

Janina Hajduk-Nijakowska

jdhn@uni.opole.pl

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9958-5771>Faculty of Political Sciences and Social Communication
University of Opole

Folkloric orality in contemporary culture

Folklorystyczna oralność w kulturze współczesnej

Folklore has so firmly established its stereotypical, often ideological dimension in the Polish humanistic tradition, as well as in colloquial circulation, that using it nowadays immediately introduces associations that make a substantive discussion impossible. Folklore studies still remain a “poor cousin of plebeian origin” in the humanities, and ideas about folklore are “shaped mainly by stage bands and occasional, regional publications, rather than by scholarship” (Bartmiński 1990: 128).¹ Moreover, the controversy surrounding the concept of contemporary folklore even leads to the negation of the existence of folklore studies as a discipline whose object of analysis is, precisely, folklore. The question arises, however, whether the disappearance of the traditional subject of folklore studies means a crisis of the discipline itself.

The core of the problem lies in what researchers recognise as the object of folklore research, for to leave it at the statement that it is folklore is obviously no longer enough these days. Czesław Hernas, to whom folklore was first and foremost a part of culture, stated unequivocally: “The development of folklore studies, which open up fields of research in new territories, leads to such a diversity in the understanding of the object of research that the construction of a single, universal definition of folklore is currently not possible” (Hernas 1984: 265). Analysing the proposals put forward by many scholars, Hernas highlighted the syncretic nature of folkloric creativity, distancing himself, however, from the necessity of taking into account the criterion of oral

¹ All citations from non-English-language sources have been translated solely for the purpose of the present article.

transmission (after all, he had already proved that print had from the very beginning reinforced and exploited the content present in direct circulation²). This view resulted from his perception of the cultural character of folklore, which, in his opinion, could not be combined only with the “spiritual culture of the simple folk”, since alongside rural folklore, he distinguished urban folklore and the folklore of various environments and professional groups. To Hernas, folklore was “still a vibrant layer in contemporary culture, continually self-adapting to today’s socio-cultural transformations” (Hernas 1984: 265). In his view, this nature of folklore also influenced its transformations, determining “the ongoing disappearance of many particular subcultural traditions in favour of general cultural patterns”. His doubts about the understanding of orality as a determinant of folklore Hernas signalled elsewhere as well: “I think that even when analysing the texts of peasant subculture, the criterion of orality cannot be maintained as a limit of definition, but only as an internal tool for ordering messages – let alone when this criterion is transferred to the analysis of urban folklore, where ephemeral street printout has long been one of the basic forms of communication” (Hernas 1976: 478).³

Hernas questions the classical literary paradigm of folklore (orality, aesthetics, folk source) based on his perception of folklore studies in an anthropological dimension, as well as from his emphasis on the cultural context of the production of folklore texts. In fact, Hernas accused folklore scholars of inaccurate “awareness of the laws governing the living circulation of texts in an environment, for collectors have long been interested in texts, not in their circulation in a one-off, authentic realisation, together with the complex semiotics of performance, situation and reception” (Hernas 1976: 477).

The essential characteristics of folkloric orality

The long-lasting debate on reformulating the object of study of contemporary folklore studies has been concluded with a decisive victory of the concept of perceiving folklore studies in an anthropological dimension. This required a redefinition of the notion of orality in contemporary culture. As put by Roch Sulima (*O zbieraniu i wydawaniu...* 1979: 5): “Personally, I would look for editions that reflect not folklore as a state, but folklore as a process, that is, a phenomenon in motion, one related to the social practice of the performers, the bearers. (...) I would therefore see not only the texts, but also the people behind them”. Jerzy Bartmiński, in turn, expected the syncretism of a folkloric text to be taken into account because, as he stressed, besides the

2 Discussing 17th-century manuscript collections of anecdotes, Hernas stated that “print or handwriting constitute only an auxiliary form during the transmission of text, because what counts here is not only the textual ‘script’, but also the performer’s histrionic talent, on which depends the artistic value of an anecdote” (Hernas 1973: 136).

