



## Epistemology of traditions: Philosophical challenges in preserving intangible cultural heritage

### Alla Kravchenko

Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor  
State University of Trade and Economics  
02156, 19 Kyoto Str., Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8429-2183>

### Iryna Kyzymenko

PhD in History, Associate Professor  
State University of Trade and Economics  
02156, 19 Kyoto Str., Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2148-9488>

### Nataliia Husieva\*

PhD in History, Associate Professor  
State University of Trade and Economics  
02156, 19 Kyoto Str., Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6062-6406>

**Abstract.** The purpose of this study was to establish a typology of intangible traditions as forms of epistemological knowledge, using the Ukrainian cultural environment as a case study; in addition, a comparative analysis was conducted with corresponding practices in Spain, Italy, and Romania in order to identify structural differences and points of intersection. The methodological framework was based on a comparative analysis of the forms of representation of intangible cultural heritage within national contexts, taking into account legal frameworks, institutional legitimisation, and methods of knowledge transmission. The analysis was conducted on the basis of official documents, elements from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) lists, and national legislative sources. As a result, it was revealed that tradition functions as an instrument for the preservation and transmission not only of cultural content, but also of structured knowledge. Four key forms of knowledge transmission were identified: oral-vocal, corporeal-ritual, culinary-domestic, and artisanal-visual. Each demonstrated a specific model of epistemic presence: from emotional memory (in songs and verbal genres) to the practical embodiment of knowledge in material forms (culinary practices, crafts). All four countries possess formalised systems for safeguarding intangible cultural

---

Received 29.06.2025 Revised 02.11.2025 Accepted 27.11.2025

---

### **Suggested Citation:**

Kravchenko, A., Kyzymenko, I., & Husieva, N. (2025). Epistemology of traditions: Philosophical challenges in preserving intangible cultural heritage. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 13(4), 110-127. doi: 10.31548/hspedagog/4.2025.110.

\*Corresponding author



heritage; however, differences were identified in the depth of integration of traditions into national institutions: Spain and Italy exhibited stable normative models, Romania showed targeted support for craftsmanship, while Ukraine was found to be at the stage of institutional transition under conditions of wartime instability. The systematisation of the obtained results made it possible to define tradition as a form of social knowledge performing normative, practical, and identificatory functions. It was demonstrated that intangible heritage requires not only ethnographic or legal approaches but also epistemological reflection as a bearer of knowledge represented in non-verbal, bodily, imagistic, or ritualised forms. The practical significance of the study lies in the development of an approach to analysing intangible heritage as a component of the system of knowledge transmission under conditions of social transformation

**Keywords:** epistemology; culture; cultural heritage; tradition; emotional memory; integration; instability

---

### Introduction

The preservation of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) has emerged in the Ukrainian intellectual sphere as an issue that transcends the protective or anthropological dimension. Under conditions of external threat and internal institutional transformation, tradition has begun to perform not only the function of cultural identification but has also become a source of knowledge transmission amid the fragmentation of semantic structures. The relevance of this research is determined by the need for a philosophical comprehension of tradition as a form of epistemological presence in contemporary society, where knowledge is not confined to academic or written formats but is transmitted through ritual, voice, craft, ceremony, and embodied practice. In the Ukrainian context – where tradition is closely linked to historical memory and the transmission of national experience – the problem of understanding intangible heritage is aggravated by the absence of stable protection mechanisms. Unlike Spain, Italy, and Romania, where the epistemological role of tradition is partially institutionalised, Ukraine faces the need to reconceptualise it as a form of knowledge that exists beyond the boundaries of a formalised cultural field.

Several attempts to systematise ICH in Ukraine have already been undertaken. In particular, O. Beidyk *et al.* (2024) presented a comprehensive structure of ICH as a multilayered

system, in which the documentation of traditional practice was accompanied by a hierarchy of significance: from local ritual knowledge to representative resources of national scope. Their study outlined prospects for the development of institutional policy in the sphere of intangible heritage, emphasising not only its cultural but also its practical value. Another conceptual approach was proposed by I. Hryhorchak (2020), who focused on the relationship between globalisation processes and local authenticity. The core of her analysis was the transformation of traditions under new social conditions, in particular the mechanisms for adapting Ukrainian forms of intangible knowledge to the international legal framework. The author concluded that without consideration of the local semantics of tradition, any interventions in its protection risk remaining superficial. In the work of O. Beznosiuk (2024), the legal indeterminacy of the concept of ICH within the national cultural field was singled out. The author established that the absence of stable definitions and the blurred boundaries between tangible and intangible heritage create obstacles to the effective protection of elements of traditional culture. The main outcome of his research was the delineation of priorities for normative systematisation.

Philosophical reflection on intangible heritage within the context of worldview transformation was provided by I. Plachinta *et al.* (2024).

They revealed how religious tradition functions as a mechanism for preserving value structures within modern society. Their results demonstrated that tradition can not only reproduce semantic constants but also ensure the ontological stability of cultural identity in situations of its devaluation. L. Polishchuk & M. Hrach (2023) focused on the issue of preserving cultural identity in wartime conditions. Their research addressed the risks of the destruction of ICH through the physical annihilation of the cultural environment. The authors concluded that in conditions of armed conflict, tradition performs a stabilising function, supporting the symbolic integrity of collective consciousness.

The issue of institutional strategies for safeguarding ICH during wartime was comprehensively analysed by Y. Rachkov (2024). His study outlined a range of challenges, paying particular attention to the shortage of qualified personnel, insufficient state funding, and the inefficiency of promotional programmes. As a result, the author concluded that the existing protection system does not correspond to current threats. The legal dimension of the problem was explored by M. Akimov *et al.* (2024), who identified gaps in the criminal-law protection of ICH. They demonstrated that Ukraine's legislation fails to ensure adequate liability for the destruction of intangible heritage forms, particularly in cases of deliberate eradication during wartime. Their conclusions underscored the urgent need for the codification of such offences.

In M. Okhrimenko's (2022) research, emphasis was placed on the practical implementation of protection policies under wartime conditions. The author analysed how local-level cultural institutions responded to the threats of destruction of the traditional environment. It was found that many decisions were improvised in nature, and the normative framework remained insufficiently adapted to a state of emergency. A. Moroko (2024) focused on the archaeological dimension of heritage, which directly intersects with intangible tradition in the form of cultural interpretation. His study showed that the loss of material carriers of heritage leads to the devaluation

of the knowledge associated with them, and this interconnection must be considered in legal regulations on heritage protection. In the work of B. Navrátilová (2024), the role of ICH elements in shaping national identity was explored. The author established that through established cultural practices – songs, rituals, crafts – a narrative of community is formed that unites the experiences of individual regions into a coherent imagination of Ukraine. The findings of this study confirmed that ICH performs not only a symbolic but also an integrative function in nation-building processes.

