

ARTISANSHIP AND OPEN-AIR TRADE IN CONTEMPORARY ROMANIA*

MARIN CONSTANTIN

“Francisc Rainer” Institute of Anthropology, Bucharest

My article deals with the trading dimension in the artisanship process as it takes place in the 2000s Romania. The research is centred on the institution of folk fair, which is described at the level of five ethnographic museums in Bucharest, Sibiu, Timisoara, and Suceava. Artisans appear to be interested not only in the traditional transmission from generation to generation of their crafts, but also in meeting and keeping a clientele for the artefacts they make. Even though, at present, craftsmanship and rural farming are separate branches of peasant economy, in the past, the folk fairs and the agricultural markets were unified, in accordance with the needs for exchange among peasants in their native countryside.

In 2002–2003, I conducted an investigation at the level of the craftsmen’s workshops in five ethnographic areas of Romania (Maramure , Mrginimea Sibiului, Oltenia, Vrancea, and Tulcea), in such domains of specialization as woodcarving, weaving, pottery, mask-making, and fishing. Since craftsmen make artefacts not solely for a domestic use in their village households, but equally for sale within the urban folk fairs, I considered it relevant to extend my previous research over such a market process.

Information for my article was collected during five folk fairs, held in 2005, in the following museums: the Museum of Peasants (Bucharest, 15–17 July), the Museum of Banat Villages (Timisoara, 5–7 August), the Astra Museum of Folk Civilisation (Sibiu, 12–15 August), the Museum of Suceava and Bukovine (Suceava, 19–21 August), and the Village Museum (Bucharest, 16–18

* *Acknowledgements.* This text is part of a research report that I wrote after accomplishing my project *When Tradition is Given a Trademark. The Market Enrolment of Folk Artisanship in Post-Socialist Romania* in the framework of Centre for Advanced Study (CAS), Sofia (2005–2006). I express here my gratitude to the CAS institution (particularly, to Professor Alexander Kiossev), and also to all my colleagues from the program “Roles, Identities, and Hybrids”, for their warm encouragements and advices. I am also deeply grateful to all my field interlocutors – the folk artisans and the museum directors – whose names are indicated at the end of my article. The entire responsibility for the content of the following material is mine.

September)¹. The museum fairs are not regular events, but they depend on fixed religious feasts or locally significant dates. As a result, the schedule of my fieldwork was made in accord with the above fairs.

As regards the institutional relevance of the museums concerned here, we first distinguish the chronological primacy and sociological encompassing of the Village Museum (founded in 1936 by the members of sociological teams led by Dimitrie Gusti, with representation of the different peasant cultures of Romania). Another case (the Museum of Peasants) is outstanding for the contemporary professional achievement of the EMYA distinction, as “the best European museum of the year” (1996). As for the Astra Museum, we take into account the profile and capacity of its establishment, as devoted to “the folk civilisation and technology in Romania” within a perimeter of 100 hectares; at the same time, the Astra Museum is the house of several national associations in artisanship. With respect to the other two museums in discussion (the Museum and the Suceava Museum), they represent the largest counties of Romania (Timi : 8,697 km²; Suceava: 8,553 km²), and also cases of regional open-air museums that are currently hosting folk fairs; another reason here is that of the multiethnic folk programmes of the two museums.

As regards the institutional relevance of the museums concerned here, I first distinguish the chronological primacy and sociological encompassing of the Bucharest Village Museum (founded in 1936 by the members of sociological teams led by Dimitrie Gusti, with representation of the different peasant cultures of Romania). Another case (the Bucharest Museum of Peasants) is outstanding for the contemporary professional achievement of the EMYA distinction, as “the best European museum of the year” (1996). As for the Sibiu Astra Museum, we take into account the profile and capacity of its establishment, as devoted to “the folk civilisation and technology in Romania” within a perimeter of 100 hectares; at the same time, the Astra Museum is the house of several national associations in artisanship. With respect to the other two museums in discussion (the Timi oara Museum and the Suceava Museum), they represent the largest counties of Romania (Timi : 8,697 km²; Suceava: 8,553 km²), and also cases of regional open-air museums that are currently hosting folk fairs; another reason here is that of the multiethnic folk programmes of the two museums.

¹ The folk fair is a peasant institution that the ethnographic museums seem to have borrowed from the peasant cultural milieu within which it had developed for centuries. Such fairs – called *nedei*, singular *nedeie* – took place since the medieval times on the western, southern, and eastern sides of the Romanian Carpathians. Anthropologist Gheorghii Gean provides (2006: 93-4) the annual calendar of sixteen folk fairs in the villages of Bârse ti, N ruja, Tirchi , and Vidra (Vrancea County), as held between 23 April and 6 December, at fixed dates, usually representing Christian feasts”. According to the author (who also relies on ethno-folkloristic and sociological descriptions of Carpathian fairs in the 1930s), a series of functions may be associated with the mountain folk fairs in Romania, including the “institutionalised entertainment” as a “means of socialisation for young people”, the “economic exchanges as influential peasant markets”, and the “ethnic function” of “reinforcing the primordial ties” between the Romanians who live in Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania (Gean 2006: 94-7).

THE FOLK-FAIR

As hosted by ethnographic museums, the folk fairs constitute the main “cultural scene” where the peasant “traditions” and “folk art” are displayed in front of an urban audience. In fact, the very notion of “fair” is intriguing when it matches the “museum” one. Folk fairs in Romania have been reported since medieval times², but they were institutions of peasantry only, with no cultural assistance from the state, the church, or the nobility. As will be seen, the twentieth-century (ethnographic) museums in Romania were for a long time assigned specialised tasks of patrimony management, and not popularising or “cultural revival” functions.

In our study, we are interested in discussing the market character of folk fairs (which seems to prevail over the museum programmes of “folk-culture” custody). This is to examine the trading metamorphosis of “artefacts” into “products”, and of “tradition” or “folk art” into “commodity-defined goods”. We also seek to understand the effectiveness degree of some market strategies among craftsmen, as well as the market social organisation of them.

A series of important factors seem to accurately indicate the market character of the folk-fair artisanship. Among such factors, we mention the artisans’ seasonal working schedule, their collectively-shared definition of “collegiality”, the national-scale of the folk-fairs network, and the openness toward other “market” frameworks in Romania (particularly, regional and urban festivals).

MP suggests that the museum-hosted folk-fairs agenda during the main Orthodox feasts of the year (Christmas and Easter, days of saints like Peter and Paul, Elias, Holy Virgin, Day of Holy Cross, Saint Demetrius, and Saint Nicholas) would reproduce the peasants’ traditional calendar and alternation of work and ritual time. At times, craftsmen describe their seasonal division of labour between artisanship and local farming activities, which they need to schedule rigorously in order to attend spring, summer, autumn, and winter fairs (for instance, AR, IB, MAP, and TB). Other artisans (CP, VA) argue their interest in the seasonal rotation of their crafts in terms of winter timing necessary for the home manufacture of objects. VMold depicts the atmosphere of the folk fairs in the past, when farming

² The folk fair is a peasant institution that the ethnographic museums seem to have borrowed from the peasant cultural milieu within which it had developed for centuries. Such fairs – called *nedei*, singular *nedie* – took place since the medieval times on the western, southern, and eastern sides of the Romanian Carpathians. Anthropologist Gheorghe Gean provides (2006: 93–4) the annual calendar of sixteen folk fairs in the villages of Bârse ti, N ruja, Tirchi , and Vidra (Vrancea County), as held between 23 April and 6 December, at fixe dates, usually representing Christian feasts”. According to the author (who also relies on ethno-folkloristic and sociological descriptions of Carpathian fairs in the 1930s), a series of functions may be associated with the mountain folk fairs in Romania, including the “institutionalised entertainment” as a “means of socialisation for young people”, the “economic exchanges as influential peasant markets”, and the “ethnic function” of “reinforcing the primordial ties” between the Romanians who live in Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania (Gean 2006: 94–7).

products, wooden artefacts, and pottery were usually brought and sold together. Perhaps as a reminiscence of such traditional markets, some artisans are engaged into “barter” transactions during the fairs of today, as when ZMB exchanged one of her wooden artefacts for a folk costume made by a colleague, or when TBus offered a wind-instrument for a table cloth.