3 Viktor Gusiev’s unambiguous statement that “some variants of folklore are generally possible without the oral element” (Gusiew 1974: 117) is worth recalling at this point.

verbal text, besides the music, “there is, after all, the situation – a ritual, customary or occasional one – and to the performer, the situation is perhaps the most important element” (O zbieraniu i wydawaniu... 1979: 8). The necessity of taking the situation in which a particular folkloric text is performed into account was also highlighted, as has already been mentioned, by Hernas: “In the traditional folkloric order, it these are the situations of the liturgical year, the situations of human life, etc. But I would also introduce the notion of circumstance, i.e. under what circumstances he [the creator] performs the text, whether this is done in his group, as a ritual performer, or for the recording researcher” (O zbieraniu i wydawaniu... 1979: 12).

Inspired by the conceptions proposed by Walter J. Ong,⁴ in his subsequent works, Sulima continued his reflections on the phenomenon of folkloric orality. He considered orality to be “the irreducible determinant of folklore” and “an oral way of existing in the world, understood as an autonomous, humanistically legitimate type of existence” (Sulima 1995: 58). Ultimately, he unequivocally defined contemporary folklore studies as an anthropology of the spoken word (Sulima 2005).

Understood as an anthropology of the spoken word, folklore studies allow for a broad perception of orality in contemporary culture. This is because orality is not only a way of existing in the world, but also a way of knowing it, since it determines “the manner of modelling the world”, i.e. creating (“ordering”) its image, which Joanna Tokarska-Bakir defined as *ontological orality*, “a certain cognitive/existential style” (Tokarska-Bakir 2000: 165). Hence, orality cannot be reduced only to the oral (direct) transmission of content. It can also be realised in the form of written (typographic), visual, as well as electronic communication. What is more, folklore can be considered “a basic form of categorising reality” (Kajfosz 2011: 75). The narrative dimension of social experience, therefore, means that “storytelling serves to tame reality, it situates people in that reality and can anticipate it; it can even construct it as a sphere of intellectual, sentimental or emotional values” (Sulima 1980: 85).

In order to be able to analyse folkloric sources from an anthropological perspective, the methods of obtaining research material need changing. This is because this material cannot be identified with a written record, whether by hand or in print. This “typographical image of folklore”, according to Sulima, “to a large extent affected the way in which folklore itself exists” (Sulima 2005: 85). Thus, if the criterion of orality is considered a distinguishing feature of the subject of folklore studies, not only does Kolberg’s impressive collection turn out to be, as Sulima put it, “the largest cemetery of orality” (Sulima 2005: 86),⁵ but also much should be done in order not to expand

4 W.J. Ong considered orality to be not only a manner of transmitting a text but, above all, a mode of thinking and expression: “a verbomotor lifestyle” (Ong 2002: 66–68, 112–113).

5 In Włodzimierz Pawluczuk’s perception, however, “folklore collected in books is a dead art” (Pawluczuk 1978: 131). This was pointed out in the 1960s by Boris N. Putilov: “The life of a folkloristic text is typified by transience, dynamism, a definite lack of stability. Constant movement is inherent in its nature.

that “cemetery”; thus, the methods of recording folklore need to be fundamentally changed – an achievement which, incidentally, is not overly complicated, considering the current development of technology, although it may arouse some controversy. Only a full film recording of the situation in which the utterance is realised,⁶ expanded by an interview, would enable the folklorist to change his/her perspective on the object of research, to break away from analysis, which has hitherto concentrated mainly on *what* was communicated (i.e. on the story), and to focus on *how* it was communicated (i.e. on the activity of telling the story). The focus is thus shifted to the action, which is, after all, carried out by the narrator in a concrete situation and the extended analysis of which enriches the context of the utterance with the behaviour of the narrator him/herself and with the reactions and behaviour of the other participants in the event. This leads to the reconstruction, as far as possible, of the cultural process of creating and transmitting the meaning and, as a result, makes it possible to bring out the essential characteristics of the message's orality.

“Orality taken broadly, including as a way of existing in the world, would therefore emerge as the main criterion of folklore and the primary subject of folklore studies. (...) Orality conceived as a worldview, as an oral way of existing in the world, accentuates that aspect of a folkloric source which is individual, which is subjective” (Sulima 2005: 87–88). Orality perceived in this manner, corresponding to J. Tokarska-Bakir's concept – that is, as not reducible to the oral, direct transmission of text, but at the same time admitting the possibility of revealing its character of a way of existing in the world and a way of knowing that world, while at the same time overlapping with the other systems of culture – allows for the realisation of a message also in the form of visual (iconographic) communication.