Despite the extensive empirical base, existing studies have predominantly focused on the legal, political, or sociocultural dimensions of heritage protection. The epistemological perspective – namely, the question of how tradition functions as a form of knowledge (embodied, ritual, artisanal, or symbolic) – has remained largely unaddressed. Moreover, a lack of comparative analysis has been identified, which would make it possible to assess the specificity of the Ukrainian experience within a broader European context. Given these limitations, the present study was aimed at the theoretical reconstruction of tradition as a form of epistemological knowledge and at identifying the philosophical challenges accompanying its safeguarding under contemporary sociocultural conditions.

The purpose of the research was to provide a philosophical interpretation of intangible cultural heritage as a mode of knowledge transmission. The objectives of the study included: identifying the forms in which tradition is realised within the Ukrainian cultural environment as a mode of epistemological presence; conducting a comparative analysis of the ways in which ICH is represented as knowledge in Ukraine and other European countries; and systematising the findings in order to formulate a typology of traditions as models of knowledge transmission and representation.

## Materials and Methods

The study focused on identifying patterns of representing tradition as a form of epistemological

presence, with a subsequent comparison between the Ukrainian context and the safeguarding practices of intangible cultural heritage in Spain, Italy, and Romania. The selection of these four countries was driven by the availability of representative examples of traditions that have been officially recognised as UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage elements and are legislatively regulated at the national level. An important criterion for including countries in the analysis was also the availability of reliable sources – legal acts and detailed descriptions of traditional practices – which enabled a comprehensive comparative study.

Ukraine was considered the primary object of research due to the need to conceptualise intangible tradition not merely as a cultural phenomenon, but as knowledge functioning outside academic institutions. The sources for the analysis were official documents: Law of Ukraine No. 1805-III “On the Protection of Cultural Heritage” (2000), Ordinance of the Cabinet of the Ministers of Ukraine No. 84-p “On Approval of An Action Plan to Support the Cultural Sector, Protect Cultural Heritage, Develop Creative Industries and Tourism” (2021) and the updated Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies (n.d.), which allowed for the reconstruction of the regulatory and institutional landscape. The empirical analysis was based on three UNESCO elements: Cossack songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2015), Culture of Ukrainian borscht cooking (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2022) and Kosiv painted ceramics (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.f), which reflect different types of epistemological knowledge – oral, culinary-domestic, and artisanal-visual.

In the context of Spain, a key criterion for inclusion in the analysis was the multi-level regulatory framework for safeguarding ICH, encompassing both the general law, Law No. 126 “On the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage” (2015), and specialised regulations,

particularly Royal Decree No. 385/2017 “On Transhumance as a Representative Manifestation of Intangible Cultural Heritage” (2017), which demonstrated the integration of practices into the state-legal domain. The study focused on castellers – human towers (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.d), flamenco (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.c) and the Mediterranean diet (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.e), three distinct models of tradition that enable the tracing of corporeal-ritualistic, vocal-emotional, and culinary-ethical knowledge transmission.

Italy was included in the study as an example of a country with a high level of heritage formalisation, enshrined in the Code of the Cultural and Landscape Heritage (2004) and Legislative Decree No. 162 “On Implementation of Directives 2004/49/EC and 2004/51/EC On the Safety and Development of the Community’s Railways” (2007), which defined the legal status of intangible objects. For analysis, the following were selected: the Opera dei Pupi (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.f.), as an example of theatricalised corporeal-symbolic practice, and the art of Neapolitan “pizzaiuolo” (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.a), as an example of a culinary tradition with an institutionalised training system. Both examples illustrate different modes of knowledge transmission – through bodily manipulation or through gastronomic routines with embedded moral norms.

The inclusion of Romania was based on its systematic state policy for supporting artisanal heritage, documented in Law of the Romanian Parliament No. 26 “On the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage” (2008) and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). The research material included traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.h), which functions as a visualised system for transmitting socio-gender norms, as well as the

vocal form of the “doina” (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.b), which accumulates emotional knowledge in the format of individual performance.

The material was analysed using the method of qualitative comparative analysis, based on a systematic comparison of forms of cultural transmission, types of knowledge, and legal mechanisms enshrined in national systems. The selection of sources was carried out based on their correspondence to the research typological model: oral, corporeal, culinary, and artisanal forms. The approach combined interpretative analysis of the content of texts and normative acts with typological systematisation, which allowed for the outlining of epistemological models of tradition implementation in a comparative context.

## Results

**The Ukrainian experience: Tradition as a form of epistemological presence.** The formation and preservation of knowledge within intangible cultural heritage in the Ukrainian context occurred in diverse forms, among which oral tradition constitutes one of the most stable. Epistemological presence implies the ability of tradition not only to preserve the substantive components of culture but also to structure knowledge that functions in the form of practices, experience, symbols, and repeated actions within a specific social environment. Unlike written or institutionalised modes of representation, such knowledge is not textually fixed but circulates within the community through rhythm, intonation, narrative structure, and ritualised action. It is not abstract but is always rooted in a specific cultural situation, space, and community.

Cossack songs of Dnipropetrovsk Region (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2015) constitute an example of the functioning of collective historical memory, where the past is not archived but re-enacted in the performance. These songs encapsulate knowledge about social structures, notions of heroism, and established behavioural models transmitted

from generation to generation without reliance on a written tradition. Their structure contains not only substantive markers of a specific era but also auditory parameters that serve as means of recognition and repetition within the collective environment. The song text, even in the absence of a fixed version, contains stable verbal formulae which, combined with the melodic structure, create a recognisable image constantly renewed in performance. Rhythm, intonation, textual variability, and the presence of a ritual context indicate that these songs are not merely carriers of content but also a complex system of epistemological transmission, where knowledge emerges as practical participation in its realisation.

