

ENCOUNTERS IN THE WORKSHOPS: RECONSIDERING PATTERN, PLOT AND SPACE OF HOREZU POTTERY

MAGDALENA BUCHCZYK¹

This article focuses on the case of Horezu pottery, considering the connections between craft continuity, history, heritage and practice. It draws on a wider body of research in which I am revisiting the 1957 collection of Romanian folk art at the Horniman Museum in London. In this context, I am researching the contemporary responses to the collection and the stories folk potters tell about the process and product of craftwork in the past and today. In this discussion, it is demonstrated that a focus on the traditional design from the perspective of the workshop provides nuanced insights on the artefacts and the myriad of relationships in which they come into being. Themes of relationships between object patterns, the social production of craft and the potters' taskscape were invoked during the conversations. Exploring the context of the pattern, life history and space in which Horezu pottery emerges, allows reconsideration of the wide range of activities and structures involved in the making of this craft. It is suggested that certain narratives and material practices triumph over others. The attention on specific stories as well the wider contexts of practice offers a potential to reimagine the Horezu artefacts in ethnographic and museum contexts.

Key words: craft, heritage, temporality, taskscape, narrative.

INTRODUCTION: NEW PATTERNS OF HERITAGE PRESENCES

The authentic Horezu potter uses certain glazes, designs and tools (Mihăescu 2005; Petrescu and Stahl 1958; Vladuțiu 1981). This symbolism is embedded in a specific set of values, as patterns connote "pre-Christian beliefs and are a landmark in arguing the ethnogenesis of the Romanian people. As a result, the ornamental pottery produced in Oboga and Horezu became the icon of Romanian identity, largely exhibited in national museums and international exhibitions (Iancu and Tesar 2008: 48).

The pattern demonstrates aesthetic and political taxonomies as well as scholarly understandings of authenticity. The material fabric of the object embodies its genuine origin and consequently, any material intervention threatens its status and

¹ Department of Anthropology, Goldsmiths College, University of London, New Cross, London, SE14 6NW, an602mb@gold.ac.uk.

provenance. This approach to modification is embedded in a specific framework of conservation practice where historic value and continuity through time are inherent in the lack of material change (see discussion in Jones and Yarrow 2013). Such perspective on the artefact demonstrates the fixed materialist paradigm of authenticity as “objective and measurable attribute inherent in the material fabric, form and function of artefacts” (Jones 2010: 182). This reductionist approach to material culture, prevalent in various forms of heritage expertise, embeds intangible culture in particular regimes of meaning and exchange (ibid). The authorised heritage discourse favours aesthetic material culture to be cared for, protected and passed down, identifying those who act as the “legitimate spokespersons for the past” (Smith 2006: 29). Folk art, it was pointed out, was implicated in several modernisation and nationalist projects that generated particular classificatory devices for the valuation of craft heritage (Iancu and Tesar 2008; Mihăilescu 2007; Popescu 2002).

Following the post-socialist deindustrialisation process, heritage and market futures became key strategies for development in the Horezu region. As state patronage retreated, civil organisations sprang up to secure funding for cultural initiatives and to promote the continuation of the craft in the area². The existing capital of local expertise, prestige and the previous state promotion became a backdrop against which new relationships were constituted and new forms emerged.

At the same time, the European Union became a significant factor in the reconstruction of regional identity, local development and the heritage management of the area. This on-going shift from national to supranational strategy has been apparent in several projects implemented in the area. In 2008, the Horezu Valley became one of the twenty European Destinations of Excellence for its intangible heritage and traditional assets. In 2009–2010, part of the Financial Mechanism of the European Economic Area initiated a EU-funded programme on local heritage protection³. Between 2010 and 2013, the local authorities run a project “Horezu Rooster – the Bastion of Sustainability of Romanian Ceramics”⁴ to promote the annual European fair “The Rooster of Horezu” with competitions in creativity,

² The Association of the Horezu Valley (Asociația Depresiunea Horezu), The Association of Folk Craftsmen ‘Rooster of Horezu’ (Asociația Meșterilor Populari „Cocoșul de Hurez”), The Association for the Promotion of Authentic Heritage in Horezu (Asociația pentru Promovarea Patrimoniului Autentic Horezu (APPAH) and The Foundation for Rural Civilisation ‘Peasants’ (Fundatia Națională pentru Civilizație Rurală „Niște Țărani”).

³ ‘Microregion Horezu – Revitalisation through Valuation of Historic Heritage’ (Microregiunea Horezu – revitalizare prin valorificarea patrimoniului istoric), recording and cataloguing the cultural heritage assets and local monuments, reporting the current state of conservation; overseeing urban planning and heritage protection regulations, providing measures for new initiatives, promoting better compliance with local specificity; developing cultural products (exhibitions, paintings, written work, video), promoting religious painting, intangible heritage, occupations and traditional products and training teachers on the awareness of heritage.

