

Ivan Šestan

Etnografski muzej

Zagreb

isestan@etnografski-muzej.hr

UDK 39.01:001.4

67/68:39.01

Pregledni članak

Primljeno: 04.08.2006.

Prihvaćeno: 17.08.2006

Tradicijski zanati

O problemima etnološkog definiranja «jasnog pojma»

Smislim odličnu definciju, a pojam neće u nju!
I. Š.

Na primjeru upotrebe termina «tradicijski zanati», autor razmatra pojavu upotrebe termina čije nam se značenje čini toliko jasnim, da ne uočavamo nepostojanje njihove definicije. Paradoksalno je da u tu skupinu pojmova idu i pojmovi na kojima se temelji određenje područja kojim se etnologija bavi, npr., tradicija i baština. U nedostatku egzaktne definicije takvih pojmova, autor rješenje vidi u subjektivnoj procjeni stručnjaka za svaki pojedinačni primjer. Koliko god željeli izbjeći subjektivnost u znanstvenom radu, neprestano smo svjesni činjenice da je to u potpunosti nemoguće, pa ta subjektivna komponenta postaje kriterijem stručnosti.

Ključne riječi: tradicijski zanati, obrti, terminologija, etnologija

Uvod

Etnologu koji se bavi temom «tradicijski zanati», u nedostatku jasne definicije ovog pojma, kao jedina mogućnost ostaje vlastita odluka o kriterijima kojima će odabrati djelatnosti što ih namjera obraditi. Rezultat su takva pristupa radovi koji se bave odabranim djelatnostima na određenom području ili razdoblju, a koji uvijek ostavljaju otvoreno pitanje jesu li neki zanati izostavljeni, tj. je li autorov izbor kriterija trebao biti drugačiji.

Uobičajeni su kriteriji: arhaičnost tehnologije izrade i oblika proizvoda; društveni sloj kojem su namijenjeni; proizvodnja za tržište ili vlastitu obitelj; udio prihoda od

zanata u odnosu prema prihodima od poljodjelstva i/ili stočarstva; način plaćanja rada majstora i sl. Koliko god je potrebno imati na umu ove kriterije, njihova rigidna primjena vodi nas nepreciznoj, a učestaloj podjeli na vještine koje se primjenjuju kao zanati (obrti), odnosno kao domaća radinost (rukotvorstvo). Na primjeru tradicijskih zanata, želim ukazati na poteškoće na koje nailazimo i u etnološkoj obradi drugih tema, a vezane su uz poteškoće oko njihova preciznog formuliranja.

Kao *terminus technicus* pretežno ću koristiti sintagmu «tradicijski zanati», jer mi se čini da u etnološkim tekstovima ona preteže, no nužnim smatram razmotriti i njezine inačice jer nije riječ o sinonimima: tradicijski/narodni/stari zanati/obrti.

Kao polazište, treba uzeti značenje termina od kojih se sintagma sastoji (tradicija, zanat, obrt), ali samo onoliko koliko je potrebno za oslikavanje složenosti problema pri definiranju cijele sintagme, a ne i svakog termina pojedinačno. I definiranje je svakog od njih opterećeno poteškoćama, a poglavito termin «tradicija». Isto vrijedi i za etnološki (antropološki) okvir ove teme, pa ću koristiti radove samo troje teoretičara (Rihtman-Auguštin, Bausinger, Boyer), smatrajući da su oni dovoljni za razumijevanje problematike.

Da u razmatranju svih pojava pučke kulture treba uzimati u obzir vrijeme i prostor, nepotrebno je dokazivati, pa to spominjem samo da bih objasnio izbor izvora koje koristim. U tom ću smislu, uz građu iz vlastitih terenskih istraživanja, pokušati dokučiti kakav su odnos prema ovom pitanju imali autori bez čijih djela (i djelovanja) o hrvatskim tradicijskim zanatima ne bi bilo uputno govoriti, iako se nisu bavili definicijom pojma «tradicijski zanati» (Radić, Berger, Hefele).

O definiciji

«Tradicijski zanati» pripadaju u skupinu pojmova koje smatramo «samorazumljivim» (*sa značenjem koje je očito*),¹ pa je to barem djelomično razlog što nema rasprave o njezinoj definiciji. Stereotip o «samorazumljivosti» ove sintagme proizlazi iz istoga takvog stereotipa o njezinim dijelovima: tradicija, narodno, zanati, obrti.

Tradicija

Unatoč obilju antropološke literature o tradicijama i tradicionalnim društvima, znanstvena teorija tradicije ne postoji (Boyer, vii). Etnološke i/ili antropološke definicije riječi *tradicija* nisu daleko otišle od doslovnog tumačenja latinske riječi *traditio*, *tradere*: predanje, usmena predaja, običaj, poredak, pravila ponašanja koja prelaze s pokoljenja na pokoljenje. Kao što očekujemo da doslovno značenje ove latinske riječi

¹ self-evident

svi znamo, slijedom toga svi znamo i što je tradicija (Boyer, viii). Pascal Boyer citira Shilsovu formulaciju, prema kojoj bi se uobičajeno mišljenje o tome što je tradicija moglo izraziti formulacijom da *tradicija obuhvaća sve što društvo u datom vremenu posjeduje, a što je postojalo i prije nego je došlo u posjed sadašnjih nositelja*. Obojica se slažu da je ovakva definicija beskorisna, pa kada bismo imali nju na pameti, odgovor na pitanje koje zanate možemo danas smatrati tradicijskim, obuhvatio bi sve one koji u suvremenom društvu postoje, a postojali su u prethodnom društvu, pa bi to, uz ostale, bili, npr. automehaničarski, vulkanizerski, vodoinstalaterski pa i stolarski zanat čiji majstor izrađuje kuhinje po mjeri. Pokušamo li, međutim, precizirati da pod terminom «tradicijski zanat» podrazumijevamo one čije se vještine prenose usmeno, izvan institucije (škole), tada smo isključili, npr., paško i lepoglavsko čipkarstvo, vezenje konavoskog veza, šivanje šestinskih *lajbeka*, izradu dječjih igračaka na Lazu i druge čije su se vještine stjecale različitim oblicima školovanja.

Zanat/obrt

I za druga dva pojma koja čine sintagmu: *obrt, zanat*, često smatramo da su samorazumljivi, da su sinonimi, a ako i pokušamo pronaći razliku u njihovim značenjima, lako ćemo pogriješiti.

U *Rječniku hrvatskog jezika* Vladimira Anića riječ «obrt» tumači se kao «privatna djelatnost» i «cirkulacija novca i kapitala» (Anić, 397),² a «zanat» kao izučenu djelatnost, struku, vještinu znanje (Anić, 837).³ Skok još dodaje da riječ potječe od arapske riječi «zanaat» sa značenjem: vještina, znanje (Skok, 642).⁴ Iz ovoga bismo mogli zaključiti da «obrt» znači djelatnost kojom se privređuje (u kojoj se «obrće» kapital), dok zanat označuje vještinu kojom se, nužno, ne zarađuje.

Riječ «zanat» Akademijin *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* tumači kao i dva prethodno navedena, izvodeći značenje riječi «obrt» iz riječi «obrtnan» (tj. okretan) (*Rječnik JAZU*, 471).⁵ Prema tome, obrt je rad koji se radi okretno, provrtano, pa bi se ova dva termina, zanat i obrt, mogli tumačiti i kao sinonimi.