CP and IB argue their advantage to sell at the fair, in comparison with the small-priced transactions at home. In general, craftsmen recognise that the museum folk-fair is the proper place to meet their clientele (ES, MD, SA, SB, and VB). According to OD, a museum folk-fair also operates a “selection of [craft] values”, to the benefit of public. IB remembers that in the beginning of 1990s, many fairs were open to any craftsman, even with no museum invitation needed, while nowadays artisans face new hardships (especially the requirement to found their own trading society in order to be allowed to commercialize objects under the museum custody).

The most nominated folk-fairs among artisans are those hosted by the Bucharest Village Museum (28 references), the Sibiu Astra Museum (27 references), the Bucharest Museum of Peasants (25 references), the Oradea Museum (15 references), the Suceava Museum (10 references), the Timi oara Museum (6 references), the Bra ov Museum of Bran (5 references), the Câmpulung-Moldovenesc Museum (4 references), and the Bra ov Museum (3 references)³. Several craftsmen point out the commercial potential of the Bucharest museums (EP, VA, VMold, and ZMB). Other folk fairs mentioned by artisans are located in Ia i (14 nominations), Cluj (8), Constan a (6), Craiova (4), Boto ani (3), M n stirea Humorului (3), Pite ti (3), Arad (2), Deva (2), Târgu-Mure (2), Târgu-Neam (2), Vaslui (2), Baia Mare (1), Bistri a (1), Buftea (1), Buz u (1), Curtea de Arge (1), Foc ani (1), Pa cani (1), R d u i (1), Râmnicu-Vâlcea (1), Roman (1), Reghin (1), Sfântul Gheorghe (1), Sighi oara (1), Slatina (1), and Vatra Dornei (1). EV (artisan from the Republic of Moldova) attends mostly the fairs from the towns of Orhei, B li, and Chisinau⁴.

A recurrent opinion is that of the folk-fair “large-family atmosphere” among artisans when they meet each other and exchange information, craft working models, and impressions about their work (DC, DM, DG, IM, SA, SB, MP, MR, C, VKR, and VL). EV equates her participation to the fairs with an “exchange of experience”, in that she finds there ideas difficult to imagine at home. IA speaks of

³ The notoriety of museums is also associated with their advertising investment, which is generalised as a market strategy of all the museums concerned here: radio and TV publicity, along with banners and promotional leafs (CEU), radio and TV, printed media (PP), Astra Film studio, tourism agencies and hotels, and TV (CB).

⁴ The general policy of museums and municipalities in hosting the folk fairs is to invite artisans from all the ethnographic areas of Romania. For example, the National Festival of Folk Traditions (Astra Museum, Sibiu) brings together 400 craftsmen of which 100 from Transylvania, 100 from Moldavia and Moldova, 100 from Wallachia, and 100 from Dobroudja (CB).

his “kindred” colleagues from the folk fairs. Such a “corporate” self-representation is particularly associated with those fairs when (in the 1990s) the craftsmen’s participation was smaller than today, and when their cohesion would have been “stronger” (ZMB). MP claims that museum folk-fair is not (due to artisans’ “collegiality”) a place for “competition”.

I think there is no real competition [among craftsmen] since customers there are for all of us. The customer comes and sees many objects, and he will choose what he wishes; maybe he would need some of my objects or something else from my colleague... So I think we artisans are rather colleagues, than rivals... It is true that [...] when we see one of us bringing to fair something new, we all will try at the next fair to present a novel, astonishing, and interesting thing. This is indeed “competition”, but an artistic one...!

Artisans rhetorically use to oppose the museum-fair to urban open-air markets (APC, CP, DC, IA, MP, NM, SA, TBus, and VLin). ND sees the markets as sites where “China-made [serial] objects” and “plastics” are usually found. However, several artisans also mention markets and diverse other places and opportunities to sell their artefacts in the city. Thus, they take part to municipality-hosted folk fairs (CP, DM, and FM). GS is present at the “Beer Festival” held in Timi oara. Weaver MD attends the “Golden Stag” international music festival in Bra ov. FM reaches the 1812-dated “Manuc Inn” in Bucharest. MJ and MM are usually invited to urban feasts like the “Festival of Hearts” and the “Harvest Day”, in Timi oara, as well as to the “Days of Timi oara” (another “Harvest Day” fair takes place in the Moreni town, cf. VMold). SA is participant at the “Days of the Ia i City”. NM travels with his painted-icons to the “Muntele G ina” ancient folk-fair (in the Transylvanian Carpathians); DC is another artisan participant to this traditional fair. VKR has attended international folklore festivals in the towns of Târgu-Jiu, Târgovi te, and Caransebe . According to EV, in the Republic of Moldova, similar folk fairs are those held in the “Day of the B l i town” and during the “Wine Feast” in Chisinau. Sometimes one artisans’ participation is said “not to fit the festival profile”, such as in the case of weaver AN at the Sighi oara Medieval Festival in Southern Transylvania. Instead, woodcarver TE does include the Sighi oara festival (along with the “Wine Festival” in Târgu-Mure) in the agenda of his folk-fair involvement. FB has attended (and has been awarded a prize) at the “Festival of Painted Eggs”, in Cioc ne ti-Suceava, while VB is present at the “Chestnuts Feast” in Baia Mare. FC plans to reach a Bucharest-based “Fair of Bread”. Other similar “festivals” of interest for artisanship are “The Folk Young-Men of Bra ov” and the “Garlic Festival” in Boto ani (OD)⁵.

⁵ In the summer of 2005, the folk fairs were relocated from the city centres to the ethnographic museums in Suceava and Timi oara, which occurred at the request of the local municipality councils (CEU and IVP). In both cases, the directors of the above museums contend that their institutions would “protect” in such way the artisans and the folk art.

Artisans generally explain their presence at the fair by need of demonstration for visitors in order that “customers understand why we ask their money...” (VKR) (similar “demonstrative” sessions are those carried out by TBus and VL). VMold says his habit is “to narrate” for his clients the “fireplace-icon story” (that is one of his artefacts). According to FC, in his “first working phase” the “[folk] creator” is satisfied when making qualitative objects; in “the second phase”, however, he “has to sell [the artefacts]”. Instead, VM claims that “I dislike selling the commodity I make...” Moreover, unlike his wife (who is “rapacious”), VM happens to reduce his prices. On the other hand, when the artisan and firm holder AN leaves her artefacts under the museum custody, she establishes “good prices”, so that sale will be made even with the museum commission included; she calls herself to be a “business partner” of museums. In general, craftsmen take the price making as their trading right, as a result of market negotiation (MP, NM, and OD), or as a placement within the general price trend of a given fair (EU), with a refusal of the museum intercession (FC, TBus). Sometimes, however, museums are claimed to “advise” the artisans when the prices they set up would be “too small” (IA, VMold).

Craftsmen like AF, FM, OD, and TB label “commodity” the artefacts they bring to museums, or which they leave under the museum custody. Market calculation within the folk fair is sometimes denied, since according to NM, “it should not be proper to negotiate the price of an icon...” On the contrary, ceramist OD’s viewpoint is that “since this is a fair, our commodity must be negotiated as such!” Notwithstanding such a tension between what “is”, and what “should not become” commerce (also present in the discourse of IM and DG), IA succeeded to sell not less than 60 masks at a three-days fair of the Museum of Peasants in Bucharest. Likewise, DM sold more than 100 wooden artefacts in two days, while MM once sold 24 little wallets. MP usually deals out “20, 30... or 50 [folk-worn] puppets” for the artisanry shops. Such wholesale is not regular among the craftsmen. MAP says, for instance, that her family association’s “commodity” is not in demand within the Astra Museum. DC and FC are similarly sceptical as to the real “purchasing power” of their folk-fair clientele. Another motivation for retail trade is that of the craftsmen who need long time to make their artefacts (IB, ZMB).