⁴ This initiative was co-organised with the Association of Horezu Depression and the Association of Folk Craftsmen ‘Rooster of Horezu’, using the funding of the Administration of National Cultural Fund (Administrația Fondului Cultural Național).

modelling and decoration of pots. In the course of the project, the local authorities sent delegations of potters to participate in similar events in Faenza (Italy) and La Galera (Spain). The aim was to reach a European public, create new networks, attract international visitors, collectors and specialists and bring Western European practitioners back to the town. In 2012, Horezu gained a new place on the map of European and universal heritage, inscribed on the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The pottery centre's continuity gained world recognition.

In the context of post-socialist deindustrialisation and reconstruction of economy, tourism and cultural heritage protection programs are key factors for the development mediated by heritage brokers, local civic organisations and various funding bodies. The expertise of the heritage specialist, previously led by state institutions, has been delegated to these stakeholders and executed through global operational procedures. This new heritage regime (Bendix et al. 2012) through the application of global typological devices of listing, recording and conservation standards had a significant impact on the construction of Horezu craftsmanship.

Through these instruments, international actors legitimise a neutral narrative of identity based on the three-hundred-year continuity and craft transmission (Petrica 2011). As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett observed, "heritage converting locations into destinations (...) makes them economically viable as exhibits of themselves" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 151). Horezu, by becoming a destination of a new kind has transformed the process of making pottery into a form of metacultural production (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004) with a particular trope on what constitutes its history and genuine cultural expressions. From emblematic nationalist folk art, Horezu pottery became framed as global intangible heritage listed and bureaucratised cultural performance with all its potentialities and limitations.

The scholarly frameworks of pottery emphasise the formal aspects of artefacts, framing and codifying the designs as signs within certain meanings and ossified values. The following section looks at how the seemingly fixed pottery design unlocks stories about historical change and current process of heritagisation.

NEGOTIATIONS IN THE ATELIER: ELICITING FRAGMENTED STORIES OF THE ROOSTER PATTERN

The conversations in the pottery workshops in 2012 often involved stories linking the folk pattern with the changing framework of practice. The analysis draws on two narratives about the design, considering the rooster pattern as vehicle of folk artists' views on the multiple pasts and presences of this craft.

During our discussions in their *ateliers*, most potters reminisced the socialist *Cooperativa Ceramica*⁵ as a well-organised workplace that provided opportunities for the artisans' development on the job. Following a period of apprenticeship

⁵ For the historical review of the cooperative see: Iancu and Tesar 2008.

within the enterprise under a master potter, new workers became responsible for specific operations on the production line, according to their skills. They were assigned to a working group (*echipa*) dealing specifically with the extraction and transport of clay, modelling, decorating or supervising the firing process. The *artisans* would work according to the norm, making for instance two hundred pieces of a particular model and size. To a large extent, the production was remembered as very advanced and technically refined – the cooperative had a German industrial clay mixer, some gas-operated kilns and various electric wheels. The process was supervised and quality-checked by master potters, ensuring that the pots met the requirements of the orders for their national and international clients. At the same time there were voices of discontent and memories of the coercive character of this form of organisation of craft labour.

According to Gabi, an eccentric and good-humoured potter in his late sixties, his father was forced to work in the cooperative. As Gabi⁶ suggested:

“People were not used to work this way... on the hour, on the hour. In the past, my father woke up as he pleased, ate, had a shower and worked. There was nothing imposed on him”.

Whereas the cooperative connoted notions of time control, in the post-socialist period, he claimed, there was a return to work individually, unsupervised and working for pleasure. This return to the household workshop was in Gabi's view a sign of autonomy. For women, he noted, it meant a possibility to reconnect production and childcare; as they were able to make pots in the house workshop. In the 1980s, the renown of traditional Horezu pottery spread across the country. Consequently, the possibility of home-based work arose for others and more artisans could work as folk artists from household studios. In the 1990s, as the privatisation of craftsmanship became an alternative to the shrinking job market, new workshops appeared on Potters' Street and around the town. The makers were the descendants of the folk potter families, former cooperative *artisans* and new craftsmen looking for ways to combat growing unemployment. Under the market economy, objects are sold in situ or as individual commissions via craft markets and middlemen. There are orders from souvenir shops, restaurants or international customers.

It has been noted that authenticity is actively produced in the process of commoditisation of culture that favours particular identities to be staged or sold (Cohen 1988; Dicks 2003; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 2004). For Constantin (2009b), Romanian crafts are hybrids produced through the active negotiations of two systems of meaning: the local representations of utilitarian domestic occupations and external imaginaries of their peasant character with “philosophical and aesthetic qualities, being traditionally “wise”, “genuine”, “beautiful”, “everlasting”” (Constantin 2009b: 17). Constantin asserted that Romanian artisans were engaged in a struggle to maintain a sense of autonomy “within their craftwork and towards political

⁶ The names of the research participants have been changed.

regimes of others” (ibid). In the post socialist market economy they constantly worked to balance their status as folk artists and producers in a complex field of institutional and commercial relationships. Constructions of authenticity were key to these negotiations.

