

Development factors of museology around the world

Saloyeva Ozoda

National Institute of Painting and
Design named after Kamoliddin Behzod
Faculty of Art Studies and Museum Studies
4th year museum management and cultural tourism
student

Abstract

This article talks about changes in the field of museums and museology around the world, and the factors of their formation. In addition, the researches of museum scientists are studied on an evolutionary basis, and the article also contains some information about the inclusion of museology as an independent science in the field of education and training of specialists.

Keywords: field of museology, the professional museologists, Museum studies, organization of ICOM, studio, office

Introduction

The history of museology may be considered as a constantly evolving process with creation of its methodological foundations, with separation of museology from other related subjects and its formation as a science. There are different views on the periodization of museology and stages of development. In the early 1980s, the Czech museologist Zbynek Stransky defined the developmental stages of museology.¹ He later reviewed his theory and instead proposed a more reliable, more accurate periodicity, and it was this study that gained fame throughout the world museology. His theory was used for the dissertation of Peter van Mensch. Ivo Maroevich, on the other hand, developed his own periodic system from this work. Stransky explained three stages in the development of museology: the pre-scientific, the empirical-descriptive, and the theoretical-analytical stages. The pre-scientific phase of museology dates back to the Renaissance. At this stage of museology, it emerged as an additional science among related disciplines. Museology became a practical subject from additional science during this period. The process of professionalization of the museum studying had begun. The first and second stages of museology were clarified in 1883 in the article "Museology as a scientific science" by I.G. Grasse with the features of the development of museology.² The main attention of experts during this period was focused on practical aspects of museum work, empirical aspects of museology, and development of museology. The study of museology had remained within the framework of traditional university disciplines. Z. Stransky, who generalized experience of museum practice, considers this feature as the beginning of the third stage. The stage of theory and synthesis is explained by the creation of the theoretical foundations of museology and its separation from the practical type as an independent scientific science. This phase began in the mid-1960s. In 1965, the seventh General

¹ Лоренте П. Х. Развитие музеологии как университетской дисциплины: от технической подготовки к критической музеологии // Вопросы музеологии. 2011. № 2 (4). С. 45–64.

² Mensch P. van. Towards a methodology of museology. Ph. D. thesis, University of Zagreb, 1992. Chapter IX. Professionalism and museology. See in the site: <http://www.muuseum.ee/uploads/files/mensch09.htm>

Conference of the International Association of Museums of History (ICOM) was held in New York.³ It was decided that theoretical museology courses should be taught in university courses.

The peculiarities of this period are important not only for significant growth of theoretical works on museology, but also for unification of professional societies of museology within the ICOM. The establishment of the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM) in 1976 was an important event.⁴ ICOM's activities were set in motion. Museum sources contain a wealth of information on manuscript and printed catalogs, descriptions of private collections of the Renaissance, cabinet of curiosities, studiolo, cabinets and grotto, and the largest proto-museum forms in European history. Their purpose is to explicate to the public the importance of such art collections.

One of the first to promote museums was the French writer and art critic Quatremère de Quincy, who called museums "warehouses," "depositories," and "mausoleums," and said that they were depriving artefacts of vitality and quality as ancient cultural heritage.⁵ Later, his views had an impact on the work of culturologists and philosophers such as W. Benjamin, T. Adorno, M. Heidegger, as well as in the artistic movement of futurism and surrealism.

In the early nineteenth century, the German philosopher *Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel* opposed this theory. According to Hegel, works of art have a performative character, and art is "At first a cultural sign which has torn its roots. A work of art does not have to live in its native land like an ordinary object. More opportunities are created to learn and feel with the heart by putting them in a separate place. Here artefact does not lose its original magic, on the contrary it is fully understood with new thinking."⁶

