as the original ancestors of the *gypsies*. Although Bataillard later pointed out that he had already drawn this conclusion in 1844, his claim was only partly recognized.³⁷³ Second, the linguist Franz Miklosich in Vienna proposed a migration route from India, through Persia and Byzantium into Europe. It seemed like only details were left to work out but that the Indian origin theory was already an established consensus in the international Gypsyologist community.

Bataillard was not convinced. Like in 1844, when as a young researcher, publishing his first thesis, he questioned statements popularized by Grellmann, three decades later, he again went head to head with some of the most influential authorities in this particular field of study. He even went as far as saying that linguistics had reached their limit in *gypsy studies*³⁷⁴: Linguists like Pott, Miklosich, or Paspati did not study *gypsies*, he criticized, but only their language. He quoted Paspati saying that the entire history of this race was in their language – a statement to which Bataillard vehemently objected. Most linguists, he ended, would content themselves with Grellmann as a point of departure, without considering more recent research (like his own for example).³⁷⁵ Instead of waiting for linguists to find new clues, he recommended anthropology, history, and archeology as new leading disciplines. He therefore based his new theory mostly on historical and archeological evidence.

³⁷² Id.: *Nouvelles Recherches*.

³⁷³ See also p. 79.

³⁷⁴ Paul Bataillard: *Sur les Origines des Bohémiens ou Tsiganes*, in: BSAP 2/10 (1875), p. 549.

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

Bataillard's new hypothesis was introduced in 1875 and 1877³⁷⁶ and can be summarized as the following: While there were indeed migrations of Djatts out of northern India, through Persia into the Byzantine Empire and eastern Europe, these people fused there with the already existing local *gypsy* race who had been there since time immemorial. He had several doubts about the Indian origin thesis that led him to this conclusion: It seemed unlikely that the 500,000 *gypsies* who were living in nineteenth century south-east Europe, would have all descended from a few thousand Djatts that were transported there in 855. Furthermore, the Djatts were raising cattle and did not master the three arts that were associated with contemporary *gypsies*: metal work, fortune-telling, and music. Especially the metal work, argued Bataillard, showed such unique technique that it must date back to high antiquity. Finally, there was the name *Tsiganes*, *Zigeuner*, *Cingari* etc. that Miklosich traced back to the old Greek name for a Byzantine group of heretics, the *Athingans* that *gypsies* were falsely equalled with. According to Bataillard, Miklosich could not explain why this erroneous name became such a widespread, long-lasting name. Bataillard suspected the Djatts could not have newly arrived and kept this name but that they must have fused with *gypsies* called by this name long before so that the label stuck. Bataillard went as far back as Herodotus to find what he believed was the actual first mention of a name variation of "Tsiganes"³⁷⁷: Herodotus mentioned a people called "Sigynnae" (Σιγύννας) living in the lower Danube region and along the rivers of the Adriatic (Herod. V, 9). In addition, Bataillard quoted Homer mentioning a people called "Sinties" (Σίντιες) living on the island of Lemnos (Hom. Il. 1, 594) and noted that this was a name *gypsies* used for themselves until today.³⁷⁸ He also claimed that the mysterious prophetesses called sybils were most likely all or at least for the most part *gypsy* women.³⁷⁹ Without further explanation, Bataillard must have assumed the reader to understand his reasoning to draw this conclusion based solely on the idea that fortune-telling was a typical occupation for *gypsy* women throughout all of time.

Bataillard did not claim to be the first one to point out this link to antiquity but instead gave credit to Gottfried Hasse (1803) and Vivien de St-Martin (1847).³⁸⁰ He

³⁷⁶ Bataillard: *Sur les Origines*: pp. 546–557; Id.: *État*.

³⁷⁷ Id.: *Sur les Origines*, p. 549; Id.: *État*, p. 41.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁷⁹ Id.: *Sur les Origines*, p. 555.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 549; Id.: *État*, p. 41.

blamed the success of Grellmann's 1417-hypothesis among linguists to have repressed these new discoveries and pointed out once again that Grellmann, like most linguists, had never met any *gypsies*.³⁸¹ Seeking approval for his hypothesis that "Sigynes" were identical with "Tsiganes", he wrote a letter to Pott and received mostly criticism and objections with a faint acknowledgement that it was not entirely impossible – which Bataillard printed immediately.³⁸² He had also contacted Ascoli, the Italian linguist who had recently mentioned Bataillard saying that his findings on the Romani language would not displease Bataillard.³⁸³ Ascoli did not disprove the Indian origin in any way but simply pointed out that there must have been many more influences. Bataillard was quick to reply defensively that he had never claimed "Sigynes" and "Sinti" to be the exclusive ancestors of *gypsies* but that these antique peoples as were already *gypsies*.³⁸⁴

Since Bataillard's antiquity-thesis did not seem to go over well with the established elite of Gypsyologists, he sought new allies and quickly found them in archeologists. He repeatedly appealed to investigate the question of *gypsy* metal work in the bronze and iron ages. Bataillard wrote letters to many archeologists and debated the probability of his ideas.³⁸⁵ He also attended international conferences on this topic, consulted archeological literature, and collected drawings of objects and even some actual metal tools and bells that he believed were made by *gypsies*.³⁸⁶ While it was widely believed that Phoenicians introduced bronze to western Europe sailing across the Mediterranean Sea as merchants, some archeologists had doubts about this theory. The main reason was that this theory failed to explain why only bronze was introduced to Europe even though both bronze and iron were already known to Phoenicians and iron was the preferred metal for the production of weapons. Bataillard saw therein an argument for nomadic metal working *gypsies* from middle and eastern Europe to have been the first to introduce bronze to western and northern Europe when travelling there occasionally.³⁸⁷ While he claimed that *gypsies* also had skills in working both bronze and iron, they had a better reason to only introduce bronze to their clients in western Europe: Bronze and iron producers worked independently from one another and in rivalry to each other.

³⁸¹ Bataillard: *État*, p. 41.

³⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 42f.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

³⁸⁴ Bataillard: *État*, p. 46.

³⁸⁵ MCL, BC, box 7.

³⁸⁶ MCL, BC, boxes 1f.

³⁸⁷ Bataillard: *État*, pp. 54f.

Thus, those working in bronze would want to keep the more durable metal iron a secret as long as possible.³⁸⁸ A bronze workshop was easier to set up so these bronze working bands were much more mobile than their iron working counterparts who were sedentary and stayed in eastern regions.³⁸⁹ Bataillard's hypothesis was largely based on comparisons between contemporary observations on *gypsy* metal working techniques and archaeological findings of the bronze age. Many scientists acknowledged that his conclusions were at least plausible. The premise of these conclusions was, however, that *gypsy* customs and traditions had – as it was widely believed – indeed not changed over the course of history.

Within French anthropology and more specifically in the SAP, his interdisciplinary approach was appreciated – even though his passion for researching *gypsies* was still slightly mocked as an obsession.³⁹⁰ Craniology was a highly respected science in French anthropology and the Polish craniologist, SAP-member, and contributor to the JGLS Isidore Kopernicki became one of Bataillard's strongest supporters. Kopernicki had the language skills in Romanes Bataillard lacked and he had reproduced many Romani songs and folk tales for the JGLS.³⁹¹ Over many years, Bataillard and Kopernicki wrote letters to each other, updating each other about their latest research.³⁹² Bataillard opened his thesis from 1878 on “Zlotars”, respectively “Dzvonkars”, which the SAP honored by publishing it in their series of *Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, with an excerpt from one of Kopernicki's letters to him.³⁹³

In brief, Bataillard challenged the predominant theory of an Indian origin that was mostly developed by linguists and accepted by Gypsylogists. Not only did he point out weaknesses of the theory but offered an alternative explanation according to which not all *gypsies* were from India, but some had already existed in Europe since time immemorial and were even responsible for the introduction of bronze to western and northern Europe. This also meant that *gypsies* were no foreign immigrants but Europeans who had made great contributions to the human evolution of the continent. Such a perspective challenged many of the existing stereotypes placed upon *gypsies* and political actions taken against them. How could the dangerous but fascinating ‘savages’ that the

³⁸⁸ Bataillard: *État*, p. 55.

³⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁰ See also p. 25.

³⁹¹ For more information on Kopernicki and his research on Romanies cf. Asséo: Izydor Kopernicki.

³⁹² MCL, BC, boxes 3, 21, 26.

³⁹³ Bataillard: *Zlotars*.

newspapers talked about so much and that scientists were obsessing about be from ‘civilized’ Europe and sung about in the Iliad? France’s most acclaimed authority on *gypsy* anthropology might not have fully convinced the public of his theory, but his example shows that the Indian origin theory was not as established and unquestioned in the nineteenth century as it may seem. Historiography seems to indicate that until the civil rights movement in post-war Europe and North America Grellmann’s theories remained unchallenged.³⁹⁴ The nineteenth century seems like the century of racialized essentialism and romanticism paired with dubious pseudo-sciences. However, it must also be acknowledged that this was an era with a plurality of opinions, where disciplines and scientific methods were still in the process of evolving, and definitions of science itself were different. Bataillard was not as successful as Grellmann, Borrow, or Ritter, yet his voice was not insignificant, especially in the French tradition of Gypsyology.

7. Bataillard’s methodology

After having discussed the content of Bataillard’s theories, the following chapters will examine his use of sources, his intentions, and the impact he had Gypsyology in France and Europe. As the first part of this chapter will show, Bataillard used a variety of sources ranging from anthropology, to history, and finally archeology. The second part is concerned with the levels of criticism with which he approached, implemented, and evaluated his historical sources. Which scientific standards did he adhere to?

The Bataillard Collection at the Manchester City Library allows an insight into Bataillard’s research methods. In the carefully organized dossiers and regionally grouped boxes, his private life remains undisclosed, but his research notes offer a unique insight into his thought processes. Much more than in his publications, which represent only a fraction of the research he conducted, the full range of his interests, the sources he drew knowledge from, and the personal networks he maintained can be reconstructed there. Sources include but are not limited to texts, photos, objects, plays, personal contacts to other researchers, journalists, archivists, and translators, technical and artistic drawings, etc. His familiarity with anthropological methods structured his work visibly: The way he organized and labeled his own dossiers are reminiscent of ethnological field studies or sociological participant observations. His notes include,

³⁹⁴ E.g. Gronemeyer / Rakelmann: *Zigeuner*, esp. pp. 217–219; Maciejewski: *Elemente*, esp. pp. 98–100.

for example, questionnaires that seemed to have helped him organize his thoughts and plan his next steps.³⁹⁵ He tried to gather statistical data on *gypsy* numbers, occupations, crime records, and more.³⁹⁶ He collected literature on craniological measurements of *gypsy* skulls by Kopernicki and Blumenbach.³⁹⁷ Among the objects there are three strands of hair, supposedly from *gypsies*, as well as a color map, presumably for eye color identification.³⁹⁸ Thus, he was certainly influenced by the SAP and their anthropological methods to gather sources and produce scientific knowledge. However, in his own publications, he rarely used anthropological evidence to support his hypotheses.

Two other branches of knowledge production he relied on were philology and archeology. Both were fields he was not formally educated in but from which he autodidactically acquired knowledge. In early Gypsyology, not having linguistic expertise was a major shortcoming. Repeatedly, he felt that he had to disclose this deficit in his publications.³⁹⁹ Colleagues reviewing his work also pointed this out to him.⁴⁰⁰ Nevertheless, Bataillard's collection shows his extensive efforts to always keep up to date on the latest linguistic debates and breakthroughs. His review article on the latest publications in *gypsy* studies from 1872 demonstrated that he did not miss any published research in whichever language⁴⁰¹ and was competent enough to evaluate them. This article brought his name back into the transnational scientific community after a longer break and earned him good reviews. He often referred to linguistic literature in his earlier works but grew more and more estranged from this community when he presented his European origin theory, which contradicted the established consensus on an Indian origin, discovered and defended by linguists. Bataillard still used etymological inferences, for instance his claim that the antique tribe of "Sigynes" were "Tsiganes"⁴⁰², but that was as far as he went using philological evidence in his later works.

This change of perspective brought him closer to archeologists. As his origin theory made claims about prehistoric times, he could rely less and less on historical or

³⁹⁵ MCL, BC, box 7.

³⁹⁶ MCL, BC, box 48.

³⁹⁷ MCL, BC, boxes 3, 6, 19, 26, 39.

³⁹⁸ MCL, BC, box 15.

³⁹⁹ E.g. Bataillard: *Affinities*, p. 584; id.: *Derniers Travaux*, p. 15.

⁴⁰⁰ E.g. N.N.: *Unser heutiges Wissen über die Zigeuner*, in: *Das Ausland* 36 (1873), p. 716.

⁴⁰¹ He hired many translators to produce French versions of the multilingual books he received, bought, and borrowed for him to study. This further shows his investment in his research, even at times when he did not publish anything.

