

Distribution: limited

CLT/NPH-87/CONF.609
PARIS, May 1987
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

MEETING OF WORKING GROUP
FOR THE PREPARATION OF A PLAN OF ACTION
TO SAFEGUARD THE NON-PHYSICAL HERITAGE

(Unesco, Paris, 16-19 June 1987)

TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TYPOLOGY
FOR THE NON-PHYSICAL HERITAGE

Certain texts included in this document have been elaborated on the one hand by Professor David Dunaway, University of New Mexico, United States of America (partly in co-operation with Professor Asen Balikci, University of Montreal, Canada) and on the other hand by Professor Lauri Honko, Director of the Nordic Institute of Folklore. The views they express are not necessarily those of Unesco.

CC-87/CONF.609

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Definition	3
Background	3
History of Unesco's work on the non-physical heritage	4
Results of previous conference and research	5
Present and future tasks	6
I. General outline of folklore	7
II. Comprehensive register of folklore	8
III. Regional classifications of folklore	8
 ANNEX - Guidelines for a typology of the non-physical heritage (a combined folkloristic and anthropological approach)	
The forms of traditional culture	2
The contexts of traditional culture	3
A. The typology	3
I. Social context	3
1. Marriage, family and kinship patterns	3
2. Stratification and leadership	3
3. Exchange and economy	3
II. Ecological context	3
1. Environment	4
2. Subsistence and technology	4
3. Settlement	4
III. Performance context	4
1. Performance	4
2. Function	4
3. Transmission	4
B. The questionnaire	5
Sample question areas	5
Recording and documentation	5
1. Social context	5
2. Ecological context	5
3. Performance context	5

	<u>Page</u>
Additional considerations	6
C. Conclusion	6
<u>Graphics:</u> Figure I - Forms of traditional culture	7
Figure II - Forms and contexts of non-physical heritage . . .	7

Definition

Defining 'non-physical heritage' is as complex as any search for a universal definition of human character and culture. The terms 'non-physical heritage', 'popular cultural traditions', and 'folklore' all refer to practices and beliefs shared and transmitted by a community over time. The terms share four common precepts: (1) collective and spontaneous participation in the traditions within a community; (2) the impersonal nature of the tradition, shared but not copyright or 'owned' by individuals; (3) the evolutionary and non-formal transmission of a tradition, changing as it passes across generations and groups; and (4) the tradition's core structure and techniques which have endured over time.

In the sense that 'non-physical heritage' is used in Unesco, the term refers to non-material forms of traditional culture (as opposed to houses, agricultural tools, clothing, etc.) but includes the traditional notions, ideas and values embodied in the manufacturing of the material object.

The domain of non-physical heritage is largely the realm of man's symbolic interaction with his environment, captured in a saying, gesture or ritual.

But before beginning the task of defining and classifying non-physical heritage, it must be pointed out that popular cultural traditions are fundamentally indivisible. Physical and non-physical heritage are but separate representations of a culture's unitary world view. The same belief system which demands construction of a roadside shrine also expresses its religious impulse through ceremonialized pageants and traditional chants. Members of a culture do not themselves divide these practices into physical and non-physical forms.

The form of cultural expression distinguishes the physical from the non-physical heritage. Separating the two may be conceived of as an effective organizational device only when their unitary and evolutionary nature is constantly in mind.

In the early days of folkloristics adherence to the study of isolated cultural features was common. Instead of trying to understand the way in which systems, cultural entities and living cultures worked, last century's founding fathers devoted all their energies to element thinking, the comparative study of isolated cultural features, and the investigation of their origin and assumed migration routes. As a result cultural features became, as it were, independent of man and the community, capable of being studied out of context and apart from their social environment. This approach still lies at the base of folklore archive systems. Entities are divided up into smaller and smaller pieces, which are systemized according to form and content with no regard for their functions or the structures to which they belong in culture.

It is from within this context that the pieces belonging to the non-physical heritage will have to be selected and organized in a coherent system.