In 1839, the term "museology" first appeared in the scientific literature. Georg Ratgeber (curator of the collections of the *Duke of Saxe-Gotha-Altenburg*) used the term twice in 1839, first in the work, "Dutch Coins and Medals in the Duke's Museum", and later in the preface to his four-volume "Traditions in the Dutch Fine Arts, Sculpture, and Engraving". Subsequent research work (1839-1844) was devoted to the description of various works of art. In his book "History of Dutch Art and the Structure of Museology", G. Ratgeber reminds of the need for scientific approach to museology, order of storage, organization and description of art collections. The term museology was not used in the next book of Ratgeber which was republished in the Netherlands, but he uses the term "description of cabinets."⁷ In the late 1830s, the emergence of the term "museology" stayed irrelevant. His authorship for the term "museology" was revived due to new researches of François Mairesse, and *André Desvallées*. G. Ratgeber wrote scientific works on the museology of art collections, and soon the term began to be applied to natural-scientific collections. Philipp Leopold Martin, a German naturalist, ornithologist and taxidermist, the founder of modern museum dermoplasty, was the first to do so. His three-volume book entitled "Practice of Natural History" (Weimar, 1869-1882) has long been a basic guide for all museums that study and display natural specimens. This manual, published in 1870, was called "Dermoplasty or Museology, or the Preparation of Animal skin, Placement and Preservation of Nature Collections".⁸ Although Philipp Martin did not fully and clearly explain the term "museology"

³ Ключевые понятия музеологии / Editors: A. Desvallées, F. Mairesse. [М.,] 2012 // http://www.icom.org.ru/docs/A206_ICOM.brochure.2012.05.press.pdf

⁴ Boylan P. J. ICOM at fifty // *Museum International*. 1996. Vol. 191. № 3. P. 47–50.

⁵ Чернышева М. А. Катрмер де Кенси о мимесисе. Классический концепт в классицистической теории искусства // Актуальные проблемы теории и истории искусства: сб. науч. статей. Вып. 5. / Под ред. С.В. Мальцевой, Е.Ю. Станюкович-Денисовой, А.В. Захаровой. — СПб.: НП-Принт, 2015. С. 689–696. — ISSN 2312-2129

⁶ Бим-Бад Б. М., Гавров С. Н. Гегель как практик и теоретик образования // Модернизация института семьи: макросоциологический, экономический и антрополого-педагогический анализ. Монография. — М.: Интеллектуальная книга, Новый хронограф, 2010. — С. 230–238. — ISBN 978-5-94881-139-0.

⁷ Meijer-Mensch van. L. New challenges, new priorities: analyzing ethical dilemmas from a stakeholder's perspective in the Netherlands // *Museum Management and Curatorship*. 2011. Vol. 26. № 2. P. 113–128.

⁸ *Masson G. Les réseaux professionnels du conservateur de musée: d'une sociabilité informelle à une organisation institutionnelle (1870–1940)* // <http://hicsa.univparis1.fr/documents/pdf/Ecole%doctorale/Geraldine%20Masson.pdf>

in this work, modern scholars believe that he meant the practice and methodology of organizing expositions, preservation of museum objects.

P.V. Mensch rightly points out that the term "museumology" is the first term in museum work and because of it scientific methodology did not answer for the questions such as gathering collections, their conservation methods, registration, storage, creation of exhibits at that time. Nevertheless, the practice and theory of museum work were, as a rule, integrated into science according to their field, and museumology was considered to be a practical science.

Von Grasse's article (1883), in which he considered museumology as an independent science, begins with the following words: "If someone 30 or even 20 years ago said that museumology was an independent branch of science, many people would have ridiculed him, looked at him with sympathy or suspicion."⁹ In other words, according to the scientist, museumology had become an independent science during this period. He focused on empirical-descriptive, ignoring theoretical foundations. The publication of this article marks the beginning of professionalization in the field of museums. Many of the problems inherent in all museums have broadened the attitude to the field.