Da se ipak ne radi o sinonimima, može se zaključiti i po različitom kontekstu u kojem se svaki od ovih termina koristi u svakodnevnom jeziku:

² Obrt 1.a. zanatstvo b. zanat kao privatna djelatnost; 4. opticaj, obratovanje, okretanje, cirkulacija (novca i kapitala).

³ Zānāt, 1. izučena proizvodna, prerađivačka, obrađivačka ili uslužna djelatnost 2. *razg.* a. zanimanje, struka, zvanje, profesija b. vještina, umješnost, znanje, majstorija.

⁴ Zānāt, «obrt (hrv. neologizam) ... Balkanski turcizam arapskog podrijetla (ar. zanaat «vještina, znanje» > tur. sanat, sanatli, sanatçı) iz esnafske terminologije: bug. zanâjat, arab. zanât, cinc. zānate.

⁵ Obrt, c) obrt je književna riječ novijih vremena za *njem.* Gewerbe, Industrie, *tal.* industria, tj. rad u velike, kojim se izrađuju različite sirovine (drvo, gvožđe, kamen, koža itd.) za namirenje ljudskih potreba, ali se uzima i mjesto: zanat, tj. rečeni rad na malo. Riječ je načinjena prema adj. obrtnan, koji znači: okretan, provrtan.

- Liječnik koji zna svoj zanat! Umjetnik koji je savladao zanat! Znanstvenik od zanata! ali:

- Obrtnička komora. Pokrenuti obrt. Voditi obrt.

Čini se da bismo, nakon ovakve kratke jezične analize i nakon analize funkcije termina u jezičnoj praksi, mogli zaključiti da razlika između termina «obrt» i «zanat» ipak postoji, i da se može formulirati na sljedeći način:

- U značenju riječi «obrt» naglašena je njegova funkcija djelatnosti kojom se vještina prakticira kao egzistencijalna osnova obitelji. Za narav obrta nije važno koliko tehničkom vještinom vlada sam vlasnik obrta, koliko je važno da tom vještinom vladaju majstori koje zapošljava.

- «Zanat» znači poznavanje vještine, ali njezino prakticiranje nije nužno usmjereno prema tržištu, a kada i jest, osim kao «obrt», prakticira se i kao izvor dopunskih prihoda, a rad se često naplaćuje u naravi.

Osim termina «tradicijski zanat», u upotrebi je i termin «stari zanat». Njega uglavnom koriste povjesničari za proučavanje cehovskih zanata, dakle izučenih zanata čiji su majstori posjedovali majstorske diplome. Svaki je od tih zanata, međutim, i etnološko područje.

Inačice i njihove kombinacije

Osnova je svakog zanata vještina (pa i talent) u obradi sirovina ili pružanju usluga, no svakom je etnologu poznato da se ona prakticira na različite načine: dok je proizvodnja jednih okrenuta tržištu, pa ih to klasificira kao obrtnike, drugi proizvode samo količinu proizvoda koja je potrebna u vlastitoj obitelji, i njihovu djelatnost ponekad nazivamo «domaćom/kućnom radinosti». Između ovih dviju, jasno određenih kategorija, pruža se, međutim, široko polje nijansi i njihovih kombinacija u kojem djeluju majstori što su vještine stekli na različite načine, kojima on predstavlja različit udio u ukupnim prihodima, koji svoje usluge naplaćuju na više načina, specijaliziranih prema proizvodima ili prema materijalu koji obrađuju i sl. Na određenom području i razdoblju, ista djelatnost postoji kao zanat, obrt, kućna radinost, odnosno kao dopunska djelatnost i djelatnost kojom se zadovoljavaju vlastite potrebe. Velik broj kombinacija ovih obilježja čini nemogućim pronaći zajedničko obilježje kao kriterij kojim bismo za svaku djelatnost što se bavi obradom materijala ili pružanjem usluga mogli procijeniti je li riječ o zanatu (obrtu) i je li on tradicijski.

Način stjecanja vještine – primjer obrade drva

Složit ćemo se da je tradicija dinamična i da se razvija samostalno i pod utjecajima. Novije faze razvoja nisu uvijek zamjenjivale prethodnu, već su dvije (ili više njih) u

praksi paralelno ostajale žive, kao što je to uočljivo na primjeru majstora za preradu i obradu drva.

«Izučeni» majstori ovih zanata bili su specijalizirani (stolari, tesari, bačvari i dr.), a svoj su rad uglavnom naplaćivali u novcu. Njihov su pandan specijalizirani «priučeni» majstori koji su poznavanje osnova zanata u pravilu stjecali kod «izučenih». Djelovali su na selu, bavili se izradom jednostavnijih i manjih predmeta, a često samo održavanjem (npr., bačava). Uz njih su, međutim, na selu djelovali «priučeni» majstori čija se specijalizacija nije temeljila na vrsti proizvoda, već drvu kao materijalu koji obrađuju. Oni su bili poznati kao «drveni majstori» jer su proizvodili gotovo sve što se moglo izraditi od drva. Od asortimana koji su dijelili s majstorima specijaliziranim po vrsti proizvoda, izrađivali su jednostavnije predmete (jednostavniji namještaj, manje i jednostavnije bačvarske proizvode), no nerijetko i vrlo komplicirane (drvene kuće često impozantnih dimenzija, mlinove, čamce i dr.), ali i proizvode koje drugi nisu proizvodili (rala, drvene plugove, jarmove, preslice, drške za alat). Vjerujem da ovo dovoljno jasno upućuje na postojanje dviju podjednako «tradicijskih» tradicija – one koja svoje majstore uči (ili «priučava») i one čiji majstori osnove vještine sami preuzimaju od drugih i usavršavaju vlastitim iskustvom.

Zanat ili kućna radinost

U radu u kojem se bavi tradicijskim mišljenjem, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin predstavlja model za istraživanje, koji temelji na zaključku da kazivači, ali i zapisivači idealiziraju život u zadrugama i da su odmaci od takvih idealiziranih obrazaca znatno više od izuzetaka. I dok se «specijalizirani rad» (zanat, obrt) na razini «idealne kulture» u okviru pojma «zajednica rada» ne spominje, na razini «stvarne kulture» on se spominje kao kategorija proturječna zajedništvu. Također, dok se obitelj idealizira kao nezavisna u odnosu na opće tokove društva, u stvarnosti je u raznovrsnim i intenzivnim kontaktima, pa i okrenuta tržištu (Rihtman-Auguštin, 185). Svakako je talent i bavljenje naučenom vještinom pojedinca izdvajao unutar zajednice (obitelji), što je dovodilo do antagonizama. U tom je smislu značajna činjenica da je na razini idealne kulture, u zajednici imovine «osebac»⁶ izuzetak od nedjeljive zajedničke imovine, dok je u stvarnosti čest. Takva imovina inokosne obitelji, kao dijela zadruge, vrlo je često stjecana upravo zanatskim vještinama, a intenzivnije bavljenje njima, naročito po raspadu zadruge, popimalo je različite oblike obrta.