Background

The popular traditions of a country situate a people in time and place, providing a cultural continuity with their ancestors and practices of the past. Substituting international pop-culture trends for longstanding traditions - expressed in (and revitalizing) their own language or dialect -

deraccinates a people, overturning social and family structures and furthering the fragmentation of mass urbanization and universal participation in a cash-and-service-economy.

Whether we refer to a people's set of unique cultural practices and beliefs as 'popular traditions' or 'folklore', their function remains the same: using the wisdom of the past to guide transitions to the future. This non-physical heritage is today threatened by neglect and ill-use. Yet this trove of traditional practices may form the basis for development in education, health and nutrition. By the end of the twentieth century, we are discovering that the intangible treasures of traditional culture are as exposed to erosion and expropriation as any decaying shrine.

To prevent the deterioration of the world's architectural and artistic treasures, Unesco developed programmes to conserve and identify our physical heritage. Today, many Member States have asked for similar protection for their less visible but equally important heritage: traditional literature, history, language, music, dance and customs. Though restoring a temple and preserving an oral tradition are by no means identical processes, they share a common foundation: that valuable works of culture concern peoples of all the world, forming a common global treasury of ideas and art.

Unesco's subprogramme on non-physical heritage was created to slow this loss of unrecorded and unwritten traditions, whether a local language, dance, healing ceremony, or religious practice. The programme represents a comprehensive effort to define, classify, collect, interpret, preserve and revitalize non-material aspects of traditional culture worldwide.

History of Unesco's work on the non-physical heritage

Unesco has had a long tradition of concern and research on the world's non-physical heritage. Although the subprogramme on non-physical heritage is new, Unesco has previously been involved in collecting oral traditions, preparing legal recommendations on the protection of folklore and in developing cultural policies which favour maintenance of popular traditions.

In 1970, the General Conference of Unesco, at its sixteenth session, adopted a ten-year plan for the study of African oral traditions and languages.

In 1973, the delegation from Bolivia requested the Director-General of Unesco to begin studies of folklore. This effort focused, in the mid-1970s, on the preparation of guidelines for protecting folklore as intellectual property. To this end a committee of governmental experts on the legal protection of folklore prepared reports on copyright and related issues. This committee subsequently broadened its scope to include identifying 'ways of providing protection for folklore on the international level', and discussed 'an integrated framework covering the definition of folklore, its identification, its conservation, its preservation and its utilization'.

In 1979, Unesco prepared and distributed an international survey of Member State activities in this area. This survey yielded 92 replies from 70 Member States. Recommendations of the panel of experts and comments from this survey were included in a 1983 Executive Board report, Preliminary study of the technical and legal aspects of the safeguarding of folklore (116 EX/126).

In 1982, the World Conference on Cultural Policies (MONDIACULT) produced The Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies. In recommendations Nos. G3 and G4, this report emphasized the importance of Member States' popular traditions.

Throughout this period, various subprogrammes of Unesco were at work collecting oral literature in Asia, Africa and South America; preparing regional histories, many of which depend on oral and non-material sources; and conducting exploratory studies on the utilization of folklore in cultural policy and promotion.

Both the protection of folklore 'under the intellectual property aspect' and the more general 'safeguarding of folklore' are processes which badly need a typology of folklore on the global basis. Otherwise it will be extremely difficult to see what kind of products of folklore should be protected and what measures can be taken for that purpose. Therefore the item of general typology can be found among the recommendations of most meetings of governmental experts.

The major task is to propose the main features of a global standard typology of folklore, which would enable archives and institutions around the world to use a similar language in their indexing, archiving and exchanging of data, marking especially those pertaining to the non-physical heritage, with a view to the possible elaboration of an outline for an initial minimum international registry of folk-cultural properties of a non-physical character and of a particularly great importance.

