

CERAMIC, TRADITION AND SOCIOLOGY: APPROACHING TURKISH CERAMIC PRACTICE

Dr. Nadide Karkiner¹

A. Hilmi Balci²

Turkey has been under the effect of crises, which is formed by the sudden meet of the modernisation with the style of Japan. The situation of this unawareness is felt on the sphere of culture and identity. Against such violent erosion of cultural heritage, there occurs the impossibility of a social, cultural and political resistance. Anatolia is a nation-state that is originated from the last parts of the Ottoman Empire as a province, which the heaviest embargo, is imposed on it. At this point, modernisation is not conceptualised easily and stand in front of the Academy, which is not, provided an agreement on it by most of the social scientists especially by historians and philosophers.

The weakness of the vertical and horizontal division of labour in academism creates the dominance of indefiniteness. Academism is not in a real awareness of these crises. Till the establishment of republic, it would have been impossible to follow the archaeological, cultural and anthropologic continuities of Anatolia as a concept of heritage. The ethno-archaeological wealth of the Anatolia would be one of the important elements of the newly established nation-state. With the anthropological and archaeological studies, it was constructed a direct relation to the pre-Islam past of the society. However, this relation could not provide the production of local craft.

With the effect of modernisation, all dimensions of traditional production in rural areas including traditional wood architect experienced a process of elimination. Even today, it has been debated directly, which, the cultural politics of the new nation-state continued with transfer of the westernisation at macro level. The phenomenon that is special to Turkey as itself causes a distance between public and private spheres, which has been the social tradition of the Ottoman Empire. The unavoidable intersection of these two spheres has been repressing heavily the civil sphere. The unorganised structure of civil sphere caused the disappearance in

¹ Department of Sociology, Anadolu University, Eskisehir, Turkey

² Part-time instructor, Department of Ceramic and Glass, Faculty of Fine Arts, Istanbul, Turkey

the traditional forms of production.

As a result of the situation above, the material dimension of the tradition is excluded from the academic context because of the weakness in the international corporations of the academicians.

The art of ceramic has been has a special place in this material tradition. The social history of ceramic will give serious clues us about the pre-Islamic, Islamic and nation-state periods of Turkey. The potential of Anatolian ceramic is qualitatively and quantitatively older and varied than the ceramic in Europe. *Cercilik* has been ambivalent in Southeastern region of Turkey since Neolithic period as the same meaning with ceramic. *Cercilik* means to exchange commodities that have use values without using money. This existent phenomenon signifies the ethno-archaeological power of the ceramic, which unfortunately, informs us about the weakness of interdisciplinary academic studies.

The attempt of Prof. Dr. Güngör Güner in the last 1970's could be taken as an exceptional the first research about primitive ceramic production types that are belong to Anatolian tradition. This study that is funded by Switzerland, is the most determinate international study about the ceramic heritage in Turkey. This study proves that the last samples of the tradition of ceramic production have been seen in Anatolia since 7000-7200 AC.

Neither in the area of academy or in industrial ceramic, it would be impossible to transform this heritage to a research programme. In Turkey, although ceramic lies in-between the conceptualisation of art and craft, the weakness of the interaction between them makes the sociological point of view of debate. Also, the debate is related to the politics of the production of industrial ceramic. The industrial bourgeoisie of Turkey has not had relations with rurality at aesthetic and cultural levels by breaking the interaction with tradition.

The most known ceramic artist in Turkey who transforms the tradition to contemporary ceramic form is Alev Ebüzziya. At this point:

In 1963, she moved to Copenhagen, first joining Royal Copenhagen Porcelain Manufactory and than opening her own workshop. She worked in Copenhagen for 20 years till her move to Paris in 1987 (Clark, 1999: 10).

Her situation gives us deep clues to about the relation of tradition to modernisation.

Alev Ebuzyiyya's pottery techniques based upon part to the fact that the pots are hand built with coils of clay rather than thrown (Clark, 1999: 8).

Anatolian women not only in ceramic but also in cooking and bakery have used the coiling technique. Beside the production of spaghetti by bakery, Anatolian women produce ceramic in poverty. The relation of Anatolia, women and ceramic has not been still studied in Turkey.

At this point, Gary Clark (1999) told about a letter of Alev Ebuzyiyya that she wrote to her family. This letter shows us that modern ceramic is very open to intercultural interactions according to aesthetic and middle east point of view:

In a recent letter the artist wrote openly and movingly about her first conscious confrontation with Sung pottery. Interestingly what she first stumbled across was not a bow but a horse. She was amazed how immediately and deeply she was moved and confessed that she has not seen a more noble and more beautiful horse: "there it stood, perfectly still, yet shaking the earth and the air around it. Just like the Archaic Kouros statues, like a sphinx, like early Anatolian statues, monumental Mesopotamian figures. Hittite reliefs and endless blue seas. The very source of my emotional and cultural heritage. Without any pretension, this trembling and timeless stillness is the very "thing" I want in my pots. It is not an intellectual need, the need not to forget the need to remember again and again. I wonder if Sung pottery would have impressed as strongly had I not known the cultures I was surrounded with since my childhood (Clark, 1999: 11).

This example shows us that cultures are inter-geographical. For the intersection of cultures, the Europe and Anatolia reciprocally need each other.

At this point, the knowledge of ceramic could be formulated as migrant. The migrant position of ceramic will be understood by the need to provide an increase in reciprocal interaction. This is possible by forming a relation to the primitive archaeological ceramic in rural Anatolia This interaction is formulated as a co-operation with academicians both in Turkey and in EU countries to transform the sphere of ceramic from the traditional and national context to an international platform.

As a resulting argument, it will be possible to construct a meta discourse for the sphere of ceramic in Turkey. In addition, it is necessitated to acquire a multidisciplinary perspective at the range of the archaeometric ceramic, ceramic engineering and ceramic art, archaeology and sociology by evaluating the traditional ceramic culture of Anatolia as an important source.

Euro Ceramics VII

10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.206-213

Ceramic, Tradition and Sociology: Approaching Turkish Ceramic Practice

10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.206-213.913