⁴⁰² See also p. 61.

philological evidence. He read archeological literature, went to conferences in Pest and Lisbon, and wrote letters to archeologists such as Chevalier de Linas, Ernest Chantre, and Jules Momméja.⁴⁰³ The latter responded by sending Bataillard many technical drawings about his findings.⁴⁰⁴ Kopernicki also provided archeological results from eastern Europe and even sent Bataillard a few bronze objects, such as three bells produced by “Zlotars”, respectively “Dzvonkars” who Bataillard believed to be *gypsies*.⁴⁰⁵ Bataillard’s thesis on these metal working peoples was largely based on archeological evidence and supported by drawings in his appendix.

Besides anthropological, linguistic, and archeological sources and methods of implementation, the most consistent part of Bataillard’s research, and the one he had the most expertise in, was the use of historical sources. Instead of listing examples of this practise, the following part discusses Bataillard’s standards of critical analysis when implementing these sources. On the one hand, he proved to be highly critical when reviewing source analysis and theories by his predecessors, on the other hand, he did not always apply the same standards to his own critical analysis of historical evidence. These standards to be discussed include the following: historicization, privileging first-hand observations over a blind trust in scholarly authorities, deciphering cultural codes such as blackness as a symbol of otherness, conceding a lack of difference to other races and a lack of cohesion within the presumed *gypsy* race, and finally impartial objectivity and neutrality.

Firstly, he was able to historicize sources as being the product of a certain time and a certain context. When reviewing the sources from the fifteenth century that had generally been accepted as being the first texts signalling the *gypsies* arrival in Europe, he took the practice of copying and re-copying into consideration.⁴⁰⁶ Similarly, he criticized Grellmann for taking his information often “from a second or third hand” (*de seconde ou de troisième main*).⁴⁰⁷ Not having met *gypsies* personally when writing about them, was also a flaw he saw in linguistic research practices.⁴⁰⁸ It might be due to Bataillard’s anthropological perspective that he believed face to face interaction was

⁴⁰³ MCL, BC, box 7

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁵ MCL, BC, box 2; Bataillard: Zlotars.

⁴⁰⁶ Bataillard: Apparition, p. 27.

⁴⁰⁷ Id.: État, p. 5.

⁴⁰⁸ See also p. 60.

necessary for obtaining useful information. However, he applied this methodological standard only in part to his own research. The information that the women scrying, soothsaying, and engaging in sex work in Alger were indeed *gypsy* women, was obtained from ‘third hand’ as well: Bataillard heard it from Fromentin, who heard it from the at the time of publication already deceased archivist of Alger.⁴⁰⁹ While he did meet *gypsies* on several occasions, his main theories, an arrival in eastern Europe long before 1417 and the introduction of bronze to northern and western Europe, did not draw on Romani testimonies. His research objects were still not deemed capable to tell their own stories. It was the non-Romani academic who presumably had to teach them their own grammar and history because they allegedly had forgotten it. For example, when Bataillard’s identified Homer’s “Sinties” of Lemnos with contemporary *gypsies* that called themselves Sinti, he could argue that this connection was missed by his colleagues who did not take Romani endonyms into consideration. However, the information that Romanies had lived in Europe since antiquity did not come from Romanies themselves but was placed upon them by Bataillard, generously baptizing them Europeans.

Another example where a repeated academic consensus lacked empirical evidence were the Persian sources. Bataillard’s observation that a statement repeated often enough by authorities does not become a truth, applies here as well even though Bataillard himself missed it. Two Persian sources, the *Shâh-Nâma* by Ferdûsi, and the chronicle written by Hamza Isfahânî, were often cited historical texts to prove that the Djatts, the alleged ‘proto-*gypsies*, migrated through Persia.⁴¹⁰ Even today, these sources often appear in introductions to Romani history.⁴¹¹ Bataillard discussed them at length in 1849 when he wrote the addition to his first thesis.⁴¹² The sources describe 12,000 musicians from India being transported to Persia. Pott and in the following Bataillard as well as many more accepted the interpretation that these musicians were *gypsies*. The presentism in this conclusion was not questioned: It fit with the Indian origin thesis and music was believed to be a typical *gypsy* occupation. Ian Hancock critically discussed

⁴⁰⁹ Bataillard: *Recherches*, p. 691.

⁴¹⁰ E.g. G. A. Grierson: *Doms, Jâts, and the Origin of the Gypsies*, in: *JGLS* 1/2 (1888), pp. 71–76.

⁴¹¹ E.g. Angus Fraser: *The Gypsies (Peoples of Europe)*, Oxford / Cambridge, MA 1992, pp. 33–41; Donald Kenrick: *Historical Dictionary of the Gypsies (Romanies) (Historical Dictionaries of Peoples and Cultures, vol. 7)*, Lanham / Toronto / Plymouth 2007, pp. xix, xxxviii.

⁴¹² Bataillard: *Nouvelles Recherches*, pp. 39–48.

the discovery and use of these Persian sources in *gypsy* and Romani scholarship in 2002.⁴¹³ He concluded that the story about the Indian musicians conveniently fit the Indian origin theory and is therefore used up until present times – albeit, he sharply conceded, this inference is false. Thus, Bataillard criticized scientific practices of copying and taking the authority of an academic consensus as a truth value, yet, he did not consistently apply this standard to his own research.

Regarding the fifteenth century sources, he also interpreted the repeating motif of being black, not necessarily as a literal description of the *gypsies*' skin color but as an "epithet synonymous with being foreign and exceptional" (*épithète[e] synonym[e] d'étrange et de singulier*).⁴¹⁴ This is an extraordinary observation, given the fact that most of Bataillard's contemporaries still pointed out the black or brown skin as a prominent feature. Bataillard himself claimed that *gypsies* were most easily identified by their darker skin tone⁴¹⁵, rather than deconstructing his own ethnocentric gaze to which a darker complexion stands out as foreign and abnormal.

Another inconsistency regarding Bataillard's critical standards, is his pointing out sameness or difference within the *gypsy* entity. On the one hand, he did not give a conclusive definition of the *gypsy* race and even studied their differences to a certain extent. Categories of difference were to him, for example, nationality, metal work, gender, or ethnonyms. Nationality was emphasized when he insisted on calling the nomadic *gypsies* coming through France "Hungarian".⁴¹⁶ Whether they worked in bronze or iron was a significant difference, allowing the imagination of sedentary iron working *gypsies*, despite nomadism generally being seen as an overarching racial characteristic.⁴¹⁷ Gender was another category of difference when morally judging alleged sexual liberties.⁴¹⁸ Finally, Bataillard studied the variety of different ethnonyms applied to *gypsies*.⁴¹⁹ On the other hand, none of these differences broke up his idea of all *gypsies* belonging to one race. He acknowledged the fact that different communities in different countries wore different dresses and hairstyles (comparing for example Algerian to

⁴¹³ Ian Hancock: We are the Romani People. *Ame Sam E Rromane Džene* (Interface Collection), Hatfield 2005, pp. 4f.

⁴¹⁴ Id.: *Apparition*, p. 31.

⁴¹⁵ See also p. 55.

⁴¹⁶ See also p. 41.

⁴¹⁷ See also p. 62.

⁴¹⁸ See also chapter 6.2.

⁴¹⁹ See also p. 55.

Hungarian, or Greek to Portuguese *gypsies*), and that they gave themselves different names, but that did not impede him from believing in their racial commonness.

When comparing Bataillard's own writings with the ones he was exposed to (i.e. his collectives), his neutral tone becomes apparent. He seems rather hesitant to let his own passion, convictions, opinions, and subjectivity in general shine through. Hence, scientific objectivity seemed to be a standard Bataillard adhered to. However, his individual subject position does matter when considering his theories. This becomes most apparent in the repeated heuristical presentism. As mentioned before with the Persian sources, present occupations that were seen as racial and therefore inalterable features were used to identify *gypsies* in historical sources: Sibyls in ancient Greek texts were seen as *gypsy* women because they were soothsaying prophetesses.⁴²⁰ Metal objects from the bronze age were interpreted as having been produced by *gypsies* because contemporary *gypsies* still often worked in metal.⁴²¹ Bronze was allegedly introduced by nomadic bronze working *gypsies* from eastern Europe as in contemporary Hungary bronze and iron are still produced by separate *gypsy* communities.⁴²² Most of Bataillard's evidence for his origin theory was negative proof pointing out flaws and weaknesses in more established theories, whereas most of his positive proof was flawed by presentism.

Finally, it is noteworthy that Bataillard's claims about *gypsy* women's sex work and other gendered assertions exhibit the weakest empirical framework. He mostly referenced Grellmann, Borrow, hearsay testimonies⁴²³, or his own observations with strong subjective notions: evocations of a heroic age⁴²⁴, a Hindu tribe⁴²⁵, unintelligent women⁴²⁶, the beauty of men and women⁴²⁷, etc., are only a few examples.

The analysis of Bataillard's methodology has shown that he at times adhered to high scientific standards but failed to consistently apply them to his own research. His writings are today most useful for his criticism. Many of our still predominant theories of Romani history are empirically weak, especially for the migration period, and based on racial bias. However, postcolonial authors in the second half of the twentieth century

⁴²⁰ See also p. 61.

⁴²¹ See also p. 62.

⁴²² See also p. 62.

⁴²³ E.g. Bataillard: *Recherches*, pp. 690f.

⁴²⁴ See also pp. 48f..

⁴²⁵ See also p. 55.

⁴²⁶ See also p. 49.

⁴²⁷ See also pp. 45f.

were not the first ones to raise doubt about these theories. Grellmann was never unanimously accepted, neither was the amateurism of the Gypsylogists. Since Bataillard had reason to critique but was lacking strong evidence for alternatives, it must next be asked what the intentions behind his new theories could have been.

8. The purpose of Gypsyology

In secondary sources, nineteenth century Gypsyology has a bad reputation: According to Gronemeyer and Rakelmann it was a “highly dubious undertaking”.⁴²⁸ Myall said it was characterized by “plagiarism, unreliability, generalisation, weak and dubious argument, and flawed methodology”.⁴²⁹ Leonardo Piasere accused scientists to be blind and not realizing that “often the only love that remains is the one that they have for themselves”.⁴³⁰ The previous chapter intended to show that while scientific standards were not consistently upheld, Bataillard’s methodology was far from being pseudo-scientific or altogether flawed. For this chapter, it can likewise be assumed that self-interest was certainly a driving force but that additional justification strategies must also be considered.

Bataillard invested a lot of time and energy in his decade-long research. Ultimately, he became a respected archivist of the Faculty of Medicine in Paris and did important work there. Yet, would he not have gotten this position even with a different research subject than *gypsy* anthropology? If he had cooperated more with the Second Empire, a government position would have been open to him long before his sixties. When studying Grellmann, Ruch concluded that the academic himself was the one profiting the most from his *gypsy* studies, as he became an acclaimed professor.⁴³¹ However, at the time when Bataillard began his research, Grellmann’s promotion was already half a century ago, and nobody since received such academic recognition with their research on *gypsies*. Most of his colleagues were linguists, Orientalists, or popular writers. Anthropology was in its formative years in France and a branch like *gypsy* anthropology did not exist prior to Bataillard. In 1875, Bataillard used the term “tsiganologue”

⁴²⁸ Gronemeyer / Rakelmann: *Zigeuner*, p. 219: “höchst dubioses Unternehmen”

⁴²⁹ Myall: *Gypsy Identities*, p. 15.

⁴³⁰ Leonardo Piasere: *Les Amours des « Tsiganologues »*, in: *Tsiganes. Identité, Évolution. Actes du Colloque pour le Trentième Anniversaire des Études Tsiganes*, ed. by Patrick Williams, Paris 1989, p. 99: “souvent le seul amour qui reste c’est celui qu’ils éprouvent envers eux-mêmes”.

⁴³¹ Ruch: *Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, p. 134.

(Gypsyologist)⁴³² but at this point, such a title was still fictional. It cannot be denied that he profited from his research on *gypsies* but if he had done it for prestige and career opportunities only, he would have probably chosen another branch of anthropology.

Regarding the long time-span he dedicated to his research before he was in a stable employment position, the meticulousness with which he collected material and organized his notes, and the difficult situation of pioneering in a new field of study, it can be argued that Bataillard was driven by a passion and belief beyond his financial payoff. What were his motivations and how did they effect his research results? It can be assumed that his research was not primarily for the benefit of his research objects, the *gypsies*, but for a presumed non-Romani readership. What did he and his presumed non-Romani readership find interesting, useful, or satisfying about theories on *gypsy* anthropology and history? Was his argumentation representative of the larger scale of French non-European anthropology? As mentioned before, his neutral style of writing did not allow much insight into his subjective opinions. He never gave an explanation about his intentions and About concluded that the origins of his interests are unknown.⁴³³ The following reasons presented here are thus interpretations from the clues occasionally given. Reasons can be subsumed under three categories: curiosity, a sense of urgency, and a mission ‘to save an endangered folk’.