Another form of oral tradition is represented in the gastronomic sphere. The tradition of borscht cooking, recognised as an element of intangible cultural heritage, embodies everyday knowledge about the structure of communal life, food culture, local ecological conditions, and ritual cyclicality (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2022). The selection of ingredients, the sequence of actions, the semantics of colour, the structure of consumption – all these components constitute knowledge transmitted in domestic practice without losing cognitive value. During the preparation of the dish, not only a set of culinary actions is reproduced but also a cultural semiotics, where culinary technique becomes a carrier of collective experience. The repetitiveness of actions ensures a stable ritual structure, and the participation of multiple generations in this process guarantees the intergenerational transmission of not only skills but also meanings related to identity, home, and community. In contemporary conditions, this tradition has also gained significance as an instrument of cultural resilience: its safeguarding in wartime demonstrates that intangible practices can perform the function of representing national resistance through action and repetition. This is confirmed not only by the inclusion of borscht on the UNESCO list but also by the increased public, media, and scholarly attention to its role in

the current cultural context. Oral and ritualised culture in the Ukrainian context demonstrates an ability to preserve and transmit structured knowledge that has cultural, social, and normative functions. Its functioning attests that knowledge within tradition is not purely declarative but effective and situationally activated. Its actualisation occurs not at the moment of reflection but at the moment of practice – in performance, in ritual, in rite. This knowledge is rooted in shared experience, which not only reproduces the past but also shapes the present.

The transition to the artisanal domain allows for the consideration of another type of intangible knowledge transmission – through material-visual codes embedded in productive practice. Unlike oral culture, which is based on auditory and linguistic structure, artisanal forms of knowledge are realised in the visual and material plane. Kosiv painted ceramics (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.g) illustrates an example of this type of continuity. Its structure includes not only craft techniques but also an elaborate system of symbolism in which each decorative element performs a semantic function. The placement of images, types of motifs, compositional schemes – all this codifies collective knowledge embodied in images that are easily identified within the local culture (Fig. 1).



**Figure 1.** Works by the masters of the Kosiv Regional Branch of the National Union of Artists of Ukraine  
**Source:** United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (n.d.g)

The technique of ornament application, the choice of colours, and the thematic compositions form a system transmitted not through instructions but through participation in practice. Transmission occurs in the form of observation, copying, and ritualised repetition – that is, through an embodied form of learning in which knowledge is sedimented in the body and gesture, rather than in text. The capacity of the ceramic craft to convey knowledge without the mediation of writing points to its epistemological autonomy. The craft environment is structured according to the principle of interaction between the visual and the practical. This means that each element of a work contains not only material parameters but also a cultural interpretation. Ceramic objects used in ritual or everyday contexts – specifically, wedding plates, christening bowls, or religious decorative elements – attest to the connection between a material object and its traditional function. In each case, the artefact is not merely an object but a carrier of normative, aesthetic, and ethical knowledge, embodied in form.

Against the background of oral culture and craft, normative regulation emerges as a mechanism that allows for the institutionalisation of these forms of knowledge. The transition to the normative plane makes it possible to assess how the state responds to intangible practices and whether it is capable of integrating them into a system of legal protection. The legislative framework for the protection of cultural heritage in Ukraine formally includes ICH within the sphere of state responsibility; however, the current legislation remains predominantly focused on objects of material culture. Law of Ukraine No. 1805-III “On the Protection of Cultural Heritage” (2000) lacks sufficiently clear mechanisms for describing, recording, and preserving intangible forms of knowledge. Categories pertaining to oral tradition, craft, or everyday rituals remain vaguely defined, which precludes their effective legal protection. The absence of an adapted lexicon and flexible identification tools limits the practical coverage of this sphere. The Government of

Ukraine adopted Ordinance of the Cabinet of the Ministers of Ukraine No. 84-p (2021), aimed at supporting creative industries and cultural heritage; however, the practical implementation of these provisions faces challenges related to funding, staffing, and a lack of methodological tools capable of encompassing precisely the intangible forms of culture. The issues of classification, assessment, and monitoring of intangible cultural manifestations remain unregulated. The efforts of professional communities and individual enthusiasts have led to the formation of the National Inventory of ICH Elements (Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies, n.d.), which provides formal recognition to elements of traditional culture and constitutes an important stage in structuring the sphere of intangible heritage. Nevertheless, even in cases of inclusion in the inventory, forms of knowledge remain vulnerable under martial law, when the cultural environment is subject to destruction and communities face displacement or the loss of bearers. This situation reveals the limitations of the normative model, which lacks flexible mechanisms for adaptation to crisis situations. In response to these challenges, there is a growing need for an epistemological rethinking of heritage, where tradition is viewed as a form of knowledge capable of functioning beyond stable structures, in situations of social and cultural risk.

The totality of the described forms – oral, artisanal, and normative – provides grounds for considering the Ukrainian experience as a complex system in which tradition functions not only as a means of preserving culture but also as a method of organising, transmitting, and recording knowledge that exists outside of academic or formalised systems. The conditions of war have only intensified the need to reinterpret this heritage as a resource of an epistemological nature, capable of existing in a fluid, mutable, and risky environment.

**Comparative perspective: The epistemology of tradition in Spain, Italy, and Romania.** Various European contexts demonstrate a variability of approaches to safeguarding intangible cultural

heritage as a means of accumulating and transmitting knowledge. In the cases studied – Spain, Italy, and Romania – tradition emerges not as an archaic form of cultural expression but as a structured instrument operating through ritual, corporeality, craft, and verbal practice. All three models rely on localised knowledge that takes the form of action, while simultaneously being integrated into legal systems that facilitate their state recognition and protection. A comparative analysis allows for tracing how the epistemological function of heritage is realised within different legal, social, and cultural traditions.

In the case of Spain, tradition appears predominantly in forms activated through the body, movement, collective action, and rhythmic coordination. One of the key elements is flamenco (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.c) – a complex cultural practice that unites vocal, dance, and guitar music into a unified system of expression. In flamenco, knowledge is not fixed in texts or musical scores; it is realised in the intonation of the voice, the rhythmic structure of movements, and the dynamics of group interaction. Such knowledge is not transmitted through written media – it requires inclusion in the environment, repeated practice, and corporeal emulation, which testifies to its processual, context-dependent character. A similar type of collective bodily action is traced in the practice of building human towers (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.d) – castells (Fig. 2). The participants in this activity perform precise spatial coordination, where physical experience and intuition are of key importance. Here, knowledge is the result not only of individual training but also of integration into a shared structure. This knowledge is synchronous, collective, and corporeal, and its reproduction is possible only in the presence of the entire group, which functions as a single organism. The expansion of the concept of tradition as knowledge in the Spanish context is exemplified by the Mediterranean diet (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.e), inscribed on the UNESCO list as a model for

safeguarding the cultural practices of daily life. In this case, it concerns the integration of gastronomic, ecological, and ethical knowledge into a stable system of daily actions – the selection of products, seasonality, eating rituals, and family hierarchy during food consumption. The diet as a form of knowledge is not reducible to a culinary recipe – it constitutes a system of beliefs about a proper way of life, consonant with the natural rhythm.