Representatives of the University of Frankfurt Institute for Social Research, founded in the 1930s, promoted critical ideas in the development of museum work (Germany. Frankfurt and Main School of Art). A characteristic feature of them had a negative attitude towards modern capitalist society. Formation of false artistic thinking through media, ideological struggle, racial, national, class and other differences were taken as a basis. At the heart of the ideas of postmodernism there were also fundamental ideological differences. Its supporters, based on the tragic historical events of the twentieth century, stressed the need to abandon large-scale art projects and develop small-scale popular art projects. Such ideas formed a new critical attitude. The task was to discover not only known sides of history, but also unknown sides. It was recognized by critical museumologists that the collection had reflected the life of the collectors' ruling classes. They also criticized seizing national legacies of other countries, looting heritage of small national ethnic groups. P.V. Mensch wrote the difference between the new critical museumology and museumology noting that "the new museum work as public museum is busy with creating a positive image of its society, the critical museumology is busy with creating a negative critical image of its society." The idea of postmodernism flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries at the Center for Museum Thought - the School of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester (UK). In the works of Susan Pierce, it is analyzed whether collecting requires a separate cultural experience or not. In her view, systematic collections do not reflect actual real events. In the researches of Eilean Hooper Greenhill educational activities of museums were analyzed based on postmodernism. She focuses on new hermeneutic ways of the museum communication. In Rigord Sandel's work, activities of museums are closely intertwined with social life, and museums are seen as a means of creating an artistic imagination in society. The evolution of museumology continued during this period as an important part of knowledge in general.

It was necessary for museum scholars to analyze the issues on a scientific basis and find solutions to the problems facing museums. There was some growth in the 1950s and 1960s, especially in the second half of the 1970s, which was associated with the International Committee for Museumology (ICOFOM).¹⁰ Scientific directions in the social block included the issues of determining status of museumologists, the structure of applied museumology, methods of application, essence of the museum objects, its functions, information capabilities, etc. which were discussed by Russian scientists (A.M.Razgon, D.A.Ravikovich, A.B.Zaks), Czechoslovak museumologists (I.Neustupniy, Y.Benesh, Z.Stransky, A.Gregorova), Croatian museumologists (A.Bauer, I.Maroevich, T.Shola), and German museumologists (Klaus Schreiner, J. Jan). Familiarisation with the theoretical works of Central and

⁹ И.Г.Т.Фон Грассе и его роль в развитии музеологии второй половины XIX в. **Source:** Problems of Museumology . 2015, Issue 2, p17-21.
^{5p.} **Author(s):** В. Г., Ананьев; Е. Н., Метелкин. Site: <https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct>

¹⁰ *Décarolis N.* ICOFOM LAM 1990–2000 // *Cahiers d'étude / Study series.* 2000. Vol. 8. P. 14–15.

Eastern European scientists in the 1980s changed Western museology in many aspects.

In Russia, the first Museum Research Institute was opened in 1955, which was mainly engaged in collecting artefacts in museums, preservation and repair of monuments and the preparation of excursion programs for museums. In 1978, Scientific museum studying laboratory was established at the Central Revolutionary Museum. In this laboratory scientific manuals were created not only for the scientific repair of museum objects, but also for the organization of museum work, and special source-studies analysis was carried out. In 1992, the Museum Studying Research Institute was renamed the Russian Institute for Cultural Studies. The first branch called "Museum work and preservation of monuments" to educate specialists for museum studies was opened in 1988 at the Leningrad State Institute of Culture (now the Saint-Petersburg State Institute of Culture) on the basis of "Culture and Art" department. In 1992, on the basis of the existing set of specialists, the department of "Museum Studies and Excursion Studies" was established, and in 2010 it turned into faculty with the same name.¹¹ The first in the CIS, on the basis of the educational programs of this department, the concept of special curricula for the training of museologists and science programs were formed.

In Uzbekistan the first students were selected for the Museum Studies in the Tashkent State Institute of Arts named after Mannon Uygun in 1992, for the Department of "History and Theory of Fine Arts" of the Faculty of Fine Arts. First students were admitted to this course on an experimental basis, including Dilafruz Muhsinova Kadirova, who is Doctor of Arts now. In this regard, Ph.D. Kadirova said: "In 1992, I was admitted to the Department of History and Theory of Fine Arts, but at the beginning of the academic year, due to the need to train museologists in Uzbekistan, six students as a separate experimental group were selected to the branch "Museum Studies and Preservation of Monuments". Within the framework of specialty disciplines, we have been introduced with the disciplines "Fundamentals of Museum Work" and "Source Studies". Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor Dresvyanskaya Galina Anatolyevna began to teach these subjects. On the basis of five years of education, I graduated from the institute in 1998. The diploma states that I entered the Tashkent State Institute of Arts named after Mannon Uygun in 1992 and graduated from the National Institute of Fine Art and Design named after Kamoliddin Behzod in 1998 with the degree of museologist, who studied in the branch of Museum Studies and Preservation of Monuments.¹² After the graduating this course, in 1999 on the basis of the department "History and Theory of Fine Arts" a new department named "Museum Studies" was opened. Ravshan Sadullaevich Fatkhullaev, a young specialist, candidate of art sciences, was appointed the head of the department. Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor Nafisa Sodikova, Doctor of Historical Sciences Jannat Hamidovna Ismailova, Doctor of Art Sciences Valentina Vitalevna Lunyova, Doctor of Architecture Mavluda Aminjanovna Yusupova, Candidate of Art History Zuhra Ibrohimova Rahimova and others were invited to teach at the Department of Museum Studies. In the same year, a master's degree in museology, 2002 17.00.07 - a postgraduate course in Museology conservation, repair and preservation of historical and cultural sites were opened. In 2008-2009, postgraduate students D.T. Kuryazova and D.A. Kurbanova defended their dissertations and received the degree of Candidate of Historical Sciences, majoring in museology. In 2020, D. Kurbanova, continuing her research work, was awarded the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences, majoring in museology.