A major concern among artisans is the transportation of their artefacts to the fairs. A series of craftsmen make here use of their personal cars (AF, AP, AN, CP, EP, EU, FB, IG, MDen, MJ, MPop, ND, NM, TE, C, ZMB, VMold and VT). According to artisans like IA, EV, VKR, collaboration in the transport payment is another possibility for reaching a fair.

Many artisans come to the fairs followed by their relatives, including the ego’s father (AT), brother (C), wife (APC, CP, EP, and FB), son (DM, FC, and ND), daughter (MJ), and granddaughter (GS). A family’s division of labour is effective in VM’s case: while he attends the Suceava museum-fair, his wife is present at another fair, in the Roman town. TB and SA make their artefacts with

their spouses' help; besides, the artisans' spouses will remain at home for farming work, while they leave for the fairs.

In the above phenomena, artisanship appears to reflect the "market-orientation" of peasantry toward the cities, in the framework of a production-and-exchange process that depends on seasonal labour organisation necessary to provide and diffuse the "commodity" demanded by the craftsmen's urban and foreign clientele. Manufacture and sale of artefacts are also adapted to the seasonal tourist presence, as in the case of the summer fairs and festivals in Bra ov, Sighi oara, Gura Humorului, and Constan a (EU, TE, VKR, and ZMB).

The folk-fair institution in contemporary Romania is the urban "delivery unit" the artisans envisage for distribution of their "products" at a regional or national scale. Participation to local folk-markets only is quite rarely reported, either in the case of the "small museum fairs" from Timi oara (MJ, MM) and Suceava (EU, MAP, C), or in that of the "large fairs" from the Sibiu Astra Museum (DC, EV), the Bucharest Museum of Peasants (SB), and the Bucharest Village Museum (MP, MR, OD). Instead, majority of craftsmen inscribe themselves into a national circuit of museum-based folk fairs and municipality-hosted city feasts, as well as tourism festivals (APC, AT, CP, DG, EP, FM, IA, IG, IM, MDen, MPop, ND, SA, TBus, VA, and VMold).

As a result, the "folk fair" is to be seen as a market framework that extends artisanship beyond the museum more-or-less effective policy of "traditional values selection" or "revitalisation"⁶. Of course, the museum fairs are (due to reasons to discuss in the following chapter) claimed to best meet the artisans' formal commercial needs. In many respects, however, the craftsmen's network of urban diversified-location fairs seems at least equally consistent with the ecotourism industry in socialist and especially post-socialist Romania. DM's membership in ANTREC (Romanian Association for Ecotourism) is relevant as to such development of artisanship.

As we are ANTREC members, the Association invites us as to attend specialised fairs it sets up for the foreign tourists. [...] Thus we took part to a fair organised with support of the European Union [...]. We conduct the project of an itinerary for the private pensions associated with ANTREC, which will be advertised within an international exhibit.

⁶ For the "salvaging" vision in the Romanian museography, see the situation of the Timi oara Museum, in the case of the acquisition of a pottery workshop, from a local village where the craft concerned had disappeared (IVP). Such approach is reinforced by the refuse of change in the folk traditions, since "nothing can replace a given tradition" (IVP). According to CEU, the "first mission" of an ethnographic museum is to keep "the trend of authentic folk art", which makes the artisans "to accept the critiques and take out their stands such improper products". CB mentions some "echoes" of the artisanship policy of the Astra Museum in Transylvanian villages where peasants start wearing again their old folk-costumes (for instance, while the church rituals) and learn their children folk dances, songs, and myths.

We have mentioned in this study several types of “membership” among the craftsmen, including organisations like the Association of Folk Artisans (AFA) and the Academy of Traditional Arts (ATA)(Sibiu), the Union of the Fine Artists (UAF)(Bucharest), and the “Association of the Amateur Painters” (AAP)(Alba). Of these associations, it is only the AFA and ATA that are linked to the museum framework of the folk fairs, while the non-governmental organisations like UAF, AAP, and ANTREC reflect another affiliation register of the artisans, at the level of private institutionalisation and interests.

On such bases – of a state and private character – is also grounded the branch “collegiality” among the artisans. Do such metaphors as the “family” or “brotherhood” self-representation of the craftsmen’s professional group account for any “guild” awareness in times of social and economic transformation in Romania? Probably they do. While it is still following diversified policies of planning and hosting the folk fairs by museums, municipalities, and NGOs, artisanship is expected to possible evolutions from a subaltern condition toward autonomous initiatives and sociality. This seems, at any rate, to be the meaning of the artisans’ private trading strategies and resources when they are present at the folk fairs. As seen earlier, many craftsmen promote wholesale and the direct or “face-to-face” price-making, which is pertinent for their increasing expertise in the market exchange of “art goods”. The use of artisans’ personal cars for their transportation to and from the fairs is an example relevant for the craftsmen’s need to detach themselves from the assistance of their work by museums or other “sponsors”.

Some “projective” trading mastery in the market artisanship could also be inferred among those artisans who come to the fairs followed by their children (GS, SA) or juvenile apprentices (EU, SB). Most of all, specialisation in commerce through the folk fairs is evident in the case of artisans’ family division of labour on the market. The family associations we have mentioned in the social framework of the “workshop-based artisanship” become this time effective also in the distribution of artefacts. As will be seen, this is the premise of a shift from the status of “client” status toward a “condition of reciprocity” between artisans and the ethnographic museums.

CLIENTELE FOR ARTEFACTS

A hypothesis of our analysis on the market enrolment of artisanship claims that production of the artefacts is built on a regular base made up of some “consumption” peculiarities associated with such folk-art “goods”. Possibility of a “ready-made” demand for objects and services in artisanry (such as the “craft-teaching sessions” and the “culinary art”) depend as seen on the agency of museums and municipalities (which artisans undertake as costs and benefits). However, beyond this mediation artisans find terrain open for their direct relationship with customers, as well as for their equally direct “distribution channels”.

Our approach will first take into account the role that the personal relationships plays in the making and keeping of a clientele for artisanship, to attempt then to discern a “typology” of the artisans’ clients. It is important to notice that, while artisanship is made as a branch of peasant economy (which involves specialisation, labour division, investments etc.) it seems to still be seen as only “folk-art” among urban and foreign customers (with implication of “intrinsic” and “ineffable”, rather than “accountable”, value of one’s artefacts). As a consequence, the market demand for artefacts is balanced between what artisans choose to “represent” as folk traditions and arts, and what their clientele happens to mean as “traditional” or “artistic” as regards peasantry. Icon-painter NM is evocative for such a “folk-market negotiation”:

[As an artisan] I strive to meet the customers’ expectancies [...] This is problematic, since I am supposed to conform to someone’s interest in a painted icon... for the rest of his/her life, so that I have to make it as that client wants...

Artisans generally contend they are establishing “their own clientele”. According to IB, he engages “friendships” with those who buy his artefacts, since such clients usually continue to frequent him. “Personalised” sale relationships are also developed among craftsmen like AT, FB, MAP, MM, and VL. IA speaks of his “20 years-known clients”. Similarly, ZMB meet customers who regularly pay visits to her stand for “two-three years long”. Other artisans describe how clientele asks them for their phone number and address, with intention of further demands (AN, EM, OD). “Monograms” or engraved trademarks on wooden artefacts, with the craftsmen’s name initials and residence (AR, IB, VMold), are similarly used in order to keep clients informed with the craft paternity. According to MP and VLin, their “long time-made clients” use to recommend them to further customers from among acquaintances. VMold speaks of his “fans” within the folk-fair framework, which concerns visitors who ask for details about the artisan’s “professional evolution” and even dare to draw his attention upon the use of raw materials other than “traditional”.