**Figure 2.** The Colla Joves castellers team rises skyward in the Catalan town of Valls

**Source:** United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (n.d.d)

Normative regulation of intangible heritage in Spain is carried out through Law No. 126 (2015), which grants such practices the status of protected objects of cultural policy. This document defines mechanisms for the inclusion of ICH elements in the national register, as well as rules for their safeguarding and promotion. Additionally, through royal decrees, such as Royal Decree No. 385/2017 (2017), specific traditional forms, for instance, “trashumancia” (seasonal migration of livestock), have received the status of representative manifestations of culture. This model testifies to the institutionalisation of local knowledge without the loss of its dynamism. The transition to the Italian context demonstrates a shift in emphasis from collective bodily interaction to an artisanal and technical form of knowledge, in which personal

mastery of technique serves as the basis for the reproduction of tradition.

In Italy, knowledge within intangible heritage takes the form of artisanal competence, in which practical experience, technology, and local semantics form a unified structure. The “Opera dei Pupi” (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.f) functions as an instrument for reproducing narrative structures in which value orientations, conflicts, and behavioural models are embedded. Within this tradition, knowledge is realised in scripted schemes, movement algorithms, character typologies, and the interrelationships between gesture and speech. The stage performance reproduces generalised perceptions of the world’s moral structure, and the very knowledge, embodied in the repertoire, is transmitted through repeated participation in performances, outside of formalised learning. Another example – the art of Neapolitan “pizzaiuolo” (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.a), testifies to the technical stability of knowledge embedded in artisanal actions. The preparation process, from the selection of flour to adherence to the temperature regime, encodes knowledge that is not articulated verbally but is fixed in a rigid sequence of actions. Each stage contains a norm, deviation from which leads to a loss of the product’s authenticity. Such knowledge is not standardised in the form of an instruction but is embedded in the physical practice of the tradition bearer.

The legal framework for this model is implemented through the Code of the Cultural and Landscape Heritage (2004), a legislative act that includes intangible elements in the general system of cultural heritage protection. It establishes the status, recognition criteria, mechanisms for inclusion in inventories, and means of state support. Additionally, Legislative Decree No. 162 (2007) regulates the activities of the Central Institute for Demoethnoanthropology, which ensures the documentation, research, and archiving of ICH elements. The Italian model demonstrates a high degree of interaction between local practice and

state policy, where craft is recognised as a bearer of cultural knowledge capable of legal formalisation and educational inclusion.

In contrast to Spain and Italy, in the Romanian context, tradition functions in forms associated with verbal emotional expression and visual symbolism, with an emphasis on cyclicity and repeatability. In Romanian intangible culture, practices dominate in which knowledge is transmitted through a combination of an intuitive emotional structure and a local-symbolic code. The “Doina” (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.b) – an improvised vocal genre – embodies knowledge about emotional states, moral situations, and shared experiences. Its structure is based not on fixed texts but on verbal creativity in real time. This knowledge is not individual in a narrow sense: it is formalised by a cultural norm that allows for improvisation within a stable intonational, rhythmic, and thematic structure. This constitutes its cognitive specificity – knowledge exists in the moment but is grounded in a deep collective archive. Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.h) reflects a visually-structured form of knowledge, in which composition, ornament, and colouring are not decorative components but carry semantic load (Fig. 3).



**Figure 3.** Example of a craft Romanian carpet  
**Source:** United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (n.d.h), A. Mitrica (2022)

The patterns encode representations of social status, ritual events, and mythological narratives.

The technical execution of the carpet requires precise knowledge of the structural sequence, materials, tools, and the temporal rhythm of work, which is transmitted through demonstration and collective production. Law of the Romanian Parliament No. 26 (2008), which regulates the safeguarding of intangible heritage in Romania, establishes principles for state support, documentation, community participation, and the creation of archives. The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) coordinates the inclusion of elements in the national inventory, organises expert assessments, and implements support programmes for tradition bearers. The Romanian model demonstrates an orientation towards supporting local communities, preserving the living environment of traditional practices, and the active role of the state in documenting and promoting cultural practices.

In summary, the three national models demonstrate distinct pathways for the formation of the epistemological status of tradition. In Spain, corporeal-social practices with high emotional intensity dominate; in Italy, the artisan structure with formally codified technique prevails; and in Romania, verbal and visual forms function through emotional-symbolic repetition. In each case, knowledge is not secondary to action but exists through action, encapsulating unique modes of cultural memory.

**Typology of traditions as epistemological models.** The study of national strategies for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage revealed that traditional practices function not merely as cultural phenomena but as specific forms of epistemological organisation of knowledge. Unlike academic or technocratic models, these forms are not grounded in textuality or standardised fixation but are realised through repeated action, material objects, or collective experience. Typologising these modes of transmission allows for outlining the structural differences between various types of knowledge embedded in

traditional practices and tracing how this knowledge is formed, transmitted, and consolidated within local cultures. A table systematising the

main types of knowledge transmission within intangible heritage and defining their epistemological functions is provided below (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Typology of forms of intangible cultural heritage transmission as epistemological models in national contexts

Mode of knowledge transmission	Countries	Epistemological significance
Oral-vocal	Ukraine, Romania	Representation of affective memory and emotional experience through rhythm, intonation, and verbalisation; transmission of historical and archetypal representations within a communal environment
Somatic-ritualistic	Spain, Italy	Embodiment of knowledge through somatic action, ritualised coordination, and spatial interaction; internalisation of norms through dynamics rather than textuality
Culinary-domestic	Ukraine, Spain, Italy	Codification of practical knowledge concerning quotidian norms, ethical conceptions, and ecological parameters; knowledge is transmitted through repeated domestic practice
Artisanal-visual	Ukraine, Romania	Visualisation of technical and symbolic knowledge through material form; informal learning through observation, participation, and embodiment of cultural identity

**Source:** compiled by the authors based on H. Chmil et al. (2021), M. Stefano (2021), S. Munoz-Vinas (2023), M. Milenković (2024)