Reference:

1. Лоренте П. Х. Развитие музеологии как университетской дисциплины: от технической подготовки к критической музеологии // Вопросы музеологии. 2011. № 2 (4). С. 45–64.

¹¹

www.spbgik.ru/cathedra/Kafedra-muzeologii-i-kulturnogo-naslediya/int_cathedra/23-Istoriya/

¹² This information was recorded during an interview with D.M. Kadirova, Doctor of Arts.

2. Mensch P. van. Towards a methodology of museology. Ph. D. thesis, University of Zagreb, 1992. Chapter IX. Professionalism and museology. See in the site: <http://www.muuseum.ee/uploads/files/mensch09.htm>
3. Ключевые понятия музеологии / Editors: A. Desvallées, F. Mairesse. [M.,] 2012 // http://www.icom.org.ru/docs/A206_ICOM.brochure.2012.05.press.pdf
4. Boylan P. J. ICOM at fifty // Museum International. 1996. Vol. 191. № 3. P. 47–50.
5. Чернышева М. А. Катрмер де Кенси о мимесисе. Классический концепт в классицистической теории искусства // Актуальные проблемы теории и истории искусства: сб. науч. статей. Вып. 5. / Под ред. С.В. Мальцевой, Е.Ю. Станюкович-Денисовой, А.В. Захаровой. – СПб.: НП-Принт, 2015. С. 689–696. – ISSN 2312-2129
6. Бим-Бад Б. М., Гавров С. Н. Гегель как практик и теоретик образования // Модернизация института семьи: макросоциологический, экономический и антрополого-педагогический анализ.
7. Монография. — М.: Интеллектуальная книга, Новый хронограф, 2010. — С. 230—238. — ISBN 978-5-94881-139-0.
8. Meijer-Mensch van. L. New challenges, new priorities: analyzing ethical dilemmas from a stakeholder's perspective in the Netherlands // Museum Management and Curatorship. 2011. Vol. 26. № 2. P. 113–128.
9. Masson G. Les réseaux professionnels du conservateur de musée: d'une sociabilité informelle à une organisation institutionnelle (1870–1940) // <http://hicsa.univparis1.fr/documents/pdf/Ecole%20doctorale/Geraldine%20Masson.pdf>
10. И.Г.Т.Фон Грассе и его роль в развитии музеологии второй половины XIX в. **Source:** Problems of Museology . 2015, Issue 2, p17-21. 5p. **Author(s):** В. Г., Ананьев; Е. Н., Метелкин. Site: <https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct>
11. Decarolis N. ICOFOM LAM 1990–2000 // Cahiers d'étude / Study series. 2000. Vol. 8. P. 14–15.
www.spbgik.ru/cathedra/Kafedra-muzeologii-i-kulturnogo-naslediya/int_cathedra/23-Istoriya/
12. This information was recorded during an interview with D.M. Kadirova, Doctor of Arts.
13. Resolution of the Academy of Arts of Uzbekistan No. 19580-20 of December 31, 2017, based on the statement of the meeting held under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Sh.M. Mirziyoev on December 25, 2017 to discuss the reports of the Ministry of Culture and the Academy of Arts.