The problem is, quite simply, that the task cannot be carried out in a few pages written by one or two scholars. The process has come to a point where real progress can only be achieved through serious work which may last a year, two years, maybe three, through work partly in the form of small workshop meetings of experts, partly in the form of continuous inventorying of certain basic materials (mainly catalogues and outlines) carried out by someone (a competent scholar at an interested institution), partly as application experiments in field and archive situations in different parts of the world. In other words, the problem is administrative and budgetary in this phase, it can probably be solved in a satisfactory manner, but it requires (a) co-operation of scholars and institutions and a small steering group to conduct the work, (b) administrative decisions as to where and by whom certain parts of the project will be carried out, and (c) economic resources for contracting competent persons and providing equipment for handling the accumulating basic materials. Certain pooling of intellectual and economic resources within and outside Unesco can, if all goes well, result in a 'global standard typology of folklore' which meets the requirements mentioned above and probably will be in widespread use well into the next century. The point of time is the best possible, because in the coming years most institutions will be requesting help in their indexation problems in connection with the transfer into computerized archiving. There is both room and need for a milestone in the indexation of folklore.

Results of previous conference and research

On 28-30 November 1984, Unesco convened an international meeting of experts to prepare a plan for the future of the subprogramme on non-physical heritage. Consultants from Morocco, Canada, Iran, France, Yugoslavia, Fiji, Peru, the United States of America and Kenya discussed the fate of traditional culture in their regions and how best to study and revitalize these traditions; observers from a dozen non-governmental organizations attended.

Participants explored the importance of the contexts of traditional culture: social, occupational-economic, performance. Delegates emphasized how much the facts of social reality underlie popular traditions; when economic reality changes, traditions inevitably change. No cultural tradition exists in a vacuum, outside the social forces which surround its creation and evolution.

Another major threat to cultural traditions occurs when the performance context is ignored - when a song or ceremony is wrenched from its original setting in a community to be reconstructed in an artificial manner by individuals who, using protection and preservation as pretexts, transform them into museum exhibits or objects of trade or propaganda.

Discussion of a definition of 'non-physical heritage' led to a consideration of transmission, and its cruciality in understanding traditional cultural practices. Who transmits traditional culture, how this is accomplished, and what continuing function it serves - these were among the key debates.

Perhaps the most central problem concerned differences in approach to traditional culture from the fields of anthropology and folklore. In brief, anthropologists study the cultural systems of traditional culture: everything from kinship patterns to subsistence strategies. Folklorists, on the other hand, study the expressed forms of traditional culture: from dance to facial adornment. To oversimplify the difference between these two fields, we might say that the anthropologist explores systems and the folklorist forms (genres) of behaviour. (Of course, both disciplines share the common, central perspective of ethnography.) The participants of the meeting never managed to agree on a common outlook with respect to this problem.

Therefore, after the Unesco meeting in November 1984 the main defenders, among the participants, of the two different 'schools', the folkloristic one and the anthropological one, Professor David Dunaway and Professor Asen Balikci, met in Montreal to compare their notes and to prepare guidelines for a typology, combining both approaches, as well as for a questionnaire for collection and standardization of data on the non-physical heritage.

The results of their discussions can be found as an annex to this report.

Present and future tasks

Considerable work remains for Unesco's subprogramme on non-physical heritage. Major task areas include the development of a draft questionnaire, in consultation with an international panel of experts in traditional culture and a consultant experienced in computerized archiving of traditions; circulation of this draft form to specialists in cultural traditions around the world to validate its cross-cultural applicability and refine the definition of categories of linguistic-geographic-cultural areas; field-testing of the questionnaire for use with collectors without ethnographic training; providing international workshops in the application of this questionnaire and in coding traditional culture patterns and traits to match standardized computer categories; the sophisticated tests of the system's ability to yield comparative, indexable data on traditional cultures; and the development of alternate output documents (documentaries, popular publications) to circulate information on tradition for those actually participating and producing that culture, to preserve and promote traditions where they occur.

The next step would be to adopt a global classification of folklore and folk-culture. There is extensive but uneven coverage of folk-cultural phenomena in the form of various type indices and catalogues. Various genres such as folktales and ballads have been thoroughly classified in a standard way in a large number of countries, and the results of classification have been published in Folklore Fellows' Communications (since 1910) and other folkloristic series. Some fields of material culture have been catalogued fairly systematically. In other words, the classification does not have to start from zero: using a cumulative computerized system to bring together existing registers of folk-culture in a fairly large number of countries, it would in certain fields of folklore be possible to achieve a very satisfactory level of identification. For those domains of folklore and folk-culture which lack a unified system of classification, the system could be created at the level of abstraction and itemization best serving the international co-ordination of identification. Member States of Unesco and various institutions in them could be encouraged, as recommended by the Paris meeting, to design and develop identification and registration systems. Ideally data systematization thinking would have to be introduced at all levels of the archiving process: fieldwork and collection, transcription and indexation. The way could be paved for international co-ordination of the work by recommending certain methods and means of standardization of folklore collecting and archiving. The hypothetical unit at Unesco could produce handbooks and leaflets in different languages for this purpose.