The mechanisms of legal regulation for intangible cultural heritage define the conditions for its preservation, transmission, and social recognition. Examining normative approaches in different countries reveals the level of institutional support for traditional forms of knowledge and the degree of their integration into state cultural

policy. National models of legitimation vary depending on the historical-legal context, administrative structure, and cultural policy, resulting in differing levels of effectiveness in safeguarding intangible heritage. The provided table summarises the key parameters of legal provision in the four countries (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Comparative characteristics of legal mechanisms for the legitimation of intangible cultural heritage in Ukraine, Spain, Italy, and Romania

Country	Regulatory framework	Institutional mechanism	Level of integration of traditional knowledge	Specificities of the legal approach
Spain	Legislative regulation via a specific law	Combined system of national and regional governance	High	Flexible integration of local traditions with state policy
Italy	Code of Cultural Heritage and related acts	Involvement of sectoral ethnoscientific institutions	High	Institutionalisation through interdisciplinary integration
Romania	Law on the Safeguarding of ICH	National Commission for Heritage Safeguarding	Medium	Systemic support for crafts and certification of practitioners
Ukraine	General law on cultural heritage	Ministry of Culture, National Register	Low / unstable	Lack of specific instruments, impact of martial law

**Source:** compiled by the authors based on Law of Ukraine No. 1805-III "On the Protection of Cultural Heritage" (2000), Code of the Cultural and Landscape Heritage (2004), Law of the Romanian Parliament No. 26 "On the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage" (2008), Law No. 126 "On the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage" (2015)

Within the research, four types of knowledge transmission within intangible tradition were identified: oral-vocal, corporeal-ritual, culinary-domestic, and craft-visual. Each functions as an autonomous form of structuring social experience, requiring no fixation in text or academic discourse. Concurrently, national strategies for legitimising traditional knowledge demonstrate significant variations, indicating the heterogeneity of the institutional field. In all cases examined, tradition emerges as a relevant form of knowledge capable of ensuring cognitive stability within contexts of cultural dynamics. This interpretation necessitates considering intangible cultural heritage not only from legal or ethnographic perspectives but also as a subject of epistemological analysis aimed at uncovering the forms and mechanisms of knowledge existence in the intangible dimension.

### Discussion

Tradition as a form of intangible cultural heritage is increasingly considered within interdisciplinary scientific discourse as a means of preserving, transmitting, and legitimising knowledge. Researchers focus on the interrelationships between cultural memory, normative institutions, and the epistemological models embodied in intangible practices. In this context, substantive analysis of individual heritage elements is important, as is comparing the mechanisms through which tradition acquires the status of knowledge in different socio-cultural environments.

The study established that intangible cultural heritage traditions functioned as forms of non-linear epistemology, where knowledge was embodied in verbal-sonic, corporeal, gastronomic, and craft-visual practices. This interpretation refined the discourse analysis of C. Melis & D. Chambers (2021), who viewed heritage through the Foucauldian prism of power-knowledge as a constructed normative category. The results of this study confirmed that the institutional articulation of heritage indeed determined the forms of its representation; however, it was simultaneously

discovered that in local traditions, knowledge circulated beyond discursive constraints, through the body, gesture, intonation, and material action. This allowed for proposing a more complex model where tradition was not only inscribed within normative space but also resisted it through inefable modalities of knowledge.

Within the understanding of heritage as a form of epistemic multiplicity, the study's results correlated with the approach of F. Mazzocchi (2022) and L. Petrenko & Y. Brach (2024), who emphasised the impossibility of reducing cultural heritage to a unified type of knowledge. The research confirmed that the diversity of transmission forms – from song genres to culinary and craft activities – necessitated the existence of different epistemological regimes, which were not reducible to cognitive or conceptual representation. This supported the thesis of epistemic diversity and specified it – through a typology of practices that generated meaning through embodiment, repetition, and affective memory. The theme of affective motivation for safeguarding traditions, explored by C. Bortolotto (2024), proved relevant to this study's results concerning corporeal-ritual forms. It was evidenced that models such as castells or flamenco transmitted not only technical skill but also structures of collective emotional memory, activated through collective performance. In this context, the conclusion regarding the role of intimacy as a factor of institutional inclusion was refined: the study demonstrated that the institutionalisation of tradition was not always accompanied by a reduction of affective content – on the contrary, in the cases of Spain and Italy, emotional experience was embedded within the very structure of normative support.

Comparing educational and transmission models with the work of W.-J. Yan & K.-R. Li (2023), who analysed heritage in educational settings, helped to actualise the practical function of traditions within the model of informal learning. It was confirmed that knowledge was transmitted not through formalised programmes but through participation, observation, and reproduction – as

in the case of culinary or craft techniques. This expanded upon the understanding of the educational potential of heritage proposed by the aforementioned authors, highlighting the need to incorporate practices of embodied knowledge into formal pedagogical environments.

The digital dimension of heritage representation, analysed by H. Tamrazyan & G. Hovhannisyan (2025), was partially correlated with the results of this study concerning the problem of categorisation. It was established that traditions based on non-verbal forms of knowledge were difficult to subject to digital cataloguing. This aligned with the assertion regarding the complexity of typologising epigraphic heritage due to its multi-layered cultural significance. The research confirmed that in cases of crafts or ritual practices, the process of formalisation was complicated by the situational, variable, and contextual nature of the knowledge, which eluded stable codification. The results related to the political and administrative aspects of legitimation were relevant to the conclusions of T. Kumar (2024), who researched the limitations of heritage documentation in India. This study identified an analogous situation in the Ukrainian context: formal normative documents existed, yet they were unable to encompass all types of epistemological activity associated with tradition. As in the work of the aforementioned author, the results evidenced that without the active involvement of tradition bearers, the legal system remained fragmented, and knowledge vulnerable to loss. The study allowed for specifying this thesis by demonstrating how forms of succession functioned through actions rather than institutional articulation.

In the sphere of innovative heritage protection, the conclusions of N. Zoannos *et al.* (2023) regarding the potential use of blockchain technologies for recording heritage acquired an additional dimension. This research found that a significant portion of traditions was based on contextual variability and local situationality, which did not align with the logic of an immutable record. This allowed for a refinement: while blockchain might

be relevant for some heritage types, it fails to account for the dynamics of affective and embodied knowledge inherent, for instance, in corporeal or culinary practices. Thus, the results called into question the universality of digital solutions for safeguarding all types of intangible heritage. The undertaken analysis of the forms of epistemological representation of intangible cultural heritage demonstrated a disparity between the normative safeguarding paradigm embedded in international institutions and the actual practices of knowledge transmission. This discrepancy correlated with the critical observations of S. Ortiz & C. de Madariaga (2021), who pointed out that the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) was limited to declarative mechanisms and failed to consider the internal dynamics of heritage within local communities. The results of this study allowed for specifying these conclusions: it was revealed that in Italy, Spain, and Romania, traditions maintained their function as an autonomous knowledge system, reproducing itself despite official procedures – through the daily corporeal and material participation of its bearers. Thus, it was demonstrated that formal inscription on UNESCO lists guaranteed neither active practice nor the genuine transmission of knowledge.