Curiosity and even voyeurism was very present around *gypsy* communities in France at the time. In a broad sense, voyeurism describes the fascination of a non-Romani audience with a community defined as *gypsy*, towards which the audience acted intrusive and self-entitled to satisfy their curiosity.⁴³⁴ In chapter 6.1 newspaper articles were discussed that described curious crowds regulated by police, clustering around tent settlements that became media events.⁴³⁵ Most likely, the people that were defined as *gypsies* and curiously observed as such, played along the fascination placed upon them as they made a living from the services they offered to their visitors. The intrusive element and the entitlement from a position of privilege becomes obvious in the incident where a man looked around, lifting some flysheets to catch ‘an indiscrete glimpse’

⁴³² Bataillard: *Sur les Origines*, p. 550

⁴³³ About: *Société*.

⁴³⁴ Cf. also Stitou: *Fascination*, p. 26: “des articles voués à satisfaire l’appétit d’exotisme de leur lecteurs”.

⁴³⁵ See also p. 40.

on the women's sleeping quarters.⁴³⁶ Bataillard's own fascination and voyeurism was most present in his early writings, when he still planned to write his ethnological study on the presumed 'secret life' of *gypsies*. From his first research proposal described in a letter to his mentor Delatour⁴³⁷ and later published in *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*⁴³⁸ to at least the mid-1860s when he repeated his project outline in a letter⁴³⁹, this notion of uncovering a secret to a presumed non-Romani readership was present. According to this letter, the *gypsies*' "secret life" (*la vie secrète*) consisted of their traditions, religious beliefs, "the mystery of their funerals", their "secret" social organisation, etc.⁴⁴⁰ The notion of a 'mystery' surrounding *gypsy* communities that needed to be uncovered remained present throughout Bataillard's career: "a strange mystery" (*une mystère étrange*)⁴⁴¹, "a curious race amongst all" (*une race curieuse entre toutes*)⁴⁴², "this mysterious race" (*cette race mystérieuse*).⁴⁴³ The introduction of his article for the "Paris-Guide" makes it clear that it was the *gypsies* mere existence in what he considered to be 'the center of civilisation' that appeared 'curious' to him: "But that such a colony exists, that it is possible nowadays in this big city [Paris, author's note], is this not in itself very curious?"⁴⁴⁴ Thus, it was clear that he did not write for the sake of Romanies, but to satisfy the curiosity of a non-Romani readership. It is besides the point that such a secret probably did not exist but was concocted by those minds whose imagination ran wild with tales about 'primitive' or antique religious traditions, erotic fantasies about marriage customs, or thrilling horror stories about cannibalism. One 'mystery' Bataillard was particularly interested in was for example their presumed 'secret' to physical and mental health as he believed they were rarely ill and never committed suicide.⁴⁴⁵ The 'mystery' added to the notion of foreignness and created a distance to what was believed to be 'European civilization'. Bataillard repeatedly admired the *gypsies*' "persistent barbarism" (*la barbarie persistante*) or "cult of nature" (*culte de la*

⁴³⁶ See also p. 46.

⁴³⁷ MCL, BC, box 9

⁴³⁸ MCL, BC, box 28. See also pp. 30f.

⁴³⁹ MCL, BC, box 3

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁴¹ Bataillard: Apparition, p. 58.

⁴⁴² Paul Bataillard: review of 'H. Bernhard: Mœurs des Bohémiens de la Moldavie et de la Valachie, Paris 1869', in: *Revue Critique*, 28/05/1870, p. 352.

⁴⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁴ Id.: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, p. 1107: "[M]ais qu'une telle colonie existe, qu'elle soit possible de nos jours dans cette grande cité, n'est-ce pas déjà bien curieux ?"

⁴⁴⁵ See also p. 48.

nature).⁴⁴⁶ These were thought to be in sharp contrast to “the empire of individualism” (*l’empire de l’individualisme*), but instead described as “fraternity” (*fraternité*) and a family that has not yet fallen into dissolution.⁴⁴⁷ These examples show that the *gypsies*’ ascribed ‘primitiveness’ or resistance to ‘civilisation’ was less based on empirical findings but on a critique of ‘civilisation’ and ‘modernity’ itself, associated with a lack of social cohesion.

Even if this romantic idea came from the realm of popular fiction, ethnology gave it a scientific framework and investigated the alleged secrets of othered communities for the sake of science without paying attention to the potential right of keeping traditions undisclosed. Melms and Hönicke therefore overstated in 2011 that Gypsyology was and is the continuation of a colonial practice of othering that has no interest in the social realities of Romani communities.⁴⁴⁸ Whether Bataillard was more interested in an ‘objective’ but potentially less compelling truth or the continuation of a better-selling revelation story, cannot be answered. In the end, he did not write his anticipated anthropological study on ‘the secret life’ of *gypsies*. Was it because he did not find what he was hoping for or simply because his interests shifted away to the sterner scientific debates on origin and migrations?

Coupled with this curiosity was a sense of urgency. It was one of Bataillard’s deep routed beliefs that the time for studying *gypsies* was running out: He already claimed in 1844 that the *gypsies* had almost completely abandoned France.⁴⁴⁹ In 1871, he urged scientists to profit from the nowadays rare occasion to study *gypsies* in France.⁴⁵⁰ In the following year, he added another aspect to the notion of a ‘disappearing race’: “There is no time to loose; as, in numerous places, like Romania for example, great transformations are happening in the Gypsy population, the classes are vanishing, the traditions get lost, the language changes; almost everywhere the original customs begin to disappear.”⁴⁵¹ In other words, *gypsies* were not only disappearing physically from Europe but also believed to erase themselves culturally through assimilation. The idea of

⁴⁴⁶ Bataillard: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, p. 1122.

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁸ Melms / Hönicke: *Antiziganismus*, p. 178.

⁴⁴⁹ Bataillard: *Apparition*, p. 57.

⁴⁵⁰ *Id.*: *Sur des Bohémiens*, p. 217.

⁴⁵¹ *Id.*: *Derniers Travaux*, pp. 25f.: “Il n’y a pas de temps à perdre ; car, en plusieurs endroits, en Roumanie par exemple, de [sic] grandes transformations s’accomplissent dans la population bohémienne, les classes se fondent, les traditions se perdent, la langue s’altère ; presque partout les mœurs originales commencent à s’effacer.”

cultural erasure through adapting to modernity, was hardly new. Authors like Grellmann and Schwieker or politicians like Maria Theresia or Joseph II believed in the necessity of forcefully molding *gypsies* into assimilated ‘new citizens’ of their nation states.⁴⁵² George Borrow, on the contrary, was saddened by the disappearance of this ‘mysterious race’.⁴⁵³ He and Bataillard were not looking for a solution to ‘the Gypsy question’ but wanted to preserve and admire what they believed to be their culture. The urgency to act gave their writings a deeper meaning and legitimacy. Romanies were caught in the crossfire between those that wanted their distinctness to be erased and those that wanted it to never change and even overdraw it. Both sides had two aspects in common: Firstly, they did not respect the Romanies’ agency about their own culture but paternalized them like voiceless children. Secondly, their concept of Romani culture did not correspond to social realities but were a racialized, stereotypical version of it. This *gypsy* culture was believed to be unaltered throughout the centuries but only now, under the beacon of hope of enlightened politics, or otherwise, under the pressures of assimilation to modernity, it seemed to change for the first time in history. Either way, times and cultures were believed to be changing, only the opinions on this change were different.

This notion of imminent change leads to the final reason that could explain Bataillard’s research interest. Briefly put, there seemed to be facts yet unknown that were of potential interest to non-Romani society and time was running out to unearth them. The adaptation of *gypsy* culture to more modern lifestyles, and racially speaking, the ‘mixing of blood’, seemed to threaten the ‘authenticity’ of what was believed to be *gypsy*: i.e. nomadic habits, a darker skin tone, certain dresses and hairstyles, a certain ‘purity’ of language, etc. The role of science was ‘to save’ racial and cultural authenticity by preservation. While curiosity can be seen as wanting to uncover knowledge that already belongs to Romanies and needs to be revealed to a non-Romani audience, the scientist-as-‘savior’-motif produces knowledge presumably unknown or forgotten by Romanies. The linguist teaches them their own grammar and controls the ‘purity’ of its vocabulary from foreign influences. The anthropologist tells them about their traditions and evaluates their authenticity. The historian tells them about their origins and history. Romani agency is denied; scientific etymology is believed to be more valuable than unrecorded

⁴⁵² Cf. the term ‘uj magyarok’ (new Hungarians) for *gypsies* in Hungary after Maria Theresia’s assimilation laws. Bogdal: Europa, p. 169.

⁴⁵³ Willems: Außenbilder, p. 99.

Romani ways of knowing. While the first two sets of beliefs put Bataillard in a position of working for the advancement of science, this last one asserts that he was producing knowledge for the sake of the *gypsies* he was studying. In the *Paris-Guide*, he even called them “his old friends” (*mes vieux amis*).⁴⁵⁴ There are indeed many indications that he believed himself to be in the role of a spokesperson for gypsy rights: In one of the earliest documents of the Bataillard Collection at Manchester, a letter Bataillard wrote in 1836, he was reacting to the overwhelmingly negative media coverage on *gypsies* in the Pyrenees.⁴⁵⁵ “Have they [the *gypsies*, author’s note] found defenders?” (*Ont-ils trouvé des défenseurs?*)⁴⁵⁶, he asked ardently. Did he see himself as their defender?

Further indications for this notion that Bataillard positioned himself – albeit cautiously – as a defender or spokesperson of the gypsy community, are his political convictions and commitments. Influenced by Quinet and Michelet, he supported the Romanian nationalist uprising against imperialist Russia, as well as the French abolitionist movement. Historian Raluca Tomi has argued that Bataillard’s 1849 publication on his was an early abolitionist critique of gypsy enslavement in Romania⁴⁵⁷: According to Tomi, documents listing Romani names in slave registers did not only serve Bataillard as additional evidence for his earlier thesis that *gypsies* have lived in eastern Europe before 1417, but became a stand-alone critique of slavery in the feudal society of Romania.

This idea of friendship and protectionism can be spun out to an extreme: Did he embark on his research journey to educate the public about the non-threatening nature of *gypsies*? Was even his later theory of a European origin of *gypsies* inspired by his wish to integrate them in European history and culture and to mitigate their foreignness? It does not seem that he was always convinced of their European roots: In his published letters to Delatour in 1840, he wondered about their “particular traits” and where they might come from; his answer was immediate: “Not from Europe apparently”.⁴⁵⁸ In the end, it became his primary research question to write about their first “appearance” in Europe.⁴⁵⁹ At this point, it was a “certainty” for him that they had

⁴⁵⁴ Bataillard: *Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris*, p. 1122.

⁴⁵⁵ MCL, BC, box 3. See also pp. 38f.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁷ Tomi: *French Influence*, p. 18.

⁴⁵⁸ Paul Bataillard: *Les Bohémiens*, in: *L’Observateur des Pyrénées*, 19/07/1840, p. 3.

⁴⁵⁹ *Id.*: *De l’Apparition*.

Indian origins, as indicated by linguists and proven by anthropologists.⁴⁶⁰ In other words, it cannot be said that his theories were entirely deducted from a pre-existing desire to make them European. Science was not a mere tool for him that could prove any given outcome. On the contrary, he seemed to have a strong faith in science to unveil truth beyond beliefs. Thus, although the previous chapter on his methodology suggested that his use of sources was highly selective and one-sidedly fitted to his new origin theory, it does not seem that he was only driven by his interest to invalidate proposals of deportation and acts of police brutality.

It is, however, noteworthy that his condemnation of violence against *gypsies* was most explicit in his address to the SAP on November 18, 1875, when he presented the first full account of his new origin theory to them and concluded:

Unfortunately, from the point of view of information that can be obtained about them [the *gypsies*, author's note], the police and too often the excessive, sometimes even ridiculous and barbaric measurements of prevention, the locals themselves, impede their [the *gypsies*'], author's note] free mobility, and above all, their longer stay in one place.⁴⁶¹

He prefaced his criticism with the remark that he only spoke from a research perspective, from which it was unfortunate that *gypsies* could not stay longer in one place to be studied. Yet, the language he used to describe the actions taken by a 'civilized' state as 'barbaric' is remarkable. Furthermore, the *gypsies*' restless mobility is explained, in this instance, by social circumstances, not by inherent racial nomadism. He was thus very cautiously avoiding overtly political statements that could be understood as compromising his scientific neutrality. As the following chapter will show, the scientific community he presented his origin theory to reacted with unimpressed scepticism and Bataillard struggled to produce more evidence and reassert his authority as an expert on the subject. Understandably, he therefore represented himself more as working disinterestedly for the advancement of science as for self-interest or in service to the *gypsy* community he harboured empathy for. Friendship and protectionism thus did not compromise his methodology to the point where he could be accused of non-scientificity. Yet, his personal stance should not be left out entirely, but must be taken into consideration when classifying his work.