Poznato je da bogata tkalačka baština hrvatskog sela podrijetlo ima u dvije tradicije. Prva je «ženska», tehnološki inferiornija, ali ornamentikom i koloritom bogatija. Njome se bave žene koje vještinu prenose s jedne ženske generacije na drugu. Druga,

⁶ Jedan od naziva za osobnu imovinu člana kućne zadruge, a koja nije uključena u zajedničku imovinu zadruge.

raširena u sjeverozapadnoj Hrvatskoj i Istri, podrijetlom je iz srednjoeuropske manufakturne (predindustrijske) tradicije, i njezini su nositelji muškarci.

Uz tkalačku djelatnost ovakvog, dvostrukog podrijetla, vezan je stereotip: žene podmiruju potrebe svoje obitelji i tkaju u tzv. «slobodno vrijeme», najčešće zimi u poljodjelski slabije aktivno doba godine, muškarci tkaju tijekom cijele godine i tako osiguravaju egzistenciju. Time smo formulirali zaključak da se tkalci bave obrtom, a tkalje kućnom radinosti.

Provjerimo ovu tvrdnju na primjeru stereotipa o bogatoj Slavoniji, regiji u kojoj djevojke od majki i baka uče tkalačke i vezilačke vještine, i uz njihovu pomoć izrađuju tekstilne proizvode koje će sobom ponijeti kao miraz. Da bi slika bila objektivna, treba uzeti u obzir da su u neposrednoj blizini bogatih obitelji živjele i brojne siromašne. Iz takvih su obitelji najvještije tkalje i vezilje bile poznate i u široj okolini, i svojom vještinom osiguravale svojim obiteljima znatne prihode. Ako uzmemo u obzir da je zemlja bila mjerilo bogatstva i siromaštva, možemo postaviti pitanje što je dopunska, a što osnovna djelatnost, kako za tkalca, tako i za tkalju.

Gradski su se obrtnici, pa i oni koji su svojim proizvodima opskrbljivali selo, smatrali srednjim slojem. Oni su, međutim, kao i njihovi *ladanjski* kolege često imali veći ili manji posjed na selu, koji su ponekad djelomično obrađivali sami, ali su im zemlju često obrađivale i mušterije plaćajući njihov stručni rad fizičkim. Seoski majstori, ponekad i oni «izučeni», obrt su prakticirali samo u vrijeme stanke od poljodjelskih radova. U Gorskom kotaru, npr., bili su poznati i tzv. neprijavljeni majstori. Oni su podjednako mogli biti «izučeni» kao i «priučeni», a svoj obrt nisu prijavljivali jer bi ih to obvezivalo da im radionice moraju biti redovito otvorene i da zapošljavaju određeni broj pomoćnika i naučnika. Takvu obvezu nisu prihvaćali isključivo zbog toga što se nisu željeli odreći bavljenja poljodjelstvom, tako da su posao preuzimali od «prijavljenih» obrtnika kako bi svoju zanatsku praksu mogli prilagoditi poljodjelskoj.

U pokupskom dijelu Gorskog Kotara poznati su bili samouki majstori koji su popravljali satove. Znanan dio zimskog razdoblja provodili su «*hausirajući*», obilazeći sela u Posavini, Moslavini i Slavoniji u potrazi za satovima koje treba popraviti, da bi se, kada su vremenske prilike dopustile, vratili u Gorski Kotar poslovima u šumi.

Ovi primjeri jasno govore da se jedna djelatnost ne smije dijeliti na «zanat, obrt» i «kućnu radinost» uzimajući kao kriterij podrijetlo dotične tradicije. Više bi opravdanja bilo takvu podjelu temeljiti na načinu prakticiranja stanovite vještine (bila ona primljena «predajom» ili «naučena») i njezinom udjelu u ukupnim приходima obitelji. U tome, pak, treba biti oprezan kada želimo stvoriti opće zaključke kako za određeno vrijeme, tako i prostor, a svakako treba biti svjestan činjenice da klasifikacije, u pravilu, ostavljaju stanovitu količinu «nedjeljivog».

Je li na temelju ovih primjera moguće stvoriti opći zaključak o tome koje su djelatnosti bile egzistencijalna osnova obitelji majstora, a koje dopunska djelatnost (tj. što je bio «obrt», a što «domaća radinost»)?

Usluge

Kako bi obrtnike u Zapadnoj Africi odredio kao društvenu skupinu, Boyer ih klasificira kao skupinu koja se bavi «nepoljoprivrednim» djelatnostima,⁷ pa kao primjere navodi kovače, lončare, tkalce, one koji se bave liječenjem itd. (Boyer, 101). Ovaj termin može zadovoljiti potrebe konteksta u kojem je upotrijebljen, no kao («negativna») definicija ne obuhvaća jedan broj neproizvodnih djelatnosti koji jezikom suvremenih gospodarstvenika nazivamo «uslugama».

Dio se tih djelatnosti razvio iz potrebe pojedinih gospodarstava koja vlastitim snagama nisu bila u stanju obaviti sve poslove koje su ona zahtijevala. Iz ekonomski slabijih, ali brojčano snažnijih obitelji angažiraju se sluge, pastiri, nadničari. Za pružanje ovakvih «usluga» znanje se stjecalo vlastitim iskustvom uz minimum «podučavanja», tako da su često sluge i pastiri bili djeca. Plaćana su bila osnovnim životnim potrebštinama: odijelom, hranom i mjestom za spavanje i doslovno su živjeli isključivo od svog rada.

Nasuprot tome, u Dalmatinskoj zagori, Bukovici i Ravnim kotarima u tradiciji transhumantnog stočarstva, ugledne družine vrsnih profesionalnih pastira s izgrađenom hijerarhijskom strukturom, u proljeće vrše «izdig» – istjerivanje stoke na planinske pašnjake, gdje ih čuvaju do jeseni. Skupine su nepisanim pravilom stjecale pravo da godinama istjeruju ovce većeg broja istih vlasnika. Velik broj grla, ali i svi poslovi oko stoke na pašnjacima zahtijevali su znanje koje se od iskusnijih pastira preuzimalo godinama. Stjecanjem tih znanja osiguravalo se, kako napredovanje unutar pastirske skupine, tako i ugled i uspjeh u poslu na području na kojem je skupina djelovala.

Na isti su način, preuzetim i vlastitim iskustvom, znanja stjecale i sve vrste narodnih liječnika, muzičara, narikača, vračara, a s obzirom na to da se radi o «neproizvodnoj djelatnosti», dodajmo ovamo zvonare i prosjake.

Zaključak

Osim termina «tradicijski zanati», u etnologiji kao i njenoj američkoj inačici – kulturnoj antropologiji, postoji znatan broj pojmova koje smatramo «samorazumljivim». Ima poteškoća pri definiranju svih sintagmi koje sadrže pojam «tradicijski», jer, kao što je već spomenuto, znanstvena teorija tradicije ne postoji. Poteškoće još dodatno povećava upotreba različito kombiniranih pojmova koji se koriste kao sinonimi (tradicijski/domaći/stari obrti/zanati), pa naša upornost da formuliramo definiciju rezultira stereotipom koji zbog nepreciznosti *ipso facto* ne može biti definicija. Kao što stereotip o kršnim, visokim Ličanima, a malim i debelim Slavoncima nije definicija,

⁷ ... non agricultural activities

jer ne obuhvaća male, debele Ličane i mršave visoke Slavonce,⁸ tako ni stereotip da su majstori tkalačkog obrta muškarci, ne može definirati tkalački obrt jer zanemaruje tkalje koje su velik dio prihoda osiguravale tkajući za druge, i tkalce koji su imali prihode od poljodjelstva bilo da su (barem djelomično) obrađivali zemlju, bilo da su svojim radom plaćali njezinu obradu.