A regular customer category is that of the Romanians who leave their country and take with them artefacts as “souvenirs” (AN, AR, CP, MAP, MM, SB, C, and VA). MP sees this fact as a “transmission of our folk art abroad”.

Private tourism-houses make up a constant clientele for artisanship. When VL attended a folk fair in his native Tulcea town, a tourism-house owner asked some of his wind-instruments to exhibit in front of tourists. AP has received similar demand for her carpets. In Bessarabia, EV is currently working together with a tourism-specialised private house in the Tribujeni town.

Several artisans distinguish between their Romanian and foreign clients according to absence of negotiation in the foreigners’ market behaviour (EM, TB), or contrarily to one’s preference for negotiation with foreigners, not with co-nationals (MJ).

According to MD, the foreign clients are interested in buying artisanery as a handmade category of objects. Potter EP knows that foreigners are those who buy his “high-value” items. Artisans like DM, IMold, and VM praise the foreigners’ better payment as well. Handicraft for tourists is sometimes alleged to cause degeneration of the traditional art-making, as in FM’s case when concerning the “peasant” shoes made in some areas of Transylvania. ND equates the “traditional” mark of his artefacts with the “souvenir” use of them among the tourists. Sometimes, such clients are associated with a given ethnic identity: Frenchmen (cf. FM, MM, MP), Dutchmen (cf. MM), Italians (cf. IG), and Germans (cf. IMold). NM says he once took (when wearing his folk costume from Southern Transylvania area) a photograph with... his Jamaican clients; he also sold in France many icons with the “Saint George” motive. According to DC, Spanish and Swiss clients are buying his violins-with-trumpet not for playing, but for keeping them as “museum objects”. Artisans like AT, FC, and VMold speak of their “clientele” made of ambassadors of the United States of America in Romania. In other situations, however, foreign clients may seem as “avaricious” to artisans like VA.

Artisans are also given opportunities to meet their foreign clients in international contexts. EP travelled (thanks to the national Ministry of Foreign Affairs) to Austria (2000), Germany (2004), and Canada (2005). ND claims that his clay-made “peasant characters” were collected by museums in Tokio and Washington (the Smithsonian Institute). By the ANTREC tourism association, DM went to Bulgaria, Hungary, and Austria. AR took a trip to Augsburg, Germany, with support of the Suceava Museum. IG opened exhibitions (through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Museum of Peasants) in Washington, the United States of America, as well as in Koblenz, Regensburg, and Ulm, Germany. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (as well as the National Cultural Foundation, and the Astra Museum, together with the Smithsonian Institution) has also supported IA and AT for their participation at Washington 1999 folk festival. The Romanian Ministry of Tourism sponsored VLin’s participation to international exhibits in the USA, England, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Russia, and Turkey... A self-supported participation to international fairs is that of FC (in the case of the Munich ceramic fair).

Artisanship envisages a large array of private clients among a series of “beneficiaries” more or less connected to “folk-art” production. One of CP’s demands is from the part of restaurant patrons who ask him to write the name of the firms concerned, on the pottery items he makes. Among IMold’s usual clients for his wooden hogsheads are mentioned the patrons of local wine cellars. One of MAP’s demands is that of a restaurant in Bra ov; in this case, MAP and her husband were asked to make the needed vessel, including mugs and soup tureens.

Further clientele for artisanship is provided from among local folk-dance bands (MM) or fiddlers (TBus, VA). Similarly, VL’s clients in wind-instruments craft are intended to play those instruments, and not to only collect them.

MPop, SB, and TBus report some school-made demand for artisanship. VA recently worked for a kindergarten in Bucharest; she also sold some of her folk-costumes at the Gura Humorului Monastery. Similarly, MN seeks for customers interested in her egg-painting works at the Moldovi a Monastery, while SA mentions her collaboration with the Hanu Monastery (Neam County), as regards some of her wooden crosses. Icon-painter FB undertakes often collaboration with local churches.

EP speaks of those “enriched” compatriots interested in “folk art” but who in fact are claimed to prefer only “kitsch” objects. IB notices the scarce presence of businessmen within the folk fairs, while most of tourists generally prefer little souvenirs (he is making wooden “statues”). The theme of “small purchasing power” of the co-national clientele is general among the Romanian artisans (EV, FC, MJ, NM, SF, C, and VM). AT is worried about those artisans whose work is unqualified, and which is at the same time sold at prices lower than in the case of the artefacts made by skilful craftsmen.

Some of ND’s clients would become “collectors” of his ceramic artefacts. Similar “collectors” are those of IA’s masks, as well as those who collect AT’s bulrush-made baskets. FC is making special pottery (of longer handwork duration) for private collectors. Nevertheless, DG claims that collectors are few today – among the Romanians –, since “people do not afford any more folk-art collections”.

At times, local clients are recruited from among the so-called “connoisseurs of folk art” (AR, APC, EP, NM). ND notices that, while the “folk art” was en vogue among peasants in the past, it is now in demand among “sirs”. MR’s “target clientele” is mostly made up by women, since they “have a sense of the home decoration”. Some artisans (MP, NM) associate such “art expertise” with foreign clientele (which would understand Romanian folk-art “better” than Romanians do).

In accordance with the field data, “personalisation” in making one’s clientele among craftsmen is apparently a means to assure regularity in the distribution of artisanry. More precisely, those long time-based market relationships are designed to build up particular “niches” in the chain of production and sale of folk-art items. In such cases, artisans obtain not only continuous demand but also confidence and prestige, which is well epitomised by the account of weaver MM.

Last year, when attending the municipality-set fair in the Timi oara city centre, I simply met a Romanian family who lives in Italy. [...] Lady wanted one of the overcoats I make. She came to my home and made such a demand to me. I made that overcoat for her, and she was to wear it. Well, this year she came back and met me again [at the fair], looked at me, and said, “When did I meet you... this happened last year!” So we recognised each other, and she was to buy two little wallets from me! This is a satisfaction...

However, we may ask if the personalised trade in artisanship is preferred (for reasons of fluidity in the sale of artefacts) to the craftsmen’s freedom in their price-

making process. While majority of artisans claim they are “open to negotiation” and that they even agree with price reductions (for instance FC and TBus), situations also occur when negotiation is not accepted (APC, SA, VM’s wife), which may be relevant for the craftsmen’s firmness in defending their *market* interests, and not those concerned with one’s clientele’s “friendship” or “taste”. As a matter of fact, artisans describe differentiated “types” of customers depending on criteria such as their clientele’s specialisation in folk art, ethnic identity, purchasing-power, educational purposes, and so on. Thus we could distinguish between the “main”, “secondary”, and “tertiary” client types in artisanry, which makes it difficult to accept the profile of some broad “ready-made” or “target” audience for the craftsmen’s work and “products”.

The “main” type of clientele in artisanry is that of the co-nationals who travel abroad and the foreign tourists who visit Romania. As seen above, a series of institutionalised “distribution units” have gradually been specialising in the market industry of the folk art and artefacts, such as artisanry shops, “folk” restaurants, folk fairs (of museum or municipality hosting) etc. In this process, artisans are present not only as “providers” for “middle-sale”, but they increasingly seek to directly access their travelling or touring clients, and thus to shorten distance from one’s village workshop to his/her trade stands. In particular, the artisans’ tourism-houses are meant to fulfil (in accordance with ecotourism in Romania) the function of “sale representative”, which is still preponderantly played upon by the above urban “partners”.

The “secondary” clientele for artisanry is more heterogeneous. Even so, it is endowed with “folk-specialisation” among customers like the patrons of “folk” restaurants or shops, as well as the folk-music bands and fiddlers. Besides, we find here demand from schools or churches, as associated with the educational and spiritual function of folk art. Finally, this group also contains those “enriched people” interested in folk art, but whose knowledge or tastes in artisanry may not be consistent.