Thinking through the narratives about the regained autonomy and the retreat to the domestic studio, this increasingly privatised landscape of craftsmanship is related to the changing sense of time for several potters. E.P. Thomson (1967) provides a useful context in the understanding of how the potters’ sense of time is interwoven with ceramic symbolism. E.P. Thompson argued that in the domestic mode of production of peasantry or artisans, there is a specific task orientation and time-sense, affecting the patterns of social understandings of the passing of time. In the artisan contexts time apprehension is linked to interconnectedness between life and work. The working day is flexible (Thompson 1967: 60) and dependent on the synchronisation of subsidiary tasks (ibid: 70)⁷. Investigating the history of time discipline, Thompson observed that as working patterns increasingly became punctuated by industrial clock-time, they were also linked to more synchronised activity in the industrial manufacturing techniques (ibid: 80). The industrial man was born out of the discipline of labour and temporality.

Verdery (1996) demonstrated significant connections between the constructions of personhood in socialist Romania through time discipline. The new temporal punctuations (ritual and daily) led to ‘*etatisation of time*’ in the nexus of the challenging social conditions and the notion of individual and his self-realisation. As the state penetrated life on an extraordinary scale, it intruded into personal and communal schedules of the citizens through various practices, from state celebrations, compulsory meetings, manifestations and bureaucratic activities such as queuing in shops. In consequence, the control of citizens’ lives through the constant intimate state presence led to the transformation of personhood and an erosion of sociability. At the same time, “these links between the self and the etatisation of time help us to understand better the regime’s profound lack of legitimacy” (Verdery 1996: 56).

The temporal arrangements of the workplace and state, it was pointed out, have significant implications for the notion of personhood in the context of labour and political structures. In the narrative of the rooster, the design could be interpreted as metaphor of the negotiations of the potters’ conceptions of work rhythms and a sense of self. The potter is strongly self-identified with the rooster – an early bird, working autonomously and displaying certain nonchalance in relation

⁷ The historical case studies, analysed by E. P. Thompson bear resemblance with Horezu. For instance, the work habits and irregularity of rhythm in task orientation were exemplified by the case of ‘An Old Potter’, written in 1903, describing the customs of English potters in the 1830s and 1840s, working according to irregular rhythms, at their own pace and with periods of non-activity. The author, a Methodist preacher, wrote that they ‘*The children and women came to work on Monday and Tuesday but a ‘holiday feeling’ prevailed and the day’s work was shorter than usual, since the potters were away a good part of the time, drinking their earnings of the previous week.*’ (ibid, 75). For the author of the ‘Old Potter’, regularity could be improved through the mechanisation of the pot-banks and regulation of industrial operations.

to the wider environment. In the post-socialist period, the potters returned to a time sense based on idioms of work measured by a sense of completion of a specific task. The privatised working environment of the atelier was seen as more meaningful, facilitating rewarding work and bringing a sense of control. This idiom of value, rather than a commoditised capitalist one is related to the use rather than management of time, as it can be either wasted or used with purpose (Heintz 2006: 145). Gabi's reflection about his father's imposed "on the hour" discipline expressed the dissatisfaction with cooperative time discipline and a positive evaluation of the newly acquired freedom of regaining the task-oriented personalised rhythm of the day and redirecting the influence of the etatisation of time. The unmaking of the working class of Horezu artisans in the 1980s created a notion of being a craftsman as being in possession of time. By becoming folk artists, Horezu potters strategically returned to the home workshop, reversed the modern project of the state and regained their autonomy and task-based organisation of labour. From 'new men' and socialist workers they re-conceptualised themselves as artisans and folk masters.

The rooster does not tell one fixed story but serves to facilitate multidirectional conversations about practice. In Horezu today, group identity is often mediated through the design, an increasingly codified image. The president of the local pottery association mentioned the rooster had become the potters' *brand*, an emblem of identification distinguishing the authentic maker from the producer of *kitsch* or usurper from outside the centre. This representational form of authenticity has recently been legally protected through the recognition of the rooster image as a protected trademark under Romanian law. The tourist office and the local cultural centre are promoting a unified visual language of designs, organising discussions with craftsmen with suggestions on the preservation of the authentic character of the craft.

The collective effort taken by the potters' association to protect the pattern as a registered trademark is a sign of solidarity as well as competitiveness. The protection effort has been framed as a response to the inflow of imitations contaminating the market. This conflicting landscape of practice is played out in the space of the town itself. Several potters warned me about the area at the edge of the town with street traders (Iancu and Tesar 2008) selling kitsch made outside Horezu. This border-zone was the newcomer's first point of contact with the town.



Figure 1. 'We don't sell products from China and Bulgaria', pottery shop door notice in Horezu.