Čini se da na temelju kriterija koje najradije koristimo u određivanju je li riječ o tradicijskom zanatu (stjecanje vještine usmenom predajom, način naplate proizvoda ili usluge, ustaljenost tehnologije i materijala itd.) taj pojam ne možemo definirati, pa smatram da se u toj prosudbi moramo voditi vlastitom (dakle, subjektivnom) stručnom prosudbom.

Antun Radić u djelu *Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje grade o narodnom životu* (1891.) temu *zanati* nije odvojio u posebno poglavlje (doduše, postoji poglavlje *Trgovina*), mada se toj temi posvećuju pitanja u okviru drugih tema. Tako se, npr., traže odgovori na pitanja kupuje li se odijelo i gdje, traže opisi alata pojedinih majstora i tko ih izrađuje, jesu li majstori izučeni ili priučeni i sl. Tako u monografijama pisanim prema *Osnovi* nalazimo vrijedne podatke o zanatima. Ipak, možemo zaključiti, da Radić, pišući *Osnovu*, nije definirao *tradicijski zanat*, iako ga je imao na umu, prepuštajući svakom tko se bude služio građom da sam procijeni koje bi podatke trebalo svrstati u ovu temu.

Slično vrijedi i za djelo Ferde Hefelea *Naši domaći obrti* (1896.), mada naslov može unijeti nedoumicu. On, naime, upućuje da će se rad baviti djelatnostima koje se izvede kod kuće ili da su kod kuće naučene, možda čak o obrtima «priučenih» majstora. U predgovoru svom nevelikom, ali vrlo vrijednom djelu, objašnjava da ga je na pisanje potaknula želja da prikupi hrvatsko nazivlje za različite alate kojim bi zamijenio «iskvareno» njemačko. Mada ga i sam smatra *malenim i nesavršenim* (Hefele, VI), sam odabir, u deset poglavlja raspoređenih i obrađenih obrta, otkriva nam njegovo subjektivno shvaćanje pojma.⁹ Čitavo je djelo većim svojim dijelom posvećeno nazivlju, dok se o majstorima, njihovu obrazovanju i značenju bavljenjem zanatom za njih i njihove obitelji malo može saznati. No, značajno je da pod istim naslovom govori, npr., o tkalstvu u Lici i Krbavi, gdje se očito radi o tipičnoj vještini autarkične obitelji, kao i o lončarstvu koje proizvodi za tržište.

Početkom dvadesetog stoljeća Salomon Berger pokušao je realizirati svoju ideju o organiziranju tkalstva, «tradicijskog zanata» *par excellence*, kao «kućne industrije». Pa iako u stvari nije moglo biti riječi o stvarnoj industriji (prije o manufakturi), ovaj nas

⁸ Parafraziram ovdje Boyerov primjer stereotipa o žirafama kao dugovratim životinjama i limunu kao žutom voću, koji ne može biti definicija, jer su žirafa kratkog vrata i plavkasti limun, i žirafa i limun (Boyer: 104).

⁹ Sadržaj: I. Tkalčija po Lici i Krbavi; II. Narodno suknarstvo i bojadisanje; III. Čohašija (abađiluk); IV. Nešto o narodnom kroju i šavu; V. Bosanska kuća; VI. Narodno lađarstvo; VII. Naši domaći mlinovi i mlinarija; VIII. Narodno đugarstvo i grada za đugarstvo nazivlje; IX. Narodna lončarija; X. Nešto o narodnoj klesariji.

termin uvodi u razdoblje u kojem je pitanje kako pomoći selu da ostatke autarkične privrede iskoristi na svoju dobrobit, postavljano sve češće, proporcionalno brzini kojom vrijednosti ruralne kulture nestaju.

Stari zanati nestaju (urari, zlatari), mijenjaju tehnologiju i asortiman (kovači postaju bravari), pojavljuju se novi kojima ni stogodišnja tradicija nije dovoljna da bi postali «stari, tradicijski» zanati (automehaničari), pa neki i nestaju prije nego ostare (radio i TV-mehaničari), drugi prilagođuju svoje djelovanje suvremenim društvenim obrascima (frizeri postaju *stlisti*, krojači *kreatori*). Uzmemo li u obzir dugu tradiciju zanata kao oblika privređivanja, a s druge strane ubrzane društvene i tehnološke mijene, sve su ove promjene razumljive.¹⁰

Od Bergerova neuspjelog pokušaja do danas, možemo zamijetiti da se motivu o pomoći selu u ekonomskom smislu pridružio i sindrom «očuvanja identiteta» kao sve prisutnija sintagma suvremenog društva.

Postavljanjem pitanja koje od zanata trebamo štititi (stimulirati), pitamo se o ulozi tradicije u suvremenom društvu. Ako tradicijske zanate u suvremenom društvu shvatimo kao relik, smještamo ih u kontekst kulturne prošlosti, ali već time što ih sa stanovišta današnjice vrednujemo kao nešto što vrijedi očuvati, mijenjamo njihovo značenje jer im pridajemo funkciju u kulturnom horizontu današnjice (Bauzinger, 231). Kulturne elemente prošlosti danas ne možemo očuvati u «okamenjenom» obliku i, ako želimo da funkcioniraju u suvremenom društvu, moramo im dopustiti prilagodbu. Tradicijski zanat, koji doslovce poštuje «izvornu» tehnologiju, oblik proizvoda i materijal, u današnje vrijeme nema izgleda za opstanak, čak i kada bismo utvrdili što podrazumijevamo pod pojmom «izvorni».

U Gospiću djeluje lončar koji je vještinu obrade gline naučio od jednog od posljednjih majstora iz obližnjega nekadašnjega lončarskog centra Kaluđerovca. Kada bi poštivao tehnologiju koju je naučio (kopanje gline i njezinu mukotrpnu obradu, upotrebu «ručnog lončarskog kola», pečenje vatrom itd.), danas sigurno ne bismo mogli kupiti po formi tipičnu kaluđerovačku peku. Iako je ona danas izrađena na električnome lončarskom kolu od uvozne talijanske gline, koja izdrži i do 1500°C pa ne puca kao što su pucale stare peke, te pečena u električnoj peći, ipak smatram da se još uvijek radi o «reliktu» koji sa stanovišta današnjice trebamo vrednovati kao vještinu koju u komercijalnom obliku treba stimulirati, jer je očuvana tipična forma i funkcija kaluđerovačke peke.¹¹

¹⁰ U ovom kontekstu paradoksalno zvuči činjenica da se «zanat sa najdužom tradicijom», u europskim kulturama do danas gotovo i nije promijenio, niti mu, za sada, prijeti izumiranje.

¹¹ Smatram važnim spomenuti da ovaj majstor lončarskim zanatom ne može ostvariti prihod od kojeg bi mogao živjeti, pa mu je glavni izvor prihoda trgovina. Osnovna pretpostavka za opstanak tradicijskog zanata u suvremenom društvu njegov je komercijalni učinak, što uključuje korištenje suvremene tehnologije. Ispravno bi bilo zaštitom uključiti i poznavanje vještine: uz djelovanje na komercijalnoj osnovi, trebalo bi stimulirati i različite oblike demonstracija (podučavanja) tradicijskog načina izrade.