Over time, this form of communication was strengthened by photography, which in traditional culture proved to be an important criterion for describing and learning about the world. The belief in the authenticity of figures and landscapes captured in photographs reinforced the role of the image in a traditional culture, until then dominated by words. It was “photography, not painting, not a description, diary, newspaper or book, that finally heralded the breaking of the monopoly of the spoken word in popular culture, although it proved unable to dominate this culture. The truth of the spoken word has been replaced in the most glaring way by the truth of photography” (Sulima 1992: 118). The task of the word was to supplement this “truth of photography”, make the image concrete and comment on it. In these circumstances, an image from a television source will have the greatest credibility; as a result, with the development

A single recording does not make this dynamism visible; on the contrary, it seems to ignore it, putting the folkloristic text into a state of immobility that is alien to it” (Putiłow 1973: 39).

- 6 Interestingly, Putiłow signalled the usefulness of recordings made “on film with sound (in which case the visual aspect of the performance is also preserved)” (Putiłow 1973: 43).

of electronic media and the emergence of new interactions connecting people with the media, it will create a progressive ability to create visual messages (cf. Hajduk-Nijakowska 2010), with those messages which nowadays are the most popular, the memes, at the forefront.

Folkloric communication on the Internet

Contemporary folklore cannot be analysed in isolation from the media, as they are a constitutive feature of the cultural context and have a decisive influence on the transformations taking place in folklore. The rapid development of new media, especially the Internet, has initiated major changes in the cultural sphere dominated by direct cultural communication. The electronic form of folkloric communication (i.e. folkloric communication conducted via the Internet) can nowadays be considered an alternative form of the informal (colloquial) oral narrative. This perception will make it possible to recreate the cultural process of the creation and transmission of the meaning, and the communication process itself will then fully reveal its syncretic character. If the Internet had not been used primarily for conversation, the process of folklore sources “entering” culture would probably have taken much longer; but as things are, all that everyday babble, the chatting, the gossiping, the innumerable confidences or counsels took the virtual world by storm to support the process of co-creating a virtual community. Of course, speech had to be “made written”, but it still simulates face-to-face conversation so effectively that not only theorists refer to it as secondary orality. Ong described this concept as follows:

Secondary orality is both remarkably like and remarkably unlike primary orality. Like primary orality, secondary orality has generated a strong group sense, for listening to spoken words forms hearers into a group, a true audience (...). But secondary orality generates a sense for groups immeasurably larger than those of primary oral culture—McLuhan’s ‘global village’ (Ong 2002: 133).

But, more importantly to a folklorist, Internet users themselves perceive interface-to-interface contact as a “real” online conversation. Wojciech Burszta made an explicit comment on the situation of a participant in virtual reality: “I cannot see the interlocutor as a flesh-and-blood person, but I see them through what they have written down and sent to me, to others, in cyberspace. Virtual language is therefore also a substitute not only for natural language, but also an expression of the hope that an encounter with another person is always possible” (Burszta 2004: 145). The Internet therefore requires not only a “making a writing” of speech, but also a “simultaneous oralisation of writing” (Górska-Olesińska 2005: 458).

Making use, in a nearly natural way, of the Internet for transmitting contents typical of traditional folklore indicates not only that its bearers have gained access to technical means enabling unhindered electronic communication, but also that they have achieved the ability to use them efficiently. In Arjun Appadurai's perception, "new forms of electronically mediated communication are beginning to create *virtual neighborhoods*, no longer bounded by territory, passports, taxes, elections (...), but by access to both the software and hardware that are required to connect to these large international computer networks" (Appadurai 2005: 195). In practice, such a virtual neighbourhood fulfils functions typical of a "real" local community. And, most importantly, content that until now functioned offline is penetrating the Internet as a matter of course, while at the same time it lends itself successfully to Internet inspiration; this determines the qualitative enrichment of the formula of this content and, almost outside the awareness of Internet users themselves, serves to co-create the social dimension of the new media. Herein lies the most exciting challenge for contemporary folklore research.