The usurpers' objects (Hungarian, Chinese or Bulgarian) sold in the stalls at the entrance to Horezu produce economic insecurities that were not addressed by the retreating state, new instruments of transnational protection of cultural property and heritage branding are being welcomed and lobbied for by the potters. Becoming a trademark, increasingly fixed decorative schemes are material manifestations of the transforming reality of practice interlinked to the effects of transition, market competition and heritage classifications.

According to Rowlands (1993), in the inscribed forms of cultural transmission, prevalent in the European material culture and heritage practice, "people are exposed constantly to highly visible examples of material objects invested with authoritative credibility" (Rowlands 1993: 142). In this light, heritage practices and institutions fetishise durability, repetition of form, authenticity, the notion of origin as "the link between past, present and future is made through their materiality". (ibid). Navigating the categories and inscriptions of heritage and tourist industries, the potters of Horezu mediate their practice within the aesthetic economy of repetition and the frameworks of the new heritage and market infrastructure. Whereas the folk artist under socialism competed on the creative scene, the living heritage craftsman is expected to carry on transmitted the increasingly authoritative pattern of craft transmission and design.

Rather than stable and permanent, the meanings of design and craft community are continuously shifting and endowed with relational understandings. The emic perspective from the workshops showed that folk pattern could be a starting point in the investigation of the multiple negotiations in relation to material practice, change and the self-identification of the makers. Some potters' stories on the rooster emphasized personal achievement and qualities that constituted their uniqueness, creativity and crafty navigational skills. At the same time, the rooster is a protective shield of the positioning of the potters' community and a symbol of increasing heritagisation of the craft practice (Leblon 2012; Poria 2010; Sanchez-Carretero 2012; Walsh 1992). Rather than a set idiom of Romanian identity, the pattern correlates with the various phenomena of adaptation and negotiation of craft selves occurring in the Horezu workshops.

HERITAGISED LIVES: ON TASKSCAPES AND PLOTS

Thinking about the wider relationships of skilled practice, Ingold (2000) argued that forms of activity are performed socially, are mutually interconnected and constitute meaning in the context of their ensemble, a wider taskscape. As tasks are interlocked social activities occurring in time, Ingold pointed to the social temporality of cultural production. The concept of taskscape provides a valuable framework for analysing craft in its movements and rhythms as well as time and place.

Making ceramics in Horezu is a combination of material and discursive tasks played out in time and space. One of the key tasks of the Horezu potter is an ability to create an authentic narrative of craftsmanship and knowledge transmission. The

potters' narratives on craft learning and making the household studio are illuminative of what being a Horezu folk artist means today. The life-stories and workshops environments are sites of self-identification and legitimation within the potters' community and in the wider context of institutions and discourses surrounding this craft practice.

The potters often tell a story of having been taught by their parents at home and born into the profession. The common part of the life histories is a narrative about early childhood memory of playing with clay. It follows with a storyline of an organic learning process that results in the point of current mastery. One potter declared that such tradition of knowledge transmission has been uninterruptedly continued in their families for the last one hundred twenty one years. Others, less specific, claimed that the family has been engaged in the production for generations. The romanticised notion of learning through pleasurable presence in the workshop conceals the nature of pottery as coping strategy in the post-socialist period. The narratives on entering the craft reveal the historical dimensions of craft training and transmission of knowledge beyond the script communicated in ethnographic exhibitions and heritage institutions.

Andrei, the son of a potter renowned in the socialist period, learnt the trade from his father in the 1990s, after he was made redundant in his "bureaucratic job". Rodica worked in commerce and decided to try pottery after a series of insufficiently paid positions as a hotel receptionist. The owner of one of the first households on Pottery Street learnt the craft in high school but after graduation worked in industry. The closure of factory in the 1990s made him to consider relearning the profession from his father-in-law. Today he and his wife have work exclusively in ceramics. In fact, the number of folk potters in the area increased as a result of the post-socialist transformation. As after the 1989 revolution those employed in the cooperative were left without work, they set up home-based studios, learning from their parents, other family members, neighbours or other craftsmen in the area. These new potters in various degrees entered the networks of partnerships with museums and craft markets. One family is perceived by the curators as living heritage and regularly produces artefacts for museum acquisitions and souvenir shops. At the same time, this family is locally seen as an inauthentic newcomer and the head of the household is said to be "just a shepherd" that had learnt the trade in his forties from a neighbour. The story is part of the interplay of solidarity and hostility amongst the makers. Potters switch the registers of storytelling about life history and craft transmission depending on the audience and circumstances.

I see their ways of telling craft stories about themselves as a form of narrative activity (Gubrium and Holstein 1998). In particular, I consider person in relation to practice:

"The person – the actor – is addressed by people and forces and institutions external to himself or herself and responds using the words, genres, actions and practices of others. In time, the person is forming in practice and so are the cultural resources that the person adapts to author himself or herself in the moment. (...)