⁴⁶⁰ Bataillard: Les Bohémiens, in: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, 22/07/1840, p. 2.

⁴⁶¹ Id.: Sur les Origines, p. 557: "Malheureusement, au point de vue des informations à recueillir auprès d'eux, la police et trop souvent les préventions excessives, quelquefois même ridicules et barbares, des habitants eux-mêmes, mettent obstacle à leur libre circulation et surtout à leur stationnement prolongé dans le même endroit."

Whether a secret defender or a truly disinterested scientist, Bataillard took part in the cementation of some popular beliefs into a scientific, racialized framework. Like many of his colleagues, he most likely participated in this process due to a combination of self-interest, curiosity, positivistic beliefs in scientific progress, self-actualization within dominant power structures, and in order to benignly impact scientific, popular, and political discourses.

9. Bataillard within European Gypsyology

After having discussed contexts, contents, methodology, and motivations of Bataillard's research, it remains to investigate his position within European Gypsyology, the reception of his theories, and the legacy of his name and writings. Bataillard may have been on the pioneering forefront of *gypsy* studies in France, but he met his equals in the still decentralized European network of Gypsyologists and Gypsyologist. His correspondences archived at Manchester are so numerous and divers that it would take another research project to fully analyse them.⁴⁶² Here only a few aspects can be pointed out regarding his networking practices.

It can be claimed that he was in contact with almost all the widely known and some of the lesser known scientists of different academic backgrounds that researched the history, language, ethnography, anthropology, folklore, or regional specifics of *gypsies* in Europe. Amongst his most important contacts and informants were Isidore Kopernicki⁴⁶³, Alexander Paspati⁴⁶⁴, Izaak Jan le Cosquino de Bussy⁴⁶⁵, Edward Innes⁴⁶⁶, Jean Watson⁴⁶⁷, Bath Smart⁴⁶⁸, Charles Leland⁴⁶⁹, Henry Crofton⁴⁷⁰, and Franz Miklosich.⁴⁷¹ They kept Bataillard informed about local research projects, sent him books and newspaper articles, and gave him feedback on his latest theories. Most often

⁴⁶² Not to mention the additional material that can be found i. a. in Paris, Liverpool, Leeds, Bucharest and in private archives. Every one of Bataillard's contacts could have potentially left behind archived records that contain letters from Bataillard.

⁴⁶³ MCL, BC, boxes 3, 19, 26.

⁴⁶⁴ MCL, BC, box 21.

⁴⁶⁵ MCL, BC, box 25.

⁴⁶⁶ MCL, BC, boxes 33, 34.

⁴⁶⁷ MCL, BC, box 35.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁰ MCL, BC, box 48.

⁴⁷¹ MCL, BC, box 52.

Bataillard opened up the conversation himself after having found an author's mailing address in their publications or having asked publishers and journal editors. He also sent out his own publications to institutions like the British Museum in 1862.⁴⁷² In some cases, however, colleagues approached him, like in the case of Charles Leland, author of many English bestsellers and future first president of the *Gypsy Lore Society*: In 1878, he introduced himself to Bataillard, saying "It is possible that you know me as the author of a book with the title 'The English Gipsies and their language' and 'English Gipsy Songs'."⁴⁷³ Bataillard knew Leland indeed as he had written a book review on "English Gipsy Songs" in the *Revue Critique* two years prior to this letter.⁴⁷⁴

It says a lot about Bataillard's influence in the European scientific community that a major name like Leland, introduced himself so humbly to Bataillard and sent him a translated chapter from his book. It is therefore not surprising that shortly after the foundation of the GLS Bataillard was invited as a member and asked to translate his first thesis into English for the JGLS.⁴⁷⁵ As a member of the GLS, he also was sent copies of *Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn*, the Austrian journal that tried to establish itself as the successor of the JGLS after its first cessation in 1892.⁴⁷⁶ Furthermore, authors like de Goeje sent Bataillard an original copy of his book as soon as it was published.⁴⁷⁷

In order to read and communicate in many languages, Bataillard relied on translators. His second wife, Charlotte Bataillard, spoke English and not only translated his article for the JGLS but was also a key figure in the communication with English-speaking scientists, as shown in many letters being directly addressed to her instead of him.⁴⁷⁸ When visiting *gypsy* camps, Bataillard was also accompanied by an interpreter.⁴⁷⁹

Thus, many of the information Bataillard gathered relied on a network of personal contacts. However, he also tried to stay informed about the latest publications, discoveries, and debates in a more systematic manner by keeping bibliographical notes and

⁴⁷² MCL, BC, box 35.

⁴⁷³ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴ MCL, BC, box 35.

⁴⁷⁵ See also p. 22.

⁴⁷⁶ MCL, BC, boxes 46, 54.

⁴⁷⁷ Bataillard: *The Affinities*, p. 583.

⁴⁷⁸ MCL, BC, box 40.

⁴⁷⁹ Bataillard: *Les Bohémiens Hongrois*, p. 219.

collecting bibliographies.⁴⁸⁰ The only bibliography that was specifically about the history and language of *gypsies*, was a German edition from 1886, based on the writings of Miklosich, which listed twelve of Bataillard's works.⁴⁸¹ Bataillard also utilized his position as an archivist to contact other archives and search their catalogues.⁴⁸² The effectiveness of his research strategies was demonstrated, for instance, in his review article from 1872 when he summarized the latest works on *gypsies* in eastern Europe, for which he earned good reviews himself.⁴⁸³

Looking at national and international reviews on Bataillard, it can be established that he was well known and highly respected in his field. He certainly earns the title as the founder of Gypsyology in France. In his own book reviews for the journal *Revue Critique*, which he co-edited, he could be very harsh: His French colleague Bernhard must have had difficulties selling his book, after Bataillard claimed that it did not reveal anything new, misread Grellmann, and left out other key authors.⁴⁸⁴ He concluded: "I have already talked much longer about this little book than it deserves; but if I can spare any serious readers the disappointment it has caused me, I shall not have wasted my efforts."⁴⁸⁵ With equal self-confidence, he also critiqued more established authors like Grellmann, Pott, Miklosich Ascoli, Paspatis, and de Goeje in his publications.

Bataillard was involved in several international academic debates; most notably one with Miklosich about the nature of the Byzantine Athingans, and another one with Burton about the title of being the first to have identified the Djatts with the *gypsies*. Miklosich is generally attributed with the discovery that the etymological origin of 'Tsiganes', 'Zigeuner', 'Cigani', etc. could have been 'Athingans', the name of a heretical sect in the Byzantine Empire. While he believed that the *gypsies* passing through the Byzantine Empire were erroneously given the name of this ancient sect, Bataillard instead claimed that some Athingans were indeed already *gypsies*.⁴⁸⁶

The claim that the Indian tribe of Djatts were the ancestors of the *gypsies* of today was made by several authors in the first half of the nineteenth century. De Goeje

⁴⁸⁰ MCL, BC, boxes 41–45.

⁴⁸¹ MCL, BC, box 43.

⁴⁸² MCL, BC, box 4.

⁴⁸³ Bataillard: *Derniers Travaux*.

⁴⁸⁴ Id.: review of 'H. Bernhard.

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 356: "J'ai parlé de ce petit livre beaucoup plus longuement qu'il ne le mérite ; mais si j'épargne à quelques lecteurs sérieux le désappointement qu'il m'a causé, je n'aurai pas perdu ma peine."

⁴⁸⁶ Paul Bataillard: *Les Tsiganes appelés Chimbres en Grèce, d'après un voyageur français du XVe siècle*, in : *Revue Critique* 18/35 (1884), pp. 159f.

attributed the discovery in 1875 to Pott, but Burton stated in the journal *The Academy* that he came up with the idea. Bataillard replied in the same journal that it should in fact be he to bear this title.⁴⁸⁷ Memorably, he claimed: “I have a right not to be completely forgotten”.⁴⁸⁸ The debate continued even after Bataillard’s demise in 1894, when Burton riposted in 1898 in his book on “The Jew, The Gypsy and El Islam”:

This is the normal process of the cabinet savant [referring to Bataillard, author’s note], who is ever appearing, like the *deus ex machina*, to snatch from the explorer’s hand the meed of originality. The former borrows from his books a dozen different theories; and when one happens to be proven true by the labours of the man of action, he straightway sets himself up as the ‘theoretical discoverer’ of the sources of the Nile, or of any other matter which engages popular attention.⁴⁸⁹

Burton’s critique of Bataillard as a “cabinet savant” who only copied from an “explorer” like him, said less about Bataillard personally as it can be seen as a general comment on the divide between scholarship and field research. As demonstrated, Bataillard went to see *gypsy* camps on numerous occasions and criticized scientists like Pott who seemed to be even proud of the fact that he did his research without meeting with *gypsies*.⁴⁹⁰ In 1910, Otto Winstedt discussed in the JGLS the question of how familiar Bataillard actually was with *gypsies*: Apparently, Winstedt had consulted “the appalling pile of his loose papers, which are now in the Public Free Reference Library at Manchester” and quickly concluded that Bataillard – unlike Pott – had been well aware of the value and interest of personal research among *gypsies*.⁴⁹¹ Today we know that he maintained long-lasting, friendly relationships with various members of the Manouch families Landauer, Reinhardt, and Weiss.⁴⁹²

De Goeje also commented in 1908 on the debate. In a short remark he said he did not know that Burton had the same idea as Pott, but he excused himself more elaborately to the “friendly scientist” (*aimable savant*) Bataillard, who should have earned the title but whom he had simply overlooked at the time.⁴⁹³ Scottish folklorist David MacRitchie, who maintained a correspondence with the Bataillards and would later

⁴⁸⁷ Bataillard: *Affinities*, p. 583.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 584.

⁴⁸⁹ Richard F. Burton: *The Jew, The Gypsy and El Islam*, ed. by W. H. Wilkins, London 1898, p. 164.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. Suci: G.H.M. Grellmann, p. 196.

⁴⁹¹ Otto Winstedt: *La Bella Chiavina: A French or Piedmont Gypsy Tale*, in: JGLS 3 (1910), p. 242.

⁴⁹² Cf. About: *Société*.

⁴⁹³ Michiel Johannes de Goeje: *Mémoire sur les Migrations des Tsiganes à travers l’Asie*, Leide 1908, p. VI.

advise Charlotte Bataillard to have her late husband's fonds purchased by the Manchester Free Library, unsurprisingly also sided with Bataillard on this question.⁴⁹⁴

When more founded scepticism was uttered about Bataillard's lack of linguistic skills or his bronze hypothesis, it was usually done in a very respectful manner, simultaneously praising one of Bataillard's other qualities. The German review journal *Das Ausland*, for example, juxtaposed his lack of language skills with a compliment of his field research: "Although the author admittedly has no special knowledge in the field of the Gypsy language, he in return has a highly significant familiarity with numerous individuals of said tribe in different countries."⁴⁹⁵ Another German journal commented on his early works that the lack of access to some German sources was unfortunate but that they would be looking forward to the promised larger publication of this "keen researcher" (*eifrig[er] Forscher*).⁴⁹⁶ Similarly, Victor de Rochas phrased his scepticism of Bataillard's bronze theory this way:

Despite all his talent, Mr. Bataillard has not yet convinced us that the brazing Gypsies could trace their noble titles back thus far. We do not see convincing evidence yet either that the Sibyls of ancient Thrace, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Greece were Gypsies. But Mr. Bataillard has not spoken his last word yet, and it can be expected a lot from a researcher this persistent.⁴⁹⁷

Facing this much criticism from his colleagues, Bataillard did not further insist on these links to antiquity but rather expanded his research on prehistoric ages. In the JGLS he explained: "But I will not now mix up these disputable questions [*gypsies* in the era of Herodotus and Homer, author's note] with purely historical studies. [...] I have seen the insufficiency of the etymological comparisons (*rapprochements étymologiques*) which had at first seemed conclusive to me".⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁴ David MacRitchie: *Accounts of the Gypsies of India*, London 1886, p. vi.

⁴⁹⁵ N.N.: Unser heutiges Wissen über die Zigeuner, in: *Das Ausland* 36 (1873), p. 717: "Obwohl der Verfasser auf dem Gebiete der Zigeunersprache eingestandenermaßen keine Specialkenntnisse besitzt, hat er dafür eine höchst bedeutsame Vertrautheit mit zahlreichen Individuen des besprochenen Volksstammes in den verschiedensten Ländern."

⁴⁹⁶ N.N.: Die Zigeuner und ihre Sprache, in: *Die Grenzboten* 11/1 (1852), S. 494.