Thus, the fact that folklore has entered the Internet naturally facilitates the emergence of virtual neighbourhoods. This is because even if they "seem on the face of it to represent just that absence of face-to-face links, spatial contiguity, and multiplex social interaction that the idea of a neighborhood seems centrally to imply" (Appadurai 2005: 195), the true power of virtual neighbourhoods lies in their ability to mobilise people in real-life existential neighbourhoods and to transform the relationships between them. This is manifested first and foremost in the constant "production" of the sense of locality and the feeling of a network community (cf. Hajduk-Nijakowska 2012a). In addition, "virtual communities have generated many new communication models conducive to new folkloric situations" (Burszta, Pomieciński 2012: 5). Thus, "in ways not anticipated by humanists, new media are reworking the logics and standards of local cultures, that is those that have been the focus of traditional ethnology" (Kowalski 2011: 45).

The object of a folklorist's interest should therefore be phenomena that circulate and spread primarily (and sometimes exclusively) on the web, which can be both a "primary" and a "secondary" environment for them. These are phenomena referred to as e-folklore, which function in a culture dominated by communication via the Internet. They can therefore be labelled as network culture or, following Violetta Krawczyk-Wasilewska, digital culture, "because the cultural extraction and transmission of meanings has always, naturally, taken place by way of coding (or rather, categorisation of concepts), which has nowadays become digitalised" (Krawczyk-Wasilewska 2009: 16). Scholars are, however, not unanimous as to how the very subject of such research should be named. In Poland, the term 'e-folklore' has been accepted for this phenomenon. Its definition, as proposed by Piotr Grochowski, includes

all kinds of texts (verbal, pictorial, audio, multimedia, behavioural/situational) functioning in different channels of Internet communication, which constitute the collective "property" of a specific group of Internet users and which are characterised by: 1) repetitiveness/popularity, 2) spontaneity/informality, 3) relative anonymity. (...) In my view, in the study of Internet texts it is possible, even necessary, to combine the project of "anthropological folklore studies" with the project of "text-oriented folklore studies" (Grochowski 2013: 63).

One thing is, however, certain: e-folklore cannot be analysed without taking into account the unique activity of network users inherent in its nature. This is because there is no doubt that being a part of web culture, e-folklore is radically different from traditional folklore (cf. Hajduk-Nijakowska 2012b). First of all, it is exceptionally dynamic due to the activity of its recipients (that is, to be precise, Internet users) who are its creators, carriers and consumers at the same time. It is therefore impossible to study e-folklore without concurrently analysing processes occurring synchronously and diachronically. This aspect was highlighted by Robert G. Howard, in whose opinion new media "can be more folkloric than old media because much online communication is more like a process than an object. When these processes occur in dynamic webs of discourse, they give rise to what Appadurai and Breckenridge call zones of contestation, where 'national, mass, and folk culture provide both mill and grist for one another'" (Howard 2008: 200).

Nearly twenty years have passed since Michael Herzfeld wrote about the role of an anthropologist in the study of the wider public: "Ethnography gives us the possibility of ideal access to the place where local forms of perception and practice converge with mass-produced forms of representation" (Herzfeld 2004: 410), because the media, as he put it, "create a space where the play of imagination and the construction of identity occur" (Herzfeld 2004: 417). This space constitutes a *sui generis* arena where the collective imagination and intelligence are revealed.

While the Internet is successfully used to transmit content typical of traditional folklore, this content no longer has a similar status; the change of context forces a change in the content itself and the use of the potential of electronic transmission. On the other hand, however, as P. Grochowski points out, entirely new phenomena are emerging, for instance

various types of *adaptations* (of computer games, scenes from popular films, television programmes), alternative narratives based on popular fantasy novels and online games (...). Moreover, in virtual space, as in the real world, it is possible to distinguish the sphere of inter-social folklore, which is available to the vast majority of net users (e.g. websites with jokes or chain letters sent by e-mail), and the sphere of environmental folklore, which is the *property* of particular groups of Internet users (e.g. players of a particular online game, users of a particular IRC channel, etc.) (Grochowski 2013: 50–51).

Thus, folklore and folklore-like phenomena reach far more diverse groups than they had at any time in the past and they help to satisfy contemporary needs by, among others, producing virtual neighbourhoods. "I would even venture to claim", adds Grochowski, "that folklore today exists primarily on the Internet" (Grochowski 2013: 48). It is, however, hard to accept this stance.