The main points are clear enough: previous work on classification must be made available by assembling existing outlines and catalogues into a computerized register, and information on the project of creating a global classification must be disseminated to interested institutions to create a favourable atmosphere for future co-operation.

Thus the standard typology must be conceived, presently at least, more as a dynamic project than as a list of items. Any idea that a kernel group of experts may be able to produce needs testing and marketing before it can be said to have attained validity. That is why the project must have at least some partners in the network of tradition archives around the world, not necessarily very many but genuinely interested and communicative. It must also have possibilities for field experiments, perhaps in co-operation with some institution carrying out fieldwork in an interesting environment. It must have access to the thinking of archives and archivists to be able to see what their actual and real problems in indexation are at present. If there appear common fields of interest between the 'Unesco project' and particular archives, parts of the project may be placed into those archives and a joint funding should be possible to create.

There could be three major levels of conceptualization and co-ordination in the standard typology, (1) namely:

I. General outline of folklore, a transcultural, phenomenologically comparative set of categories of folklore and folkloric phenomena easily to be found in most cultures of the world, mainly for orientation purposes; this should be created anew, not using human relations area files, universal decimal classification, or other existing systems of classification as a frame solution, the material or physical aspect of folk-culture (objects, etc.)

(1) The three levels of conceptualization have been suggested by Professor Lauri Honko.

being taken into consideration only as a manifestation of non-physical ideas, values, etc. i.e. rather as a supplementary dimension than as a primary object of research.

II. Comprehensive register of folklore, on a lower level of abstraction than the previous outline but still transcultural, comprising detailed information on the forms and types of folkloric products and phenomena, linking together selected items from existing catalogues and type systems but placing them into a new order and providing for a functioning bibliographical reference system.

III. Regional classifications of folklore, not necessarily transcultural but locally well descriptive systems of tradition, archival or natural, enabling the users to see the 'live' systems in tradition and the possibilities of linking them to internationally accepted classification systems; field experiments of the 'Unesco project' could begin from here.

Without knowing available resources and already accepted plans it is perhaps futile to recommend very concrete steps of action, but it seems to me that at least the following moves will have to be taken sooner or later:

1. a small working group of experts to discuss the units of classification at the various levels of analysis as indicated above, with the aim of coming to a first consensus on the nature and structure of a new general outline of folklore;
2. contracting of some person(s) and institution(s) to start inventorying at the level two, to secure the project an access to available classifications and outlines of folklore, with the aim of coming to grips with the problems of integration of existing inventories into a comprehensive register of folklore;
3. planning of field experiments in folklore classification in cooperation with interested institutions or scholars, with the aim of gaining first-hand information of the whole process of collecting and archiving in a contemporary milieu with emphasis on standardization of the process for training purposes.

ANNEX

GUIDELINES FOR A TYPOLOGY OF THE NON-PHYSICAL HERITAGE(1)

(A combined folkloristic and anthropological approach)

The creation of a typology encompassing the whole world's non-physical heritage is approached warily. Two principal categories of problems in the creation of such a taxonomy are: (1) the inherent mismatch between a system of scientific classification based on the precepts of one culture and 'applied' in another; and (2) the inherent problems of creating any typology divorced from the flux, impounderability (to use Malinowski's term), and groundedness of daily life in a traditional culture.

Classificatory systems have themselves been debated widely within the disciplines of anthropology and folklore. Though the process of creating a typology has been a continuing fundamental task for generations of scholars, no single system has yet satisfied all the requirements, including the universal applicability and the translatability of forms across cultures.