⁴⁹⁷ Victor de Rochas: *Les Parias de France et de l'Espagne*. Vol. 2: Les Bohémiens, in: *Bulletin de la Société des Sciences, Lettres et Arts de PAU* 2/5 (1876), p. 296: "Malgré tout son talent, M. Bataillard ne nous a pas encore convaincu que les chaudronniers bohémiens puissent faire remonter aussi loin leurs titres de noblesse. Nous ne voyons pas encore non plus de preuves convaincantes que les Sybilles de l'antiquité en Thrace, en Asie-Mineure, en Egypte et en Grèce fussent des tziganes. Mais M. Bataillard n'a pas dit son dernier mot, et l'on peut attendre beaucoup d'un chercheur aussi persévérant."

⁴⁹⁸ Bataillard: *Beginning*, p. 189.

Bataillard's claims about *gypsies* in prehistoric Europe, by contrast, were received much more enthusiastically: German historian Carl Hopf was an early supporter of this thesis and asserted in 1870 that Bataillard's work, published in French journals, did not receive enough recognition in Germany, even though it was "critical and reliable" (*kritisch und zuverlässig*).⁴⁹⁹

A noteworthy reception of Bataillard's work can also be found in Portugal by the philologist Francisco Adolpho Coelho. Not only did he mention Bataillard in several of his publications, including his *Bibliographia Critica*⁵⁰⁰, but he also published part of their exchange at a congress for anthropology and prehistoric archeology in 1880.⁵⁰¹ In 1892, he honored Bataillard by calling him "one of the greatest experts of the literature on Gypsies".⁵⁰²

The greatest praise of his complete works Bataillard received, however, from a French anthropologist: Eugène Pittard was one of the leading international racial scientists, linking physical to social anthropology as historical explanation.⁵⁰³ He contributed to the JGLS since 1908 and became the society's president from 1933 to 1936. In 1931, he claimed: "I certainly believe that it is Bataillard [instead of Grellmann, author's note] who must be considered as the most important author of the first scientific researches on this very interesting problem of origins."⁵⁰⁴

Unfortunately, Pittard continued, Bataillard was too often reduced to his early works, his thesis of 1844 and the addition he made to it in 1849. Indeed, evidence supporting this statement is not hard to find. Even the aforementioned Coelho made no mention of Bataillard's second major thesis on the bronze age in his works. Carl Hopf had popularized Bataillard in Germany, as R. Rösler acknowledged in *Das Ausland* in

⁴⁹⁹ Carl Hopf: *Die Einwanderung der Zigeuner in Europa*, Gotha 1870, p. 8.

⁵⁰⁰ Francisco Adolpho Coelho: review of 'Paul Bataillard: Sur les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale' and 'Franz Miklosich: Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas', in: *Bibliographia Critica IX-X* (1873), pp. 270–274.

⁵⁰¹ Id.: *Les Ciganos. A propos de la Communication de M. P. Bataillard. Les Gitanos d'Espagne et les Ciganos de Portugal*, Extrait du Compte Rendu de la 9^e Session du Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques en 1880, Lisbon 1884.

⁵⁰² Id.: *Os Ciganos de Portugal. Com um Estudo sobre o Calão. Memoria destinada a X Sessão do Congresso Internacional dos Orientalistas*, Lisbon 1892, p. 174: "Um dos melhores conhecedores da litteratura relativa aos tsiganos".

⁵⁰³ Cf. Acton: *Scientific Racism*, p. 1192; Chantal Courtois Farfara: *L'Objectif et le Flou. Ambivalence des Regards de l'Anthropologie, le Cas Eugène Pittard (1867–1962)*, in: *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, ed. by Ilse About / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutra, Arles 2018, pp. 168–170.

⁵⁰⁴ Pittard: *Tsiganes*, p. 13: "Je crois bien que c'est Bataillard qu'il faut considérer comme le plus important auteur des premières recherches scientifiques sur ce très intéressant problème des origines."

1872.⁵⁰⁵ However, despite Hopf's complete reception of Bataillard's works thus far, Rösler only mentioned Bataillard's 1844 and 1849 theses. The reception in the English-speaking countries, mainly through the JGLS, also focussed solely on these early works. When the editors of the JGLS approached Bataillard, they asked his permission simply to reproduce, in English, the work which he had published in 1844.⁵⁰⁶ Bataillard, however, felt it was more appropriate to write up an entirely new, four-part summary of his work thus far in 1889, including the additional evidence from 1849 as well as the doubts he since had developed about the Indian origin theory as presented by Pott, Miklosich, de Goeje, and more. A look at his collected notes, gives an insight into why he might have felt, this additional effort seemed necessary: Ten years prior, he had received a review article by Henry Crofton in *The Edinburg Review* in which he was referenced with his 1844 and 1849 theses.⁵⁰⁷ Bataillard's pencil commentary on the sides revealed that he was only partly satisfied with this review⁵⁰⁸: He criticized that Crofton paraphrased one of his articles for the *Revue Critique* without precise reference and that his article for *The Academy* as well as his publications for the BSAP were completely left out. Thus, Bataillard was well aware that his reception in Britain was only fragmentary and the request by the JGLS gave him an opportunity to remind his anglophone readers of his newer research.

Regarding his posthumous reception – which could not be exhaustively presented in this paper – this tendency to privilege his earlier works continued. When MacRitchie had recommended the transferral of Bataillard's collection to Manchester, he certainly must have hoped to inspire British researchers to revisit Bataillard's work. A description of the collection's content as well as a summary of Bataillard's theories with special emphasis on his contributions to research on *gypsies* in England and Scotland was published simultaneously in *The Guardian* and *The Library*.⁵⁰⁹ However, at the end of the nineteenth century this first generation of academic Gypsyologists came to an end and gave way to a new chapter. The GLS was struggling with financial issues, and in 1899, Francis Hindes Groome was saddened to conclude that in the last twenty years,

⁵⁰⁵ R. Rösler: Die Einwanderung der Zigeuner in Europa, in: Das Ausland 17 (1872), pp. 406f.

⁵⁰⁶ Bataillard: Beginnings, p. 185.

⁵⁰⁷ Henry Crofton: Origin and Wanderings of the Gypsies, in: The Edinburg Review, or Critical Journal 303 (1878), pp. 117–146.

⁵⁰⁸ MCL, BC, box 54.

⁵⁰⁹ N.N.: The Bataillard Gipsy Collection, in: The Library 7 (1895), pp. 402–404; N.N.: The Bataillard Gipsy Collection, in: The Manchester Guardian, Oct 9, 1895, p. 8.

Gypsyology had lost important contributors, such as Paspati, Kopernicki, Miklosich and Bataillard.⁵¹⁰ Winstedt attested the fact that in 1910, the Bataillard Collection at Manchester still remained an “appalling pile of his loose papers”.⁵¹¹ Bataillard was not forgotten at all, as shown by the fact that Winstedt did not feel the need to introduce Bataillard to the readers of the JGLS. Neither did Pittard when he praised Bataillard in 1931 as “the most important author of the first scientific researches on this very interesting problem of origins.”⁵¹² The article presented by Bataillard’s granddaughter to the JGLS in 1955 further alludes to the fact that Bataillard’s memory was still kept alive in post-war Europe.⁵¹³ In French historiography, dating from Vaux de Foletier, Liégeois, Bloch, de Ville to Clébert, Bataillard was still a well-known, acclaimed, and diversely discussed figure.⁵¹⁴

Contemporary mentions of Bataillard, by contrast, are sparse. Much of the authoritative scientific literature fails to mention him at all (Acton, Bogdal, Fraser, Hancock, Lucassen, Myall, et al.). Willems lists Bataillard in a short note besides others but added the erroneous dates “1843–49” in brackets.⁵¹⁵ This reference was copied by Suciú’s Grellmann study.⁵¹⁶ Stitou discussed an article by Bataillard in 2011 but seemed unaware of the entire corpus and legacy of Bataillard.⁵¹⁷ In more recent years, the French historians Sébastien Meyer and Ilsen About have undertaken the painstakingly difficult task to ‘re-discover’ Bataillard and his archives. Meyer has given the ‘appalling pile of loose papers’ at Manchester some structure by numbering the boxes⁵¹⁸, and the archive is now promoting the collection with a special mention on their website.⁵¹⁹

It is noteworthy that Bataillard has received an entirely different reception in Romania, where his name is still commemorated as one of the French supporters of the Wallachian revolution in 1848. In 1894, after Bataillard’s passing, one of Bataillard’s Romanian friends, J. Bratiano, came to Paris and asked the family for permission to

⁵¹⁰ Francis Hindes Groome: *Gypsy Folk-Tales*, London 1899.

⁵¹¹ Winstedt: *La Bella Chiavina*, p. 242.

⁵¹² Pittard : *Les Tsiganes*, p. 13.

⁵¹³ Wilson: *Paul*.

⁵¹⁴ See also p. 4.

⁵¹⁵ Willems: *In Search*, p. 12.

⁵¹⁶ Suciú: G.H.M. Grellmann, pp. 196f.

⁵¹⁷ Stitou: *Fascination*.

⁵¹⁸ Meyer: *Itinéraires*, p. 265; About: *Sociétés*.

⁵¹⁹ Manchester City Council: Bataillard gypsy collection, online: <https://cms.manchester.gov.uk/directory_record/212361/bataillard_gypsy_collection/category/1367/view_all_collections> [16/05/18].

collect documents that could be of interest for his country.⁵²⁰ Apparently, the family gave him a “blank cheque” (*carte blanche*)⁵²¹ to take everything with him to Bucharest what he deemed important. This shows that the significance of Bataillard’s role in the Romanian collective memory was recognized early on. In 1929, Olimpiu Boitoş honored Bataillard with his “homage”⁵²², for which he travelled to London to meet with Bataillard’s daughters, Louisa Blakesley and Henriette Wilson, and consult some of the personal correspondence at the time still in the family’s possession.⁵²³ This publication became an important reference for more recent publications on Romanian 1848-revolutionaries in political exile⁵²⁴, or on the French influence over abolitionism in the Romanian Principalities.⁵²⁵

Bataillard was a well-connected scientist of the nineteenth century. His research was acclaimed far beyond national borders and his efforts to establish Gypsyology in France inspired subsequent generations. His published works represent only a fraction of the research he has conducted, and from these, only his early works have received a wider reception. The recent efforts to promote a revisiting of the Bataillard Collection could lead to a wider echo of his extraordinary origin hypothesis, which does not fit many of the categories historiography has laid out for nineteenth century *gypsy* studies.

10. Conclusion

Given that science does not only advance through empirical cognition but also through the situatedness of knowledge, this study set out to ask in which social, institutional, and biographical contexts Paul Bataillard produced knowledge about the imagined race of *gypsies*. Choosing the founder of French Gypsyology as a point of departure for a critical prosopography of nineteenth century Gypsyology, the scientific gaze, its contexts, claims to truth, standards of scientificity, impact, and power structures were examined.

Firstly, the focus was on Bataillard’s ideological environment, the institutional structures, and his colleagues in the SAP. It was found that Bataillard’s research was

⁵²⁰ Boitoş: Paul Bataillard, p. 155.

⁵²¹ Ibid.

⁵²² Ibid., p. 12.

⁵²³ Ibid., p. 155; cf. also Olimpiu Boitoş (Ed.): Une Correspondance Française concernant le Congrès de Berlin (1878). Lettres de la Famille de Paul Bataillard, Bucharest 1931.

⁵²⁴ Jianu: Circle.

⁵²⁵ Tomi: French Influence.

situated in a context of interdisciplinary research and exchange in a young scholarly society without the rigidity of an academic discipline and the hierarchy of university chairs. The SAP was marked by a strong tendency to biologize and put into measurable terms social questions, as did Bataillard for instance with racializing *gypsy* women's sex work. Gendered power imbalances in the SAP were called out by its only female member, Clémence Royer. It hence does not surprise that patriarchal assumptions about women's bodies and sexualities would pass in the BSAP unquestioned. The anthropologists of the SAP were furthermore chiefly concerned with classifying and defining the presumed different stages of civilization and the possibility of racial perfectibility or degeneration respectively. These debates seemed to have informed Bataillard's own conceptions of race, his concerns about racially authentic lifestyles and outward appearances, and his conviction that the *gypsy* race was in the process of disappearing. Like in many racialological writings this process was blamed on the pressures of modernity and interracial relationships, adding a sense of urgency to Bataillard's cause of studying their 'secrets' and origins before it was too late.

Paul Bataillard himself was a Paris-based but internationally connected and politically active researcher, journalist, and collector. His personal contacts and democratic convictions informed his academic interests as well as the reach and scope of his research. His contacts to the Romanian community in Paris, for instance, granted him access to a Wallachian document that he used as evidence in his 1849-addition to his thesis. It could also explain why he paid closer attention to eastern Europe and the traces of *gypsy* presence there, as opposed to focussing only on the western European chronicles and generalizing this information. It is noteworthy that his decade-long dedication to the field did not present him with the most promising career opportunities and yet he chose to not become a popular writer, a linguist, or Orientalist like many of his colleagues. Neither did he cooperate more with the Second Empire to facilitate permanent employment.