Thus, local practice is significant for the continuing formation of institutional arrangements in socio-historic time/space.” (Holland and Lave 2009: 4).

Thinking through public time and narrative in Horezu illuminates the process of constructing and reconstructing identity that plays a role in mediating history and on-going practice (ibid). The production of craft persons is related to interwoven and often contested domains of local cultural production and intimate embodied identities that result in a particular “history-in-person” (ibid).

The narrative mechanisms through which craftsmen are mediated and communicated are ordered in a particular sequence. For Ricoeur (1980), storytelling gives meaning to the experience of time, constructing narrative identities through the intentional creation of a plot as well as through meaningful action. The narrative is an inherently performative phenomenon and the acts of “recitation” and public storytelling incorporate the story into a community, gathering it together through social practice of plots performed within public time (Ricoeur 1980: 175).

In this context, telling stories of pleasurable child education of craft creates a plot that legitimises the maker in front of the external public time and heritage discourse. At the same time, its public character serves as a community-building device, bringing together makers with the same chronology of practice, transgressing the storms of lived history. Narratives bring the makers together; giving the plot a common pattern and sequence. In their story, craftsmanship is linear and regular; one generation of makers replaces the set of previous practitioners in a sequential continuity.

Folk art is a pleasure of the atelier. This insertion of life history, in the narrative of learning in the parental workshop, performs a function for the identity and self-presentation of the potter as a legitimate craftsman. In Horezu, the self-presentation of a master maker is supported by the art of storytelling. Self-presentation is a constant narrative act of grasping together two time-points: of the learning process and current excellence in the quality of production, creativity and respect for traditional models and techniques ... all embedded in the memory of being a child playing in the workshop. In Ricoeur’s words, Horezu potters are characters in a quest of continuity and “the quest has been absorbed into the movement by which the hero – if we may still call him by that name-becomes who he is. Memory, therefore, is no longer the narrative of external adventures stretching along episodic time. It is itself the spiral movement that, through anecdotes and episodes, brings us back to the almost motionless constellation of potentialities that the narrative retrieves. The end of the story is what equates the present with the past, the actual with the potential. The hero is who he was (Ricoeur 1980: 186).

In this life history narrative, the authentic Horezu potter has grown up in the atelier with its traditional tools, patterns and operations. Kin-based apprenticeship is of value in the categories framing the pure repository of folk art. The plot perpetuates the idealised mentoring process and serves as metaphor of genuine status and reputation of the makers. The art of storytelling to communicate the

authentic origins of the craftsperson has a particular intended effect as understood by Gell (1998). As Kingston (1999) suggested: “The technology of enchantment relates specifically to the power of origination and those regarded as responsible. Origination also has a special role in the Western imagination of authenticity, which has the same root, *auctur*, as both author and its subsidiary, authority.” (Kingston 1999: 344)

The magical effect of the potter’s authenticity acts in a similar way to the technology of enchantment and connotes ideas of enchanting origination and authority of the maker’s unique craft knowledge.

Authenticity is performed through the itinerary of the socially desirable craft biography and constitutes the temporality of the potters’ taskscape (Ingold 2000: 196). The plot of the intimate personal memory is facilitated by the public representations. Potters aware of the values and distinctions associated with the craft, maintain the story of exclusive origin of skill through play, a narrative being a significant factor for their choice of what type of memories are chosen to be publicly evoked or negated. In this context of pure origins, the experience of learning in the cooperatives, knowledge transmission from the peers, neighbours, in the schooling system or apprenticeship appears unworthy to be told. Other learning environments, of significant presence in the experience of Horezu makers of the last forty years, are not mobilised as a base for self-presentation.

These selective life stories and reminiscences of learning are situated between biography and discourse, generating public narratives in Ricoeur’s sense and producing social consequences. The landmarks of learning and absences of experience demonstrate how life-history relates to the genre of story-telling (Haukanes 2005). There is much at stake in successful storytelling – the narrative is a prerequisite of maintaining the status. The continuous transmission of knowledge along family lines has been one of the key categories of authorised heritage discourse both in the socialist period and today, within UNESCO’s categories of the craft as intangible heritage of outstanding universal value. Currently, in market and tourist encounters, the potters perpetuate the narrative promoted by this interpretation. The story plays a public role in the process of heritagisation through the rendering of biography. This task is completed skilfully by the folk artists. They use these narratives to fit into the official chronology of craft transmission and to maintain their status and neo-traditional identity within the collective of legitimate makers. The narrative community is increasingly characterised by new internal and external divisions of practitioners according to the values assigned by museums and tourist offices as well as by the craftsman themselves.

In the context of the workshop today, how did the potters perceive different categories of practitioners?