As early as 1909, in Alfred Kroeber's 'Classificatory systems of relationship', anthropological schisms on terminology and standards for comparing societies was debated. The bedrock concept of culture - on which anthropology's systematic approach is based - can itself be approached from dramatically different directions. Clyde Kluckholm, in 'The concept of culture', lists explanatory, descriptive, functional and epistemological approaches.

The field of folklore employs typologies ranging from the Aarne-Thompson Tale-type index to Propp's Morphology of the folktale, to comparative indices of jokes, proverbs, etc. In anthropology, one central classificatory system is the Outline of cultural materials, originally developed by George Murdock and his associates at Yale University in 1937 and updated periodically (see Unesco document CLT-84/CONF.603, Annex IV). What these efforts have in common with the effort undertaken here is an attempt to reduce complex, multilayered cultural traits and events to a numerical coding to provide comparative data. The user of this and other typologies of traditional culture must approach them with care, for they may be more indicative of the Euro-American intellectual frame of reference than they are of a comprehensive description of any particular culture. Their function is to yield comparative data for scientists and researchers. No other claims may be made or understood.

Our second point is the imponderability and flux of traditional culture vis-à-vis the fixed classifications of any typology. Unfortunately cultural traditions do not occur with numbers attached. Ethnographers find no rules codified, because members of traditional societies do not themselves categorize their behaviour, and ethnographers bring the bias of their thinking and culture to their work.

(1) These guidelines have been worked out by Professor David Dunaway after consultations with Professor Asen Balikci.

Thus, any typology must necessarily begin from an outsider's (etic) point of view; in that sense most typologies - whether derived directly from field experience or from ethnographic literature - are induced - that is, a researcher abstracts patterns of behaviour from ethnographic observation. While this practice is fundamental to the analysis of traditional culture - and to any scientific ordering of human beliefs and behaviours - we must not lose sight that these external judgements are unable to evoke the depth and complexity of human interaction.

The typology which follows (see A below) then, is an abstraction of traditional culture, based on a history of such abstractions in two fields: anthropology and folklore. It is prepared not as an intellectual exercise but as a basis for programmatic decisions in the subprogramme on non-physical heritage of Unesco. It might, in the future, serve as the basis for a comprehensive questionnaire to provide data for an international inventory of popular cultural traditions. For the purpose of such a questionnaire, a number of sample question areas have been suggested (see B below).

The forms of traditional culture

This typology is discussed both in terms of the forms (genres) of tradition from a folkloristic view, and the contexts of tradition, from the anthropological view.

Material culture includes the structures, art, handicrafts, artifacts, and instruments created exclusively by traditional design or technique. Material culture objects illustrate and bear non-physical traditions, by example, as a carved bow displays the artistry and craft of the community's aesthetic conception even as it serves as a specific, non-artistic purpose. Included as material culture are forms of folk art and craft without verbal ritual (e.g. traditional painting or sculpture).

Non-material culture refers to cultural practices without primarily physical representations: all the customs, oral traditions and unwritten institutions of a people, together with techniques of traditional production and style. Non-material culture can be divided into three major categories: verbal traditions, semi-verbal traditions, and non-verbal traditions.

Verbal or oral tradition includes the various performed oral arts: oral traditional history, song, folk speech and dialect, and oral literature, including narrative forms (myth, legend, riddles, tale, proverb, joke, ballad texts, folk drama, epic) and non-narrative forms (sayings, charms, chants, blessings, curses, insults, tongue-twisters, folk poetry, greeting and leave-taking formulae) (see Figure I).

Semi-verbal traditions refer to areas of non-material culture which are primarily a combination of artefact and oral art: traditional medicine, cookery, ceremonies, rituals, festivals, etc. These practices include both verbal and material elements, such as the folk healer or witch doctor whose medicine depends on a combination of herbs and oral spells. Folk art and craft is included in this category when a verbal ceremony is part of its context or function (e.g. string games, graffiti, cartoons, etc.).

Non-verbal traditions include gestures, non-verbal customs, rituals, and beliefs, non-verbal music (instrument and vocable), and traditional dance.

Non-physical heritage excludes 'fine art' (opera, symphonic music, professional drama) as well as those parts of popular, commercial culture which borrow forms, techniques and instrumentation from popular traditional culture.