Nastojeći poduzeti konkretnu akciju u cilju opstanka tradicijskih zanata kao dijela kulturne baštine, Hrvatska obrtnička komora planira poduzeti mjere kojima bi se olakšalo djelovanje majstorima tradicijskih zanata i ukazalo na njihov značenje kao elementa kulturne baštine. Osim mjera koje bi te obrte stimulirale u financijskom smislu, predviđeno je i dodjeljivanje oznake koja bi jamčila da se radi o autentičnoj kulturnoj vrijednosti. Primjenu ovih mjera treba regulirati pravilnikom, koji u prvome redu treba odrediti na koje će se zanate one odnositi. Osim problema s definicijom, postavlja se i pitanje treba li doista štiti sve zanate koje smatramo tradicijskim.

Nastojanje da se pronađu najbolja (ili najmanje loša) rješenja ovih problema, čini se da je razlog što konačan tekst ovog Pravilnika još uvijek nije oblikovan, već postoji samo kao radni tekst. Članak 2, tog teksta, opisuje što se smatra tradicijskim obrtom, pa iako takav opis u etnološkom smislu ne možemo smatrati definicijom, ako imamo u vidu cilj koji se želi postići, čini se da je formulacija blizu upotrebljivosti. S obzirom na to da se osim na tradicijske, ovaj članak odnosi i na umjetničke obrte, citirat ću samo dio tog članka:

“Tradicijskim i umjetničkim obrtom u smislu ovog Pravilnika, smatraju se oni obrti, koji izrađuju proizvode ili pružaju usluge s pretežitim udjelom ručnog rada, za koje je potrebno posebno poznavanje obrtničkih vještina i umijeća, te koji se tehnikama proizvodnje i rada, namjenom i oblikom, oslanjaju na obrasce tradicijske kulture pa u tom smislu mogu simbolizirati lokalni, regionalni ili nacionalni identitet.”

Pod tradicijskim, odnosno umjetničkim obrtima, smatraju se i oni koji se u procesu izrade proizvoda/pružanja usluga koriste i novijim tehnologijama, rabeći suvremenije alate u nekim fazama izrade, kako bi se posao olakšao i ubrzao, ako se takvim sredstvima-pomagalima ne obezvređuje estetska razina i karakter tradicijskog, odnosno umjetničkog obrta.

Obrti, čiji se proizvodi prenose generacijski i koji se i danas oživljavaju s novim funkcijama – u obliku suvenira, i sve više koriste u turističkoj ponudi hrvatske kulturne baštine, također se u smislu ovog Pravilnika mogu smatrati tradicijskim ili umjetničkim obrtima.

Ovakav opis područja na koje se Pravilnik odnosi, više je uputa za stručno povjerenstvo koje bi trebalo procjenjivati svaki pojedinačni primjer nego li definicija.

Na kraju, postavimo sa stajališta današnjice još jednom pitanje: što je to tradicijski zanat kao djelatnost koju je danas moguće štiti kao kulturno dobro? Smatram da je u nedostatku egzaktno definicije, rješenje u subjektivnoj procjeni stručnjaka za svaki pojedinačni primjer. Koliko god željeli izbjeći subjektivnost, moramo biti svjesni činjenice da je to nemoguće u potpunosti, pa komponenta subjektivnosti postaje kriterijem stručnosti. Procjenu treba temeljiti na sljedećim elementima: arhaičnost tehnologije, autentičnost forme, funkcija proizvoda i materijala od kojeg je izrađen. S obzirom na to da uz doslovno poštivanje svih tih elemenata takva djelatnost danas ne bi mogla opstati, na stručnjaku je da procijeni koje je od njih i u kojoj mjeri pojedini zanat (ili njegov proizvod) sačuva.

Izvori i literatura

Anić, V. (1991) *Rječnik hrvatskog jezika*, Novi Liber, Zagreb

Bauzinger, H. (2002) *Etnologija, Od proučavanja starine do kulturologije*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd

Berger, S. (1907) *Tragedija hrvatske tekstilne kućne industrije*, Zagreb

Boyer, P. (1990) *Tradition as Truth and Communication, A cognitive description of traditional discourse*, Cambridge University Press

Hefele, F. (1896) *Naši domaći obrti*, Sisak

Radić, A. (1867) *Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu, u: Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena*, JAZU, Zagreb

Rihtman-Auguštin, D. (1984) *Struktura tradicijskog mišljenja*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb

Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb

Skok P. (1971-1972) *Etimologijski rječnik*, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb

Hrvatska obrtnička komora: *Teze za izradu nacrtu prijedloga Pravilnika o tradicijskim i umjetničkom obrtima* – Radni materijal

Podaci s vlastitih terenskih istraživanja

Ivan Šestan

Ethnographic Museum

Zagreb

isestan@etnografski-muzej.hr

UDC 39.01:001.4

67/68:39.01

Review

Received: August 4, 2006

Accepted: August 17, 2006

Traditional crafts

On Problems of Ethnological Definition of a ‘Clear Concept’

*I came up with a great definition, and the
concept just wouldn't fit into it!*

I.Š.

On the example of the usage of the term ‘traditional crafts’, the author is discussing the usage of terms whose meaning appears so self-evident, that we do not notice that their clear definition does not exist. What makes things more interesting is that in this group of concepts we can include concepts which form the base for defining the fields of study of ethnology, such as ‘tradition’ and ‘heritage’. The solution of the problem of non existence of these definitions, the author sees in the subjective evaluation of experts for every example respectively. As much as we want to avoid subjectivity in a scientific work, we are constantly aware of the fact that this is not altogether possible, and hence this subjective aspect becomes the criterion of expertise.

Key words: traditional arts and crafts, terminology, ethnology

Introduction

To an ethnologist who deals with the topic of ‘traditional crafts’, lacking any clear definition of this concept, the only possibility he/she has is to decide on the criteria of selection through which he/she will chose the activities he/she plans to analyze. The result of this approach are the articles which deal with selected activities on specific regions or in specific pe-

riods, and which always leave open the question whether some of the crafts were left out, i.e., whether the author's criterion of selection could have been different.

The common criteria are: archaic production technology and form of the product; social group for which these products were produced for; market production or production for the needs of one's family; the share portion of income from crafts in the income from agriculture or cattle-breeding; means of paying the laborers, etc.

Even though we have to keep in mind these selection criteria, their rigid application will lead us to an imprecise and, actually, quite common division on skills which are applied as trades (crafts) and those which are used in home industry (handicrafts). On the example of traditional crafts, I would like to point to the difficulties we are faced with in the ethnological analyses of other topics as well, and which are related to the problems of their imprecise definition.

As *terminus technicus* in this article I will mostly use the syntagm 'traditional crafts', because I think that this one can be the most commonly found in ethnological texts, but I also consider it necessary to analyze its variants, because they are not synonyms: traditional/folk/old trades/crafts.

For a start, I will analyze the meanings of the terms from which this syntagm is composed of (tradition, trades, crafts), but only to that extent to which I could use it to illustrate the complexity of the problem of defining the whole syntagm, and not each individual component. Each component is difficult to define, and that is especially the case with the term 'tradition'. The same goes for the ethnological (anthropological) framework of this topic, so I will use the works of only three theoreticians (Rihtman-Auguštin, Bausinger, Boyer), considering them sufficient for the understanding of this problem.

