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company on the South Side of Chicago, to imagine that I could make the best paver in the Mid-West and people from around the world would want my pavers, with clays that were mined in Illinois. I could hire 400–500 people in my neighborhood, make lots and lots of bricks that would be needed by my mayor, and my state legislator, and my president. I could go to People’s Gas and I say, “Look man, I’m re-industrializing the South Side of Chicago. These brick prices are the reason why no industry is here now. The gas prices are the reason that there are no brick industries here, can’t y’all help a brother out?” Which means that in addition to knowing how to make a brick, which I don’t know how to do it yet, I need your help, I would also have to learn a little bit about lobbying for energy policy, to know enough about these adjacent fields so I can effectively participate. And so there’s no need to expand.

Prologue

A waterlogged cardboard box washes up on the muddy banks of the Huangpu River in Shanghai. The fisherman, currently employed by the authorities to recover pig carcasses, thousands of which have already floated downstream due to unsanitary farming practices (Diverson, 2013), reaches out towards the box, tearing through the rotten cardboard with his boot hook. Polystyrene packaging brushes spill out, virgin white against the grimy shore. Seeking a change from decomposing porcine fluids, he sits down and starts to examine the contents of the box. Inside are several items carefully packed in bubble wrap and tissue paper. The largest piece turns out to be a porcelain jug. It is glazed and covered in printed imagery and text. The box also contains a ceramic paintbrush, a number of small porcelain boots and a collection of porcelain tags threaded with twine. Intrigued, the fisherman finishes his shift and takes the flotsam back to his wife, who is waiting nearby in their one-storey breeze-block house. The jug is displayed on a shelf in the kitchen where it gradually fills with cooking utensils. The brush breaks in two after being played with by his grandchildren and the pieces are cast back into the river where they descend into the silt. The boots, made from this slate of porcelain paper clay, are gradually broken and discarded. Suddenly, the boots survive longer as toys, before eventually being tidied away into a shoebox and forgotten. The jug remains, now minus the handle which was never intended for serious use. The fisherman occasionally looks at the photographs on the jug of foreign men from long ago, their eyes staring back at him through a veil of cooking oil and sweat. He wonders who they were and why they floated to him one day while he cleared dead pigs from the river.

Introduction

This is an imagined account of what might have happened to my artworks, Crinum Jug (2012) and associated pieces, after they were lost at an art fair in Shanghai in March 2013. Have they already entered the archaeological record, perhaps on a landfill site somewhere in Shanghai, or will they be found and kept for posterity by a loving owner? Inquiries have been too small and, as the fate of these items remains unknown, a story must suffice.

In relation to museum collections, archaeologist Chris Green (2004a, p. 35) differentiates between ‘things’ and ‘objects’, arguing that the former become the latter when they are separated from the ‘generic flow of life’, depriving them of their position in relation to associated things and people. In this chapter, I want to trace the ‘life history’ of the jug from its beginning as porcelain clay to its last known whereabouts. Although it has been removed from currency, in discussing the jug’s pre-loss career, I will show how it became adorned and activated through a process of marking, display and engagement with the community. While monuments are often problematised as ‘crystallised’ sites of forgetting (Nora, 1989; Connerton, 2009), it is argued here that, like the jug, ceramic objects have the potential
to form dynamic link of social creativity and remembrance. This incident is worthy of discussion as it demonstrates how such objects, invested with the toil of human endeavour and possessing the potential to affect (Drury, 2010) and evoke (Tingle, 2007), can become catalysts in the mediation of complex human object relationships.

Coraline Holtorf (2003) traced the ‘life history’ of a potsherd from excavation to subsequent classification and accession into a museum. Through this ‘chronographic approach’, he sought to understand how artefacts become recognised as ancient by archaeologists and how their archaeological meaning is created in the present. Countering normative approaches, Holtorf (2003, p. 54) construes an object’s entrance into the archaeological record as a new episode of ‘Life’ rather than the beginning of a process of ‘decay’. Taking inspiration from this, I aim to provide a biography of the jug which, although told in the present, will ‘extend both into the past and future’ (Holtorf, 2003, p. 55). By discussing how Crimson Jug came into being in the first place and entitling its pre-disappearance life, what Holtorf (2007, p. 58) describes as a ‘short’ life history is provided. By tracing its past life episode as a second life rather than a ‘death’, I add to the ‘long’ life history of the object. In doing so, I hope to show that the jug remains as more than just an imagined story.