The documented role of language as a vector of intergenerational epistemology resonated with the theses of N. Braber & V. Howard (2023), who considered language an autonomous form of intangible heritage that functioned not merely as a means of communication, but as a bearer of a cultural code. It was confirmed that within local traditions, verbal units did not perform an informative function in isolation but served as markers of ritual, ceremonial, or artisanal content. For instance, terms used in gastronomic discourse (as in the case of Ukrainian borscht) were not neutral lexemes but denoted specific stages of action, rite, or intention. This allowed for an expansion of the conclusions of the aforementioned study, emphasising not only the linguistic dimension of heritage preservation but also the

cognitive function of language as a structure of preserved collective memory.

The problem of the legal regime and intellectual property in the sphere of intangible cultural heritage, analysed by B. Ubertazzi (2022), was tangential to the conflict identified in this study between institutional safeguarding and the living practice of tradition. It was established that practices recorded in registries were not subject to unified legal protection, as the knowledge circulating in artisanal-visual or corporeal-ritual forms could not be formalised into a patent or copyright. This was observed, in particular, in the Ukrainian and Romanian contexts. The study clarified that the legal mechanism must account not only for the product of tradition but also for the processuality of its transmission, which is not a copy but an empirical reproduction of affective and corporeal experience.

The identified transformation of intangible heritage into an object of symbolic capital correlated with the findings of B. Santamarina (2023), who considered UNESCO's activities as the production of "heritage brands". The analysis revealed that practices included in the Representative List acquired commercial significance in tourism and cultural industries, which affected the nature of their functioning. For example, in the case of flamenco or castells, authentic forms were transformed into a spectacular format oriented towards an external audience. This allowed for the development of the idea of "heritage capitalisation" in the context of its distancing from the bearer-community, while simultaneously emphasising that symbolic value does not always contribute to the preservation of the epistemological function of tradition. The study enabled a rethinking of the approaches of R. Smeets (2023), who emphasised the reorientation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) towards sustainable development. The results revealed that in local contexts, traditions indeed acted as instruments for the sustainable reproduction of knowledge; however, they were not always amenable to

adaptation into development programmes in the form expected institutionally. In cases where tradition was embodied in situational, non-systemic experience (as in gastronomic or seasonal rites), it was not integrated into the logic of sustainable economic or educational planning. This allowed for a supplementation of the stated concept by pointing to the need for a more flexible interpretation of heritage within development policies.

Finally, the conclusions of S. Qechai (2023), focused on the symbolic power of UNESCO in constructing global heritage, were juxtaposed with the identified limitations in representing local forms of epistemology. The study confirmed that global standards did not encompass all forms of knowledge – particularly those lacking fixed objectified expression. For instance, bodily techniques in food preparation or pottery-making could not be uniformly recorded without a loss of context. Consequently, a critical rethinking of the unifying heritage strategy was proposed, which confirmed the observations regarding its political and discursive nature in the global sphere.

The obtained analytical results allowed for the outlining of key directions in contemporary scholarly reflection on intangible cultural heritage as a form of knowledge. A comparison with existing studies demonstrated that questions regarding the epistemological nature of tradition, the mechanisms of its institutional legitimation, as well as the forms of its preservation and transmission, are considered in both normative-legal and socio-cultural dimensions. The identified correspondence between the typology proposed within this study and ideas concerning the diversity of cognitive regimes, the institutionalisation of knowledge, and the risks of heritage universalisation allows for an expansion of the interpretative boundaries of tradition, not merely as an object of safeguarding, but as an active epistemological resource.

## Conclusions

In the course of the research, it was documented that within the Ukrainian cultural environment,

tradition functioned as a form of epistemological presence, independent of written or institutionalised channels of knowledge. It was established that oral-vocal, artisanal, culinary-domestic, and ritual-corporeal practices ensured not only the preservation of cultural content but also formed stable models of cognitive interaction. In particular, it was evidenced that Ukrainian Cossack songs, gastronomic, and artisanal traditions served as effective mechanisms for transmitting historical memory, moral-ethical conceptions, and technical-symbolic knowledge, which were passed down through generations via the practice of participation, ritualised repetitiveness, and corporeal interaction. It was revealed that these forms were capable of transmitting cognitive structures even in the absence of formal education or written media. The conducted comparison with the experience of Spain, Italy, and Romania made it possible to outline common and distinct models of representing intangible cultural heritage as knowledge. It was determined that in all the studied countries, tradition functioned as a means of fixing not only cultural identity but also socio-normative structures, representing shared experience in forms such as music, ritual, craft, and gastronomy. At the same time, differences in the degree of formalisation of these forms were recorded: while Spain and Italy demonstrated a high level of normative institutionalisation of ICH elements, Ukraine was at a stage of transitional system stabilisation, and Romania was distinguished by its emphasis on artisanal support through state policy.

The systematisation of the identified data allowed for the formulation of a typology of traditions as epistemological models, within which four forms of knowledge transmission were distinguished: oral-vocal, ritual-corporeal, culinary-domestic, and artisanal-visual. Each of them was characterised by specific mechanisms for preserving and transmitting cognitive content that existed outside textual codes. It was ascertained that these forms possessed an internal structure that ensured not only repetitiveness but also adaptability to a changing environment, as evidenced particularly in the conditions of cultural transformation caused by war. A limitation of the study was its focus primarily on representative practices already recognised or inventoried at the national or international level, which limits the coverage of local or marginalised forms of intangible heritage that remain outside legal and academic focus. Promising directions for further research include studying the dynamics of intangible heritage transformation under conditions of migration processes, armed conflict, and digitalisation, as well as analysing the interaction between local epistemologies and global mechanisms of cultural legitimation.

### Acknowledgements

None.

### Funding

No financial support was provided.

### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

### References

- [1] Akimov, M., Pokhylenko, I., Chernikova, I., & Zoriana, B. (2024). Current issues in the criminal legal protection of cultural heritage in Ukraine. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 14(1), 167-170. doi: [10.33543/140139167170](https://doi.org/10.33543/140139167170).
- [2] Beznosiuk, O. (2024). Intangible cultural heritage in the general field of cultural heritage: Organizational, legal, and scientific approaches to studying it. *Geography and Tourism*, 76, 11-17. doi: [10.17721/2308-135x.2024.76.11-17](https://doi.org/10.17721/2308-135x.2024.76.11-17).
- [3] Beidyk, O.O., Donetc, I.A., Arabadji, O.S., & Arsenenko, I.A. (2024). Intangible cultural heritage of Ukraine: Scientific and practical significance, structure, and development prospects. *Journal of Geology Geography and Geoecology*, 33(1), 35-43. doi: [10.15421/112404](https://doi.org/10.15421/112404).

- [4] Bortolotto, C. (2024). The embarrassment of heritage alienability. *Current Anthropology*, 65(1), 100-122. doi: [10.1086/728686](https://doi.org/10.1086/728686).
- [5] Braber, N., & Howard, V. (2023). Safeguarding language as intangible cultural heritage. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*. Retrieved from <https://www.ijih.org/volumes/article/1090>.
- [6] Chmil, H., Kuznietsova, I., Mishchenko, M., Oliynyk, O., & Demeshchenko, V. (2021). Intangible cultural heritage as a resource for consolidating modern Ukrainian society. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 747-760. doi: [10.21744/lingcure.v5ns4.1713](https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns4.1713).
- [7] Code of the Cultural and Landscape Heritage. (2004, January). Retrieved from <https://surl.li/fcywrb>.
- [8] Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. (2003, September). Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>.
- [9] Hryhorchak, I. (2020). Safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage in terms of globalisation: International practice and Ukrainian realities. *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, 2, 10-16. doi: [10.32461/2226-3209.2.2020.220337](https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.2.2020.220337).
- [10] Kumar, T.G. (2022). Identification, documentation and promotion of cultural heritage: Problems and prospects in the Indian context. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 14(6), 950-962. doi: [10.1108/jchmsd-03-2022-0043](https://doi.org/10.1108/jchmsd-03-2022-0043).
- [11] Law No. 126 "On the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage". (2015, May). Retrieved from <https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2015-5794>.
- [12] Law of the Romanian Parliament No. 26 "On the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage". (2008, February). Retrieved from <https://legislatie.just.ro/public/detaiIdocument/90098>.
- [13] Law of Ukraine No. 1805-III "On the Protection of Cultural Heritage". (2000, June). Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1805-14#Text>.
- [14] Legislative Decree No. 162 "On Implementation of Directives 2004/49/EC and 2004/51/EC On the Safety and Development of the Community's Railways". (2007, December). Retrieved from <https://www.normattiva.it/uri-res/N2Ls?urn:nir:stato:decreto.legislativo:2007-08-10:162>.
- [15] Mazzocchi, F. (2022). Diving deeper into the concept of 'cultural heritage' and its relationship with epistemic diversity. *Social Epistemology*, 36(3), 393-406. doi: [10.1080/02691728.2021.2023682](https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2021.2023682).
- [16] Melis, C., & Chambers, D. (2021). The construction of intangible cultural heritage: A Foucauldian critique. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 89, article number 103206. doi: [10.1016/j.annals.2021.103206](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103206).
- [17] Milenković, M. (2024). *Intangible cultural heritage and reconciliation in the Western Balkans: An anthropological perspective*. London: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781003495710](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003495710).
- [18] Mitrica, A. (2022). *In the UNESCO patrimony: The unique craft of carpet weaving in Romania and Moldavian Republic*. Retrieved from <https://www.madewithloveromania.com/post/in-the-unesco-patrimony-the-unique-craft-of-carpet-weaving-in-romania-and-moldavian-republic>.
- [19] Moroko, A. (2024). Legal and regulatory aspects of archaeological heritage protection in contemporary Ukraine: General overview and opportunities for improvement. *Ancient Life*, 15, 21-32. doi: [10.37098/va-2024-15-21-32](https://doi.org/10.37098/va-2024-15-21-32).
- [20] Munoz-Vinas, S. (2023). *A theory of cultural heritage: Beyond the intangible*. London: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781003288121](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003288121).
- [21] Navrátilová, B. (2024). Elements of the intangible cultural heritage of Ukraine in the construction of the national identity. In *Proceeding of the 5<sup>th</sup> congress of Slavic geographers and ethnographers* (pp. 343-356). Belgrade: Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić". doi: [10.46793/CSGE5.343BN](https://doi.org/10.46793/CSGE5.343BN).
- [22] Okhrimenko, M. (2022). Protection of cultural heritage during wartime in Ukraine: Legislation and practical aspects of implementation. *Text and Image Essential Problems in Art History*, 1, 51-66. doi: [10.17721/2519-4801.2022.1.05](https://doi.org/10.17721/2519-4801.2022.1.05).