It is beyond discussion that the analysis of all the phenomena from traditional culture should include the components of time and space, so I am only pointing this out to explain why I used these specific sources. In this way, using also my own field material, I will try to detect what was the attitude towards this topic of the authors whose work (and activities) in the field of Croatian traditional crafts should undoubtedly be included in any discussion of this topic, even though they never dealt with the exact definitions of the concept of 'traditional crafts' (Radić, Berger, Hefele).

On definition

The term 'traditional crafts' belongs to the group of concepts whose meaning appears self-evident (the meaning appears obvious)¹, so this was at least partly the reason why

¹ 'self-evident' concepts

there were no discussions about its definition. The stereotype that the meaning of this syntagm is self-evident stems from a similar stereotype related to its components: tradition, folk, trades, crafts.

Tradition

In spite of volumes of anthropological literature written on tradition and traditional societies, a scientific definition of tradition does not exist (Boyer:vii). Ethnological and anthropological definitions of the word *tradition* have not gone too far from the literary interpretation of the Latin word *tradition*, *tradere*: legacy, oral literature, custom, order, rules of behavior transmitted through generations. Since it is expected that we all know the literary meaning of this Latin word, consequentially, we all know what tradition is (Boyer:vii). Pascal Boyer is quoting Shils's definition, according to which the common opinion on what tradition is could be expressed in the following way: *tradition includes everything that a society at a given moment possesses and that also existed before it came into possession of the current bearers*. They both agree that this definition is useless, because if we would bear it in mind, then the answer to the question which crafts we can today consider as traditional would include all those which exist in the contemporary society and which existed in the past and that would, next to others, include the auto mechanics, tire repairmen, plumbers, as well as carpenters who are producing kitchens by special order. If we try to, however, be more precise and say that under the term 'traditional crafts' we understand all those whose skills were transferred orally, outside an institution (school), then we would exclude lace making of Pag and Lepoglava, the making of embroidery of Konavle, sewing of the *lajbek* (waistcoat) of Šestine, production of the children's toys in Laz and others, whose skills were obtained through various schools.

Trade/craft

The meaning of the other two concepts which formulate the syntagm: trades, crafts, often seems self-evident, and we even consider them synonyms, and if we try to find the difference in their meanings, we can easily make a mistake.

In *Croatian Dictionary* by Vladimir Anić, the word 'craft' is defined as a 'private enterprise' and 'circulation of money and capital' (397)², and 'trade' as a learned activity, occupation, skill, knowledge (837)³. Skok adds that the word stems from the Arab word 'zanaat' which means: skill, knowledge (642).⁴ From this, we could conclude

² Craft 1.a. craftsmanship b. craft as a private enterprise; 4 turnovers, circulation (of money and capital).

³ Trade 1. learned activities in production industries, manufacturing industries, service trades 2. *coll.* a. occupation, job, calling, profession b. skill, artistry, knowledge, craftsmanship.

⁴ Trade «craft... Balkan-Turkish word of Arab origin (Ar. Zanaat «skill, knowledge» > tur. sanat, sanatli, sanatçı) from guild-terminology: Bug. zanâjat, arab. zanât, cinc. zânate.

that 'craft' refers to an activity through which money is earned (the capital is gained), while the trade refers to a skill through the usage of which a person does not necessarily have to earn money.

Academy's *Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian Language*, interprets the word 'trade' in the same way as the two prior dictionaries, and traces the meaning of the word craft to 'crafty', (skillful) (471).⁵ According to this, a craft is a work which has to be done skillfully, so here we could interpret the terms, trade and craft, as synonyms.

But that we are actually not talking about synonyms, we can conclude from different contexts in which each of these terms is used in everyday language:

- Doctor who knows his trade! Artist who has mastered his trade! A scientist by trade!

but:

- Chamber of trades and crafts! To engage in a craft. To work in a craft.

It seems that we could, after this short linguistic analysis and the analysis of the function of these terms in linguistic practice, conclude that there is, after all, a difference between the terms 'craft' and 'trade' and that it can be explained in the following way:

- In the meaning of the word 'craft', the element which is emphasized is its function of the activity in which this skill is practiced as the basic way of assuring subsistence for the family. For the craft itself, it is not important which are the technical skills of the owner of the craft, it is only important that those who work for him/her possess certain technical skills.

- 'Trade' also refers to the knowledge of a certain skill, the practicing of which is not necessarily directed towards the market, and when it is, it can be practiced as 'craft', or as a source of additional income, and the workers are often paid in goods.

The term which is also often used, besides the term 'traditional crafts' is the term 'old crafts'. It is mostly used by historians studying craft guilds, i.e. learned crafts for which the craftsmen had to obtain specific certificates. Each of these crafts can be an object of ethnological research.

Variants and their combinations

The basis of each craft is the skill (even talent) in the processing of primary products or providing services, but every ethnologist knows that they can be practiced in

⁵ Craft, c) craft is a new standard word from Germ. Gewerbe, Industrie, Ital. Industria, i.e. large-scale work, for producing raw material (wood, iron, stone, leather, etc.), for human usage, but also used for place: craft, i.e. same work, smaller in scale. The (Croatian) word originated from adv. crafty, meaning skillful.

different ways: while the production of certain crafts is turned towards the market which classifies these producers as craftsmen, others produce only quantities which are required by their own families, and their production is sometimes classified as 'home or domestic industry'. Between these two, clearly separated categories, there is, however, a broad range of variations and their combinations which include craftsmen who have acquired their skills in different ways, to whom the crafts bring different percentages in the share of the profit, who charge their services in different ways, who are specialized according to the products or according to material they process, etc. Across certain region and in a certain period, the same activity can exist as a craft, a trade, domestic industry, as source of additional income or as production satisfying one's own needs. Large number of possible combinations of these elements makes it impossible to find some common features which could serve as the criteria for establishing whether one activity, which deals with processing of primary products or providing services, is a trade (craft) and whether we can classify it as traditional.

The ways of acquiring skill – the example of wood processing craft

We will easily agree that tradition is dynamic and that it develops either independently or under certain influences. New developmental phases did not automatically substitute the old ones, but two (or more) existed simultaneously in practice, as we can illustrate by using the example of craftsmen from wood processing and wood manufacturing industry.

'Skilled' craftsmen of these crafts were highly specialized (carpenters, framers, coopers), and they were paid in money. Their counterparts were the specialized 'semiskilled' craftsmen who, generally, learned the basics of the craft from the skilled craftsmen. They worked in rural regions, engaged in production of simpler or smaller items and dealt often only with maintenance (of barrels, for example). Together with them, however, a third group of 'semiskilled' craftsmen existed in the rural regions whose specialization was not based on the type of the product, but on the wood as the material they used in their production. They were known as the 'wooden craftsmen' because they produced everything they could out of wood. From the selection of products they shared with the craftsmen specialized according to the type of product, they produced simpler items (simpler furniture, smaller and simpler barrels), but quite often they would produce very complicated products (large wooden houses, mills, boats, etc) as well as the products which were not produced for some time (ploughshares, wooden ploughs, yokes, distaffs, tool handles). I believe that this clearly points to the existence of two equally 'traditional' traditions – the one which teaches the craftsmen (or trains them) and the one in which the craftsmen themselves adopt basic skills from other craftsmen and improve them through their own work.