The Internet inspires the participants of specific sites to participate in "conversations" and to search for like-minded people; it enables the rapid global circulation of transmitted content that enriches local narrative traditions; it supports creativity that has clear hallmarks of a folkloric activity and fosters the development of imagination. In the context of folkloric orality, Internet users – and the numbers of those have rapidly increased, particularly after two years of social isolation during the pandemic – successfully manage spontaneous/unofficial "sense-making" in the Internet space. Diverse content penetrating from the global world into local cultural structures is "appropriated" there, indigenised and given new, tame meanings.

Thus, the process of cultural socialisation unfolds not only in a different space, but also in a new way. Traditional forms of creating knowledge about the world, which are based on analogue reading, are being abandoned and replaced by a computer interface offering new options of extending the text: combining the word with moving images, sound or music; their variants take the form of digital arrangements of image and sound. This grassroots creative activity of Internet users has been termed *convergence* by Henry Jenkins. In his view, the power of convergence lies in the fact that it "occurs within the brains of individual consumers and through their social interactions with others. Each of us constructs our own personal mythology from bits and fragments of information extracted from the media flow and transformed into resources through which we make sense of our everyday lives" (Jenkins 2006: 3–4). The process of contemporary cultural socialisation has been in a nearly natural way enriched by folkloric orality.

Bibliography

- Appadurai, A. (2005). *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bartmiński, J. (1990). *Folklor, język, poetyka*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Burszta, W.J. (2004). *Różnorodność i tożsamość. Antropologia jako kulturowa refleksyjność*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Burszta, W.J., Pomiećński, A. (2012). E-folklor – wstęp. *Kultura Popularna*, 3, 4–5.
- Górska-Olesińska, M. (2005). Trwałe konwersacje. Wirtualna realis Sieci jako rzeczywistość w konwersacji. In: M. Ostrowicki (ed.), *Estetyka wirtualności* (pp. 455–473). Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych „Universitas”.
- Grochowski, P. (2013). Folklorysta w sieci. Prolegomena do badań folkloru internetowego. In: P. Grochowski (ed.) *Netlor. Wiedza cyfrowych tubylców* (pp. 41–64). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

- Gusiew, W.J. (1974). *Estetyka folkloru* (trans. T. Zieliński). Zakład Naukowy im. Ossolińskich: Wrocław.
- Hajduk-Nijakowska, J. (2010). E-folklor. Rola internetu w powstawaniu nowych zjawisk folklorystycznych. In: P. Francuz, St. Jędrzejowski (eds.), *Nowe media i komunikowanie wizualne* (pp. 201–213). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II.
- Hajduk-Nijakowska, J. (2012a). E-folklor jako subkultura sieci. In: M. Górńska-Olesińska (ed.), *Liberatura, e-literatura i... Remiksy, remediacje, redefinicje* (pp. 83–98). Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Hajduk-Nijakowska, J. (2012b). Folklorystyczny nerw internetu. Wspólnotowa przestrzeń emocji i wyobraźni. *Kultura Popularna*, 3, 6–18.
- Hernas, Cz. (1973). *Barok*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Hernas, Cz. (1976). Miejsce badań nad folklorem literackim. In: H. Markiewicz, J. Sławiński (eds.), *Problemy metodologiczne współczesnego literaturoznawstwa* (pp. 467–481). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Hernas, Cz. (1984). Folklor. In: A. Hutnikiewicz, Cz. Hernas, J. Krzyżanowski (eds.), *Literatura polska. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny*. Vol. 1 (pp. 264–266). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Herzfeld, M. (2004). *Antropologia. Praktykowanie teorii w kulturze i społeczeństwie* (trans. M. M. Piechaczek). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Howard, R.G. (2008). Electronic Hybridity: The Persistent Processes of the Vernacular Web. *Journal of American Folklore*, 121 (480), 192–218.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Kajfosz, J. (2011). Folklor jako tekst w obiegu i jego potencjał konstruowania rzeczywistości. In: J. Hajduk-Nijakowska, T. Smolińska (eds.), *Nowe konteksty badań folklorystycznych* (pp. 53–77). Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Kowalski, P. (2011). Folklorystyka na nowych obszarach: antropologia mediów. In: J. Hajduk-Nijakowska, T. Smolińska (eds.), *Nowe konteksty badań folklorystycznych* (pp. 39–52). Wrocław: Polskie Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze.
- Krawczyk-Wasilewska, V. (2009). E-folklor jako zjawisko kultury digitalnej. In: G. Gańczarczyk, P. Grochowski (eds.), *Folklor w dobie internetu* (pp. 15–22). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- O zbieraniu i wydawaniu tekstów folkloru (1979). *Literatura Ludowa*, 1–3, 3–18.
- Ong, W.J. (2002). *Orality and Literacy. The Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pawluczuk, W. (1978). *Naprawianie świata*. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.
- Putiłow, B.N. (1973). Folklorystyka współczesna i problemy tekstologii (trans. T. Zieliński). *Literatura Ludowa*, 2, 37–47.
- Sulima, R. (1980). *Dokument i literatura*. Warszawa: Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza.
- Sulima, R. (1992). *Słowo i etos. Szkice o kulturze*. Warszawa: Fundacja Artystyczna Związku Młodzieży Wiejskiej „Galicja”.
- Sulima, R. (1995). Rekonstrukcje i interpretacje. Od folklorystyki do antropologii codzienności. In: D. Simonides (ed.), *Folklorystyka. Dylematy i perspektywy* (pp. 55–72). Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Sulima, R. (2005). Folklorystyka jako antropologia słowa mówionego. *Literatura Ludowa*, 4–5, 81–92.
- Tokarska-Bakir, J. (2000). *Obraz osobliwy. Hermeneutyczna lektura źródeł etnograficznych. Wielkie opowieści*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych „Universitas”.