As for the “tertiary” client type, which is reported to a lesser extent, it does include the “collectors” and “connoisseurs of folk art”. Specialised clientele in this case is expected not only to assure one’s sale of artefacts, but also to confer public validation for those artefacts’ “traditional genuineness”, “aesthetic refinement”, “ethnographic authenticity” etc. As seen in a precedent chapter, artisans are sometimes subject to evaluation from specialised committees of museums. However, the museums’ evaluation of artisanry is part of the official politics of “culture” in Romania, with scopes like the preservation and restoration of the peasant traditions, and it is manifestly not associated with the “popular culture” or common-sense of the “specialised” visitors. That is, a “collector” or “connoisseur” will not necessarily reflect the museum vision on what folk-art is or should be, but will probably follow his/her particular goals and interests (including perhaps commercial ones).

The above classification (which especially relies on the rate of the craftsmen’s clientele) could be related to the distinction between “local-and-

regional”, “national”, and “international” layers of client extraction. Such distinction might be useful in order to avoid some possible misinterpretation of the “clientele typology” in artisanship in essentialist terms about “patriotism” or “globalisation” in the diffusion of artefacts. Again, the differences in the clientele localisation are heuristic as regards the shift in the cultural meaning of artefacts when sold on markets remote from the craftsmen’s ethnographic areas.

Local-and-regional clientele is particularly reported among the “secondary” type of customers (such as folk-music bands and fiddlers, as well as schools and churches). National-level clientele is present among Romanians who travel abroad (= the “main” client type), as well as among some folk-art “collectors” and “connoisseurs” (= the “tertiary” type of clientele). As for the international layer of clients, it includes foreign tourists and co-nationals who live abroad (= the “main” purchasing sector)⁷.

To meet their clients, artisans need either (1) to found their own tourism pensions at home (=“main client type” + “international” client layer), or (2) to attend the national network of folk fairs (=“main”, “secondary”, and “tertiary” client types + “national” and “international” client layers), or finally (3) to travel for exhibitions abroad (= “main” client type + “international” client layer).

In fact, such a dilatation in the “consumption network” for artefacts is another facet of artisanship seen as a “craftwork-and-fair” process. We have identified as a “workshop phase” in the artisans’ work, which takes place as a home industry in their villages, and a subsequent “folk-fair phase”, which occurs as commerce in the cities⁸. Probably, the “secondary” client type is more expected to address first the “use-value” of artefacts (at least, in the case of some restaurants and fiddlers), which as seen is associated with local-and-regional customers. Instead, the “main” and “tertiary” types of clientele are best suited for the “exchange-value” of artefacts, namely in relation to “national” and “international” groups of customers.

CONTEXTUALISING ARTISANSHIP: FOLK FAIRS AND OPEN-AIR MARKETS IN ROMANIA AND EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Artisanship is a part of the market economy in post-socialism. It was also well integrated in the socialist economy. Ethnographic and historical information exists on folk fairs as peasant markets in medieval and modern times. What is the

⁷ A particular example on the implications of the foreign “partnership” and clientele for the folk artisanship in Romania is that of the “Aid to Artisans” project, which a private foundation from Connecticut, the United States of America, developed with the Astra Museum in Sibiu. According to CB, the above collaboration consisted of international training in marketing for artisans, invitation for craftsmen to international fairs and festivals, publishing in the United States of America of a comprehensive catalogue on artisanship in Romania, demands for Romanian women-weavers from the part of American fashion houses, etc.

⁸ Director IVP correlates craftsmanship with the “market passion” and artisanery with “necessity” – both of these being taken as basic traits among the artisans. A similar understanding of artisans as “craftsmen” but also “traders” is shared by the directors CEU and PP.

extent to which the artisanship process can be relevant for a broader understanding of the peasant economies today, in what generally concerns the market exchange between peasantry and the urban population? A comparative discussion on the folk, agricultural, and bazaar-like “open-air markets” (OAMs) in Romania and Central-and-Eastern Europe will be undertaken here as an attempt to contextualise artisanship.

A historical relationship. From the perspective of economic research, the open-air markets in Central and Eastern Europe were preceded by “traditional fairs with licensed artisans in the centre and trader-tourists around the fringe” (Sik & Wallace 1999: 698; Csako and Sik 1999: 723). More specifically, in the case of the “folk” or “traditional” OAMs in medieval Hungary.

[...] serf vendors usually brought grain or food surplus to market towns, as the roads leading to these places were usually more accessible and they could buy the hand-crafted goods that other highlanders transported to the marketplace and were permitted to sell according to set rules. (Csako & Sik 1999: 718)

On the other hand, ethnographic evidences reveal how agricultural producers found within the 1930s folk fairs in the mountains of Transylvania a proper place to trade their goods aside the craftsmen who were selling artefacts. Following the data provided by sociologist Florea Florescu (*apud* Gean 2006: 94).

[...] more than 2,300 individuals – men and women, young and old – from about 70 villages participated in the famous fair of G ina Mountain, which took place on 18 July 1937. All kinds of goods were displayed on that occasion, but especially three categories: wooden vessels and tools, pottery, and sheepskin coats. These categories corresponded to the main branches of the division of labour within the large area of villages which attended the fair. Otherwise, the spectrum of goods for sale was much larger and comprised, for example, textiles, drinks, cereals, and fruits.⁹

The socialism-postsocialism cultural continuum. The data of our current database indicate that many artisans in Romania learned and practiced their crafts under communism (see also Constantin 2003). Prior to 1989, they worked within socialist cooperatives, and their artefacts were distributed through the state-owned artisanry shops. Likewise, artisans began the public representation of their handicrafts and artefacts in the framework of nationalistic festivals of political propaganda, as well as through museum-hosted folk fairs based in Bucharest and Sibiu. Autarchy, centralism, and uniformity have been described as main factors of economic decline that determined in the 1980s the breakdown between artisans and the socialist policies.

⁹Coexistence of artisanship with agriculture and pastoralism is still present in some ethnographic areas of the Romanian Carpathians. Thus, in the herding villages in Southern Transylvania, artisanship and agriculture are “incorporated” within the “dominant” economy of transhumance (which also includes the modern industry of ecotourism)(Constantin 2004: 84, 101).

Among the attributes of the “Comecon OAM trade”¹⁰ in socialist Hungary, there are mentioned the context of economic shortages, set prices, limited border-crossing, tourist traffic with foreign goods cheaper and of best quality than those from home, retailers and itinerant traders, autarchy, uniformly low level of incomes, limited standard of living, demand for cheap (though low quality) goods, and the 1970s orientation toward Western goods (Csako & Sik 1999). The above authors also evoke the “folk trading” that accompanied before 1989 the state monopole over commerce, as well as the “traditional seasonal fairs” whose omnipresence in Eastern and Central Europe would have “reduced the costs of setting up the comecon marketplaces”.

In their post-socialist “market-economy apprenticeship”, artisans in Romania rely upon media advertising, investments in raw-material supply and transportation, private initiatives in family associations and firms, ecotourism, partnerships with state and private institutions and agents etc. In several cases, the craft specialisation accompanies the former or current practice of modern professions, or is the result of economic conversion from industry to artisanship.

After 1989, the land restitution and industrial decline determined many peasants to reconvert themselves into agricultural producers, with the Bucharest OAMs as “trade laboratories” where they engage in relationships with customers, middlemen, and market administration in order to obtain selling facilities and distribute their farming produces (Chelcea et al. 2003; Constantin 2005). In the Hungarian OAMs of Kecskemet, Szeged, Pécs, and Budapest-Josefvaros, the post-socialist trade supplied a need for products cheaper than in normal retail outlets, in association with decline of living standards among many people; the average number of traders increased from 87 (1995) to 92 (1997), while price hunting appears as a main strategy to cope with the worse economic condition in the Central Europe countries (Csako & Sik 1999). Replacement of socialist with privatised retail, the end of state paternalism, the growth of consumer culture, and the response to context of hyper-inflation and currency destabilisation are further phenomena associated with the OAMs continuation in post-socialist East and Central Europe (Sik & Wallace 1999)¹¹.