The beginning

A brief consideration of the provenance of the raw materials used in making the jug shows how they are already ‘entangled’ (Hodder, 2012) in human-object relationships before they are formed into an object. The jug was slip cast from Special Porcelain P20 manufactured by Valentine Clays of Stoke-on-Trent. The raw materials include china clay, probably sourced from south-western England, as well as smaller quantities of feldspar, silica and bentonite obtained from various unspecified sources. The porcelain is purchased in bulk by Sadler’sfield Pottery Supplies, before being sold to the University of Sunderland. Other materials, including stains, oxides and glazes, come from a range of disparate suppliers and locations. The jug was made from a plaster mould taken from an original item sourced during a visit to Stoke-on-Trent for the British Ceramics Biennial 2011. The ring of porcelain busts upon which it rests was cast from moulds taken from my own Action Man toy, which have owned since the 1980s. Here, a personal heritage site is mixed with wider historic references.

Kith and Kin

The decision to make the jug was also the result of a complex process of person-object dynamism. Its genesis can be traced back to my participation in Kith and Kin: New glass and ceramics, a group exhibition held at the National Glass Centre, University of Sunderland, between November 2011 and February 2012. My doctoral research concerned the Sunderland Muses & Winter Gardens (SMWG) collection of largely nineteenth-century transfer-printed Sunderland hillware pottery. Reflecting this, my installation presented paper ephemera from the Scotch Pottery Archive (1878–1896), which I had accessioned as part of my research, alongside pieces of original Sunderland pottery and some of my own ceramic work. This material ‘dialogue’ aimed to show how Sunderland pottery production had been an intergenerational activity, familial ties of potters had produced objects which were used communally or functionally by other families. I made a series of porcelain jugs and flasks blending historical surface decoration adapted from items of Scotch pottery in the collection with contemporary imagery derived from a focus group I had done with local soldiers from Third Battalion. The Siloes (1885–90), the inspiration for model objects that had remained on field memories came to mind with being separated from their families while on tour. A change of heart through Kith and Kin provided the opportunity to create and display further work. For the second stage, I decided to make another jug in response to an enquiry made by Howard Frost, a visitor to the first part of the exhibition. Based in Sunderland, Howard had traced his family tree back to his great-great-grandfather, William Crison (1755–1836), who was indentured as an apprentice potter at Scotch’s Southwick Pottery in 1788. Several other members of the Crison family were also potters and Howard, excitedly informed, had traced information on the earliest known crison family, corresponding with the town of paper ephemera I had accessioned and displayed from the Scotch Pottery Archive.

For example, William Crison is mentioned as the father of Robert Crison (born 1804) in a declaration of non-receipt of parcelled assistance. ‘Mark Crison (1814–1912), manager of Richley’s Pottery, named an indenture,’ he wrote. ‘His great-grandfather, brother: His great-uncle, mother Robert Crison (born 1836), wrote a letter to Sunderland Museum & Winter Gardens in 1969, aged ninety-three, claiming to be the last of a family of ‘great throwers’ and the only surviving bowl appren- tice potter in the British Isles. Robert’s brothers, William Stanley Crison (1888–1955) and John Henry Crison (1897–1916), served in the Durham Light Infantry (DLI) during the First World War. John Henry was killed in action on 14 September 1916 during the Battle of the Somme. Some of this information was used to make the digital decals which decorate the jug. In displays, juxtaposition of the jug with another work, ‘Richley Hole’/ED Bone (2011), underlines the historical link between the DLI and the DLI, their contemporary descendants. This ceramic narrative presents the original bridge built by a soldier to evacuate improvised explosive devices in Afghanistan was also lost in Shigah.

Crimson Jug, then, was an attempt to materialise Howard’s research as a mnemonic object which celebrated his connection to the Crison family of potters, while also referencing my work on the archive and with the community (Figure 12.1). The jug gathered together a range of potentially ephemeral information that he had accumulated, often in the form of digital downloads from family history resources, and translated it into surface imagery fixed onto the porcelain jug in order to make what I intended to be an enduring, or at least semi-durable (Ponsell 2010, pp. 36–40), form of external stochastic storage (Bennett 2003, p. 188).

Milburn Jug

My account of the creation of Crimson Jug on Tune & Wear Archives & Museums’ (TWMAG) blog resulted in a series of local and international Internet queries from several other descendants of the Crison family (McHugh, 2013a). One sustained correspondence came from Sally Hyde, a British-born, New Zealand-based occupational therapist and amateur potter. Her great-great-great-great-grandfather, William Milburn (1731–1849), had also been a master potter at Scotch’s Southwick Pottery and a con- temporary of William and Robert Crison. This led to the production of a further jug based upon her connection to this potter (Hyde, 2012; McHugh, 2012b; Figure 12.2). The two jugs were displayed alongside relevant archival materials in part of What’s Your Scop? Discovering family Ancestry, a genealogy exhibition held at SWMG during the summer of 2012. The exhibition was attended by Ms Hyde’s parents as well as Anne Holmes, the great-great-great-great-granddaughter of William Crison, who had also responded to the blog. This process can be described as a ‘cycle of engagement’ (McHugh, 2013, p. 84), in which my initial curiosity response to the collection resulted in the enquiry from Howard Frost. Making Crimson Jug prompted further engagement, where Sally Hyde and I negotiated the creation of Milburn Jug (2012) online using her ancestry.com account. This, in turn, led to further engagement through the online presence of the blog.