Summary

Accepting the anthropological perspective of analysing oral folklore, understood as a part of culture – any culture – requires a redefinition of the notion of orality in contemporary culture. Orality does not mean solely oral direct transmission of texts; it also reveals a way in which human beings operate in their world, as well as the manner of its cognition formed by folk-type thinking. A message may also be transmitted in the form of visual or electronic communication. Analysing contemporary folkloric texts from the anthropological perspective requires changing the existing method of acquiring research material. This includes primarily the situation in which the given text is realized. The cultural context is especially significant in analysing Internet-based form of folkloric communication, where it is necessary to take the role of virtual community into account. By penetrating the Internet, the content which until then functioned outside it is subjected to changes resulting from the Internet-related inspiration. It therefore co-creates e-folklore, the analysis of which must take the exceptional activity of Internet users into consideration. The process of contemporary cultural socialisation has been in a nearly natural way enriched by folkloric orality.

Keywords: orality, folk-type thinking, e-folklore

Summary translated by J. Jędrzejowski

Streszczenie

Przyjęcie antropologicznej perspektywy analizowania folkloru słownego, rozumianego jako część kultury (każdej kultury), wymaga zredefiniowania pojęcia oralności w kulturze współczesnej. Oralność nie oznacza tylko ustnego, bezpośredniego przekazywania tekstu, ale ujawnia również sposób funkcjonowania człowieka w świecie oraz sposób jego poznawania ukształtowany przez myślenie typu ludowego. Przekaz może być realizowany również w formie komunikacji wizualnej lub elektronicznej. Analizowanie współczesne przekazów folklorystycznych z perspektywy antropologicznej wymaga zmiany metody pozyskiwania materiału badawczego, uwzględniającego przede wszystkim sytuację w jakiej realizowany jest dany przekaz. Kulturowy kontekst szczególnie ważny jest przy analizowaniu internetowej formy komunikacji folklorystycznej, w której konieczne jest uwzględnienie roli wspólnoty wirtualnej. Treści funkcjonujące dotąd poza siecią przenikając do internetu, poddawane są zmianom wynikającym z internetowej inspiracji i współtworzą e-folklor, którego analiza wymaga uwzględnienia wyjątkowej aktywności użytkowników sieci. Proces współczesnej socjalizacji kulturowej niemal w naturalny sposób został wzbogacony folklorystyczną oralnością.

Słowa kluczowe: oralność, myślenie typu ludowego, e-folklor

Translated by K. Michałowicz