¹⁰ “Comecon” is an acronym for the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, an intergovernmental organization that covered the Soviet-Bloc countries, aimed at “joint planning and the promotion of bilateral and multilateral trade, along with cooperation in the specialization of production, establishing of joint enterprises, and so on” (Csako & Sik 1999: 715).

¹¹ Agnes Csako and Endre Sik speak of a “path-dependent legacy” in the Hungarian OAMs of today, in association with both “pre-communist institutions and human capital” and “structural characteristics of the communist and Comecon systems”, with the result of “the spread of a marketplace-based system of retail trade”. While the legacy of different frames and types of commerce is present in artisanship and the OAM trade as well, this should not be equated with the maintenance of some autarchic enclaves in the distribution of craft, agricultural, or non-agricultural goods in post-socialism. Artisanry within the network of open-air museums in Romania, as well as the trader tourism in Bulgaria and the countries of Central Europe, are patterns of exchange set up at a national and, respectively, international scale, which is a distinctive trait of the contemporary market economy.

Economic and administrative characteristics. Across our current “categories of analysis” of artisanship (as well as in Constantin 2003), we have described artisans as rural craft-workers engaged in “exhibits-for-sale” through the folk fairs that open-air museums set up in the cities of Bucharest, Sibiu, Timi oara, and Suceava. We have also mentioned the farming or agricultural activities of many craftsmen. Either as “traditions” or as “folk arts”, or still as ethnic groups, the artisans have been referred to as peasant groups who take their countryside-originated crafts and artefacts as an economic resource to exploit on the urban markets. “Folk” traders in Hungarian contemporary OAMs are reported in Pécs, where they sell “popular art from Romania” (Csako & Sik 1999: 724). Similarly, in Pécs and Kecskemet, traders who originate in the villages wear folk costumes (*Idem*, p. 728).

In the 2000s Bucharest OAMs, the peasant producers or growers are referred to as the main social “actors” (Chelcea et al. 2003) or “groups” (Constantin 2005) of urban marketplaces. Agricultural producers are rural landowners and possess their own farming goods. Some of them are presented as having “seniority” in the OAM trade (Chelcea et al. 2003) but also as depending on their productive schedules in agriculture (Constantin 2005). Weekly-held OAMs were set up in the 1990s Hungary to bring together the producers and consumers of agricultural goods (Sik & Wallace 1999: 707). Within the Pécs fair, animals were sold in the mid-1980s (Csako & Sik 1999: 724). In the OAM of Varna (the ex-socialist *Kolhozen Pasar*) Bulgarian farmers from the region sell their farm produces, mainly fruit and vegetables (Thuen 1999: 742).

Artisans who attend the folk fairs in Romania make use of their trademarks or visit cards in order to legitimise their craftwork as well as to promote their production of artefacts. At the same time, many craftsmen are registered as family associations or firms, and they take membership in artisanship associations as a means to be allowed to attend the folk fairs organised by museums.

Producer licenses and badges are reported among the trading farmers in Bucharest OAMs (Chelcea et al. 2003; Constantin 2005). In Hungarian OAMs from Kecskemet, Szeged, Pécs, and Budapest-Josefvaros, permanent traders of non-agricultural goods are associated with the possession of a permit or ticket (Csako & Sik 1999: 726).

Artisans in Romania subordinate themselves to the state policy by museums and municipalities in setting up folk fairs (as concerns the schedule, location, taxation, custody of artefacts, public relations, etc.) and officially in “preserving traditions”. They also engage in private partnerships with tourism agencies, hotels, artisanry shops, restaurants etc.

OAMs in Bucharest, Kecskemet, Szeged, Pécs, Budapest-Josefvaros, and Varna are mostly under the state administration (city-councils)(Chelcea et al. 2003; Csako and Sik 1999; Thuen 1999). Private stakeholders by franchise contracts with municipality are reported in five OAMs of the 6th Bucharest district (Chelcea et al.

2003), as well as in an OAM from the 4th district of Romanian capital (Constantin 2005); such OAMs remain subject of control by the city councils, police, Office of Consumer's Protection etc. The state-institutions' policy for a "civilised trade" (aimed at delimiting legal selling areas and eliminating the middlemen) are described for the Bucharest OAMs (Chelcea et al. 2003).

Artisans in Romania usually undertake the retail trade. However, depending on demands and time planning, they also consent to wholesale transactions. Some artisans speak of their artefacts in terms of "commodities" and "stocks". Craftsmen generally take the price making as their trading right, as a result of market negotiation, are paid amounts in advance, and make use of museum custody and private partnerships in the distribution of their goods.

In the Progresul OAM from Bucharest, rotation of retail and wholesale trade is described as a market strategy among the peasants and middlemen (Constantin 2005). In other Bucharest OAMs, the agricultural producers develop trading strategies such as renting more than one stall; renting the stalls by the market administration for middlemen and subletting them by the same middlemen to peasant producers is a practice associated with retailing and wholesale in the Bucharest OAMs (Chelcea et al. 2003). Retail traders of the Varna OAM depend on the wholesale markets in Istanbul for the supply with non-agricultural goods (Thuen 1999). The prices that producers set up depend on haggling and market "face-to-face" transactions (Constantin 2005). In the Hungarian OAMs of Kecskemet, Szeged, Pécs, and Budapest-Josefvaros, the prices are set as a result of bargaining between seller and buyer "in one-third of the cases" (Csako & Sik 1999).

As artisans attend a national-wide network of folk fairs in Romania, they need to invest in transportation (by train, bus, or personal cars). They are sometimes assisted here by museums and municipalities, unless they may associate themselves in covering their travel expenses.

Renting of co-villagers' transportation facilities by the peasant producers coming to Bucharest OAMs, as well as peasant's association in paying the transportation costs, are reported by Chelcea et al. (2003). Non-agricultural trader tourism of Bulgarian middle citizens, Turks, and Gypsies from the Varna OAM to Istanbul dwells on travel arrangements with bus drivers and custom officers (Thuen 1999). Small-scale non-agricultural traders from Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus to Hungary, Poland, and Czech Republic need to borrow money for their trips abroad by train or bus, as well as to face the changing state regulations in crossing the border (Wallace et al. 1999)¹².

¹² While within the traditional fairs, the craft trade was accompanied by the market distribution of agricultural goods, the open-air markets bring together agricultural and non-agricultural products. According to Csako and Sik (1999: 729–731), four main types of products are sold and bought within the Hungarian markets of Budapest-Josefvaros, Kecskemet, Pecs, and Szeged, as follows: food (mainly in the Pecs OAM), clothes (in all the OAMs), household products, appliances, and cosmetics (= Pecs), and culture or hobby products (= Pecs, Kecskemet). As regards the trader tourism from Eastern to Central Europe, it includes textiles, cigarettes, alcohol, videos, CDs, computer software, small domestic utensils, food etc. (Wallace et al. 1999: 758)

Artisans' professional status is a matter of formalisation-and-informality scale as regards the lack of any official framework for their handicrafts in economic terms, taxation on the craft production and exchange, supply of raw materials, delimitation of distribution etc.

Informality in Bucharest OAMs is described in the case of illegal sidewalk selling (Chelcea et al. 2003) and in the wholesale flow of goods from agricultural growers to middlemen (Constantin 2005). Occasional sellers devoid of licenses and market-selling facilities are reported for the OAMs in Pécs (47% of the local traders), as well as in Kecskemet (Csako and Sik 1999). An "informal social control" is played upon (through middlemen, co-ethnics, family and social networks) by trader-tourists from Russia, Ukraine, Romania etc., when they bring their commodities in Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Poland (Wallace et al. 1999).