- [23] Ordinance of the Cabinet of the Ministers of Ukraine No. 84-p "On Approval of An Action Plan to Support the Cultural Sector, Protect Cultural Heritage, Develop Creative Industries and Tourism". (2021, February). Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/84-2021-%D1%80#Text>.
- [24] Ortiz, S.L., & de Madariaga, C.J. (2021). The UNESCO convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage: A critical analysis. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 28(3), 327-341. doi: [10.1080/10286632.2021.1941914](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2021.1941914).
- [25] Petrenko, L., & Brach, Y. (2024). Socio-pedagogical prerequisites for the formation of A. Karyshyn's scientific heritage. *Ukrainian Professional Education*, 8(2), 33-40. doi: [10.33989/2519-8254.2024.16.314286](https://doi.org/10.33989/2519-8254.2024.16.314286).
- [26] Plachinta, I., Tsurkan, T., Namestiuik, S., Nykiforchuk, Z., & Nykyforuk, T. (2024). Philosophical specificity of religious outlook and modern Ukrainian culture formation. *Current Issues of Social Sciences and History of Medicine*, 1, 67-71. doi: [10.24061/2411-6181.12.024.418](https://doi.org/10.24061/2411-6181.12.024.418).
- [27] Polishchuk, L., & Hrach, M. (2023). War and heritage: Experience of preserving cultural identity. *Current Issues in Research Conservation and Restoration of Historic Fortifications*, 2023(19), 43-53. doi: [10.23939/fortifications2023.19.043](https://doi.org/10.23939/fortifications2023.19.043).
- [28] Qechai, S. (2023). UNESCO and the shaping of intangible cultural heritage: Exploring its significance and implications. *Journal of Human and Social Sciences of the Academy of the Kingdom of Morocco*, 2(1), 113-124. doi: [10.34874/PRSM.shs-arm-vol2iss1.36815](https://doi.org/10.34874/PRSM.shs-arm-vol2iss1.36815).
- [29] Rachkov, Y. (2024). Problems of the preservation, management, and popularization of the intangible cultural heritage of Ukraine in Wartime. *Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series History*, 65, 228-256. doi: [10.26565/2220-7929-2024-65-10](https://doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2024-65-10).
- [30] Royal Decree No. 385/2017 "On Transhumance as a Representative Manifestation of Intangible Cultural Heritage". (2017, April). Retrieved from [https://www.boe.es/diario\\_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2017-4009](https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2017-4009).
- [31] Santamarina, B. (2023). The global competition of the intangible. UNESCO as a producer of heritage brands. *Heritage & Society*, 16(3), 251-270. doi: [10.1080/2159032x.2023.2226572](https://doi.org/10.1080/2159032x.2023.2226572).
- [32] Smeets, R. (2023). The reorientation of a convention: UNESCO, intangible heritage, and sustainable development. In C. Bortolotto & A. Skounti (Eds.), *Intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development: Inside a UNESCO convention* (pp. 36-54). London: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781003244158-4](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003244158-4).
- [33] Stefano, M.L. (2021). *Practical considerations for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage*. London: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781003034216](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003034216).
- [34] Tamrazyan, H., & Hovhannisyan, G. (2025). Cultural categorization in epigraphic heritage digitization. *Heritage*, 8(5), article number 148. doi: [10.3390/heritage8050148](https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage8050148).
- [35] Ubertazzi, B. (2022). *Intangible cultural heritage, sustainable development and intellectual property: International and European perspectives*. Cham: Springer. doi: [10.1007/978-3-031-08104-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08104-0).
- [36] Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies. (n.d.). *Elements of the intangible cultural heritage of Ukraine*. Retrieved from <https://uccr.org.ua/nks/elementy-nks/>.
- [37] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.a). *Art of Neapolitan "Pizzaiuolo"*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-neapolitan-pizzaiuolo-00722>.
- [38] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). *Cossack's songs of Dnipropetrovsk region*. Retrieved from <https://surl.li/bxokmi>.
- [39] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2022). *Culture of Ukrainian borscht cooking inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*. Retrieved from <https://surl.li/crmenu>.

- [40] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.b). *Doina*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/doina-00192>.
- [41] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.c). *Flamenco*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/flamenco-00363>.
- [42] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.d). *Human towers*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/human-towers-00364>.
- [43] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.e). *Mediterranean diet*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/mediterranean-diet-00884>.
- [44] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.f). *Opera dei Pupi, Sicilian puppet theatre*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/opera-dei-pupi-sicilian-puppet-theatre-00011>.
- [45] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.g). *Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/tradition-of-kosiv-painted-ceramics-01456>.
- [46] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.h). *Traditional wall-carpet craftsmanship in Romania and the Republic of Moldova*. Retrieved from <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-wall-carpet-craftsmanship-in-romania-and-the-republic-of-moldova-01167>.
- [47] Yan, W.-J., & Li, K.-R. (2023). Sustainable cultural innovation practice: Heritage education in universities and creative inheritance of intangible cultural heritage craft. *Sustainability*, 15(2), article number 1194. doi: [10.3390/su15021194](https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021194).
- [48] Zoannos, N., Chourdaki, P., & Assimakopoulos, N. (2023). Can UNESCO use blockchain to ensure the intangible cultural heritage of humanity? A systemic approach that explains the why, how, and difficulties of such a venture. *Heritage*, 6(3), 3232-3255. doi: [10.3390/heritage6030171](https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage6030171).

## Епістемологія традицій: філософські виклики збереження нематеріальної культурної спадщини

### Алла Кравченко

Доктор філософських наук, доцент  
Державний торговельно-економічний університет  
02156, вул. Кіото, 19, м. Київ, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8429-2183>

### Ірина Кизименко

Кандидат історичних наук, доцент  
Державний торговельно-економічний університет  
02156, вул. Кіото, 19, м. Київ, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2148-9488>

### Наталія Гусєва

Кандидат історичних наук, доцент  
Державний торговельно-економічний університет  
02156, вул. Кіото, 19, м. Київ, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6062-6406>

**Анотація.** Метою дослідження було встановити типологію нематеріальних традицій як форм епістемологічного знання на прикладі українського культурного середовища; додатково проведено порівняння з відповідними практиками в Іспанії, Італії та Румунії для виявлення структурних відмінностей і точок перетину. Методологічну основу становив порівняльний аналіз форм репрезентації нематеріальної культурної спадщини у національних контекстах з урахуванням правових рамок, інституційної легітимації та способів передачі знання. Аналіз проводився на основі офіційних документів, елементів списку Організації Об'єднаних Націй з питань освіти, науки і культури (ЮНЕСКО) та національних законодавчих джерел. У результаті було виявлено, що традиція функціонує як інструмент збереження та передачі не лише культурного змісту, але й структурованого знання. Зафіксовано чотири ключові форми трансляції знання: усно-вокальна, тілесно-обрядова, кулінарно-побутова та ремісничо-візуальна. Кожна з них демонструвала специфічну модель епістемічної присутності: від емоційної пам'яті (у піснях та вербальних жанрах) до практичного втілення знання у матеріальних формах (кулінарія, ремесла). Усі чотири країни мали формалізовані системи збереження нематеріальної культурної спадщини, проте виявлені розбіжності в глибині інтеграції традицій у національні інститути: Іспанія та Італія демонстрували стабільну нормативну модель, Румунія – цілеспрямовану підтримку ремесел, а Україна перебувала на етапі інституційного переходу в умовах воєнної нестабільності. Систематизація отриманих результатів дозволила визначити традицію як форму соціального знання, що виконує нормативну, практичну й ідентифікаційну функцію. Було показано, що нематеріальна спадщина вимагає не лише етнографічного або правового підходу, але й епістемологічного осмислення як носія знання, репрезентованого у невербальних, тілесних, образних або ритуалізованих формах. Практична значимість дослідження полягала у розробці підходу до аналізу нематеріальної спадщини як складника системи трансляції знання в умовах соціальних трансформацій

**Ключові слова:** епістемологія; культура; культурна спадщина; традиція; емоційна пам'ять; інтеграція; нестабільність