The second part of this paper was concerned with his implicit presumptions about race and gender, his exposure to popular representations of *gypsies*, and his theories on their origin. The predominant scientific discourse on *gypsies* emphasized otherness and a stark contrast to definitions of 'civilizations'. The principle of identity by non-alterity can be found here again. Bataillard's voice had a certain uniqueness in this conversation as he worked to a certain extent together with *gypsy* communities, conceded a certain level of individuality to them, and stressed their Europeaness more than their

presumed contrast to civilization. However, his blind spots lay with his uncritical adoption of normalized gendered and racialized stereotypes. As a scholar he took part in the process of reproducing and cementing them as scientific truths that could be used to discipline and police Romani and non-Romani communities. For example, the idea of the beautiful, sensual, seductive, sexually available young *gypsy* girl was a popular motif in literature and art but also became a presumed inalterable, racial fact of looser sexual morals than their *white* counterparts. The *gypsy* gender binary was always constructed in relation to the one of the presumed *white* readership. Thus, the admiration of virtues defined as masculine in *gypsy* men, was also a comment on modern non-Romani manhood. In addition, this micro-historical case study allowed a more nuanced look on historiographical models flawed by teleology, reducing the nineteenth century to being the preparation for the violent first half of the twentieth century. Bataillard's writings and the debates in the scientific community around him reveal a plurality of opinions, internal tensions and disagreements. For example, the raciological dilemma of the inalterability of races can be found again in Bataillard's disagreement with Grellmann's or Basque proposals of deportation, despite his own belief that *gypsy* occupations like metal work, playing music, and soothsaying have never changed. Definitions of race and gender are therefore never singular but always dynamic and constructed in relation to and sometimes in conflict with previous as well as simultaneously co-existing definitions. They must thus always be assessed as specific to every historical period, source, author, and context. One of these definitions that long were thought to be unchallenged until recent times, was the presumed Indian origin developed by linguists. Not only did Bataillard point out weaknesses of this theory but offered an alternative explanation according to which not all *gypsies* were from India, but some had already existed in Europe since time immemorial and were even responsible for the introduction of bronze to western and northern Europe. This also meant that *gypsies* were no foreign immigrants but Europeans who had made great contributions to the human evolution of the continent.

How did he justify his claim to scientificity and possibly positivistic truth then? Who defined, in which context, for which reasons, and with which consequences who a *gypsy* was? Nineteenth century Gypsyology was marked decidedly by the lack of Romani voices in the conversation and created cultural difference between the imagined races. Bataillard used a variety of sources ranging from anthropological, linguistic, and archeological sources and methods of implementation to support his claim to

scientificity, respectively truth. The most consistent part of Bataillard's research and the one he had the most expertise in, however, was the use of historical sources. His standards of critical analysis include historization, privileging first-hand observations over a blind trust in scholarly authorities, deciphering cultural codes such as blackness as a symbol of otherness, conceding a lack of difference to other races and a lack of cohesion within the presumed *gypsy* race, and finally impartial objectivity and neutrality. On the one hand, he proved to be highly critical when reviewing source analysis and theories by his predecessors and colleagues, on the other hand, he did not always apply the same standards to his own critical analysis of historical evidence: This becomes evident when he positioned himself as a friend or defender of *gypsies*, when he did not reflect on his position in patriarchy, when his identifications of *gypsies* in historical and archeological sources were flawed by presentism, and when he still believed in the racial unity of *gypsy* communities despite having pointed out many differences among them. Given this methodological analysis, his writings are most useful today for his criticism of the Indian origin theory as empirically weak, especially for the migration period.

One of the most important, yet most difficult to answer question in this study was, which intentions accompanied and shaped Bataillard's knowledge production process. Despite the overwhelmingly negative reputation of nineteenth century Gypsyology for its racial bias and self-serving interests, the analysis of Bataillard's motivations took justification strategies into consideration based on empirical evidence and with the explanatory power to elucidate his decade-long research passion. Reasons that were found were subsumed under three categories: curiosity, a sense of urgency, and the mission 'to save an endangered folk'. Firstly, it became apparent that Bataillard set out to uncover alleged secrets to his non-Romani readership. The notion of mysteriousness fed into othering strategies and the presumed distance to 'European civilization' and modernity. Otherness was not necessarily seen as negative but could be also read as a cultural critique of *fin-de-siècle* modernity, characterized by decaying public health, increasing suicide rates, 'feminization', the loneliness of individualism, and the dissolution of family bonds. Ethnology gave these fears a scientific framework and investigated the alleged secrets of othered communities for the sake of science and to potentially save the *white* race from degeneration and losing its superior status. Coupled with this curiosity was a sense of urgency. It was one of Bataillard's deep rooted beliefs that the time for studying *gypsies* was running out. Given that he thought he was meeting

some of the last ‘authentic’ *gypsies*, his efforts to document their lifestyles and history became a noble act of a higher legitimacy. However, his concept of Romani culture did not necessarily correspond to social realities but was a racialized, stereotypical version of it. The role of science was ‘to save’ racial and cultural authenticity by preservation. This aspect also implies that Bataillard did not only work to satisfy the curiosity of his audience or to reveal information that can be used for his own benefit or more abstractly for the sake of scientific progress. Instead it proposes that he also truly believed in his research to be valid without self-interest and as an act of empathy for an under-privileged community. Many instances were pointed out where he seemed to believe himself to be a friend or defender rather than a disinterested scientist. Yet, his position within dominant power relationships remained unquestioned. His study objects, the imagined race of *gypsies*, were no interlocutors at eye level. They had no agency, no voice, no own epistemologies. In the paternalistic narrative of colonialism, they were a child-like, primitive race in the midst of civilization. In other words, *gypsies* existed as the flipside of the self-creation of the European cultural subject. Their inalterability was as much an answer to the fast changes of modernity as their disappearance was a criticism of the same. His motivations thus can be summed up as a combination of self-interest, curiosity, beliefs in scientific progress, self-actualization within dominant power structures, and in order to impact scientific, popular, and political discourses.

The final chapter of this paper interrogated the influence Bataillard had during his lifetime, the impact he still has on today’s body of knowledge, and how he is commemorated in the scientific community. Bataillard was a well-connected academic of the nineteenth century and his archived correspondences are an apt point of departure to study the European landscape of Gypsyology. His research was acclaimed far beyond national borders and his efforts to establish Gypsyology in France inspired subsequent generations. At least within the English-speaking scientific tradition, an emphasis on Bataillard’s earlier works was noticed. Furthermore, a separate Romanian tradition commemorated Bataillard as a supporter of the Wallachian revolution of 1848. In France, even when his name is not always mentioned explicitly, the knowledge he produced is recognizable in many of the subsequent works of literature on *gypsy* history, origin and migrations.

Regarding the polarized research opinions on nineteenth century Gypsyology, it was asked at the beginning, where in the spectrum of blind but mostly harmless romanticism on the one hand, or wilful preparation of mass extermination on the other hand,

Bataillard was positioned. A certain notion of romanticism was present in Bataillard's idealization of the presumed cult of nature. It could also be shown, however, that romanticism fed into the idea of the 'internal other' or 'savage in the midst of civilization'. The methodological analysis furthermore revealed that romantic Gypsyology was not mere amateurish pseudoscience but measured against contemporary standards and definitions of science: Bataillard was praised as working diligently, critically, and accurately. The chapter on intentions demonstrated that he could not be accused of wilfulness but that the positions he took still made him complicit to some extent in colonial patronizing as well as invisibilizing Romani voices and social realities.

In addition to giving a more nuanced perspective on historiographic simplicity and contributing to a prosopography of nineteenth century Gypsyology, this study also meant to promote using Bataillard's long abandoned *archive savante* and attempted to work out some of the aspects that need to be considered when doing so. Certainly, not all questions have been addressed or answered here. For instance, when Bataillard was baptized the founder of French Gypsyology, this was not meant to imply that there were no other French researchers working on *gypsy* anthropology at the same time. The BSAP alone gave a platform to several other authors. Yet, it was noticed that Bataillard very rarely referenced his French colleagues and seemed to privilege international academics. Were there internal conflicts or rivalries or did they simply produce less valuable knowledge to him? Secondly, the aspect of transnational connectedness and his vast network of correspondents invites further research on communication practices, scientific networking strategies, etc. Thirdly, a key factor in this multilingual network were Bataillard's translators and interpreters. Their role and practices could not be elaborated in this paper. Fourthly, the role of Bataillard's two wives, Thérèse and Charlotte Bataillard, has only been hinted at in this paper. How much of the research, networking, travelling, documenting, etc. was done by them? The handwriting in the archived records could elucidate many more aspects in this regard. Fifthly, the idea of the *gypsy* as a "surrogate victim, penalized in order to keep in line a population", as proposed by Herbert Heuss⁵²⁶, has only briefly been touched here. What else did Bataillard's construction of the *gypsy* reveal about his ideas and thoughts on his own society? For example, on the effects of modernity, on the way men and women should behave, etc.?

⁵²⁶ Herbert Hess: Anti-Gypsism Research: The creation of a new field of study, in: *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle. Commitment in Romani Studies. A Collection of Papers and Poems to Celebrate Donald Kenrick's seventieth year*, ed. by id., Hatfield 2000, p. 53.

Finally, the limitations of this short digression into Bataillard's post-mortem reception must be acknowledged here. Much more can be said and found on the multilingual literature between now and his lifetime. May this paper inspire more research on Paul Bataillard and the beginnings of Gypsyology in France.

11. Bibliography

11.1. Primary sources

Archive records

Bibliothèques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Manuscrits et archives littéraires et artistiques français du XX^e siècle, Collection Jean Boudout-Edgar Quinet.

Bibliothèques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Manuscrits et archives scientifiques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Fonds d'archives scientifiques, Fonds de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris.

Manchester City Library, Special Collections, The Bataillard Collection, boxes 1–60.

National Library of Romania, special collections, Brătianu Collection.

University of Leeds Library, Special Collections, Romany Collection.

University of Liverpool, Sydney Jones Library, Special Collections & Archives, Gypsy Lore Society Archives.

Printed sources

Barousse, Prosper: Une Tribu des Bohémiens, in: *Mosaïque du Midi* (1838), pp. 64–70.

Bataillard, Paul: Beginning of the Immigration of the Gypsies into Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century, in: *JGLS 1* (1889), pp. 185–212, 260–286, 324–345.

Bataillard, Paul: Beginning of the Immigration of the Gypsies into Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century, in: *JGLS 2* (1891), pp. 27–53.

Bataillard, Paul: De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe, 1, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 5* (1844), pp. 438–475.

Bataillard, Paul: De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe, 2, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 5* (1844), pp. 521–539.

Bataillard, Paul: *De l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe*, Paris 1844.

Bataillard, Paul: *De la Situation Régulière de la Moldo-Valachie vis-à-vis de la Porte*, Bruxelles 1857.

Bataillard, Paul: Deuxième Note sur les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale, in: *BSAP 7* (1872), pp. 748–755.

Bataillard, Paul: Essai sur les Bohémiens. À propos d'une nouvelle, in: *Bulletin de la Société des Sciences, Lettres et Art de Pau* (1842), pp. 87–109.

- Bataillard, Paul: État de la Question de l'Ancienneté des Tsiganes en Europe, pour servir d'Introduction à la Question de l'Importation du Bronze dans le Nord et l'Occident de l'Europe par les Tsiganes, Paris 1877.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens Hongrois à Paris, in: BSAP 2/6 (1871), p. 217.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens Hongrois à Paris, in: La Cloche, 07/10/1871.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens, in: L'Observateur des Pyrénées, 19/07/1840, p. 1–3.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens, in: L'Observateur des Pyrénées, 22/07/1840, pp. 1f.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens, in: L'Observateur des Pyrénées, 24/07/1840, p. 1–3.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens, in: L'Observateur des Pyrénées, 26/07/1840, p. 1–3.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Bohémiens ou Tsiganes à Paris, in: Paris-Guide par les principaux écrivains et artistes de la France, vol. 2: La Vie, Paris 1867, pp. 1107–1123.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Débuts de l'Immigration des Tsiganes dans l'Europe Occidentale au Quinzième Siècle. Résumé suivi d'Explications Chronologiques, in: BSAP 4/1 (1890), pp. 290–318.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Débuts de l'Immigration des Tsiganes dans l'Europe Occidentale au Quinzième Siècle. Résumé suivi d'Explications Chronologiques, Paris 1890.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale, Paris 1872.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Gitanos d'Espagne et les Ciganos de Portugal, à propos de la Question de l'Importation des Métaux en Europe par les Tsiganes, Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques. Compte Rendu de la Neuvième Session à Lisbonne 1880, Lisbonne 1884, pp. 483–518.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Tsiganes appelés Chimbres en Grèce, d'après un voyageur français du XVe siècle, in : Revue Critique 18/35 (1884), pp. 158–163.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Zlotars, dits aussi Dzvonkars, Tsiganes, Fondateurs en Bronze et en Laiton dans la Galicie Orientale et la Bukovine, in: Mémoires de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris 2/1 (1878), pp. 499–566.
- Bataillard, Paul: Les Zlotars. Dits aussi Dzvonkars. Tsiganes Fondateurs en Bronze et en Laiton dans la Galicie Orientale et la Bukovine, Paris 1878, pp. 499–568.
- Bataillard, Paul: Notes et Questions sur les Bohémiens en Algérie, Paris 1874.
- Bataillard, Paul: Nouvelles Recherches sur l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe et sur l'Origine de ce Peuple, in: Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 11 (1850), pp. 14–55.
- Bataillard, Paul: Nouvelles Recherches sur l'Apparition et de la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe, Paris 1849.