The jug as a gathering point

Archaeologist Ian Hodder (2012, p. 8) discusses Martin Hodder’s influential exploration of a jug as both a material entity and a ‘gathering’ point. Much like the potsherd discussed by Holtorf (2002), the jug’s status as an object to be studied comes from its materiality; it is made from clay which has been
brought to a stand’ (Hodgson, 1971, p. 167) through being ‘in things’, however, emerges not from
its materiality, but from its potential to link humans to their cultural and environmental context as a
‘thingly’ meeting of absence and presence’ (Adorno, 2010, p. 404). As Hodder explains,

The jug takes what is poured into it, and then pours the liquid out. The water and wine come from
a rock spring or from rain or from the grape growing in the earth. The pouring out can quench
thirst for humans or be a libation to the gods. So the jug connects humans, gods, earth and the sky.
(Hodder, 2012, p. 8)

Borrowing the Old High German definition of a thing, or dinge, as a gathering to discuss a ‘controverted
matter’, Hodder (1971, pp. 168–174) argues out its contents in the form of a gift’ (p. 172). Here, the jug’s
functionality makes it a thing: ‘The jug is a thing a vessel—it can hold something’ (p. 168). The jug’s ability
to hold and pour comes from its formal properties—its sides and base—which form an empty space:

The emptiness, the void, is what does the vessel’s holding. The empty space, this nothing of the
jug, is what the jug is as the holding vessel. . . . But if the holding is done by the jug’s void, then the
potter who forms sides and bottom on his wheel does not, strictly speaking, make the jug. He only
shapes the clay. No—he shapes the void. . . . The vessel’s thingness does not lie at all in the material
of which it consists, but in the void that holds.

(Hodder, 1971, p. 169)
Sally made her own jug in tandem with the one I made, including her favourite verses taken from some items of Scott's pottery. Anne and Sally collect Sunderland pottery and expressed a desire to locate items that might have been made by their ancestors. As Anne (Holmes, 2012) commented, 'The discoveries made on my family history journey have made me very proud of my north-eastern roots. They have also inspired me to collect Sunderland pottery and I now have a small collection including some pieces from Scott.'

The digital trace of Cranio Jug on the TWAM blog has continued to generate stories after it was lost at the exhibition in Shanghai. This suggests that its real significance can be construed as residing not wholly in its materiality, but rather in the relationships it has helped to build between people and things across time and space. In this way, it matters little whether or not this is a true jug in the Heideggerian sense; its 'void' has been metaphorically filled through person-object interaction and its 'outpouring' (Heidegger 1971, p. 390) - its 'gift' - has been the stimulation and convergence of dialogues, human and material. Although Gaden (2004a, p. 36) argues that '[d]isplay is part of a larger, complex process involving 'things' and the experiences of humans, in this case, exhibiting these jugs has had the opposite effect, turning them from ceramic objects removed from the 'flow of life' into 'things' involved in a network of social relationships.

The jug as a 'distributed' memory trace

As Glen R. Brown (2013) has noted, 'The natural life of a functional ceramic vessel, like that of something literally alive, is fraught with risk.' This might equally be said of a widely exhibited artwork. According to TINT online tracking, the parcel containing the jug and associated items arrived safely in Shanghai on 21 March 2013. This digital trace of the delivery of the jug stands as its last known whereabouts, through which we can feel the presence of its absence.

At this time, I was taking part in an Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) international placement at the National Museum of Ethnology, Japan, where I was researching the George Brown Collection of Oceanic objects as part of my doctorate (McHugh, 2015). Studying this ethnographic collection has led to a more nuanced understanding of the relationships between material endurance and memory, helping me to reconfigure Cranio Jug's disappearance. The George Brown Collection was an index of loss (Adams, 2016) and this is certainly true of the George Brown material. Objects initially displaced from their Pacific origins in the nineteenth century by the missionary Brown were later whisked from their adoptive home of Newcastle upon Tyne when most of the collection was sold to the Japanese institution in 1986. Interestingly, the items of the collection which have been retained in the UK are mainly the New Ireland malanggan incised carvings, objects which were intended by their makers to be destroyed after use.