The contexts of traditional culture

The forms of traditional culture above classify expressed culture: those activities and beliefs derived and performed from a traditional world-view. Underlying these expressions of tradition are the contexts of these activities and beliefs: social, ecological and performance. No tradition occurs in isolation from the world-view in which it is embedded; no tradition exists independently of its social, ecological or performance contexts (see Figure II). The following categories were created on the basis of the discussions between Professor Dunaway and Professor Balikci:

A. THE TYPOLOGY

I. SOCIAL CONTEXT

The social context of traditional culture may be divided into three general groupings: marriage, family and kinship patterns; stratification and leadership; exchange and economy.

1. Marriage, family and kinship patterns

These subgroups refer to the bonding and basic social behaviour of groups, families, and larger kinship groupings, including tribes, subtribes, clans. This area includes marriage and sexual arrangements; friendship and etiquette; rules of descent and lineage; child-rearing and family and tribal life.

2. Stratification and leadership

This subcontext includes systems of social control and status within groups, including prestige, status in all forms, mobility within social groupings and stratification. This is also the system of distribution and maintenance of political and military authority, including decision-making, laws and mores, property-owning and succession. Also incorporated are systems of social control, including law-enforcement and adjudication, deviance and reform, health care and inheritance.

3. Exchange and economy

This context refers to the traditional distribution of goods and services within a community. This includes the economy and its secondary characteristics: markets, occupational modes, distributive and redistributive systems and forms of exchange: currency, trade, territoriality.

II. ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The ecological context of a traditional community refers to the effects of the environment on community organization: environment, subsistence and technology and settlement subcontexts.

1. Environment

This subcontext refers to background physical characteristics of the location of a traditional culture, including geographical details, the presence or absence of natural resources (water, soil, light, etc.); notable meteorological characteristics and other features which help determine the physical anthropology of a community.

2. Subsistence and technology

This subcontext concerns the basic processes a community uses to sustain itself: resource extraction, agricultural practice, husbandry, food practices, clothing, forces and relations of production, tools, instruments, weapons, vehicles, etc.

3. Settlement

This subcontext refers to the demographic distribution of traditional societies: their living, working and ceremonial spaces; their types of housing and housing arrangements, including co- and multiple habitation; their transportation patterns to and from work and recreation; community space and how this is apportioned and used; acculturation; cultural history and records.

III. PERFORMANCE CONTEXT

Understanding how, where and why a tradition is performed is critical to interpreting its meaning and function. The subcontexts of performance include: performance, transmission and function.

1. Performance

This subcontext includes the physical and metaphysical circumstances under which a tradition is performed; the traditional audience characteristics (age, sex, group membership); the degree and kind of audience participation (as co-performers, spectators, commentators); the mood of performer and audience (solemn to ecstatic); formulae and extemporaneity in a tradition's core structure and variants; rewards (penalties) for (in) correct rendering.

2. Function

This refers to the reasons why and how a tradition persists in a community, including the role and status of tradition-bearers, the commercial/non-commercial intent of tradition (for tourists? for an elite, religious or elite?); the role of the tradition in a community's belief system; and reported origins of the tradition.

3. Transmission

This refers to the ways a tradition is recreated and evolved by a community, including the selection of tradition-bearers and their training and resources; how a tradition's authenticity is evaluated; the degree of innovation or conservation allowed; and the vehicles for transmission (oral, aural, visual, written, electronic).

B. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Sample question areas

The task of preparing a definitive questionnaire for collecting and standardizing data on the world's traditional culture is an enormous undertaking, which anthropologists and folklorists have worked on for nearly a century, dating back to the efforts of German scholars categorizing tales collected by the Grimm brothers and Finnish scholars analysing the Kalevala.

Among the key problems which must be resolved are: international, intercultural agreement on the definition of traditional forms - how to define a 'proverb' the same way in Ecuador as in Malta; creating a protocol for coding items and forms of folklore into a computer for central distribution and statistical manipulation; international agreement on the division of areas for the purpose of data organization and collection - by linguistic, geographic or world culture areas. Decisions of this sort can only be decided through polling leaders in the international ethnographic community and through consultancies with experts experienced in the emergent field of computerized archiving of traditional culture.