- Bataillard, Paul: Quelques Mots sur les Bohémiens Hongrois, in: BSAP 4 (1869), pp. 549–552.
- Bataillard, Paul: Recherches à faire sur les Bohémiens en Algérie, in: Bulletins de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris II/8 (1873), pp. 690–711.
- Bataillard, Paul: review of 'H. Bernhard: Mœurs des Bohémiens de la Moldavie et de la Valachie, Paris 1869', in: Revue Critique, 28/05/1870, pp. 352–356.
- Bataillard, Paul: Sur des Bohémiens Hongrois à Paris, in: BSAP II/6 (1871), pp. 216–224.
- Bataillard, Paul: Sur la Langue des Bohémiens, in: BSAP 9 (1874), pp. 128–138
- Bataillard, Paul: Sur les anciens métallurges en Grèce, Paris 1880.
- Bataillard, Paul: Sur les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale, in: BSAP 7 (1872), pp. 706–711.
- Bataillard, Paul: Sur les Origines des Bohémiens ou Tsiganes, in: BSAP 2/10 (1875), p. 546–557.
- Bataillard, Paul: The Affinities of the Gipsies with the Jats, in: The Academy, 5/6/1875, pp. 583–585.
- Olimpiu Boitoș (Ed.): Une Correspondance Française concernant le Congrès de Berlin (1878). Lettres de la Famille de Paul Bataillard, Bucharest 1931.
- Boitoș, Olimpiu: Paul Bataillard et la Révolution Roumaine de 1848. Contribution à l'Histoire des Relations Franco-Roumaines, Extrait des « Mélanges de l'École Roumaine en France », 1929, II., Paris 1930.
- Borrow, George: The Zincali; or, An Account of the Gypsies of Spain, New York 1842.
- Burton, Richard F.: The Jew, The Gypsy and El Islam, ed. by W. H. Wilkins, London 1898.
- Coelho, Francisco Adolpho: Les Ciganos. A propos de la Communication de M. P. Bataillard. Les Gitanos d'Espagne et les Ciganos de Portugal, Extrait du Compte Rendu de la 9^e Session du Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques en 1880, Lisbon 1884.
- Coelho, Francisco Adolpho: Os Ciganos de Portugal. Com um Estudo sobre o Calão. Memoria destinada a X Sessão do Congresso Internacional dos Orientalistas, Lisbon 1892.
- Coelho, Francisco Adolpho: review of 'Paul Bataillard: Sur les Derniers Travaux relatifs aux Bohémiens de l'Europe Orientale' and 'Franz Miklosich: Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas', in: Bibliographia Critica IX-X (1873), pp. 270–274.

- Crofton, Henry: Origin and Wanderings of the Gypsies, in: *The Edinburg Review, or Critical Journal* 303 (1878), pp. 117–146.
- Dareste, Camille: Correspondance, in: *BSAP* 4/5 (1894), pp. 230f.
- Duhoussset, Émile: Sur les Tsiganes de la Perse. Réponse à M. P. Bataillard, in : *BSAP* 2/10 (1875), p. 597.
- Goeje, Michiel Johannes de: *Mémoire sur les Migrations des Tsiganes à travers l'Asie*, Leide 1908.
- Grellmann, Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb: *Die Zigeuner. Ein Historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksahle dieses Volks in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge*, Dessau / Leipzig 1783.
- Grierson, G. A.: Doms, Jâts, and the Origin oft he Gypsies, in: *JGLS* 1/2 (1888), pp. 71–76.
- Groome, Francis Hindes: *Gypsy Folk-Tales*, London 1899.
- Gypsy Lore Society: Members, in: *JGLS* 1 (1889), p. 181.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried: *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit. Zweiter Teil. Neuntes Buch*, Berlin 2013.
- Hopf, Carl: *Die Einwanderung der Zigeuner in Europa*, Gotha 1870.
- Leland, Charles G.: An die g. Mitglieder der „Gypsy Lore Society“, in: *Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn. Zeitschrift für die Völkerkunde Ungarns und der damit in ethnographischen Beziehungen stehenden Länder. Zugleich Organ für allgemeine Zigeunerkunde*, Budapest 1893, inner cover text.
- MacRitchie, David: *Accounts of the Gypsies of India*, London 1886.
- Miklosich, Franz: *Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas I–XII.*, Wien 1872–1880.
- Pennell, Elizabeth Robins: *To Gipsyland*, New York 1893; Francis Hindes Groome: *In Gipsy Tents*, Edinburgh 1881.
- Pittard, Eugène: Les Tsiganes ou Bohémiens. Recherches anthropologiques dans la Péninsule des Balkans, in: *Le Globe. Revue Genevoise de Géographie* 70 (1931), pp. 1–286.
- Pott, August Friedrich: *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien. Ethnographisch-linguistische Untersuchung, vornehmlich ihrer Herkunft und Sprache, nach gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen. Erster Theil: Einleitung und Grammatik*, Halle 1844.
- Rüdiger, Johann Christian Christoph: *Von der Sprache und Herkunft der Zigeuner aus Indien. Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig 1782. Mit einer Einleitung von Harald Haarmann (Linguarum Minorum Documenta Historiographica, vol 6)*, Hamburg 1990.

Schwicker, Johann Heinrich: *Die Zigeuner in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen*, Wien / Teschen 1883.

Winstedt, Otto: *La Bella Chiavina: A French or Piedmont Gypsy Tale*, in: *JGLS* 3 (1910), pp. 242–253.

Wislocki, Heinrich von: *Zur Ethnographie der Zigeuner in Südosteuropa. Tsiganologische Aufsätze und Briefe aus dem Zeitraum 1880–1905 (Studien zur Tsiganologie und Folkloristik, vol. 12)*, ed. by Joachim S. Hohmann, Frankfurt am Main et al. 1994.

N.N.: *Chronique et Mélanges*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 38 (1877), p. 176.

N.N.: *Chronique*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 55 (1894), p. 226.

N.N.: *The Bataillard Gipsy Collection*, in: *The Library* 7 (1895), pp. 402–404.

N.N.: *The Bataillard Gipsy Collection*, in: *The Manchester Guardian*, Oct 9, 1895, p. 8.

11.2. Secondary sources

About, Ilse: *La Société des Manouches de Paris au XIX^e siècle. Autour de quelques Explorations Ethnographiques de Paul Bataillard*, in: *Ethnologie française* (2018, forthcoming).

About, Ilse / Marc Bordigoni (Ed.): *Présences Tsiganes. Enquêtes et Expériences dans les Archives*, Paris 2018.

About, Ilse / Marc Bordigoni: *Écrire une Histoire des Mondes Tsiganes : La Découverte et Soulèvement des Archives*, in: *Présence Tsiganes. Enquêtes et Expériences dans les Archives*, ed. by Ilse About / Marc Bordigoni, Paris 2018, pp. 17–42.

About, Ilse / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre (Ed.): *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, Arles 2018.

Acton, Thomas: *Introduction. The Life and Times of Donald Simon Kenrick*, in: *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle. Commitment in Romani Studies. A Collection of Papers and Poems to Celebrate Donald Kenrick's seventieth year*, ed. by id., Hatfield 2000, pp. ix–xxxii.

Acton, Thomas: *Scientific Racism, Popular Racism and the Discourse of the Gypsy Lore Society*, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39/7 (2016), pp. 1187–1204.

Asséo, Henriette: *Des Bohémiens Européennes et de leurs Savants à l'époque des Lumières*, in: *Le Monde en Mélanges. Textes offerts à Maurice Godelier*, ed. by Monique Jeudy-Ballini, Paris 2016, pp. 381–402.

Asséo, Henriette: *Izydor Kopernicki et les Roms de la Galice Polonaise*, in: *Études tsiganes* 48–49/4 (2011), pp. 140–147.

- Asséo, Henriette: L'Histoire au XIX^e siècle, in: *Les Populations Tsiganes en France*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Liégeois, Paris 1981, pp. 5–13.
- Baumgartner, Gerhard: "Zigeuner"-Fotographie aus den Ländern der Habsburgermonarchie im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert, in: *Inszenierung des Fremden. Fotografische Darstellung von Sinti und Roma im Kontext der historischen Bildforschung*, ed. by Silvio Peritore and Frank Reuter, Heidelberg 2011, pp. 133–162.
- Bert, Jean-François: Qu'est-ce qu'une archive de chercheur ? (Collection « Encyclopédie numérique »), Marseille 2014.
- Blanckaert, Claude: Fondements Disciplinaires de l'Anthropologie Française au XIX^e Siècle. Perspectives Historiographiques, in: *Politix* 8/29 (1995), pp. 31–54.
- Blanckaert, Claude: On the Origins of French Ethnology. William Edwards and the Doctrine of Race, in: *Bones, Bodies, Behaviour. Essays on Biological Anthropology* (History of Anthropology, vol. 5), London / Madison 1988, pp. 18–55.
- Bloch, Jules: *Les Tsiganes* (Que sais-je?, vol. 580), Paris 1953.
- Bogdal, Klaus-Michael: *Europa erfindet die Zigeuner. Eine Geschichte von Faszination und Verachtung*, Berlin 2011.
- Clébert, Jean-Paul: *Les Tziganes* (Collection Signes des Temps, vol. 10), Paris 1961.
- Collins, Patricia Hill: *Black Feminist Thought. Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, Boston 1990.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé: Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color, in: *Stanford Law Review* 43 (1991), pp. 1241–1299.
- Dietrich, Anette: *Weißer Weiblichkeit. Konstruktion von „Rasse“ und Geschlecht im deutschen Kolonialismus*, Bielefeld 2007.
- Eggers, Maureen Maisha / Grada Kilomba / Peggy Piesche / Susan Arndt: Konzeptuelle Überlegungen, in: *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte. Kritische Weißseinsforschung in Deutschland*, ed. by id., Münster 2009, pp. 11–13.
- Farfara, Chantal Courtois: L'Objectif et le Flou. Ambivalence des Regards de l'Anthropologie, le Cas Eugène Pittard (1867–1962), in: *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, ed. by Ilsen About / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre, Arles 2018, pp. 168–170.
- Fings, Karola: *Sinti und Roma. Geschichte einer Minderheit*, München 2016.
- Foucault, Michel: *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, ed. by Colin Gordon, New York 1980.
- Fraser, Angus: *The Gypsies (Peoples of Europe)*, Oxford / Cambridge, MA 1992.

- Fraser, Angus: The Present and Future of the Gypsy Past, in: *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 13/2 (2000), pp. 17–31.
- Fromentin, Eugène: *Lettres de Jeunesse. Biographie et Notes* par Pierre Blanchon (Jacques-André Méry), Paris 2009.
- Garbe, Sebastian: Deskolonisierung des Wissens: Zur Kritik der epistemischen Gewalt in der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie, in: *Austrian Studies in Social Anthropology* 1 (2013), pp. 1–17.
- Gheorghe, Nicolae: Roma-Gypsy Ethnicity in Eastern Europe, in: *Social Research* 58/4 (1991), pp. 829–844.
- Gronemeyer, Reimer / Georgia A. Rakelmann: *Die Zigeuner. Reisende in Europa. Roma, Sinti, Manouches, Gitanos, Gypsies, Kalderasch, Vlach und andere*, Köln 1988.
- Hancock, Ian: The Concoctors: Creating Fake Romani Culture, in: *The Role of the Romanies. Images and Counter-Images of ‘Gypsies’/Romanies in European Cultures*, ed. by Nicholas Saul / Susan Tebbutt, pp. 85–97.
- Hancock, Ian: The “Gypsy” Stereotype and the Sexualization of Romani Women, in: *“Gypsies” in European Literature and Culture. Studies in European Culture and History*, ed. by Valentina Glajar and Domnica Radulescu, New York et. al. 2008, pp. 181–192.
- Hancock, Ian: *We are the Romani People. Ame Sam E Rromane Džene* (Interface Collection), Hatfield 2005.
- Haraway, Donna: Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective, in: *Feminist Studies* 14/3 (1988), pp. 575–599.
- Hartung, Jan-Peter: (Re-)Presenting the Other? – Erkenntniskritische Überlegungen zum Orientalismus, in: *Räume der Hybridität. Postkoloniale Konzepte in Theorie und Literatur*, ed. by Christof Hamann and Cornelia Sieber, Hildesheim / Zürich / New York 2002, pp. 135–150.
- Hess, Herbert: Anti-Gypsism Research: The creation of a new field of study, in: *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle. Commitment in Romani Studies. A Collection of Papers and Poems to Celebrate Donald Kenrick’s seventieth year*, ed. by id., Hatfield 2000, pp. 52–68.
- Hummel, Diana: *Der Bevölkerungsdiskurs. Demographisches Wissen und politische Macht* (Forschung Politikwissenschaft, vol. 108), Opladen 2000.
- Jianu, Angela: *A Circle of Friends. Romanian Revolutionaries and Political Exile, 1840–1859*, Leiden 2011.
- Kallenberg, Vera: Von “liederlichen Land-Läuffern“ zum „asiatischen Volk“. Die Repräsentation der ‚Zigeuner‘ in deutschsprachigen Lexika und Enzyklopädien zwischen 1700 und 1850. Eine wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (*Zivilisationen & Geschichte*, vol. 5), Frankfurt am Main 2010.