One of the craftsmen's market strategies is to argue some "ethics of trade" when they consider the price making and "education of public" within the folk fairs, and particularly in denying the commercial nature of artisanship.

Moral overtones in Bucharest OAMs are contained in the "ethic of subsistence" that some market administrators exhibit with concern to their "tolerance" for the street traders' poverty (Chelcea et al. 2003), as well as in the blame by public and the city authorities on the "speculative" trading activity of the market middlemen (Constantin 2005). Morality of commerce is also present in the Roma trading-tourism specialisation (when opposed to condemnation of trade from socialist or ethnic-majority perspectives)(Thuen 1999). Another instance of morality issue is that of the "trader's dilemma" (capitalistic wealth-accumulation or profit disbursement amongst one's kin?) as present in the "social capital investment" of the East-European traders into their ethnic ties, family and social networks (Wallace et al. 1999)¹³.

Kin and ethnic groups and networks. Kin-structured patterns shape the artisanship process both at the level of craftwork and within the folk fairs in Romania, in relation to ego's paternal and maternal grand-parents, parents, spouse, sons and daughters, and even grandsons and granddaughters. Private associations and division of labour among and within the artisans' families are basic in their craft specialisation in socialist and post-socialist contexts.

Family cooperation (as among ego's parents, spouse, sons and daughters, kinsmen in law etc.) is effective in the Bucharest OAM of Progresul (Constantin 2005). Producers' networks of relatives, in-laws, and neighbours are also reported

¹³ With respect to the use of "social capital" in trade, Claire Wallace et al. argue (1999) that "The extent of moral obligation or the kind of moral ties which are developed during the turbulent post-communist period can affect the kind of capitalism which develops there". From this perspective, the "morality of trade" among artisans and the OAM traders seems to be more related to the post-socialist redefinition of the trade as a permanent profession and specialisation, than to some connection between the "nature" of commerce and a given social or ethnic group.

in the OAMs of the 4th and 5th districts of Bucharest (Chelcea et al. 2003). In the case of the Varna OAM, participation of the Gypsies in trade turns to be a family affair (Thuen 1999). Social networks and strategies in the trader tourism in the Central and Eastern Europe are described as “strong ties” within the nuclear and there-generation families of East-European small-scale traders (Wallace et al. 1999).

In Romania, ethnicity is present in artisanship with a function of “specificity assertion” among Romanian and Hungarian craftsmen, across the phases of production, distribution, and representation of artefacts. Roma tinsmiths and their products within the folk fairs from Bucharest and Sibiu are equated with the “increasing openness toward multiculturalism” in the policy of Romanian museums.

The “specialised trading-category” of Roma is a social actor in the Progresul OAM from Bucharest, while the transactions between Romanian producers and Roma merchants play a “central role” in articulating the local commerce (Constantin 2005). Middlemen and “their important role” in the Bucharest OAMs are recruited from marginal ethnic groups such as Roma (Chelcea et al. 2003). *Gadzhe* (non-Roma) and Roma travellers are associated in the trader tourism from Varna to Istanbul (Thuen 1999). Foreign traders are reported in the Hungarian OAMs from Kecskemet (Poles and Ukrainians), Pécs (Chinese), Szeged (Uzbekistani and Indonesians), and Budapest-Josefvaros (Chinese, Vietnamese, Romanians, Turks)(Csako and Sik 1999). 73% of small traders from Ukraine, Russia and Belarus in Poland, 38% in Slovakia and 21% in Hungary mention the resort to their co-nationals during the journeys across the border in order to trade; knit ethnic groups characterise the Chinese and Vietnamese traders in Hungary, while others (Hungarians from Romania, Romanians, Ukrainians), melt easier into the local population in Hungary or Poland (Wallace et al. 1999)¹⁴.

Conclusions: similarities and differences between artisanship and the OAM trade. To some extent, artisanship and OAM trade are analogous phenomena. They share a historical background and display important common features during socialism and post-socialism as well. A series of patterns of exchange (such as possession of goods and trademarks, relationships with state and private partners, wholesale and retail strategies, investments in transportation, the formalisation-and-informality scale, and the ethic of trade) are encountered both in

¹⁴ The kin and ethnic loyalties in the OAM trade are generally relevant for the “Lack of *formal* regulation to guarantee or protect activity of small-scale traders in post-communism” (Wallace et al. 1999: 751), and the craftsmen’ reliance on their kinsmen and co-nationals in the artisanship process may be similarly interpreted in terms of a need to substitute for the absence in the Romanian legislation of the economic validation of artisanship. At the same time, the social capital of kinship and ethnicity is described as a “currency of trading” in both socialist and capitalist contexts, to the extent in which “economic activity is socially embedded in social, family and ethnic networks” (Wallace et al. 1999: 752, 767). While it is obviously “socially embedded” (in term of kinship) as well, artisanship in Romania seems to play upon ethnicity, like upon the “folk” traditions and arts, in order to assert one’s identity in the process of exchange outside and not within his or her ethnic boundaries.

the framework of the folk fairs and urban marketplaces. After all, the artisans and OAM traders undertake their market economies within and through kin and ethnic ties and networks.

At the same time, comparison of artisanship with OAM trade is inadequate in that the artisans are traders of their own goods, namely artefacts made by craftwork, while the OAM traders divide between agricultural growers and sellers of industrial products. Moreover, the OAM trading “tourists” behave somehow on the fringes of the legality/illegality interplay, which is not the case of artisans who are members of national associations and place their commerce under the control (and protection) of municipalities and museums. While the OAMs of today are locations for the small-scale retail of industrial or serial commodities, the museum-hosted folk fairs are presented as a cultural restoration of the traditional markets among peasants. It seems that a broad and definitive bifurcation has occurred between the “folk” and “bazaar” types of open-air markets, which makes difficult the endeavour to situate artisanship in the sphere of the OAM trade in whatever conditions.

The accuracy of such a contextualising approach asks therefore that artisans can only be paralleled and discussed upon in relation to peasant farming producers. In fact, according to the historical sources, the agricultural markets and folk fairs were unified in the past. As seen earlier, there still exists some contact between artisanship and OAM trade in that some craftsmen are also engaged in farming activities, and they are at times reported within agricultural markets. What we described as “regeneration” of the contemporary peasant crafts in terms of a self-directed “enforcement in professional status” and “revival of auctorial ethos” among artisans is *mutatis mutandis* similar to the rural growers’ private economic initiatives and licenses. Probably that the folk fair and the open-air marketplace will wholly meet each other again once the peasant households still mostly devoted to a subsistence economy in post-socialist Romania would be turned into productive farms to effectively get involved with the urban clientele.

REFERENCES

- Chelcea, Liviu, Cosmin Radu and Livia Constantinescu.** (2003). “Marketplaces, Morality and Political Practices: The Geography of Shopping in Two Districts of Bucharest”, *Romanian Journal of Society and Politics*, 3 (2), pp. 185–221.
- Constantin, Marin.** (2004). “Capitalism and Transhumance. A Comparison of Three Pastoral Market-Types in Europe (1950-2000)”, in *New Europe College Yearbook 2003–2004*, pp. 57–116.
- Idem, (2005). “Nego i negu tori într-o pia din Bucure ti [Trade and Traders within a Bucharest Marketplace]”, in *Sociologie Româneasc* , New series, 3, pp. 247-57.
- Csako, Agnes, and Endre Sik.** (1999). “Characteristics and Origin of the Comecon Open-Air Market in Hungary”, in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), pp. 715–37.
- Gean , Gheorghii .** (2006). “The Carpathian Folk Fairs and The Origins of National Consciousness among Romanians”, in *Nationalities Papers*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 91–110.
- Sik, Endre and Claire Wallace.** (1999). “The Development of Open-air Markets in East-Central Europe”, in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), pp. 697–713.