In the socialist period, there was space for both folk artists and workers-artisans, the makers could choose to enter the museum-folk art fair networks or be employed by the cooperative. The dissolution of the cooperative industry in the 1990s led to the unemployment of a vast number of artisan potters and other types of craftsmen. Those, living in the Potters Street benefited from the rise of heritage

industry, entered the growing folk art market and became elements of the intangible cultural heritage. Others, who could not set up a workshop, act as waged labourers for the first category of makers, with an increasingly inferior status of anonymous workers. These waged marginalised craftsmen, a product of the post-socialist closure of the cooperative, seemed to mirror the pre-industrial era category of journeymen moving from one master to another to do small jobs.

Considering the emerging divisions within the community of makers, it is interesting to revisit the issue of pottery and status. As Bourdieu (1984) observed, “potters who call themselves ‘art craftsmen’, or technicians who claim to be engineers are (...) strategies, like all processes of competition (...) The negotiations between antagonistic interest groups, which arise from the establishment of collective agreements and which concern, inseparably, the tasks entailed by a given job, the properties required of its occupants (e.g., diplomas) and the corresponding advantages, both material and symbolic (the name), are an institutionalised, theatrical version of the incessant struggles over the classifications which help to produce the classes, although these classifications are the product of the struggles between the classes and depend on the power relations between them” (Bourdieu 1984: 481).

Bourdieu’s insight is useful in grasping the relationships amongst the contemporary makers. In this context, the symbolic boundaries between actors are embedded in practice and generate status groups engaged in classificatory struggle. These struggles of prestige can be played out in narratives as words, people and things are being placed in a hierarchical order. Craft community solidarity is often embedded in distinctions and as Kondo pointed out, “solidary communities are based on the exclusion of the unskilled” (Kondo 1990: 230).

The problem of emerging distinctions is linked to the issue of the plot. Returning to Ricoeur, by adopting the generational logic in our interpretation of the past, we risk creating a problematic fictive narrative of sequential chains of memories and practices that could be continuously extended to the past as a “retention of retentions” (Ricoeur 1980: 114). Heritage frameworks tend to view traditional craft as a form of retention, fixing the past into transmittable wholes. Key to this story is a narrative of undisturbed traditional transmission of craft knowledge, as illustrated by the UNESCO nomination:

“All practice this traditional craft passed on as a family activity, with several generations working in the workshops. The craftsmanship is passed down from generation to generation using the same methods and techniques inherited from their ancestors.” (Petrica 2011: 2)

In the case of Horezu, adopting the exclusively family-based model provides a limited view on the craft. This framework creates a distorted image of how, why and under what conditions the craft has been learned, abandoned or taken over in the historical context of post-war Romania. Alongside the pleasant experience of the child in the atelier, there exists a wider range of learning environments constituted through various interactions and activities in both informal and formal settings. After the decline of the cooperative, the economic constraints and the architecture of the heritage industry have generated new communities and

categories of inclusion and exclusion, with designated potters' dynasties, authorised craftsmen, new families involved in the practice and a network of journeymen-like waged workers, unprotected labourers employed by other makers. There is a tendency towards growing distinctions between these groups with a significant decrease in status for the post-cooperative artisans affected by deskilling, growing insecurity and lack of access to a workshop. Along with the heritagisation of life histories and skills, these new forms of division of practitioners might be more prevalent today as the possession of traditional workshop and family history becomes a marker of genuine and necessary element of making pottery in the town. As selected potters become listed, registered and catalogued as elements of the intangible cultural heritage, new spheres of distinction are being reified, creating social distance and limited chances for the unprotected labourers.

Understanding these life histories as narrative devices of community, self-identity and autonomy brings insights into the current typologies of those involved in the production of ceramics in Horezu. Exploring the complexity of narrative time and labour rhythms (with its metaphors embedded in the pattern) as opposed to the time of the authorised heritage discourse, it is useful to reconsider the idiom of craftsmanship as a lineal intergenerational affair. These understandings undermine the historical experiences and downplay other avenues of transmission. In result, the plot is increasingly fixed and does not allow for alternative narratives. The following section considers one of the material aspects of practice that became the main anchor of the craftsman's taskscape and plot – the Horezu workshop.

THE TASK OF DOMESTICATED AUTHENTICITY

For Ingold (2000), taskscapes are embedded in landscapes and places are constituted as embodied forms of activity. The features of places are constituted along the lines of taskscapes and are incorporated in the flow of practice (2000: 198). Considering places as congealed with tasks shows how the everyday spaces of the Horezu craftsmen perform in the wider array of the potters' activities.

Visiting Potters' Street, the first impression is of walking into the space of a medieval guild. Typically, the façade of each building is covered in plates produced by the residents of the house. There is a heritage name plaque placed next to the door and various pots are scattered around the yard and on the fence. Stepping into the yard through the gate, the visitor is invited to visit the workshop. There, under the diplomas certifying the potters' prizes gained in national craft markets or folk art festivals, freshly made pots are available for purchase. If the visitors have special requirements, the potter might take them to the domestic space, the kitchen or the living room where more pots are stored. The households of potters who used to be renowned folk artists under socialism have private exhibitions of historical pieces and one created a special dedicated space of a private museum, displaying the oeuvre of the family. The domestic space is key for self-presentation in Horezu and constitutive of the status of the craftsman.