- Kenrick, Donald / Grattan Puxon: *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies* (The Columbus Centre Series), London 1972.
- Kenrick, Donald: *Historical Dictionary of the Gypsies (Romanies)* (Historical Dictionaries of Peoples and Cultures, vol. 7), Lanham / Toronto / Plymouth 2007.
- Klos, Sandra: *Narratives of Otherness. Debates on the Origins of Romani Peoples in the Fifteenth Century*, in: *Beiträge zur Minderheitengeschichte* 1/2016, online: <<http://minorities.hypotheses.org/essays-und-reflexionen-zum-thema-minderheitengeschichte-und-buergerrechte>> [11/05/18].
- Laferté, Gilles: *Des Archives d'Enquêtes Ethnographiques pour quoi faire ? Les Conditions d'une Revisite*, in: *Genèse* 63 (2006), pp. 25–45.
- Lander, Edgardo: *La Colonidad del Saber: Eurocentrismo y Ciencias Sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*, Buenos Aires 2000.
- Lee, Ronald: *Roma in Europe: "Gypsy" Myth and Romani Reality – New Evidence for Romani History*, in: *"Gypsies" in European Literature and Culture. Studies in European Culture and History*, ed. by Valentina Glajar / Domnica Radulescu, New York et al. 2008, pp. 1–28.
- Liégeois, Jean-Pierre: *Sinti, Roma, Fahrende* (Interface series), Berlin 2002.
- Liégeois, Jean-Pierre: *Tsiganes*, Paris 1983.
- Lucassen, Leo / Wim Willems / Annemarie Cottaar: *Gypsies and other Itinerant Groups. A Socio-Historical Approach*, New York 1998.
- Lucassen, Leo: *Zigeuner. Die Geschichte eines polizeilichen Ordnungsbegriffes in Deutschland 1700–1945*, Köln / Weimar / Wien 1996.
- Maciejewski, Franz: *Elemente des Antiziganismus*, in: *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion des Zigeuners. Zur Genese eines Vorurteils* (Wissenschaftliche Reihe des Fritz Bauer Instituts, vol. 2), ed. by Jacqueline Giere, Frankfurt am Main / New York 1996, pp. 9–28.
- MacMaster, Neil: *Racism in Europe 1870–2000* (European Culture and Society, vol. 2), Houndmills et al. 2001.
- Manchester City Council: *Bataillard gypsy collection*, online: <https://cms.manchester.gov.uk/directory_record/212361/bataillard_gypsy_collection/category/1367/view_all_collections> [16/05/18].
- Mayall, David: *Gypsy Identities 1500–2000. From Egipcians and Moon-men to Ethnic Romany*, London / New York 2004.
- Melms, Maria / Michael Hönicke: *Antiziganismus und Tsiganologie. Versuch einer Standortbestimmung*, in: *Vielheiten. Leipziger Studien zu Roma/Zigeuner-Kulturen* (Tsiganologie, vol. 2), ed. by Theresa Jacobs / Fabian Jacobs, Leipzig 2011, pp. 175–198.

- Meyer, Sébastien: Des Itinéraires Confluents. Artistes, Savants et Modèles Bohémiens en France, Entre 1830 et 1870, in: *Présence Tsiganes. Enquêtes et Expériences dans les Archives*, ed. by Ilse About / Marc Bordigoni, Paris 2018, pp. 265–287.
- Meyer, Sébastien: Exercices de Style et Regards Savants. L'Anthropologie des Tsiganes et la Photographie au XIX^e siècle, in: *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, ed. by Ilse About / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre, Arles 2018, pp. 164–167.
- Mosse, George L.: *Die Geschichte des Rassismus in Europa*, Frankfurt am Main 1990.
- Padure, Ionela: Le Regard d'une *Romni* sur quelques Photographies, in: *Mondes Tsiganes. Une Histoire Photographique, 1860–1980*, ed. by Ilse About / Mathieu Pernot / Adèle Sutre, Arles 2018, pp. 161–163.
- Piasere, Leonardo: Les Amours des « Tsiganologues », in: *Tsiganes. Identité, Évolution. Actes du Colloque pour le Trentième Anniversaire des Études Tsiganes*, ed. by Patrick Williams, Paris 1989, pp. 99–110.
- Rose, Romani: Vorwort, in: *Zur Mythischen Figur des Zigeuners in der Deutschen Zigeunerforschung. Mit einem Vorwort von Romani Rose (Forum für Sinti und Roma, vol. 1)*, by Kirsten Martins-Heuß, Frankfurt am Main 1983, pp. 1–34.
- Ruch, Martin: *Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschsprachigen "Zigeunerforschung" von den Anfängen bis 1900*, Freiburg 1986.
- Said, Edward William: *Orientalism*. New York 1979.
- Shiva, Vandana: Reductionist Science as Epistemological Violence, in: *Science, Hegemony and Violence: A Requiem for Modernity*, ed. by Ashis Nandy, Oxford 1988, pp. 232–256.
- Sibeud, Emmanuelle: The Metamorphosis of Ethnology in France, 1839–1930, in: *A new History of Anthropology*, ed. by Henrika Kuklick, Malden / Oxford / Carlton 2008, pp. 96–110.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty: Can the Subaltern Speak?, in: *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, Basingstoke 1988, pp. 271–313.
- Stitou, Emmanuelle: Entre Fascination et Rejet. L'Image de la Bohémienne dans quelques Écrits du XIX^e siècle, in: *Études Tsiganes* 47/3 (2011), pp. 26–39.
- Suciu, Cristian: G.H.M. Grellmann and the Enlightenment's Discovery of the Roma, in: *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai – Studia Europaea* 1 (2008), pp. 189–200.
- Tomi, Raluca: The French Influence over Abolitionism in the Romanian Principalities, in: *Transylvanian Review* 19/4 (2010), pp. 9–22.
- Vaux de Foletier, François de: *Les bohémiens en France au 19^e siècle (Collection Lat-tès/Histoire « Groupes et Sociétés »)*, Paris 1981.

- Vaux de Foletier, François de: Voyages et Migrations des Tsiganes en France au XIX^e siècle, in: *Études Tsiganes* 19/3 (1973), pp. 1–30.
- Ville, Frans de: *Tziganes. Témoins de Temps*, Bruxelles 1956.
- Wartelle, Jean-Claude: La Société d'Anthropologie de Paris de 1859 à 1920, in: *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 1/10 (2004), pp. 125–171.
- Willems, Wim: Außenbilder von Sinti und Roma in der frühen Zigeunerforschung, in: *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion des Zigeuners. Zur Genese eines Vorurteils* (Wissenschaftliche Reihe des Fritz Bauer Instituts, vol. 2), ed. by Jacqueline Giere, Frankfurt am Main / New York 1996, pp. 87–108.
- Willems, Wim: *In Search of the True Gypsy. From Enlightenment to Final Solution*, London / Portland 1997.
- Willems, Wim / Leo Lucassen: The Church of Knowledge. The Gypsy in Dutch Encyclopedias and their sources, in: *100 Years of Gypsy Studies: Papers from the 10th Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter, March 25–27, 1988, Wagner College, Staten Island, New York, Commemorating the Centennial of the Gypsy Lore Society*, ed. by Matt T. Salo, Cheverly 1990, pp. 31–50.
- Wilson, Sabine: Paul Théodore Bataillard, in: *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* (1955), pp. 37–42.
- Wolf, Benedikt: Helfer des Feindes. Von der Häresie der Athinganoi zum „Stamm“ der Atsinganoi, in: *Antiziganismus. Soziale und historische Dimensionen von „Zigeuner“-Stereotypen*, ed. by Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma, Heidelberg 2015, pp. 18–37.
- Wright, Barbara (Ed.): *Correspondance d'Eugène Fromentin. Tome I: 1839-1858*, Paris 1995.
- Wright, Barbara: *Eugène Fromentin: A Life in Art and Letters (Romanticism and after in France, vol. 5)*, Bern et al. 2000.
- N.N.: Bataillard, Paul Théodore, in: *Dictionnaire de Biographie Contemporaine*, ed. by A. Bitard, ³1887, online: World Biographical Information System <<https://wbis.degruyter.com/biographic-document/F11194>> [19/02/18].
- N.N.: Bataillard (Paul-Théodore), in: *Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains*, ⁶1893, online: World Biographical Information System <<https://wbis.degruyter.com/biographic-document/F11194>> [20/02/18].
- N.N.: *L'Observateur des Pyrénées*, online: <<http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb328277978>> [19/03/18].
- N.N.: Schwicker, Johann Heinrich, online: <<http://kulturportal-west-ost.eu/biographie/schwicker-johann-heinrich-2>> [12/04/18].

12. Appendix

12.1. Abstract

Paul Bataillard (1816–1894) was a Parisian journalist, editor, republican, historian, anthropologist and archivist. His numerous publications on the ethnography, history, and origins of people defined as *Bohémiens* or *Tsiganes* lay the foundation of French Gypsyology, the scientific discovery and description of the *gypsy* identity. Contributing to a critical prosopography of nineteenth century research on the imagined race of *gypsies*, this micro-historical study examines the scientific gaze, its contexts, claims to truth, standards of scientificity, impact, and power structures. The first part analyses the social, institutional, ideological, and biographical contexts of Bataillard's research. The second part focuses on the content of his theories, dissecting implicit conceptions of race and gender, his exposure and reaction to popular representations of *gypsies*, and his hypothesis on their origin. The final part draws conclusions firstly about his scientific standards and how consistently he adhered to them, secondly about his motivations and how his research interests were sustained, and lastly about the impact he had on French and European Gypsyology. Placing the researcher at the center of this historical study, reverses the scientific gaze on *gypsies* and reveals the situatedness of knowledge produced by Gypsyology.

12.2. Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Paul Bataillard (1816–1894) war ein Pariser Journalist, Redakteur, Republikaner, Historiker, Anthropologe und Archivar. Seine zahlreichen Veröffentlichungen zur Ethnographie, Geschichte und Herkunft derjenigen Personen, die er als *Bohémiens* oder *Tsiganes* definierte, bildeten das Fundament französischer Tsiganologie, der wissenschaftlichen Entdeckung und Beschreibung der *zigeuner*-Identität. Als Beitrag zu einer kritischen Prosopographie der Forschung im neunzehnten Jahrhundert rund um die vorgestellte ‚Rasse‘ der *zigeuner*, untersucht diese Studie den wissenschaftlichen Blick, seine Kontexte, Wahrheitsansprüche, Wissenschaftlichkeitsstandards, Wirkung sowie Machtverhältnisse. Der erste Teil analysiert die sozialen, institutionellen und biographischen Kontexte von Bataillards Forschung. Der zweite Teil fokussiert auf den Inhalt seiner Theorien und analysiert implizite Konzeptionen von ‚Rasse‘ und Geschlecht, seinen Umgang mit populären *zigeuner*-Darstellungen und seine eigene Hypothese zur Herkunft der *zigeuner*. Der letzte Teil untersucht Bataillards wissenschaftliche

Standards und wie exakt er sie selbst befolgte. Außerdem werden seine Absichten und Hintergründe sich der Tsiganologie dauerhaft zu widmen interpretiert. Schließlich gilt das letzte Kapitel dem Einfluss, den Bataillard auf die französische und europäische Forschung hatte. Indem der Wissenschaftler selbst ins Zentrum der historischen Analyse gerückt wird, kehrt sich der wissenschaftliche Blick auf *zigeuner* um und die Verankerung des tsiganologischen Wissens in sozialen Kontexten wird aufgedeckt.