Craft or domestic industry

In her book in which she analyses traditional mind, Dunja Rihtman –Auguštin presents a research model, based on a conclusion that the informants, as well as the researchers, idealize life in extended communal families (*zadruga*) and that the exceptions from such idealized patterns are quite frequent. And while ‘specialized’ work (trade, craft) on the level of the ‘ideal culture’ under the framework of the concept of the ‘working community’ is not mentioned at all, on the level of the ‘real culture’ it is mentioned as a category opposed to the idea of community. Furthermore, while the family is idealized as independent from the general trends in society, in reality it is in various and intensive contacts with societal trends and even turned towards the market (Rihtman-Auguštin:185). By all means, a talent and engaging in a learned craft would single out an individual inside a family, and this would cause conflicts. In relation to this it is important to point out that on the level of ideal culture, ‘*osebac*’⁶ (private property of an individual) was considered an exception from the indivisible communal property, while in reality it was quite common. This individual property of a nuclear family, which was a part of extended communal family called *zadruga*, was frequently earned through certain skills, and more intensive engagement in these skills, especially after the break up of *zadruga*, resulted in formation of various crafts.

It is well known that the rich weaving heritage of Croatian rural regions has its origin in two different traditions. The first one is ‘female’ tradition, technologically inferior, but richer in color and ornaments. This tradition is transmitted from the members of one female generation to the other. The other one, frequent in the Northwestern Croatia and Istria, has its origin in the Central European manufacturing (pre-industrial) tradition, and their carriers are men.

To this double origin of the weaving craft a stereotype is linked: women weave to satisfy the demands of their families and they do it in their ‘free time’, usually during the winter, agriculturally less active part of the year, men weave during the whole year and provide for themselves in this way. Thus, we have formulated conclusion that the male weavers engage in craft, while female weavers in domestic industry.

We can check the validity of this conclusion using the stereotype on rich Slavonia, a region where girls learn weaving and embroidering techniques from their mothers and grandmothers, and, with their help, make textile products which they will take with them as their dowry. To make the picture more objective, we have to bear in mind that numerous poor families lived next to rich families. Exactly from the poor families, the most gifted weavers and embroiders came from, they were well known in surrounding villages, and, through their skills, they ensured quite substantial incomes to their families. If we bear in mind that in those times the amount of land

⁶ One of the names for the private property of the members of communal families, and which is not included in the communal property of *zadruga*.

was the criterion for establishing whether a family was rich or poor, then we can ask ourselves what exactly was primary and what secondary source of income, for male and female weavers alike.

The town craftsmen, including those who were selling their products in the villages, were considered to belong to the middle class. They, however, similarly to their rural colleagues, frequently owned larger or smaller parcels of land, parts of which they sometimes used to cultivate themselves, but their land was also frequently cultivated by their customers, who paid their expert work with the manual work. Village craftsmen, sometimes even the skilled ones, practiced their craft only during the intermissions in agricultural labor. For example, in the region of Gorski Kotar existed the so-called ‘unregistered’ craftsmen. They could be ‘skilled’ or ‘semiskilled’, but they did not register their crafts because that would oblige them to keep their services open all the time and to employ a certain number of workers and apprentices. They did not want to accept this obligation simply because they did not want to give up cultivating the land, so they would obtain work from the ‘registered’ craftsmen and thus adjust their crafts work to agricultural work.

In the Pokupje region of Gorski Kotar, there were self-taught craftsmen who repaired watches. Most of the winter period they spent ‘housing’, i.e. going through the villages in Posavina, Moslavina and Slavonija searching for watches and clocks which required servicing, and then, when weather would permit them, they would return to Gorski Kotar and to their forest work.

These examples clearly show that one activity should not be divided to ‘trade, craft’ and to ‘domestic industry’, taking as a criterion the origin of this tradition. We could find more justification to base our division on the ways in which certain activity was practiced (whether it was obtained through transmission of tradition or through learning) and its share in the total income of a family. Here, however, we have to be careful when we want to reach some general conclusions valid for a certain period or a certain region and, by all means, we have to be aware of the fact that classifications, in general, leave behind a certain number of ‘non-dividable’ concepts.

Can we use these examples to reach some general conclusions on which activities were the primary sources of income for a craftsman’s family and which were the sources of additional income (i.e. what is ‘craft’ and what is ‘domestic industry’)?

Services

In order to classify the Western African craftsmen as a social group, Boyer describes them as the group of people who engage in ‘non-agricultural’ activities⁷, and as an

⁷ ...non agricultural activities

example he outlines blacksmiths, potters, weavers, those who engage in healing practices, etc. (101). This term can satisfy the requirements of the context in which it is used, but as a ('negative') definition it does not include a number of non-productive activities which, in the language of modern economy, we call, 'services'.

Partly, these activities have developed from the need of certain households whose members could not complete all the necessary jobs. From the economically weaker, but numerically richer families the servants, shepherds and day workers were recruited. The knowledge necessary for the provision of these 'services' was obtained through individual experience and with minimum 'teaching', so often children worked as servants and shepherds. They were paid in bare essentials: clothes, food and a place to sleep and they literary survived from what they were given for their work.

Unlike them, in the regions of Dalmatinska Zagora, Bukovica and Ravni Kotari, in the tradition of trans-humanic cattle breeding, well-known associations of professional shepherds, organized according to a strict hierarchy, drove their cattle every spring to 'izdig' – to mountain pastures, where they kept them until fall. These groups obtained, through unwritten laws, the right to drive away sheep from the same owners over a number of years. Large numbers of sheep, but also all the related work on the pastures, required knowledge which was obtained, in the course of many years, from the experienced shepherds. The obtained knowledge insured not only the advancement inside the shepherds group but also respect and success in work generally in the region where the group was active.

In the same way, through their own experiences and the experiences of others, the knowledge was obtained by all kinds of folk healers, musicians, keeners, fortune tellers; and, since we are here talking about the non-productive activities, we can add sacristans and beggars.

Conclusion

Besides the term 'traditional crafts', in ethnology, as well as in its American variant, cultural anthropology, there is a significant number of terms whose meaning appears 'self-evident'. There are some difficulties in defining all the terms which contain the word 'tradition' because, as it was mentioned earlier, a scientific theory of tradition does not exist. The problem gets even more complicated through the usage of differently combined terms which are used as synonyms (traditional/domestic/old crafts/trades), and thus our insistence on formulating a definition would result in a stereotype which, because of its imprecision *ipso facto* could not be a definition. In the same way in which a stereotype on big, tall people from Lika, and short and chubby people of Slavonija can not be a definition, because it does not include all the short

and chubby inhabitants of Lika and all the thin and tall Slavonians,⁸ a stereotype that the masters of weaving craft are men, can not define the weaving craft, because it omits the female weavers who ensured large percentages of their income by weaving, as well as the male weavers who obtained income from agriculture, whether they (even partially) cultivated the land themselves, or worked to pay off the cultivation of the land.

It seems that on the basis of criterion which we most commonly use to determine whether we are talking about a traditional craft (acquiring knowledge through oral history, the means of charging for products or services, the stability of technology and material, etc.), this concept cannot be defined, and therefore I think that here we have to rely on our own (and therefore subjective) expert judgment.