The households of the Potters Street are currently public and commercial emblems and exhibiting is one of the main activities in the production of the craftsman identity. The space becomes a hybrid of interlinked private and public spheres. Exhibition of production processes takes place during public demonstrations – making occurs in front of the public gaze, voyeuristic pleasure of tourists, heritage experts and clients. Heritagisation modifies the content of the workplace and, whereas before the potters would have sold all their produce, now they have become conservators of their works. These presentations are public articulations of skill, illustrating the importance of the discursive component in this craft. Labour experience becomes reified, aestheticised and performed in the spectacle of heritage. The intimate private setting serves to legitimise the public role of the heritage craftsperson.



Figure 2. Front room in a household of the Potter's street.



Figure 3. Boutique run by one of the potters at the entrance to Horezu.

As Horezu develops its status as a tourist destination, the fashioning of the household studio reaches a new level of elaboration. Two younger potters have relocated from the Potters Street to the main road at the entrance to the town. These purpose-built structures are manifestations of the space-based competition over resources in the heritage industry. The buildings are designed primarily as shopping areas with dedicated galleries and workshops incorporated within the commercial space. In one case, the surroundings are constructed for public use – the garden is planned as a pleasant environment for the tourist to stroll amongst greenery between the store and the workshop. As domestic spaces are relocated in order to be publicly available, the beneficial position allows the selected potters to attract the first incomers to their house-studios.

The creation of the studio spectacle is embedded within a range of practices of self- construction. The task of making the atelier is a sign of the metacultural production of workplace to fit the idiom of heritage; the studio is both authentically

local and universal at once (Herzfeld 2004; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004). The heritagised space of the workshop with its emblematic toolkit serves as a material form emphasizing continuity. The *domesticated* workplace connotes a long tradition, a particularly intimate relationship with the craft. Those who demonstrate a house-based skilled practice are the possessors of a particular familiarity with the craft.

Increasingly the value of the maker is fixed in the production of the place, an essentialist notion of craftsmanship linked to the museum-house, the spectacle-studio, the commercialised and heritagised space of work. The studio is a part of the inscribed practices framing Horezu craftsmanship where “objects are culturally constructed to connote and consolidate the possession of past events associated with their use or ownership” (Rowlands 1993: 145). It is a reified metaphor manifesting legitimate practice and the possession of a particular status within the community of makers and the global hierarchy of value framing traditional artisanship (Herzfeld 2004).

CONCLUSION

Horezu potters are involved in a set of tasks including design choices, storytelling and spatial practices. Rather than mechanically reproducing the idiom of heritage or economic models, they act upon them generating materialised responses and developing an extended dynamic repertoire of tasks. These intimate practices have a resonance with embodied histories as well as the maker’s own sense of individual identity and technical mastery. I argued that making artefacts is an activity embedded in network of distinctions, meanings and categories. The patterns are an intersection of these forces, decisions and restrictions, becoming a material manifestation of objectified performances and the changing interactions between the makers and their social worlds. They are strongly embedded in the politics of value and the relationships between the craft practitioners, the state and several new heritage actors (such as UNESCO), framing the socio-economic status and the prestige of the potters.

The ensemble of activities, choices, dependencies, inclusions and exclusions is the complex taskscape of their practice (Ingold 2000). Becoming a Horezu potter involves a whole range of manual, narrative, material and social skills, including storytelling about the self, cultural transmission and the ability to create material environments of conspicuous display. In order to resist marginalisation, the makers generate a taskscape of stories, objects and material as well as spatial practice. Only through these complex negotiations, can they escape obliteration (as usurpers, reproductive workers or newcomers) and engage with the changing social representations, hierarchies of value and historical events in which these activities are embedded. In this sense, the fashioning of the self and of the space in which the profession is enacted are key components of the taskscape by which the potters regenerate (rather than merely invent) their craft’s tradition. Reassessing the craft through the multiple voices from the workshop allows to recontextualise the artefacts and the tasks of this craft beyond.