In malanggan rituals, the wooden carvings become 'gradually imbeded' (Gell, 1998, p. 324) with the agency of the deceased through a process of carving and firing, and can be seen as both the initiators and the outcomes of complex social relations. Once abandoned or destroyed, a 'memory trace', or 'internal skin' (Gell, 1998, p. 228) is retained in the minds of those involved in the ritual, providing an enduring 'image-based resource' (Kieloch, 2002, pp. 190-191) which mediates social relationships into the future. Cranio Jug is comparable in that it both catalysed and recorded social interaction. It became charged with agency and meaning through decoration and firing, and was invested with provenance through display. Also, while its current fate is unknown, the connections established by making it continue as dynamic human relationships mediated through material, verbal and digital narratives. Although its 'death' was unintended, and its function incomparable to the malanggan carvings, memory traces of it persist in the minds of those involved, as well as in the digital presence of the blogs and associated enquiries. That this piece led to Cranio Jug suggests that, like the malanggan carvings, it was not a dead end, but formed a focus of social creativity (Chua and Elliott, 2013, p. 8), leading to further production.

**Networked objects**

While falling short of what Julian Bleecker (2006, p. 165) has described as a 'blogle', a 'network object' which can directly and autonomously upload information to the internet, these ceramic jugs became activated through social media when I blogged about them (McHugh, 2012a; 2012b). Interested parties, from places ranging from Sunderland to Canada and Kuwait, who searched for information about their ancestors, were able to discover these blog entries and share their genealogical knowledge and experiences. The accounts written by Anne Holmes (2012) and Sally Hyde (2012) for the What's Your Story: Discovering family history website attracted further enquiries. Although not active participants like Bleecker's 'blogle', the blogs prompted the writing of the blogs, which went on to become lost of creative resonance. Their online presence dissolved, therefore, play a similar role in 'knitting together, facilitating and contributing to networks of social exchange and discourse' (Bleecker, 2006, p. 165).

David Gannett (2011) has argued that grassroots creativity, ranging from embroidery to digital social networking, can have an empowering and transformative impact. As he notes, 'Making and sharing things online, engaging with people who (at first) you don't know anything about, anywhere in the world, can be very rewarding' (Gannett, 2011, p. 114). One of the blog comments (see McHugh, 2012a), where a father, Dennis Crimson, and his daughter, Kirsty, 'meet' online, demonstrates that tracing one's family tree is a creative process which often brings together like-minded communities or even members of the same family. Like Anne's and Sally's family history research, which sought to link their ancestors to tangible objects, Kirsty's investigation into the origin of her surname also shows that such genealogical delving often relies on an imaginative form of past- or presentistic memory which might centre around a material trace. As she muses, 'I'm sure the family name is tied to some sort of landmark, perhaps a megalith, but Google has only so many answers' (McHugh, 2012a).

**Conclusion - life after death**

Cranio Jug does not just exist as a digital trace or as an imagined narrative. A necessarily imperfect replica of it was made for an exhibition at SWHG in June 2013. As Heidegger's jug shows, objects become things when they are socially constituted as such. This is well illustrated by archaeologist Judy Joy's (2007)
An item, made specifically to replace an earlier work which has become damaged or lost, may be regarded as essentially the same as the earlier version. What we would regard as a copy may even be esteemed more highly than the original.

(McLeod, 1985, p. 46)

That Crimson Jug Mark II (2013) is a replica is less important than the potential it carries forward. It inherits the biography of the original but also has the possibility of a second 'life' where it may go on to encourage more person-object interaction through further display as part of the SMWGC's contemporary collection.

Returning to the shard analogy, a preoccupation with archaeology was a recurrent theme of the 'Ceramics in the Expanded Field' conference held at the University of Westminster in July 2014. Christie Brown's (2016) "expanded field" of interests included antiquity, and her work Skipper (2013) was inspired by Freud's metaphorical description of psychoanalysis as excavation. Julian Stair's (2014) funerary ware explores the relationship between pottery and the body, the addition of the deceased's ash to the clay body physically and metaphorically incrusting (Hoiberg, 2004; Pelham, 2008, p. 50) and immersing. In his keynote address, Eleanor Gates (2014), showing a series of old archaeological slides and diagrams of pottery, raised the question, 'Who will share our pots in the future?', seemingly inviting the conference delegates to think about their contribution as ceramic artists and curators to posterity. It is hoped that the account of Crimson Jug demonstrates that the output of ceramic artists, especially those using fired clay, has the potential to reflect the present as well as add to the future archaeological record. Ultimately, as archaeologist Laurent Olivier (2001, p. 187) highlights, by making new things we are augmenting this palimpsest as 'all manifestations that bear witness, physically, to human activity are, by their nature, concerned with archaeology'. Although museum objects tend to come from the past and are intended to endure into the future, we encounter them in the present. The challenge of an artistic reinterpretation might be to reimagine these objects from the past, making them 'things' of today by addressing their unique 'material trajectories' (Olken, 2010, p. 126) and harnessing their potential to act as gathering points of person-object interaction.
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