In his work, *Recommendations for the collection and study of folk life*, Antun Radić did not separate the topic of the *crafts* in a special chapter (there is however a chapter on *Trade*), but the questions listed under other headings were dedicated to this topic. So, for example, there was a question on whether the suits were bought and where, the descriptions of the tools of specific craftsmen were sought for and the persons who made them, a question whether the craftsmen were skilled or semiskilled, etc. Therefore in monographs written from the Radić's *Recommendations*, we can find valuable information on crafts. However, we can conclude that Radić, while writing *Recommendations*, did not define the term *traditional craft*, even though he thought about it, but left it to all those who would use the material, to decide which data should be listed under this heading.

The similar can be said for the work of Ferdo Hefele, *Our Domestic Crafts* (1896), even though the title can initially confuse us. It points to the conclusion that the work will analyze the activities performed at home or which are learned at home, maybe even crafts of semi-skilled workers. In the introduction to his rather small, but very significant work, he explained that in his writing he was motivated by the wish to collect Croatian names for various tools which would replace the 'corrupted' German ones. Even though he himself claimed that his selection of crafts was *scarce and faulty* (Hefele:VI), it revealed, in the list of crafts classified and analyzed in ten chapters, his own subjective understanding of this term.⁹ The whole work was mostly dedicated to names, and we could learn little about craftsmen, their education and the importance of their craft for them and for their families. However, it was significant that under the same heading he spoke about, for example, weaving in the regions of Lika

⁸ I am paraphrasing here Boyle's example of the stereotype of giraffes as animals with long necks and lemons as yellow fruits, which can not be a definition, because both a short-necked giraffe and a blue lemon are again a giraffe and a lemon (Boyer:104).

⁹ Content: I. Weaving in Lika and Krbava; II. Folk cloth making and coloring; III. *Čohašija (abadiluk)*; IV. About folk cut and seam; V. Bosnian house; VI. Folk boat making; VII Our domestic mills and mill equipment; VIII. Folk cooperery and names from cooper's trade; IX. Folk pottery; X. About folk stone-cutting

and Krbava, where it was obviously a skill typically used by autarchic families, and about pottery, which was produced for the market.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Salomon Berger tried to implement his idea on organizing the weaving craft, a 'traditional craft' *par excellence*, as 'domestic industry'. And even though they could not talk about real industry (rather about manufacture), this term introduces us to the period in which the question how to help the rural regions to use the leftovers of their autarchic economy for their own benefit, was more frequently asked, more frequently with the disappearance of the values of rural culture.

Old crafts are disappearing (clockmakers, goldsmiths), they change their technology and product lines (blacksmiths are becoming locksmiths), and new ones appear for which not even a hundred-years-old tradition is not enough to be called 'old, traditional' crafts (auto-mechanics); some disappear before they were given the chance to become old (radio and TV services), others adapt their activities to modern societal trends (hairdressers become *stylists*, tailors *designers*). If we take into account the long tradition of crafts as means of earning money, and, on the other hand, quick societal and technological changes, all these modifications are easily understandable.¹⁰ From Berger's failed attempt till today, we can notice that the motif of helping rural regions in economic sense was joined by the syndrome of 'preserving identity', as an increasingly present syntagm of modern society.

By asking the question which crafts should be protected (stimulated), we are asking what role tradition has in today's society. If we understand traditional crafts in modern society as a 'relic', then we place them in the context of cultural past, however, only by defining them as something that is worth preserving, we change their meaning because we ascribe them a function in the cultural horizon of today (Bauzinger: 231). We can preserve cultural elements of the past in a 'petrified' form, and if we want them to function in modern society, we have to allow them to adjust. A traditional craft, which literary observes the 'original' technology, the form of the product and its material, has no chance of surviving in today's world, even when we establish what it is exactly that we mean under the term 'original'.

In the town of Gospić, there is a potter who learned the skill of pottery-making from one of the last craftsmen from the near-by village of Kaluđerovac, once famous pottery-making centre. If he would literary adhere to the technology he learned (extraction of clay and its processing, the use of hand wheel, baking in fire), today we could certainly not buy the baking lid of Kaluđerovac, typical for its form. Even though this baking lid is today produced on the electric wheel from the imported Italian clay, and can hence sustain the heat of 1500°C without breaking, as the old lids did, and is baked in an electric stove, I nevertheless think that this is still a 'relic' which, from

¹⁰ In this context, it is a paradox that the 'oldest trade' has hardly changed at all till present day in European cultures and that, for now, its existence is not threatened in any way.

our present-day perspective, we have to value as a skill which should be stimulated in its commercial form, because the typical form and function of the Kaluderovac baking lid are preserved.¹¹

In the attempt to initiate a concrete project whose aim is the survival of traditional crafts as parts of cultural heritage, Croatian Chamber of Trades and Crafts plans to instigate certain measures which would facilitate the work of traditional craftsmen and point to their significance as the element of cultural heritage. Besides measures which would stimulate these crafts on financial levels, they planned the design of a brand which would certify that specific products are of authentic cultural value. The application of these measures should be regulated by a Code, which should, in the first instance, determine which crafts are going to be included in the project. Besides the problem of definition, there is also a question whether we should attempt at preserving all the crafts we consider traditional.

The attempt to find the best possible solutions (or the least damaging) of these problems seems to be the reason why the text of this Code is not formulated yet, but exist only as a draft. The Article 2 of this draft defines what is considered to be a traditional craft, and even though this description can not be used as a definition in ethnological sense, if we bear in mind the aim we wish to achieve, it seems that this definition is quite usable. Since this article refers not only to traditional, but also to artistic crafts, I will quote only a section from this Article:

‘Traditional and artistic crafts, in the context of this Code, are those crafts that make products or provide services mostly through manual work, for which special knowledge of skills and arts of a craft is necessary, and which, in the techniques of the production and the function and form of the products lean on the patterns of traditional culture, and, in this way, can symbolize local, regional or national identity.’

This notion of traditional or artistic crafts includes also those crafts which in the process of the production/providing services use new technologies and modern tools in certain phases of production, so as to facilitate and accelerate the process, but only if those tools and technologies do not degrade the esthetic level and character of the traditional or, artistic craft.

The crafts, the products of which were passed through generations and which are today revived again with new functions – as souvenirs, and are increasingly used as parts of tourist offer presenting Croatian cultural heritage, can also be, in the context of this Code, considered as traditional or artistic crafts.

¹¹ I think that it is important to mention that this craftsman can not obtain sufficient income from his pottery-making business, and the primary source of his income is trade. The basic assumption for the survival of traditional crafts in modern society is their commercial effect, which includes the usage of modern technologies. The best solution would be to protect the knowledge of the skill itself: together with the commercial aspect, different forms of teaching (workshops) of the traditional production techniques should also be stimulated.

This description of the areas which the Code should cover is more of an instruction for the Commission of experts which should evaluate every individual case, than a definition.

At the end: let us ask once more, from our current point of view, the following question: what is a traditional craft as an activity which can be today protected as cultural heritage? I think that in the absence of an adequate definition, the solution is in the subjective expert evaluation for each individual case. As much as we would want to avoid subjectivity, we have to be aware that this is not entirely possible, and thus the subjective component becomes the criterion of expertise. The evaluation should be based on the following elements: archaic technology, authenticity of the form, the function of the product and the material from which it is made. Taking into account the fact that with literal observance of all these elements, such an activity would not survive today, it is up to the expert to determine which of these elements, and to what extent, has this craft (or its product) preserved.

Translated by Tanja Bukovčan