We have derived from the above typology a series of question areas. These question areas include the basic essentials and questions necessary to provide cross-cultural data; they are broken down into sections roughly corresponding to the contexts of traditional culture described above.

Recording and documentation

This introductory section includes necessary information on the immediate circumstances of the tradition recorded: who made the recording; by what means (tape or video recording, notebook, etc.); on what date and location; how many tapes or notebooks were used; what was the relationship between the collector and the traditional informant.

1. Social context

This section describes the social situation of the informant; understanding which social groups - and the tradition - belong to is crucial. Specify family, age-group, clan, subtribe and tribe memberships; social-status distinctions in the informant's culture, and where he or she belongs; economic/class ranks in the society originating the tradition, and where the informant fits in this schema.

2. Ecological context

This section describes the physical surroundings and origins of the tradition and the tradition-bearer, including: addresses, place of birth, location and origin of family (and other social groupings); area of origin of the tradition; occupation and education of the tradition-bearer and his or her source; physical location where the tradition occurs, whether community or individual space.

3. Performance context

This section describes the transmission and origin, audience, function, and performance of the tradition.

Transmission and origin

When, where and how was the tradition learned? From whom? At what age? Where, when and how did he or she learn it? Who created this tradition? When and how? What is it called, with alternate names?

Audience

For what audience is this tradition performed? What are their age, sex and group memberships? Is the tradition for insiders/outsideers? What does the audience do during the performance? What is their mood? Do some members participate more than others? Who in the community knows the tradition best?

Function

What is the purpose of tradition? Why perform it? When is the tradition appropriate/inappropriate? Why has this particular tradition survived? What is the effect of this tradition? Is it true/accurate/helpful?

Performance

Was this performance a good one? How can one distinguish an authentic performance from a poor one? What are the rewards (penalties) for a good (bad) rendition? In the past, who performed it differently? In exactly what ways? What are its important (traditional) parts? What formulas govern performance?

Additional considerations

Alongside gathering contextual information on the tradition surveyed or collected, additional considerations help fill in holes in the record. Among these are: noting gestures and facial expressions during the tradition's performance, gathering supporting documentation, including artefacts and photographs; asking and following up leads on other performers of this tradition; and writing up a set of field notes to provide qualitative information on the recording session or interview, with details of the interaction, mood and setting.

C. CONCLUSION

This annex has summarized approaches to classification systems of traditional culture, to prepare a typology joining anthropological and folkloristic approaches.

The typology has been broken down into sample question areas, to offer suggestions for international collection and manipulation of traditional cultural forms in context. The question areas provide a means of keying critical contextual information (social, ecological, performance) to the forms of traditional culture collected.

FIGURE I
FORMS OF TRADITIONAL CULTURE

<u>World Non-Physical Heritage</u>	<u>Material Culture</u>	Architecture arts and crafts (non-verbal) instruments, tools, weapons house and vehicle decoration costume and dress	
	<u>Non-Material Culture</u>	<u>Non-Verbal Traditions</u>	gestures music (instrumental+vocal) dance customs and beliefs
		<u>Semi-Verbal Traditions</u> (Oral Art + Artifact)	medicine cookery games ceremonies and ritual drama
		<u>Verbal Traditions</u>	myth, legend, epic, saga, tale, riddle, joke, ballad text, memorial, traditional history
		<u>Narrative</u>	
		<u>Non-Narrative</u>	languages and dialects, proverbs, blessings, curses insults, word-play, poetry, chants, greeting & leaving formulae, lyric song texts

FIGURE II
FORMS AND CONTEXTS OF NON-PHYSICAL HERITAGE

		FORMS OF TRADITION		
		VERBAL TRADITIONS (+ LANGUAGES)	SEMI-VERBAL TRADITIONS (ORAL ART + ARTIFACT)	NON-VERBAL TRADITIONS
CONTEXTS OF TRADITION	SOCIAL CONTEXT			
	ECOLOGICAL CONTEXT			
	PERFORMANCE CONTEXT			