- Thuen, Trond.** (1999). "The Significance of Borders in the East European Transition", in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), pp. 738–50.
- Wallace, Claire, Oksana Shmulyar, Vasil Bedzir.** (1999). "Investing in Social Capital: The case of Small-Scale, Cross-Border Traders in Post-Communist Central Europe", in *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23 (4), pp. 751–70.

LIST OF THE CITED ARTISANS

- AF : Arpad Fabian (Pottery, Corund village, Harghita County, Transylvania, born 1960, Hungarian, Catholic)
- AG : Ana Grunzu (Maize-leaves knitting, Tome ti village, Ia i County, Moldavia, born 1955, Romanian, Orthodox)
- AN : Adriana Neme (Weaving, Cluj, Transylvania, born 1960, Romanian, Orthodox)
- IA : Ioan Albu (Mask-making, Timi e ti village, Neam County, Moldavia, born 1948, Romanian, Orthodox)
- APC : Alexandru Per a Cuza (Woodcarving, Târgu L pu town, Maramure County, transylvania, born 1945, Romanian, Orthodox)
- AP : Ana Pietraru (Weaving, Valea Seac village , Neam County, Moldavia, born 1940, Romanian, Orthodox)
- AR : Avram Ro ca (Woodcarving, B l ceana village, Suceava County, Moldavia, born 1959, Romanian, Orthodox.
- AT : Alice Torella (Bulrush-knitting, Târgu-Mure town, Transylvania, born 1980, Hungarian, Reformat)
- CP : Costel Popa (Pottery, Horezu town, Vâlcea County, Oltenia, born 1961, Romanian, Orthodox)
- DC : Dorel Codoban (Violin-making, Ro ia Lazuri village, Bihor County, Transylvania, born 1946, Romanian, Orthodox)
- DG : Dan Gherasimescu (Woodcarving, Curtea de Arge town, Muntenia, born 1958, Romanian, Orthodox)
- DM : Daniel Martalogu (Wooden miniature carving, Bucharest, born 1948, Romanian, Orthodox)
- EM : Elena Milie (Icon painting, Pite ti town, Arge County, Muntenia, born 1950, Romanian, Orthodox)
- EP : Eugen Petru (Pottery, Vl de ti village, Vâlcea County, Oltenia, born 1962, Romanian, Orthodox)
- ES : Elisabeta Stângaciu (Wood chopping, B beni village, Vâlcea County, Moldavia, born 1956, Romanian, Orthodox)
- EU : Elena Ursache (Icon-painting and Egg-painting, Sl tioara village, Suceava County, born 1968, Romanian, Orthodox)
- EV : Eleonora Volo ciuc (Maize-leaves knitting, Chiperceni-Orhei, Republic of Moldova, born 1965, Moldavian, Orthodox)
- FB : Florin Bejinari (Icon-painting and Egg-painting, R d u i town, Moldavia, born 1961, Romanian, Orthodox)
- FC : Florin Colibaba (Pottery, R d u i town, born 1956, Romanian, Orthodox)
- FM : Floare Moldovan (Shoemaking, Runcu Salvei village, Bistri a County, Transylvania, born 1935, Romanian, Orthodox)
- GS : Genoveva Sauciu (Egg-painting, Gemenea village, Suceava County, Moldavia, born 1949, Romanian, Orthodox)
- IA : Ioan Albu (Mask-Making, Timi e ti village, Neam County, Moldavia, born 1948, Romanian, Orthodox)
- IB : Ion B lan (Woodcarving, Rotaria village, Ia i County, Moldavia, born 1966, Romanian, Orthodox)
- IG : Iulia Goran (Embroidery, Breaza town, Muntenia, born 1950, Romanian, Orthodox)
- IM : Ioan Maric (Naïve art painting, Bac u town, Moldavia, born 1953, Romanian, Orthodox)
- IMold : Iosef Moldovan (Cooper-work, Ple a village, Suceava County, born 1938, Romanian and Polish ethnic identity, Catholic)

MD : Maria Dinea (Weaving, P niceni village, Cluj County, Transylvania, Romanian, Orthodox)
MDen : Máthe Dénes (Pottery, Corund village, Harghita County, Transylvania, born 1952, Hungarian, Catholic)
MJ : Maria Jebelean (Weaving, Timi oara town, Transylvania, born 1935, Romanian, Orthodox)
MAP : Marioara-Angelica Pascaniuc (Pottery, Marginea village, Suceava County, Moldavia, born 1971, Romanian, Orthodox)
MM : Mariana Marcovici (Weaving, Timi oara town, Transylvania, born 1957, Romanian, Orthodox)
MN : Marioara Negur (Egg-painting, Vatra Moldovi ei village, Suceava County, born 1968, Romanian, Orthodox)
MP : Margareta Petrescu (Weaving, Bucharest, born 1948, Romanian, Orthodox)
MPop : Monica Popescu (Woodcarving, Bucharest, born 1963, Romanian, Orthodox)
MR : Mariana R ileanu (Hemp-knitting, Buftea town, Muntenia, born 1959, Romanian, Orthodox)
ND : Nicolae Diaconu (Ceramics, ib ne ti village, Ia i County, Moldavia, born 1955, Romanian, Orthodox)
NM : Nicu Muntean (Icon painting, Vinerea village, Alba County, transylvania, born 1949, Romanian, Orthodox)
OD : Olimpia Dimitriu (Pottery, Bucharest, born 1960, Romanian, Orthodox)
SA : Sonica Apalaghiei (Woodcarving, S veni village, Boto ani County, Moldavia, born 1962, Romanian, Orthodox)
SB : Sânziana Baci (Icon-painting, Bucharest, born 1959, Romanian, Orthodox)
SF : Sandor Fazekas (Horn-and-bone carving, Lunca Ozum, Covasna County, born 1953, Transylvania, Hungarian, Reformat)
C : tefan Csukat (Ceramics, Suceava town, born 1964, Hungarian and Romanian ethnic identity, Orthodox)
TB : Traian Brându a (Weaving and Leather processing craft, Salba village, Bistri a County, Transylvania, born 1933, Romanian, Orthodox)
TBus : Teodor Busnea (Wind-instruments making, Râmnicu-Vâlcea town, Muntenia, born 1950, Romanian, Orthodox)
TE : Toader Egn tescu (Woodcarving, Suceava town, Moldavia, born 1957, Romanian, Orthodox)
VA : Vera Andronic (Weaving, M n stirea Humorului town, Moldavia, born 1959, Romanian, Orthodox)
VB : Vasile Borodi (Hat-making, Sârbi village, Maramure County, born 1954, Transylvania, Romanian, Orthodox)
VKR : Violeta Karmen Roman (Lace craft, Feldioara village, Bra ov County, Transylvania, born 1955, Romanian, Orthodox)
VL : Valeriu Leonov (Wind-instruments making, Tulcea town, Dobrodja, born 1964, Romanian, Orthodox)
VLin : Virginia Linu (Weaving, Salba village, Bistri a County, Transylvania, born 1970, Romanian, Orthodox)
VM : Valentin Matra (Basketry, Vorona village, Boto ani County, Moldavia, born 1958, Romanian, Orthodox)
VMold : Vasile Moldoveanu (Woodcarving, Moreni town, Muntenia, born 1952, Romanian, Orthodox)
VT : Vasile Tericean (Pottery, Obâr ia village, Hunedoara County, Transylvania, born 1935, Romanian, Orthodox)
ZMB : Zina Manesa-Burloiu (Woodcarving, Bra ov town, Transylvania, born 1970, Romanian, Orthodox)

LIST OF THE CITED MUSEUM DIRECTORS

CB : Corneliu Bucur (Director of the Astra Museum, Sibiu) CEU
: Constantin Emil Ursu (Director of the Suceava Museum) PP :
Paulina Popoiu (Director of the Village Museum, Bucharest) IVP
: Ioan Viorel Popescu (Director of the Timi oara Museum)