REFERENCES

- Bourdieu P. 1984. Classes and Classifications, in: Bourdieu P., *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 466-484.
- Cohen E. 1988. Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 371-86.
- Constantin M. 2009a. Socioeconomic aspects of artisanship among ethnic minorities in the 2000s Romania. *Revista de Etnografie și Folclor* 1-2: 119-133.
- Constantin M. 2009b. When tradition is given a trademark: Artisanship within the museum folk-fairs in the 2000s Romania. *CAS Sofia Working Paper Series* 2: 3-18.
- Constantin M. 2011. Artisanship and Ethnicity in the 2000s Romania. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 45 (1): 1-35.
- Dicks B. 2003. *Culture on Display: The Production of Contemporary Visitability*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gell A. 1998. *Art and agency: an anthropological theory*. London: Clarendon Press.
- Gubrium J. F., Holstein J. A. 1998. Narrative practice and the coherence of personal stories. *The Sociological Quarterly* 39 (1): 163-187.
- Haukanes H. 2005. Telling lives. Autobiography and History after Socialism. *Anthropology of East Europe Review*, North America, Available at: <http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/aeer/article/view/243>. Accessed on 05 January 2014.
- Heintz M. 2006. "Be European, Recycle Yourself!": *The Changing Work Ethic in Romania* (Vol. 12). Münster: LIT Verlag Münster.
- Herzfeld M. 2004. *Body Impolitic: Artisans and Artifice in the Global Hierarchy of Value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holland D., Lave J. 2009. Social practice theory and the production of history in person. *An International Journal of Human Activity Theory* 2: 1-15. Available at: <http://kuir.jm.kansai-u.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10112/7582/1/KU-0900-20090000-01.pdf>. Accessed on 6th March 2014.
- Iancu B., Tesar C. 2008. The Historical Role of Politics in the Constitution of the Present Romanian Market of Peasant Artefacts. *MARTOR: Revista de Anthropologie a Muzeului Țăranului* 11: 47-66.
- Ingold T. 2000. *The perception of the environment*. London: Routledge.
- Jones S. 2010. Negotiating Authentic Objects and Authentic Selves Beyond the Deconstruction of Authenticity. *Journal of Material Culture* 15 (2): 181-203.
- Jones S., Yarrow T. 2013. Crafting authenticity: An ethnography of conservation practice. *Journal of Material Culture* 18 (1): 3-26.
- Kingston S. 1999. The essential attitude: Authenticity in primitive art, ethnographic performances and museums. *Journal of Material Culture* 4 (3): 338-351.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B. 1998. *Destination culture: tourism, museums, and heritage*. London and Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B. 1995. Theorizing heritage. *Ethnomusicology* 39 (3): 367-380.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B. 2004. Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International* 56 (1-2): 52-65.
- Leblon A. 2012. A Policy of Intangible Cultural Heritage between Local Constraints and International Standards: The Cultural Space of the *yaaral* and the *degal*, in: Bendix, Eggert, Peselmann (eds.) *Heritage Regimes and the State*, Vol. 6: "Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property". Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen: 97-121.
- Mihăescu C. 2005. *Ceramica de Hurez, Lutul – miracol și devenire*. București: Editura Contrast.
- Mihăilescu V. 2007. *Autochtonism and national ideology in Romania*. Centre of Advanced Studies Working Papers. <http://www.cas.bg/uploads/files/Sofia-Academic-Nexus-WP/Vintila%20Mihăilescu.pdf>
- Mihăilescu V. 2008a. Introduction, in: Mihăilescu V., *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, pp. 1-19.
- Mihăilescu V. 2008b. A New Festival for a New Man: The Socialist Market of 'Folk experts' during 'Singing Romania' Festival, in: Mihăilescu V., *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, pp. 55-81.

- Petrescu P., Stahl P. H. 1958. *Ceramica din Hurez*. București: Editura de Stat Pentru Literatură și Artă.
- Petrica O. 2011. "Nomination file no. 00610 for Inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2011". Retrieved on February 24th 2014: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/RL/00610>
- Popescu I. 2002. *Foloasele privirii*. București: Paideia.
- Poria Y. 2010. The Story Behind the Picture: Preferences for the Visual Display at Heritage Sites, in: Watterton E., Watson S. (ed.), *Culture, heritage and representation: perspectives on Visuality and the Past*. London: Ashgate, pp. 217-229.
- Ricoeur P. 1980. Narrative Time. *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1): 169-190.
- Rowlands M. 1993. The Role of Memory in the Transmission of Culture. *World Archaeology* 25 (2): 141-151.
- Smith L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Sánchez-Carretero C. 2012. Heritage Regimes and the *Camino de Santiago*: Gaps and Logics, in:
- Bendix R. F., Eggert A., Peselmann A. (ed.), *Heritage Regimes and the State*, Vol. 6 in "Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property". Göttingen: Universitätsverlag.
- Thompson E. P. 1967. Time, work-discipline, and industrial capitalism. *Past and present* 38: 56-97.
- Verdery K. 1991. *National Ideology under Socialism: Identity and Politics in Ceaușescu Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Verdery K. 1996. *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vladutiu I. 1981. *Creatori populari din Romania*. București: Editura Sport-Turism.
- Walsh K. 1992. *The Representation of the Past. Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- HAEMUS "UNESCO places Romania's Horezu ceramics on the list of intangible cultural heritage". Available at: <http://haemus.org.mk/unesco-places-romania-horezu-ceramics-on-the-list-of-intangible-cultural-heritage/> Accessed on 5th January 2013.